

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS  
BY DEPUTY S.C. FERGUSON OF ST. BRELADE**

**ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 18th JULY 2006**

**Question**

Would the Minister inform members, for each of the last 4 years –

- (a) of the cost of overtime incurred by the Professional Standards Unit?
- (b) of the cost of any additional uniformed officers or civilian staff involved in investigations?
- (c) of the cost of overtime for additional uniformed officers and civilian staff involved in investigations?
- (d) of the cost of covering the absence of uniformed officers and civilian staff on suspension including overtime costs incurred?
- (e) of the cost of secondment of officers from other departments or from the U.K. and of temporary/seconded civilian staff brought in to cover suspensions?
- (f) of the cost of any specialised equipment used by the Professional Standards Unit?
- (g) of the number of applications made for permission to institute a phone tap on officers and civilian staff under investigation?
- (h) of the cost of phone tapping, including legal costs of applications?
- (i) of the percentage of the Deputy Chief Officer's time attributable to investigations?
- (j) of the number of investigations each year?
- (k) of the number of officers and staff charged, arising from investigations?
- (l) of the number of retirements/resignations arising from investigations?
- (m) of the total number of officers retiring in 2005 at 50 and 55 years of age? and,
- (n) of the total number of officers estimated to retire in 2006 at 50 and 55 years of age?

**Answer**

- (a) The total cost of overtime incurred by the Professional Standards Department in the last four years is as follows -

2003 – £793  
2004 – £884  
2005 – £1,933  
2006 – £505.

These are from an annual overtime budget for the Police of £560,000. The Professional Standards Department is probably the least costly department in the Police in respect of overtime.

- (b) There has been no additional cost other than overtime which is dealt with below. Additional officers were

only used on two occasions and as both matters involved serious criminal allegations, the officers were utilised in their normal operational role of investigating crime. As explained in a previous oral answer to the Deputy, duties were re-rostered and other matters re-prioritised, as is usual when serious allegations of crime are made and need to be investigated. One of these two occasions led to lengthy jail sentences at the Royal Court this year for a number of men for drugs importation, as well as other convictions at the Magistrate's Court. The other is being currently considered by H.M. Attorney General.

- (c) This only applies to two particular operations. The first was an operation which resulted in a number of men being given lengthy prison sentences at the Royal Court for importation of drugs, as well as convictions for other men in respect of the fabrication of alibis for guilty persons where they tried to get an innocent person convicted of an assault. This operation lasted three years and cost a total of £37,046 in overtime, but resulted in the jailing of a number of dangerous criminals. This was a Professional Standards Department enquiry, and interestingly is about half the cost of the recent enquiry by Devon and Cornwall into the fatal police crash last year. The second case was a lengthy enquiry into corruption which resulted in an officer being required to resign after pleading guilty to serious discipline charges. The Police were given sanction to proceed with these before the criminal matters were resolved. H.M. Attorney General is now considering the question of a prosecution in this case. The overtime bill for this was £15,855.
- (d) In respect of covering costs for suspended police officers, the answer is the same as that given in the oral answer to Deputy Ferguson on the 20th June 2006. There are no covering costs for police officers. Duties have been re-rostered or tasks re-prioritised. Departments have normally had to absorb the absence of suspended staff in the same manner as those sick or seconded. The one exception was when, in a particular department, the three top civil service staff were suspended for misuse of funds and other assets. That was covered by the temporary promotion of one existing staff member to Head of Department, (since ratified permanently), and the employment of temporary staff for six months. The total cost of this was £26,030 inclusive of the temporary promotion.
- (e) No staff have been brought from the U.K. to fill in for suspended officers or staff. The cost of civilian staff brought in to cover on one occasion only is shown in (d) above.
- (f) The Professional Standards Department does not possess specialised equipment. If required, they use the standard equipment issued to and retained by the Technical Support Unit of the Police.
- (g) and (h)  
For legal and operational reasons, the Police cannot either confirm or deny anything in relation to this. The Police's general operational activity in this area is inspected each year by the Surveillance Commissioner who reports to the States.
- (i) The Deputy Chief Officer does not take part in investigations; he supervises and directs the most serious, sees all files at completion, and decides on the disposal of cases which are not criminal. The answer, therefore, is nil.

(j) Public Complaints –

2003 – 44  
2004 – 38  
2005 – 38  
2006 – 16.

Internal Complaints –

2003 – 11  
2004 – 19  
2005 – 12  
2006 – 8

It will be noticed that the number of complaints made by the public is falling. Internal complaints have risen in line with increased confidence among staff that matters will be effectively dealt with.

- (k) 2003 - one police officer and five civil servants were charged with discipline offences. The police officer and one civil servant later resigned before hearings, three civil servants were sacked at hearings, and one civil servant received a final written warning, but later resigned when he again came under investigation. Additionally, five cases were dealt with by 'words of advice'.

2004 - two police officers and one civil servant were charged with discipline offences; one of the officers was also charged criminally. The two police officers and the civil servant resigned before a hearing. Seven cases were dealt with by 'words of advice'.

2005 - one police officer was charged with discipline offences, pleaded guilty, reprimanded and subject to Service Confidence Procedures. Five cases were dealt with by 'words of advice'.

2006 - two police officers were charged with discipline offences; one was reduced in rank and one was required to resign and is awaiting H.M. Attorney General's decision on criminal charges. Two civil servants were charged with discipline matters and are awaiting hearings. Five matters so far have been dealt with by 'words of advice'.

- (l) 2003 – nil.

2004 - Three police officers and one civil servant resigned whilst under criminal/discipline investigation.

2005 - three police officers and one civil servant resigned whilst under criminal/discipline investigation. One other probationary officer's probation was not confirmed because of the number of similar type assault allegations from the public and other performance issues.

2006 - One police officer was required to resign as an alternative to dismissal after pleading guilty at a hearing; the outcome of criminal investigation is awaited. One police officer resigned after a commercial quantity of drugs was found at the home address shared with a partner and the launch of discipline investigation.

- (m) 2005 - Eight officers retired at the age of 50; two retired who had stayed to 51; one retired at 54; two retired at 55; and one remained to 57. Six of these continued to work within the States, two of them within the States of Jersey Police. Another 11, who could have retired, chose to remain.
- (n) 2006 - Two officers have left this year at the age of 50, but both have remained with the Police in other capacities. One will retire in September at the age of 50. Two retired at 55. Another 14 are eligible to retire but have given no indication that they have any wish to do so.