



Police and Crime Commissioner for Dyfed-Powys

OPCC Complaint Reviews Reporting period Update Report October - December 2025 Quarter

Contents

Review data	2
Reason for upheld reviews	2
Oversight	3

Review data

Date	Number of reviews received	Number of reviews Upheld	Number of reviews Not Upheld	OPCC average number of days to complete	Sancus average number of days to complete	Number of reviews sent to Sancus
Q3 25/26	13	3	11	18	5	3
Q3 24/25	3	3	0	29	8	3

The OPCC has seen an increase in complaint reviews in comparison to the same period last year.

The number of complaints upheld has stayed the same.

The average days for a review to be completed has reduced in comparison to the same period last year.

The IOPC data can be found on their website here: [Publications Library | Independent Office for Police Conduct \(IOPC\)](#)

Reason for upheld reviews

- 1. Complaint ref: PCC-06112025-7/CO/00433/25 - The complainant is unhappy with the decision to close a case involving their son and a near miss with a vehicle. The complainant believes that there has been a failure to complete necessary enquiries.***

This review was upheld on the basis that the Victims Code of Practice (VCOP) has not been met and that further information was required to address the concerns raised. As a result the following recommendations were made:

- A formal apology to be provided to the victim for not meeting the requirements of VCOP.
- A clear explanation to the victim's mother in how the offence of Careless Driving was reached by the complaint handler instead of "Potentially Dangerous driving" as referenced within the occurrence log.

PSD response

The PSD accepted the recommendations set and provided an apology on behalf of the Force and a further explanation provided.

- 2. Complaint ref: PCC-15122025-1 / CO/37/25 – The complainant is unhappy with the way the officer spoke to them after an incident involving their dog. The complainant is also concerned that their former***

partner, who is a police officer has been allowing their son to ride in a police car and play with a police dog.

The review was upheld as the reviewer determined that there was insufficient / missing information within the outcome letter. Although after considering the documentation provided as part of the review and from undertaking enquiries with the PSD the review was able to provide the additional information as part of the review outcome and therefore determined there was no further recommendations and no response required from PSD.

3. Complaint ref: PCC-16122025-4 / CO/00253/25 - The complainant is unhappy with the attitude of two PCSOs who attended their address regarding a dispute with their neighbours. They are also unhappy with how the police have generally handled the neighbour dispute over many years.

After independently reviewing the Body Worn Video footage provided as part of the review the reviewer disagreed with the complaint handlers findings considering that the service provided by the PCSO was not acceptable. As a result the following recommendations were made:

1. That the PCSO provided with the opportunity to review and reflect on their interaction with the complainant.
2. A formal apology to be provided to the complainant for the service provided by PCSO.

PSD response

The PSD accepted the recommendations set and requested that the complaint handler provides feedback in person via a reflective discussion to the officer in question. Additionally, a letter of apology was sent to the complainant.

Oversight

The local policing bodies will, during the course of the review process, spot anomalies that do not change the outcome being reasonable and proportionate, but where the service in handling the complaint can be improved. The review process provides local policing bodies with the opportunity to address those anomalies, in individual cases, with the appropriate authorities [IOPC-Focus-19-Reviews \(18\).pdf](#)

There were 6 reviews during this period where it was considered the service in handling the complaint could have been improved.

Themes identified as oversight:

- Timeliness in completing complaints.
- 28-day statutory updates not provided.

- Language used within correspondence to the complainant and within the outcome letter was not trauma informed.
- Terminology used was incorrect.
- Allocation of complaint handler – In one case it was determined that the complaint handler was the supervisor of the officer subject to the complaint therefore their independence was questioned.

The OPCC also make a record of any best practice identified from conducting a review. Within one review best practice was identified where the complaint handler identified that there is a lack of support to those impacted by serious and fatal RTCs where they do not fall into the category of victim, witness or family i.e. the suspect/offender. The CH took it upon themselves to raise this at a national level.

This report is provided to the Professional Standards Department Assurance Board for reporting. Further information on the Professional Standards Assurance Board can be found here: [Terms of Reference](#)
