

Lost MC Raid Inquiry

Investigation into LSPS AFOs in regard to a
attempted search of Lost MC Clubhouse
premises on 8 July 2020

PUBLIC VERSION

Independent Investigation Report

Report Date: 13/07/2020

Report Title: Lost MC Inquiry #1 (2020/1143)

Investigators: M Lockwood, R Snyder, K Jones, A Johnson

Version: Redacted

> Report

The purpose of this report

The purpose of this report is to determine whether there was any criminal offence and/or misconduct on behalf of the police in relation to the complaint submitted by [REDACTED] on 10/07/2020 concerning an attempted search of the Lost MC Clubhouse premises.

The complainant specifically mentions the following Authorised Firearms Officers:

- [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

The investigation

The investigation involved a visit to the premises where the alleged incident took place as well as interviews with all parties involved, those being [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. A concern during our interviews was the large congregation of other firearms officers present outside the interview room at Mission Row PD, the IOPC will need a more suitable venue if this ends up recurring.

The findings of this investigation

We split our investigation into three distinguishable concerns; one being the attempted search of the premises without a warrant, the second is the trespass by a lone officer at the back of the premises before any other officers gained entry through the front gate and the third being [REDACTED] providing an incorrect collar nr.

In regards to the **first concern**, entry and search without warrant, we have found there to be no wrongdoing on behalf of the police based on statements made by [REDACTED] in Appendix 1B. They had reasonable evidence to believe there were firearms on the property and further evidence to believe these firearms could and had been used to endanger life, therefore, giving police grounds to enter without warrant under **Section 17 (1) (e) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984: “[...] enter and search any premises for the purpose of saving life or limb or preventing serious damage to property.”** It is also worth noting that the officers did not actually gain entry to the property at any time with the exception for [REDACTED].

In regards to the **second concern**, [REDACTED] stated during an interview that he lost his footing and fell into the property. Once there he was reluctant to leave immediately as he would have to turn his back on possibly armed individuals.

Lastly, in regards to the **third concern**, it has also been made clear that, when taking Appendix 1A and our interviews into consideration, the reason for providing an incorrect collar nr. was due to a recent change of police unit and heightened adrenaline due to the ongoing situation. Whilst this can be assumed not to have been done out of malice but out of forgetfulness or at worst out of negligence it is still, in the eyes of the IOPC, to be considered a breach of professionalism, however not a serious one at that.

In conclusion, this inquiry finds there to be no evidence to support a serious breach of police procedure or misconduct and no criminal offences committed. It is, however, worth noting that [REDACTED] in our eyes put himself in further danger by staying in the compound instead of leaving as at that point he was completely alone and isolated. He was also further provoking the Lost MC who had already shown their discontent in relation to the officers' presence. To avoid any such incidents in future the IOPC would recommend that officers exercise caution, to in this case avoid falling, especially when involved in such high-tension operations.