

independent and effective investigations and reviews

pirc

Police Investigations &  
Review Commissioner

PIRC/00065/18  
December 2018

# Report of a Complaint Handling Review in relation to Police Scotland

---

# What we do

---

We obtain all the material information from Police Scotland and the applicant. We then use this to review how the complaint was dealt with and conclude whether the complaint was handled to a reasonable standard\*. In doing so, we consider factors such as:

- whether Police Scotland carried out sufficient enquiries into the complaint;
- whether Police Scotland's response to the complaint was supported by the material information available;
- whether Police Scotland adhered to the relevant policies, procedures and legal provisions in dealing with the complaint;
- whether Police Scotland's response was adequately reasoned; and
- where the complaint resulted in Police Scotland identifying measures necessary to improve its service, that these measures were adequate and have been implemented.

Finally, where we consider appropriate, we make recommendations, issue reconsideration directions and identify learning points for Police Scotland.

\*Sections 34 and 35 of the Police, Public Order and Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 2006 as amended ("the Act") provide that the Police Investigations and Review Commissioner ("the PIRC") may examine the manner in which particular kinds of complaints are dealt with by Police Scotland.

---

# Executive Summary

---

## The Complaints

The complaints in this case arose in the context of a long running dispute involving the applicant and members of her family, and another family who lived on the same street. We have reviewed two complaints, namely that:

1. on 23 December 2017, an officer was uncivil towards the applicant; and
  2. an officer lied to the applicant regarding a line of enquiry involved in a criminal investigation.
- 

## Police Scotland's Decision

Police Scotland did not uphold either of the applicant's complaints.

---

## Our Findings

We have found that Police Scotland have handled complaint 2 to a reasonable standard; but not complaint 1.

Consequently, we have made two recommendations to address the shortcomings we have identified. In summary, we recommend that further enquiries are carried out in relation to complaint 1; and, that both aspects of complaint 2 are recorded separately. A further response should then be sent to the applicant.

We expect our recommendations to be implemented by Police Scotland within two months of the date of this report.

---

# Background

---

The applicant and her family, including Miss A and Mr B, are involved in a long running dispute with Ms C and her family. This has resulted in both Miss A and Mr B being issued with a 2 year non-harassment order which states they must not approach Ms C or members of her family.

On the 23 December 2017, Miss A and Mr B were at a shopping centre where Ms C and her daughter also happened to be. Ms C alleged that Mr B spent approximately ten minutes staring at her and her daughter in a threatening manner. She called the police from the shopping centre and reported Mr B for breaching the non-harassment order. Constables D and E attended and accompanied Ms C home to take her statement. Miss A also called the police to report the incident.

Constables D and E attended at the applicant's home after taking Ms C's statement. At this point, both officers were aware that Miss A had also reported an incident that may have been linked to that reported by Ms C. The officers asked the applicant if they could speak to Miss A, however the applicant advised that Miss A was not there. She also advised that Ms C was lying about the incident, and suggested that Constables D and E view the CCTV footage from the shopping centre to gain an accurate understanding of events. She alleged Constable D was uncivil towards her, having said that he had no interest in viewing the CCTV and that she was not a party to the complaint.

Whilst the applicant was speaking with Constables D and E, Mr B arrived at the applicant's address. He was thereafter arrested by Constables D and E for breaching the non-harassment order.

The applicant contacted Sergeant F later that same date and advised him of the background to the dispute. She asked Sergeant F if the CCTV from the shopping centre would be viewed as part of their enquiry. She said Sergeant F told her that he would phone her with an update once he had spoken to Constables D and E.

On 25 December 2017, Sergeant F contacted the applicant by telephone. He told her that the CCTV had been viewed. However, Miss A later told the applicant that she had a telephone conversation with Constable E on 29 December 2017. Miss A alleged that, during this conversation, Constable E told her that the CCTV that had been viewed was from a different shopping centre to that in which the incident occurred.

On 6 January 2018, the applicant and Sergeant F had a further conversation regarding the CCTV. Whilst the applicant was on the telephone, Sergeant F confirmed with Constable E that the CCTV from the relevant shopping centre had been viewed on 23 December 2017. The applicant alleged that Sergeant F suggested during this conversation that Miss A had lied about her conversation with Constable E on 29 December 2017.

The applicant submitted her complaints to Police Scotland in an undated letter, which was marked as having been received on 10 January 2018. The complaint enquiry was allocated to Sergeant G. Inspector J met with the applicant on 27 January 2018 and obtained her statement of complaint. The Heads of Complaint form was agreed and signed on the same date.

The applicant received a response to her complaints from Chief Inspector H in a letter dated 15 March 2018.

---

# Complaint 1

---

The applicant complained that, on 23 December 2017, an officer was uncivil towards her. She said that officers had attended at her address to speak to her daughter, Miss A, but her daughter was not at home. She said that she made the officers aware of the long running dispute between her family and that of Ms C, and that Ms C was lying about the incident. She suggested that the officers view the CCTV from the shopping centre to better understand what had actually happened.

The applicant's position is that Constable D replied to her suggestion by telling her that *"We're not interested in viewing CCTV"* and *"it is not your complaint"*.

## Police Scotland's Handling of Complaint 1 (not upheld by the police)

Chief Inspector H summarised the applicant's statement in relation to the incident that took place on 23 December 2017 and her subsequent complaints to Police Scotland<sup>1</sup>. Chief Inspector H said that the applicant had informed Constables D and E of her view that Ms C was lying and advised them to view the CCTV from the shopping centre. Chief Inspector H said that the applicant's position was that Constable D responded by saying *"We're not interested in viewing CCTV"* and *"it is not your complaint"*.

Chief Inspector H said that Constable D confirmed that he had attended the incident at the shopping centre along with Constable E on 23 December 2017. Constable D stated that, after having attended the incident, his enquiries had led him to attend at the applicant's home address. Chief Inspector H said that Constable D's position was that the applicant had *"accused him and [Constable E] of not doing their jobs correctly"*. He said that Constable D had stated that he *"had cause to make an arrest in furtherance of his enquiries"* whilst at the applicant's address, and that the applicant again repeated to him that he was not doing his job properly. Chief Inspector H said that Constable D told the applicant that he was carrying out a criminal investigation, and that the applicant had not been identified as a witness. Constable D said he told the applicant that if her daughter, Miss A, had an incident to report then she should contact the police. Chief Inspector H said that Constable D had denied the applicant's allegation that he was uncivil towards her and stated that at no point did he specifically say the following: *"We're not interested in viewing CCTV"* and *"it's not your complaint"*.

Chief Inspector H said that Constable E also confirmed his attendance at the shopping centre along with Constable D on 23 December 2017. This resulted in him attending the applicant's home address with Constable D on the same date. Constable E stated that when he and Constable D attended at the applicant's property, she was *"irate as a result of him attending at another address"* prior to speaking to her. He further stated that he neither heard nor observed Constable D use the phrases *"We're not interested in viewing CCTV"* and *"it's not your complaint"* towards the applicant.

Chief Inspector H advised the applicant that there were no other witnesses or CCTV footage which provided an independent account of the interaction between her and the officers. Chief Inspector H said that this presented him with two conflicting versions of events, therefore, on the balance of probabilities, he was unable to uphold the applicant's complaint.

---

<sup>1</sup> The full response to the applicant's complaint can be found at paragraphs 8 – 13 of the appendix to this report.

## Our Review of Complaint 1

We have been provided with copies of Constable D and E's statements in response to the complaint. Having read the statements, we can confirm that they have been accurately summarised by Chief Inspector H in his response letter, in the main. Both officers were consistent in their description of the applicant's demeanour when they attended at her address. They were also consistent in their description of the conversation between the applicant and Constable D saying that, at no time, did Constable D state that they were not interested in viewing the CCTV and that it was not the applicant's complaint. It was on this basis that Chief Inspector H determined that the applicant's complaint was not upheld. He did so using the balance of probabilities test as set out in Police Scotland's Complaints About the Police Standard Operating Procedure (the "Complaints SOP"). This stipulates that, where the available evidence is equally weighted, the complaint will not be upheld. As Chief Inspector H explained to the applicant, the statement provided by her, when taken alongside those of Constables D and E, presented two conflicting versions of events. Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, Chief Inspector H did not uphold the applicant's complaint.

However, we note that Chief Inspector H said within the response letter that "*there were no other witnesses identified or CCTV footage available to support your account*". Constable D has also said within his statement that, whilst attending to take a statement from Ms C, he was advised that Miss A had reported an incident that may be linked to the one he was dealing with at the time. He was also advised "*that both parties had audio and visual CCTV cameras installed due to the previous incidents*". Accordingly, we consider that this does not support Chief Inspector H's position that there was no CCTV available of the interaction between the applicant and the officers. Instead, this would suggest that the applicant may have been in possession of CCTV that could potentially provide an independent account. There is nothing within the complaint file to suggest as to whether there was any attempt and/or enquiry made with the applicant to ascertain if she had CCTV footage from the incident that may have informed the complaint enquiry. As Chief Inspector H has based his decision not to uphold the applicant's complaint in part on the lack of any available CCTV footage, we consider that insufficient enquiry was carried out in relation in this connection.

We conclude, therefore, that this complaint has not been handled to a reasonable standard.

### Our Conclusion on Complaint 1

We conclude that Police Scotland did not handle this complaint to a reasonable standard.

We recommend that further enquiries are carried out to ascertain whether any CCTV footage captured at the applicant's address on the date in question may have been useful in informing the complaint enquiry. If such footage is available, this should be requested from the applicant and assessed, providing a further response as appropriate. This response should make clear whether the complaint has been upheld, fully explaining its conclusions and providing an apology if appropriate to do so.

If no CCTV footage is not available from the applicant, no further action is required of Police Scotland in relation to this complaint.

---

# Complaint 2

---

The applicant complained that an officer – Sergeant F – lied to her regarding a line of enquiry involved in a criminal investigation. Furthermore, the applicant believes that due to a miscommunication, the officers attended the wrong shopping centre to view the CCTV. She also stated that Sergeant F suggested to her that Ms A had lied regarding the conversation she had with Constable E on 29 December 2017.

## Police Scotland’s Handling of Complaint 2 (not upheld by the police)

Chief Inspector H summarised the applicant’s complaint in respect of the viewing of the CCTV at the shopping centre in question on 23 December 2017<sup>2</sup>. Chief Inspector H confirmed his understanding of the applicant’s complaint as follows: “*You believe that [Sergeant F] lied to you regarding the CCTV being viewed and believe that the officers have viewed CCTV at [another shopping centre] and not [the shopping centre in question]*”.

Chief Inspector H said that Sergeant F confirmed his conversation with the applicant on 25 December 2017. Sergeant F said that the applicant had requested confirmation from him that he had viewed the CCTV. He stated that he advised the applicant that it was not his role to view CCTV, however he had obtained confirmation from Constables D and E that the footage had been viewed.

Chief Inspector H said that Sergeant F also confirmed his conversation with the applicant on 6 January 2018 when the applicant again asked him for confirmation that the CCTV from the shopping centre had been viewed. Sergeant F stated that he advised the applicant that the CCTV had been viewed; however, to be certain he said that he would check with Constable E which he did while speaking to the applicant. Chief Inspector H said that Sergeant F “*denies your allegation and states at no time did he state to you that he had viewed the CCTV or lie to you*”.

Chief Inspector H said that Constable D stated that he and Constable E viewed the available CCTV at the shopping centre on 23 December 2017. This position is supported by Constable E who confirmed that he viewed the available CCTV with Constable D. Chief Inspector H said that Constable D also stated that during a telephone conversation he had with Miss A, he advised her that “*he could not discuss any aspect of this enquiry with her whereby she became irate and abruptly ended the telephone call to him*”.

Chief Inspector H said that, during the complaint enquiry, Sergeant G had confirmed that Constables D and E had reviewed the CCTV available from the shopping centre on 23 December 2017. Chief Inspector H said that this had been documented in the Police report and that COPFS had been fully updated in relation to the availability of CCTV relating to the incident. Chief Inspector H said that Sergeant G had also obtained a statement from the Operations Manager at the shopping centre, in which he confirmed that Constable D had attended the shopping centre and signed the ‘Data Disclosure Visiting’ form. This form is completed by any person viewing the CCTV. Chief Inspector H said that the Operations Manager also stated that an entry was made in the ‘Daily Occurrence Log’ at the shopping centre on 23 December 2017 recording that an incident had taken place and that officers had attended.

---

<sup>2</sup> The full response to the applicant’s complaint can be found at paragraphs 15 – 26 of the appendix to this report.

Chief Inspector H said that Sergeant G had established that the CCTV had been viewed by Constable D. However, Chief Inspector H said that in terms of the content of the phone call between the applicant and Sergeant F in relation to the viewing of the CCTV, he had been presented with two conflicting accounts. Chief Inspector H said that he was unable to determine which was the more accurate account therefore he was unable to uphold the applicant's complaint.

## Our Review of Complaint 2

We consider that there are two aspects to the applicant's complaint, namely that:

- i. Constables D and E viewed the wrong CCTV on the date in question; and
- ii. Sergeant F lied to her about the viewing of the CCTV.

These will be considered in turn.

- **Viewing of the CCTV by Constables D and E**

We have reviewed the statements provided by Constable D and E as part of the complaint enquiry. Both officers state that they viewed the CCTV on the date in question at the shopping centre in question.

Chief Inspector H's response letter makes reference to the 'Data Disclosure Visiting' form and the 'Daily Occurrence Log' from the shopping centre in which the incident took place. The first of these is relied upon as evidence to confirm that Constables D and E viewed the CCTV at the relevant shopping centre on 23 December 2017. We have been provided with copies of the 'Data Disclosure Visiting' form that has been referred to by Chief Inspector H in his response letter. We have also been provided with a copy of a document headed 'Duty Record', which we have inferred is the document referred to by Chief Inspector H as the 'Daily Occurrence Log'. Having viewed both documents, we can confirm that the 'Data Disclosure Visiting' form has been signed by Constable D on 23 December 2017. We also note that the Duty Record documents that the police were on site viewing CCTV at 1440 hours on this date. Whilst it does not specifically make reference to Constable D and E by name, it would seem reasonable to infer that this entry relates to Constables D and E.

The response letter also refers to a statement provided by the Operations Manager at the shopping Centre. This statement has been relied upon by Chief Inspector H to authenticate the documents described above. In his statement, the Operations Manager said that he was asked by Sergeant G to review the Data Disclosure Visiting form for 23 December 2017. He confirmed that Constable D had *"been marked through the data log, he signed the form and dated it as 23 December 2017"*. His statement also advised that the form was signed on the day of the incident on behalf of the shopping centre by another member of staff, Mr L. We consider, therefore, that Chief Inspector H's response that Constables D and E viewed the CCTV at the shopping centre in question to be based on the material information available. We conclude, therefore, that this aspect of the applicant's complaint has been handled to a reasonable standard.

- **Sergeant F lied to the applicant**

The applicant stated that she spoke with Sergeant F on 23 December 2017 and asked him to confirm that the CCTV had been viewed at the shopping centre in question. He advised her that he would make enquiries with Constables D and E and call her back. The applicant then missed a call from Sergeant F later the same day and, when she returned his call, was advised that he was not back on duty until 25 December 2017. The 101 Operator advised the applicant that a message would be left asking him to

call her, which he did at c.0900 hours on 25 December 2017. Sergeant F said that he was asked by the applicant during this call to confirm if the CCTV had been viewed and if he had personally viewed it. He advised her that it was not his job to view CCTV but that Constables D and E had done so. However, in her statement of complaint, the applicant said that during a conversation with Miss A on 29 December 2017, Miss A told her that she had been advised by Constable E that that CCTV from another shopping centre had been viewed. The applicant attempted to query this with Sergeant F, however she has not been specific about the date, stating only that it was after 29 December and before the new year. Sergeant F makes reference to contacting the applicant again on 6 January 2018 on his return to duty, having received an email to this effect. During this call, the applicant again requested confirmation that the CCTV had been viewed, which he obtained from Constable E.

Chief Inspector H advised the applicant that he had been presented with two conflicting versions of events in respect of the conversations between her and Sergeant F regarding the viewing of the CCTV and that he was unable to determine which was more accurate. Therefore, on balance, the applicant's complaint was not upheld. We agree with this position.

However, whilst the complaint enquiry was ongoing, the applicant provided Sergeant G with a copy letter from Mr B's solicitor enclosing an email from the shopping centre in question. The applicant's position is that the content of this correspondence supported her position that Sergeant F had lied to her about the CCTV having been viewed. There is nothing within the complaint file to indicate whether any enquiry was carried out into this correspondence during the complaint enquiry. That said, as we have mentioned within our report, we have been provided with information that supports Police Scotland's position that the CCTV from the relevant shopping centre was viewed. Furthermore, we note that the correspondence in question provided by the applicant is only a partial copy and does not contain the full text of the request sent by Mr B's solicitor to the shopping centre. Accordingly, whilst Chief Inspector H's response does not appear to have addressed this particular aspect of the applicant's complaint, we do not consider the information in itself to be sufficient to sway the balance of probabilities in the applicant's favour in this instance.

Notwithstanding the short-coming we have identified above, the crux of the applicant's complaint is that Sergeant F lied to her about having viewed the CCTV. For the reasons outlined above, we consider that Chief Inspector H's response to this aspect of the applicant's complaint is supported by the material information available. We conclude, therefore, that this aspect of the applicant's complaint has been handled to a reasonable standard.

## **Our Conclusion on Complaint 2**

We conclude that Police Scotland did handle this complaint to a reasonable standard.

However, as each aspect of the applicant's complaint was capable of being upheld or not on its own, we recommend that:

- both aspects of the applicant's complaint are recorded separately and an individual determination made.

---

## What happens next

---

We have made two recommendations. We expect these to be implemented within two months of the date of this report. We will continue to liaise with Police Scotland until such time as we consider that the recommendations have been implemented to our satisfaction.

**Ann McGruer**  
**Review Officer**

**Jacqui Jeffrey**  
**Senior Review Officer**

---

# Appendix

---

## Copy of Police Scotland's response letter dated 15 March 2018

(Redacted and paragraphs numbered)

1. *I refer to your letter date 6 January 2017 [sic] in which you complained about the actions of police officers following an incident which occurred within [first named shopping centre], on 23 December 2017 and thereafter at your property at [redacted].*
2. *I am the Senior Officer with responsibility for the direction and administration of Complaints about the Police within Greater Glasgow Division and I allocated this matter to [Sergeant G] to investigate the circumstances on my behalf. [Sergeant G] has concluded his enquiry and I have now had the opportunity to review his findings.*
3. *[Applicant's name] it is my understanding from a statement you provided to [Inspector J] on 27 January 2018 that there are 2 elements to your complaint, which can be summarised as follows:*
4. *Complaint 1: That on 23 December 2017 [Constable D] was uncivil towards you.*
5. *Complaint 2: That [Sergeant F] lied to you regarding a line of enquiry involved in a criminal investigation.*
6. *I shall now address each individual aspect of your complaint in the order that they are presented.*
7. *Complaint 1*
8. *[Applicant's name] you have told us about an incident, involving your daughter, [Miss A] and her Partner, [Mr B] which took place within [first named shopping centre], on 23 December 2017. You stated that this incident relates to an ongoing dispute between members of your family and your neighbour.*
9. *You state that on 23 December 2017 two uniformed officers known to you as [Constables D and E] attended at your home and asked to speak with [Miss A]. You replied by telling him that she was not at home. You stated that you told [Constables D and E] that your neighbour, [Ms C] was lying and told them to view the CCTV at [first named shopping centre]. You stated that [Constable D] said to you "We are not interested in viewing CCTV" and "it is not your complaint". You believed this was uncivil.*
10. *[Constable D] has responded to your allegation and states that on 23 December 2017, along with [Constable E] he was allocated to an incident at [first named shopping centre]. [Constable D] states enquiries from this incident resulted in him attending at your home. [Constable D] states that you accused him and [Constable E] of not doing their jobs correctly. He further states that whilst in [redacted] he had cause to make an arrest in the furtherance of his enquiries. He states that you once again told him that he was not doing his job properly. [Constable D] states that he informed you that he was carrying out a criminal investigation to which you had not been identified as a witness and that should [Miss A] have any incident to report she should contact Police Scotland.*
11. *[Constable D] denies your allegation and states that at no point during his conversations with you was he uncivil or specifically state: "We're not interested in viewing CCTV" and "it's not your complaint".*
12. *[Constable E] has responded to your allegation and states that on 23 December 2017 along with [Constable D] he attended at an incident at [first named shopping centre] which thereafter resulted in him attending your home. He states when he attended your property you were irate as a result of him attending at another address prior to speaking with you. He states that at no time did he hear or observe [Constable D] being uncivil towards you or hear him use the phrase, "We're not interested in viewing CCTV" and "it's not your complaint".*

13. [Applicant's name] *there were no other witnesses identified or CCTV footage available to support your account. Having considered the evidence available to me, I am presented with two conflicting versions of events and, on the balance of probabilities I am unable to uphold your allegation.*
14. *Complaint 2*
15. [Applicant's name] *you have told us that following the incident within [first named shopping centre] you called [named police office] and spoke with [Sergeant F]. You state that you provided him with a brief history of your ongoing dispute with your neighbour and asked if the CCTV at [named shopping centre] had been reviewed as part of the enquiries being carried out by his officers.*
16. *You stated that [Sergeant F] agreed to speak with the officers and contact you once he has spoken with them. You stated that [Sergeant F] contacted you on 25 December 2017 and told you that he had viewed the CCTV.*
17. *You then stated that on 29 December 2017 [Miss A] told you that [Constable E] had told her that he had viewed CCTV at [second named shopping centre], despite the incident happening at [first named shopping centre].*
18. *You stated that on 29 December 2017 you spoke to [Sergeant F] again and asked him why he lied to you on 25 December 2017 about the CCTV. He stated that he understood that the CCTV had been viewed.*
19. *You believe that [Sergeant F] lied to you regarding the CCTV being viewed and believe that the officers have viewed CCTV at [second named shopping centre] and not [first named shopping centre].*
20. [Sergeant F] *states that on 25 December 2017 he spoke with you in relation to an ongoing enquiry which was being conducted by [Constables D and E]. He states that during this conversation you asked him if he could confirm that CCTV had been checked within [first named shopping centre] and if he had viewed it. [Sergeant F] states he informed you that viewing CCTV was not his role however he had been advised by [Constables D and E] that the CCTV had been viewed.*
21. [Sergeant F] *states on 6 January 2018 he had a further conversation with you on the telephone where again you asked for confirmation that the CCTV had been viewed. [Sergeant F] states he advised you that the CCTV had been reviewed but for complete certainty he would confirm this one again by contacting [Constable E] which he did and confirmation was provided to you at that time. [Sergeant F] denies your allegation and states that at no time did he state to you that he had viewed the CCTV or lie to you.*
22. [Constable D] *states that on 23 December 2017 along with [Constable E] he reviewed the available CCTV footage at [first named shopping centre] as part of his investigation.*
23. [Constable E] *states that on 23 December 2017 along with [Constable D] he viewed the available CCTV footage from [first named shopping centre]. He further states that during a phone call to [Miss A] he stated that he could not discuss any aspect of this enquiry with her whereby she became irate and abruptly ended the telephone call to him.*
24. [Sergeant G] *has confirmed that as part of their enquiries [Constable D and E] have reviewed the available footage at [first named shopping centre] on 23 December 2017. This has been documented in the Police report and the Procurator Fiscal has been fully updated as to the availability of CCTV in relation to the incident on 23 December 2017. [Sergeant G] also attended at [first named shopping centre] and obtained a statement from the Operations Manager.*
25. *The Operations Manager confirms that on 23 December 2017 [Constable D] attended at the management suite and signed the 'Data Disclosure Visiting' form which is the form completed by any persons coming into the management suite to review CCTV. The Operations Manager also confirmed that on 23 December 2017 an entry was made within their 'Daily occurrence Log' recording an incident had occurred and the presence of officers in the centre.*
26. *You state that [Sergeant F] lied to you during a telephone call regarding the viewing of CCTV. [Sergeant G] has established that officers attended to view the CCTV, at [first named shopping centre] and that fact is documented in shopping centre records. In terms of the content of the*

*phone call, however, I am presented with two conflicting versions of the same conversation and I am unable to determine which the more accurate account is. Therefore I am unable to uphold your complaint.*

*27. I understand that you raised an issue with [Sergeant G] during a telephone conversation on 21 February 2018 relating to the lack of contact your daughter has had with Police Scotland regarding a counter allegation which she made on 23 December 2017. I understand at this time that you do not wish this recorded as an official complaint but that you expect officers to contact your daughter to address her concerns. [Sergeant G] advises me that this matter has been brought to the attention of your local Area Inspector who has since allocated this enquiry to a [Constable K] who has since met with [Miss A] to discuss her concerns.*

*28. I accept that you may not be happy with my decision not to uphold your complaints but my determination is based on the evidence available to me. All officers in Police Scotland must conduct themselves in a professional and courteous manner in accordance with our Code of Ethics. It is my sincere hope that any future dealings you have with the [sic] Police Scotland will be in a more positive light and in line with your expectations.*