

Witness Name: TPS 1989 MARK READ  
Statement No: WITN0011001  
Dated: 3 October 2025

## THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

---

### FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF T/PS MARK READ

---

1. I am Temporary Police Sergeant 1989 Mark Read of Leicestershire Police.
2. This statement is made pursuant to a request from the Inquiry dated 18 June 2025. I have obtained legal advice in drafting this statement from Mr Mark Wardley, Solicitor, Straw and Pearce solicitors, and Mr Hugh Davies KC. The format of the response reflects and follows the issues raised in that request.
3. I have been employed by Leicestershire Police since 2003. During my career I have been based at Hinckley and Market Bosworth, as well as Braunstone, prior to moving to Coalville in 2022.
4. My entire career has been in frontline policing responding to incidents rather than complex investigations. This area is where my skill set lays rather than in-depth investigations. As such I am not PIP2 qualified. PIP2 is a qualification from the College of Policing which teaches about the planning, monitoring and managing of serious and complex investigations. I have completed all

compulsory training for my role as a response officer. To date I have received no training as such to be a police sergeant. Following sergeants' exams, the role is predominantly experience based. I passed the sergeants' exams – essentially a self-taught paper exercise – in March 2022.

5. I was promoted to the rank of temporary sergeant in August 2022, in the role of response sergeant at Coalville police station. I have remained in the role since. My work-based assessment to become a substantive sergeant was suspended due to the IOPC investigation into this matter. On 11 September 2025, I received an email from Leicestershire Police Human Resource Department confirming that following a review of the suspension, the decision has been made to reverse the suspension, and on 20 October 2025 I will begin my work-based assessment to become a substantive sergeant.
  
6. I have been asked to set out when I first became aware of an incident involving Valdo Calocane (by that name or any alias) at Arvato on 5 May 2023 and what I was told of the incident. On 5 May 2023 I started my shift at 17:00 hours. I briefed the late shift officers and during this briefing a report of an assault which occurred in Kegworth, Leicestershire came over the radio. PC 4430 Amos-Perkins and his in-company probationary student PC 1965 Taylor were present in the briefing. I cannot now recall whether the control room dispatched them to the incident, or if I instructed them to attend. The STORM log [LEPF0000015] reflects operational interactions through the control room.

7. On the information provided to me by the control room this appeared to be a low-level assault. I conducted a dynamic risk assessment and believed that the report could be dealt with by one double-crewed mobile team. This decision was based on the fact that information had been received from the person reporting that the suspect had already left the location. This reduced the threat of harm to the alleged victims and/or the attending officers.
  
8. As the supervisor on duty, my role was to oversee incidents on the North West area of Leicestershire and, where required, provide direction and guidance either via the radio or attendance at more serious or complex incidents. I observe that on the day in question I was overseeing throughout the shift approximately 14 'live' incidents.
  
9. On this occasion I assessed this report as one that I could provide guidance remotely via the radio should it be required and not one that I was required to attend. Attending an incident in person has the consequence that I am less able directly to supervise other incidents than I would be from the police station.
  
10. In relation to overseeing the subsequent investigation by PC Taylor into the allegation of assault, as a supervisor it is my role to assist and guide the officer should they require it, and conduct a review of the investigation whilst the officer undertook any investigation. In theory, I was mandated to conduct reviews at 28-day intervals. A 28-day review is a sergeant's review of the progression of investigations being undertaken by members of the sergeant's shift. The review will clarify the work that has been completed following any previous guidance

the sergeant has given to the officer; how the investigation is progressing and developing; along with identifying any further lines of investigation the officer In the case may be required to complete to bring the investigation to a conclusion.

11. During the period between 5 May and 13 June 2023 my workload was consistently high, and indeed beyond my capacity to complete when on duty. I was covering two separate shifts, who were working two different shift patterns, due to internal movements of sergeants at Coalville. By this I mean that the sergeant from 'I' shift in front of me in the shift pattern was moved from response sergeant to a neighbourhood policing role. This sergeant's workload was shared between myself and the 'E' shift sergeant, but this sergeant was in the process of being reverted back to constable, meaning the entire workload from the 'I' shift sergeant was placed on myself to complete. In terms of numbers of officers under my direct supervision, this was approximately 8, with each of them typically having between 10 – 15 ongoing investigations of different degrees of complexity and challenge.

12. I routinely worked for approximately 8 hours in any 4 day rest period in order to attempt to stay on top of the volume of work. Perhaps 25% of this was paid as overtime, the rest was unpaid. The volume of work across our area was known to be at or beyond the capacity of officers to address it, but this was ultimately a product of the limitations of resources available. We were all simply doing our best to manage the realities of what was possible.

13. I had a wide range of duties, and these engaged multiple national and local policies and procedures. It is difficult to produce a single definitive list. Leicestershire Police will have records of the policies, procedures and criteria that were in force in May and June 2023; I no longer have access to all these documents, and they undergo revision over time. I recall a local policy called Operation Forefront, which is an evolving policy and sets out officers' roles and responsibilities within the force.

14. As a response sergeant it was my responsibility to ensure all domestic reports were attended as they were recognised as a Force priority on a day-to-day basis. I had the responsibility to review prisoners who were in police custody being dealt with by officers from the North West area, along with managing missing person reports. In addition, I was required to review crime files, including reviewing files to be sent to the CPS; filing crime reports (that is making decisions as to the disposal of crime reports); and allocating crime to officers to investigate.

15. During the relevant time period 5 May to 13 June 2023, I was at work for a total of 22 days within this relevant period. I was also directed by the 'Operational Incident Commander' (rank of Inspector) to cover multiple areas including the West Leicester and Leicester city centre on occasions. This placed a further and significant additional strain of my already substantial workload.

16. Looking back, I believe that it was as a result of the reality of my workload that I failed to conduct a 28-day written review of the assault allegation in Kegworth.

17. I was unaware of the link between the incident on 5 May 2023 and the tragic and appalling events of 13 June 2023 until I was contacted by Nottingham Police on 13 June 2023. They requested some assistance from me in regard to the attending Leicestershire officers' body worn camera footage. I attempted to retrieve the bodyworn camera footage with Leicestershire Police IT department, but I was informed that it had been permanently deleted. This happens automatically when it is not marked as 'Evidential' by the relevant officer.

18. Prior to 13 June 2023 I did not make Nottinghamshire Police aware of the suspect living in Nottingham due to the fact that I was unaware of it. Because of operational and wider demand on me, I had not conducted a 28-day review. If I had been aware that the suspect was wanted on warrant and resided in Nottinghamshire, I would have directed PC Taylor, who was the investigating officer, to ensure Nottinghamshire Police were made aware. The advice would have been to contact them immediately.

19. I accept that if I had conducted a 28-day review, it is likely that I would also have advised PC Taylor to conduct NICHE, PNC and PND checks on the named suspect if she had not done so, since the outcome of any such checks was not recorded on the NICHE OCCURRENCE OEL [LEPF0000004]. Had she already done such checks I would have advised that the result – even if negative – was recorded on the OEL.

20. Had I conducted a written review of the incident in Kegworth this would have provided PC Taylor, who was in her in-company probationary period, a more structured investigation plan. Not doing so was a reflection of capacity and workload, but equally in future I will attempt to give greater priority to reviewing cases under investigation by less experienced officers, however competent they appear to be, and even when (as here) they have capable tutor constables.

21. I have been asked if the way in which the investigation was carried out was appropriate. Given the documented issues PC Taylor experienced during this investigation with making arrangements with the victims to obtain statements of complaint; with them not engaging after the initial attendance; and the delay in the employment agency providing the correct details of the suspect, I believe the investigation was conducted at an appropriate level. Without a statement of complaint for a common assault with no injuries and poor quality CCTV it is very unlikely that this matter would have been prosecuted by the CPS.

22. Whilst these statements could have been obtained earlier, in my opinion reasonable attempts were made to obtain them and to liaise with the alleged victims. This was only one of multiple investigations the response officers were responsible for. The attending officers were called to another Grade 1 incident whilst at the scene and this was the correct operational priority to attend.

23. Valdo Calocane's background, including the outstanding warrant, should have been checked and acted on as soon as his identity was established. This should have been recorded on the NICHE OCCURRENCE OEL [LEPF0000004].

24. I have been asked if I consider if there are any structural issues (regarding police policies, methodology, training etc) which contributed to any issues I have identified. These are implicit in my previous answers. Such structural issues include the following: the fact that I am not PIP2 trained and that I was overseeing two separate shifts' workloads along with my own workload in respect of my role as a response sergeant. As a consequence the two new roles of 'crime manager' and 'performance manager' were introduced to reduce the workload of a response sergeant (see below). Accordingly, to a significant extent from the perspective of a response sergeant, the identified structural issues have been substantively addressed.

25. Since the horrific incident in Nottingham, Leicestershire Police have created and implemented two new roles.

26. Firstly, a 'crime manager', who reviews all incoming reports and sets out an investigation plan before allocating to an officer to progress and the reviewing of crime files to be sent to the CPS. This role has been disseminated to all Leicestershire neighbourhood policing areas. This role has reduced the demand on my role as a response sergeant by removing these daily tasks away from my role.

27. Secondly, a 'performance manager', which again is implemented in all neighbourhood policing areas. This role also assists with reviewing crime files for the CPS, and addresses any performance issues identified for any officer

within the neighbourhood policing area regardless of their role. This role has reduced further demand on the response sergeant.

28. As a result of both these new roles my role as a response sergeant has become less demanding, allowing me significantly more time to conduct regular crime reviews, and to deal with the day-to-day running of a shift.

29. I have been asked if there are any recommendations that I consider could help prevent any of the issues that I have identified in respect of this matter. A recommendation I would make to ensure (so far as possible) that the tragic events in Nottingham are not repeated, is to provide all sergeants who are responsible for a shift that carry crime queues to be given dedicated 'protected' time to conduct crime reviews with the officers under their supervision, during which they are not required to respond to live reports unless in exceptional circumstances. The reasons for this are implicit in what I have set out in previous answers. I accept that implementing this may come back to demand and resourcing.

30. Tutor constables should receive specific training that they should 'assume nothing' during an in-company probationer's probationary period. Assumptions may be based on wholly different operational experience, and what seems obvious to an experienced officer may not to a probationer, however competent they appear. There is always the risk of subconscious assumption, and officers should be trained about the risk of that to promote double-checking of even basic investigative actions.

Conclusion

31. I fully accept that the criminal conduct of Valdo Calocane on 13 June 2023 requires a detailed independent investigation, in public so far as possible, such that the legitimate concerns of those directly affected by his actions, and the wider public, can understand what happened and the roles of state agencies leading up to his offending. I am as shocked and concerned by what he did as anyone else. I will act to promote the objectives of the public inquiry in any way I can.

32. I also accept the necessity of the IOPC independent investigation into the investigation of which I was part.

Statement of Truth

I believe the content of this statement to be true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief of its truth.

**GRO-B**

T/PS 1989 MARK READ

03/10/2025

Dated

## Index of Documents

1. LEPF0000015 STORM INCIDENT LOG
2. LEPF0000004 NICHE OCCURRENCE