

Witness Name: ZOEY PRICE

Statement No: WITN0016001

Dated: 24/10/25

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PS ZOEY PRICE

I, ZOEY PRICE, will say as follows: -

1. My name is Zoey Price.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the "Inquiry") with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 27th June 2025 (the "Request").
3. In making this statement, I have refreshed my memory by reading the Occurrence Log for Occurrence 21000375087 (URN: NGPF0000043).

My Background

4. My name is Zoey Price. I joined Nottinghamshire Police in 2013. Prior to joining the police I worked in hospitality in the restaurant industry. I had various job roles from waitress to deputy manager. For approximately 2 years prior to joining Nottinghamshire Police, I was employed by a local council and my role was in environmental enforcement dealing with issues such as fly tipping and littering.

5. After my initial training which included Professionalising Investigations Programme Level 1 (the entry-level qualification for police officers and staff involved in investigating volume and priority crimes), I joined the Radford Road Response policing team on rota 5. During my time there, I attended various training sessions including use of taser, Public Order Training and Initial Phase Pursuit.
6. I also attend the yearly officer safety training, first aid training and fitness test.
7. In November 2020 I studied for and passed a paper based Sergeant's law exam.
8. In February 2021 I moved to Rota 3 at Radford Road as a Temporary Sergeant. I received no specific training to become a Sergeant. I passed the interview board and was officially promoted as of 18th October 2021. Following my substantive promotion to Sergeant, I was provided with 5 separate one day training sessions, completed over the course of 12 months. The training was made up of 5 modules; Sergeant Leadership module 1 – Operational Policing, Sergeant Leadership module 2 – Leadership fundamentals, Sergeant Leadership module 3 – Effective teams, Sergeant Leadership module 4 – Health and Safety and the 5th module related to Attendance Management
9. In September 2022 I was posted as a Sergeant on the Operation Reacher Team at Oxclose Lane Police Station, Nottingham. This was a proactive team attached to the neighbourhood policing teams.
10. Since September 2024 I have been based at Mansfield Police Station on the Priority Tasking Team. This is a proactive team that supports local policing in the monthly taskings set out by the Force's Senior Leadership Team.

11. Prior to the 5th July 2021, to the best of my recollection, I had no knowledge of, or interactions with, Valdo Calocane, by that or any other name.

Events of the 5th July 2021

12. I had no direct involvement in the events of the 5th July 2021. I did not attend incident 0581_05052021 and I was not involved in any subsequent enquiries in relation to it.
13. As part of the NICHE Records Management System, any request to authorise the closing of an occurrence has to be reviewed and authorised by a Sergeant. The officer in the case, who, by reference to the Occurrence Log (**URN: NGPF0000043**) for the incident was PC Pannell, asked me to review the recorded crime occurrence and consider her request to file the crime as undetected. At about 9.26 pm on the 5th July 2021, I reviewed the evidence provided in the report.
14. A Sergeant is required to review and endorse a crime for undetected filing. This is one part of the response Sergeant's role. The term 'undetected filing' is used when a crime is closed down with no further action taken and no longer being investigated as the police were unable to mount a prosecution due to insufficient evidence.
15. I reviewed the officer's Occurrence Entry Logs within the NICHE system (this is the system used to record and manage crime reports) and any supporting documents attached to the Log. I did not gather any evidence myself. A review of the officer's Occurrence Entry log informed me that all reasonable lines of

enquiry to gather any evidence were made. I assessed the evidence gathered by the officer and made decisions on the information presented to me.

16. I reviewed the Occurrence Entry Logs (OEL's) and any other evidence and/or documents attached to the NICHE Occurrence (**URN: NGPF0000043**). This was a report of a common assault of an adult student (Sebastian **GRO-B**) by another adult student (Calocane) residing in the same flat. I made the decision to file the crime as undetected based on the information within the Occurrence log, taking account of the Nottinghamshire Police Crime Outcomes Guide (**URN: NGPF0006054**), the victim's wishes not to support a prosecution and the evidential threshold test (no realistic prospect of conviction).
17. This incident was recorded as outcome *16 Victim Declines / Withdraws Support - Named Suspect Identified*, as set out in the Force's Crime Outcomes Guide (**URN: NGPF0006054**).
18. The decision was based on the information I had at the time. This was that:
 - 18.1 The victim did not wish to pursue any prosecution;
 - 18.2 There was no injury;
 - 18.3 There was no CCTV;
 - 18.4 There were no other witnesses (one word against other);
 - 18.5 The victim was not deemed vulnerable and was an adult;
 - 18.6 Suitable safety advice had been given to the victim and relevant signposting to the Nottinghamshire Police website;

- 18.7 Advice had been given to Sebastian GRO-B to make Calocane's mental health nurses aware of the incident.
19. It was my opinion that the crime did not meet the evidential threshold for any prosecution and did not meet the public interest threshold either. This would include consideration of:
- 19.1 The seriousness of the offence: low level assault with no injury;
- 19.2 The level of culpability of the suspect: no apparent pre-planned assault;
- 19.3 That prosecution was not a proportionate response to this incident, because it was a single low level assault with no injury and the victim did not support a prosecution; and
- 19.4 There was no impact to the community.
20. I do not recall what was known about the previous offending history of Calocane but this would not have affected the outcome in this case given the particular facts, as there still would have been a lack of independent evidence and an unwilling victim.
21. I also took account of the victim's wishes simply to report the incident and decided in the circumstances to approve the closing of this report.
22. In making my decision, I had regard to the Force's Crime Recording Policy (URN: **NGPF0006050**) which determines the criteria for the recording of particular crimes, the Crime Outcomes Guide as mentioned above and the Out Of Court Disposals Procedure (URN: **NGPF0006053**), the last of which I discounted because sufficient evidence to support a charge is required before such a disposal can be considered.

23. I wish to make clear that I did note that the investigating officer's entry on NICHE mixed up the names of the victim and the suspect. It did not cause an issue in this case as I realised that this error had been made.
24. I have been asked what my knowledge was of any issues concerning Valdo Calocane's mental health. My response is that I was aware of a reference to his being visited by mental health nurses.
25. I have been asked whether details of the attendance and/or decisions or actions taken communicated to: (1) Health, social services or multi-agency organisations; (2) Valdo Calocane's family; (3) Nottingham University; (4) others who might be affected by Valdo Calocane's actions. My response is that no details were shared with any other agency.
26. I have been asked whether there were any barriers to the sharing of information with any of the above, or any other relevant individual, body or organisation. My response is that no information was shared and therefore there were no barriers. However, at the time, there was no formal mechanism in place for the Police to share information with mental health services in these circumstances.
27. I have been asked the question whether there were any outstanding criminal matters at the time of my involvement in this matter and if so, what my knowledge of these were and what if any actions did I take. My response is that I was not aware of any outstanding offences.
28. I have been asked why this matter was not pursued. My response is set out at paragraphs 18 and 19 of this statement.

29. I have been asked to set out any difficulties recording this incident, including but not limited to the accurate recording of names and when I first become aware of this issue and how. My response is that the recording of names within the crime are correct for crime recording purposes. The names in the initial summary write up by the investigating officer are the wrong way around. In the final Occurrence Log entry, the officer had written the names the correct way around before it was filed. I do not recall when I first became aware of this or how.
30. I have been asked what I understood the purpose to be of making officers aware of this incident but not recording the matter as a criminal complaint and on what basis (including any relevant policy or guidance) would such a matter not be recorded as a criminal complaint. My response is that, at the time of my dealing with the matter, a crime had been recorded. The Force Crime Recording Policy required that a crime be recorded when the circumstances reported amounted to a crime defined by law, a victim had confirmed that a crime has occurred and at the time of reporting there is no credible evidence to the contrary immediately available.
31. I have been asked in relation to the Occurrence Log entry that: "officers advised CALOCANE to speak to nurses about the incident when they arrive at the address and to keep a continued distance from [GRO-B]" (the names are likely to be in reverse) who the officers involved in providing this advice were and what was the basis (including any relevant policy or guidance) for that advice. My response is that PC 4416 Wakefield and PC 1190 Pannell dealt with the incident and I do not know which one gave the advice. There is no policy or guidance which would relate to the giving of this advice. Officers give

advice based on the officer's experience, background, training and personal history.

32. I have been asked if I had any involvement in any assessment of Valdo Calocane, what procedures were in place as to assessment of medical and mental health issues and drug testing, and provision of appropriate medical support and were those procedures followed. My response is that I had no involvement in any assessment or testing of Calocane.
33. I have been asked to set out the relevant policies, procedures and criteria which I consider governed my role in relation to this incident and set out the ways in which I consider these were or were not met. My response is that I have set out in the body of this statement the various policies and procedures applicable to my role and the ways in which I consider they were applied.
34. I have been asked whether, looking back, I consider there are additional actions that I or others could have taken in respect of the incident. My response is while I consider all reasonable basic lines of enquiry were completed and proportionate advice given; in hindsight it would have been better had we contacted the University about this incident. They may have had more information in relation to Calocane's mental health and may have been able to put measures in place to safeguard Sebastian [GRO-B] prior to his moving out in the September.
35. I have been asked whether there were any structural issues (regarding police policies, procedures, methodology, training etc.) which contributed to any issues I have identified. My response is that, at the time, there was no mechanism in place for the police to share information with mental health

services in these circumstances. It is my understanding that the sharing agreement was that an adult had to give consent for details to be shared. This is not now necessarily the case. Attending officers will complete a form known as a Public Protection Notice (PPN) which is then sent to a safeguarding team within Nottinghamshire Police. These are reviewed by that team and they decide whether it is necessary and proportionate to share details and with what agency.

36. I have been asked whether there are any recommendations that I consider could help prevent any of the issues that I have identified in respect of this matter. My response is that better information for police officers on how and when to contact University authorities in relation to issues involving students may help to provide better safeguarding.

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.

Signed: **GRO-B**

Dated: 24/10/25

Index to First Witness Statement of ZOEY PRICE

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0000043	Occurrence Log 21000375087
2	NGPF0006054	Policy Document. Re: Crime Outcomes Procedural Guide, NPF
3	NGPF0006050	Crime Recording, 01/04/2021, NPF
4	NGPF0006053	Policy Document. Re: Out of Court Disposals, NPF