

Witness Name: STEPHEN SWIFT

Statement No: WITN0021001

Dated: 29/10/2025

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PS STEPHEN SWIFT

I, STEPHEN SWIFT, will say as follows: -

1. My name is Stephen Swift.
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 order to refresh my memory in the making of this statement, I have read and reviewed Custody Records C20024405 and C20024552 (URN: NGPF0000077 and URN: NGPF0000095 respectively).

My Background

4. Prior to joining the police, I pursued a path of academic advancement following the completion of secondary school. I began by studying A Levels, which led to my enrolment in an undergraduate programme in Human Geography. Upon completing my degree, I was awarded a funded scholarship from the Social Sciences Research Council (SSRC). This opportunity enabled me to complete a Postgraduate Certificate, a Postgraduate Diploma in research, and ultimately

a master's degree in Economic and Social Science Research I joined Nottinghamshire Police in 2006.

5. I served as a police constable until 2019, spending approximately nine years as a Response Officer based in Sutton-in-Ashfield. I subsequently transitioned into the role of Field Intelligence Officer, where I continued to develop my operational and investigative expertise focusing on covert policing. In January 2019, I was appointed Acting Sergeant within the Intelligence Support Unit, and in May 2019, I received a temporary promotion in the same role. Following a successful interview during the summer of 2019, I achieved substantive promotion and received my first substantive posting within the Custody Department.

6. I am currently based at Nottinghamshire Police Headquarters in the role of Applications Sergeant. I am the primary liaison between Nottinghamshire Police and service providers for Nottinghamshire Police's core records management platform, NICHE RMS. I represent Nottinghamshire Police at regional and national stakeholder groups in order to influence system development and share operational insights. My key responsibilities are:
 - To serve as Nottinghamshire Police's subject matter expert for all aspects of the NICHE system, providing strategic and operational guidance across the organisation.

 - To represent Nottinghamshire Police at external governance forums, contributing to cross-force collaboration and policy alignment.

- To foster productive partnerships with internal stakeholders, developers, and third-party suppliers to support the scoping, design, and implementation of system workflows, applications, and integrations.
 - To maintain oversight of service performance and development costs, supporting fiscal accountability and alignment with operational needs; and.
 - To collaborate with the Asset & Configuration Lead to manage software licensing, entitlement tracking, support contracts, and renewal cycles.
7. Between 4th November 2019 and 7th March 2021 I performed the role of Custody Sergeant at the Bridewell Custody Suite, Nottingham and between 8th March 2021 and 31st August 2021 at Mansfield Custody Suite, Nottinghamshire.
 8. The role of the Custody Sergeant is to take responsibility for the custody and protection of detainees and the progress of the investigative process in the police station. The primary legislation governing the arrest and detention of persons is the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (“PACE”).
 9. My initial custody sergeant training commenced 4th November 2019 and concluded 6th December 2019 with refresher training being conducted 28th October 2020 and 15th September 2021. In addition, custody staff receive advanced first aid training as part of the initial 5-week course. These skills were refreshed on 9th June 2021 and 8th July 2020.
 10. The initial custody sergeant training covers the breadth of upskilling required to effectively operate as a Custody Officer and includes legislative training, enhanced first aid training, enhanced NICHE system training (NICHE is the Nottinghamshire Police crime recording and management system), risk assessment training, mental health awareness. The training includes a number

of guest training sessions from partners such as Mitie Care and Custody who provide Health Care Professionals in the custody environment; Project Nova, who specifically support those who have experienced previous military service and mental health awareness input provided by the Force mental health lead.

11. Prior to 24th May 2020, I had no knowledge of, or interactions with, Valdo Calocane, by that or any other name, to the best of my recollection.

Events of 24th May 2020

12. At or around 06.30pm on 24th May 2020, I was on duty as a Custody Officer at the Bridewell Custody Suite when I took over responsibility for the detainees in Cells MR5-J4 from Police Sergeant 1173 Hennessy.
13. At that time, the person I now know to be Valdo Calocane was detained under custody reference number C20024405.
14. Custody Record C20024405 (**URN: NGPF0000077**) had been created as a result of Mr Calocane having been brought into custody at 00:47 am on 24th May 2020 and remained in police detention.
15. Given the number of persons brought into the custody suite, I have no independent recollection of Mr Calocane or his period of detention and rely on the content of the Custody Record.
16. The Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000077**) indicates that Mr Calocane was arrested on suspicion of causing criminal damage at 00:20 am on the 24th May 2020 by PC 3482 Eustace.
17. The handover process between departing and receiving Custody Sergeants occurs at the booking in desk around the Booking in Sergeants' terminal. Any

non-custody staff are requested to leave the area and an Aide Memoire document is used to facilitate the verbal briefing between the departing and receiving teams to remind the handing over Sergeant of pertinent points to make the receiving Sergeant aware of so as to comply with the handover procedure contained in APP custody. The handover is conducted in accordance with the requirements of the College of Policing Authorised Professional Practice for Custody (APP), the East Midlands CJS Custody Procedures (URN: **NGPF0006072**) and Nottinghamshire Police Custody Procedure PS330 (URN: **NGPF0007406**).

18. While this takes place the Custody Whiteboard is usually displayed on the screen and individual records can be opened as they are discussed. The whiteboard is a graphical representation of the custody suite with each cell occupying a row and resembles a spreadsheet in appearance. Each row has several columns which include details such as cell number, name of detainee, the occupants' total time in custody, when the next PACE review is to be conducted and by who, the detainees' observation level and visit frequency and any risk indicators displayed as icons. There is also a free text remarks field for pertinent notes. Most amendments to the whiteboard are made in the respective custody records and cannot be amended directly from the whiteboard itself; the exception to this is the note field which can only be amended whilst working in the Whiteboard itself. Access to amend the whiteboard and records are controlled by system roles and are limited to those that work in custody.
19. A copy of the document is then e-mailed to the receiving Sergeant and was sent to me at 06.25pm on the 24th May 2020 (URN: **NGPF0000067**).

20. It is not uncommon for this to be sent in the few minutes ahead of the formal handover as each Sergeant's position is rostered ahead of the day.
21. From a review of the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000077**), I can see that PS 1173 Hennessy documented that the handover took place at or around 06.38 pm.
22. At the time of the handover, Mr Calocane had already been interviewed and released under investigation for the allegation and was awaiting transport home.
23. Following the verbal handover process, as the receiving Sergeant, I would have conducted a walkthrough of the Suite and those cells I was taking responsibility for, together with my designated Detention Officer. This includes visiting and speaking to each detainee and if necessary, waking them in order to do so. 24th May 2020 was a Sunday so the minimum staffing for Custody officers for the suite which is split over two floors was three Sergeants, I don't recall exactly how many Sergeants were on duty that day.
24. At or around 07.00pm on the 24th May 2020 I documented that this visit had taken place with Detention Officer 9171 Taylor and that Mr Calocane made no representations or requests.
25. At or around 07.17 pm on the 24th May 2020 Mr Calocane, along with his property being held whilst in custody, were handed over to the transporting officer and the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000077**) was closed. Mr Calocane was released at 07.17 pm.
26. At or around 09.30 pm on the 24th May 2020, I was still on duty when Mr Calocane was returned to the Bridewell Custody Suite in relation to a new

incident 0730_24052020. A new Custody Record, C20024552 (URN: **NGPF0000095**), was created.

27. The Custody Record (URN: **NGPF0000095**) indicates that PC Lane presented Mr Calocane following his arrest relating to alleged criminal damage to a neighbour's door after Calocane had returned home. I now believe the details of the arresting, investigating and presenting officer may have been incorrectly recorded. I will deal with that issue elsewhere in this statement.
28. The Custody Record (URN: **NGPF0000095**) shows that I authorised the detention of Mr Calocane at or around 09.46 pm.
29. The grounds for arresting a person are set out in section 24 of PACE. In summary, in addition to having reasonable grounds for suspecting someone of committing an offence, the arresting officer must also believe the arrest is necessary.
30. As a Custody Officer I would seek information from the arresting or delivering officer as to the circumstances of the person's arrest. This includes the circumstances that led to the arrest. This information is entered onto the Custody Record.
31. In relation to Mr Calocane, the custody record (URN: **NGPF0000095**) details that the circumstances of the arrest were that: "THE DETAINEE HAS RETURNED (*sic*) HOME FROM CUSTODY EARLIER IN THE EVENING, HE HAS THEN BEEN KICKING THE FRONT DOOR OF A NEIGHBOURS PROPERTY SO HARD IT HAS DAMAGED THE LOCKING MECHANISM AND HAS CAUSED THE OCCUPANT TO FLEE THE ADDRESS BY JUMPING OUT OF A FIRST FLOOR WINDOW."

32. I am also aware, having reviewed the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**), that the necessity for the arrest is set out as to 'Allow the prompt and effective investigation; Protect a child or other vulnerable person'.
33. I would have obtained the above information from the arresting or delivering officer in order to be satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to detain the person in order to charge him or her with an offence or that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the person's detention is necessary in order to secure or preserve evidence relating to the offence(s) for which the person has been arrested and secure evidence by questioning. This information is recorded on the custody record by me as required by section 37 of PACE.
34. As part of the process of booking a person into police custody, I also conducted a risk assessment at around 09:40 pm which included the taking of information from the detained person in order to assess any medical conditions which may require special consideration or require treatment to be given to the person.
35. I can see from having reviewed the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) that Mr Calocane appears to have remained silent to all questions I put to him. It is not unusual for detainees to refuse to speak. The risk assessment process is more than just listening to the responses or silences, it involves observing the detainee, their demeanour, behaviour, reviewing previous interactions whether that be previous records and risk assessments, Police National Computer (PNC) history or previous known interactions.
36. As the Custody Sergeant, I am primarily responsible for the welfare and safety and lawful detention of the detainee whilst in police custody. The custody record

- records at 09:41 pm that a request for Mr Calocane to be examined for fitness to detain due to mental health concerns was made and that would have been at my request.
37. At 09:43 pm Mr Calocane was placed on Level 3 – constant observations. Level 3 observation is commonly applied when a full risk assessment cannot be made. It means that while in his cell, Mr Calocane would have been continually monitored via in-cell CCTV by an appropriately trained and briefed member of staff or police officer to ensure that he was unable to harm himself. The College of Policing APP for Custody also recommends that an HCP be called for all level 3 detainees.
 38. The Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) records that at or around 09.54 pm I attempted to contact the Mental Health Crisis Team who had had an interaction with Mr Calocane earlier in the day and a message was left requesting a call back
 39. The Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) also details that Mr Calocane was seen by a Health Care Professional employed by Mitie who are contracted to provide this service to Nottinghamshire Police in order to assess Mr Calocane's fitness to be detained. At 9.59 pm, Nurse Finney assessed Mr Calocane was fit to be detained on the basis that he was safer in police custody than out on the street.
 40. The Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) details that at or around 10.47 pm I attempted to contact the Crisis team again and left another message for them.
 41. The Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) details that at or around 11.01 pm a member of the Mental Health Crisis Team returned my call and that I

summarised the conversation as follows: 'They confirm that the detainee was seen in the day and was assessed as having 1st episode Psychosis and sleep deprivation. The Detainee wasn't detained under MH act and the plan going forward was for the crisis team to visit this evening and monitor the detainee take medication and then to visit him twice a day going forward.

I have relayed the circumstances of today's incident to them and Brandy will be making contact with a band 7 senior to review how best to progress. Brandy stated she will ring back once she has sought this advice.'

42. I can see from the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) that Mr Calocane had a supervised telephone conversation with his mother at or around 11:54 pm.
43. At or around 00:07am on the 25th May 2020 I attempted once again to conduct a risk assessment of Valdo Calocane. From the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**), I can see that he responded to my questions, however answered no to each one. I then updated the risk assessment with the following 'THE DETAINEE WAS SILENT AND NOT ANSWERING QUESTIONS, HOWEVER NOW IS. CRISIS TEAM STATE HAS 1ST EPPISODE PSYCOSIS (*sic*) AND SLEEP DEPVEVATION (*sic*) ALTHOUGH DETAINEE ANSWERED NO TO EVERY QUESTION.' There was no change to the care plan and Valdo Calocane remained on L3 observations.
44. I made an entry on the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) that, at or around 01:07 am on 25th May 2020, I received an update from the Mental Health Crisis Team and recorded the following summary: 'Update from Brandy from the Crisis team, their Band 7 recommends another MH assessment, they have

made contact with EDT (Emergency Duty Team) however they will not take the referral from them. Contact made with HCP who will make contact with EDT'

45. It appears from subsequent entries made in the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) that at or around 01:10 am the HCP Nurse Finney referred the case to an Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP) in accordance with the Crisis Team recommendations and was then recontacted by the AMHP at or around 01:45 am and updated the Custody Record with the following note: 'They will come and perform a full MHAA (Mental Health Act Assessment) later on today at approx. 09:00am'
46. Mr Calocane remained on level 3 observations for the rest of the night. From my review of the record, he appears to have remained awake all evening.
47. At or around 06.46 am hours on 25th May 2020 I verbally handed over to the receiving Custody Sergeant Cook and forwarded him the handover Aide Memoire word document at 06:46 am via e-mail (**URN: NGPF0000080**). In summary, the information passed was: 'Silent throughout booking in process. Detainee has been stood in cell all night. Was mentally assessed 24/05/2020 and deemed fit after similar offence. Crisis team provided details: From MH assessment yesterday was to be seen by crisis team at home tonight then twice a day to ensure compliance with meds. Committed new offence before crisis team pick up job.

Mother is Celeste CALOCANE [GRO-B] lives at [GRO-B]

Is stopping locally and will take custody of son upon release.

Contact made with Crisis team: New MH assessment booked 9am'

48. I can see from the Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) that Sergeant 90 Cook endorsed the record with to the effect that he accepted responsibility for Mr Calocane at 07:09 am.
49. I do not recall having any subsequent involvement with Mr Calocane.
50. Mr Calocane received the appropriate referral initially to the Health Care Professional based at the suite which subsequently resulted in a referral to an Approved Mental Health Professional. He was appropriately risk assessed, and mitigations put in place to ensure his safety during my period of responsibility for his detention.
51. I have been asked what my knowledge of any issues concerning Valdo Calocane's mental health was. My response is that my initial knowledge of issues concerning Valdo Calocane's mental health is that received at the commencement of my tour of duty on 24th May 2020 upon receiving the handover from PS Hennessy. Subsequently all further knowledge is recorded within custody record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) and has been set out above.
52. I have been asked whether details of the attendance and/or decisions or actions taken were 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 I did communicate directly with health and social services as set out in the Custody Log entries (**URN: NGPF0000095**) and also contact was made with Calocane's family to enable Calocane to speak to his mother. That contact was facilitated by Detention Officer Patel. At the custody desks there are two handsets, one on the detainee side of the desk with no buttons and another

on the staff/officer side which allows for outgoing calls. This then allows for a three way call to take place between the detainee and their nominated person while the detention officer can monitor and control the call from the second handset

53. I have been asked if 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 there was an initial delay in being able to contact the Crisis Team and obtain an understanding of their intervention post release and obtain their advice. Two calls were placed which are documented in the custody record (**URN: NGPF0000095**) occurring at or around 09:54pm and 10:47 pm on 24th May 2020 respectively. There was also a delay in obtaining the full Mental Health Act Assessment for Valdo Calocane in that an appointment was set for 09:00am 25th May 2020 following a referral made by HCP Finney at or around 01:10 am.
54. I have been asked if there were any outstanding criminal matters at the time of my involvement in this matter and if so, what my knowledge was of these and what actions did I take. My response is I was aware that Valdo Calocane had been released under investigation for an offence of criminal damage under £5000 earlier that evening, as I had processed his release in regard to C20024405 (**URN: NGPF0000077**) earlier in the shift.
55. I have been asked if I had any involvement in any assessment of Valdo Calocane and what procedures were in place as to assessment of medical and mental health issues and drug testing, and provision of appropriate medical

- support. My response is that I have set out in some detail in this statement the steps taken to assess Calocane's mental health.
56. 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 Mr Calocane was detained throughout to the best of my recollection in accordance with PACE and the APP for Custody and the East Midlands Criminal Justice Service (EMCJS) Custody Procedures which were applicable at the time. EMCJS was a regional collaboration for all criminal Justice services between Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire Police.
57. I have been asked to set out any concerns that I have in respect of the police's actions in relation to this matter. My response is that I have no specific concerns in regard to the police's actions.
58. I have been asked to set out any concerns that I have in respect of the recording of this matter. My response is that I have a concern in relation to this matter in respect of the issue I raised at paragraph 27 above. On reading Custody Record C20024552 (**URN: NGPF0000095**), I see that it indicates that PC 3973 Lane was the arresting, investigating and delivering police officer. However, I have now been made aware that PC Lane was not on duty at the time of arrest and that the information in those fields within the record are inaccurate. Occurrence 20000262821 attributed to the arrest has a creation time of 00:01 25th May 2020. Reviewing the event log on the Custody Record, I can see that, at 00:46 am, Detention Officer Moore populated the occurrence number into

the arrest details on the Custody Record which, in turn, linked the officer details to the NICHE occurrence. I have subsequently been advised that the transporting and arresting officer was PC 3974 Smith and it is likely, therefore, that I mistakenly keyed 3973 instead of 3974, which would automatically populate the field with PC Lane's name.

59. I have been asked if I consider there are additional actions that I or others could have taken in respect of the incident. If so, please set these out in detail. My response is that, upon review, the period of Valdo Calocane's detention I was responsible for was an overnight period of approximately 10 continuous hours and that, at the point of hand over to PS Cook at 07:09am the following morning, I was responsible for a total of 8 detainees. Valdo Calocane was one of three detainees on L3 CCTV observations and there was a further detainee on a higher level four constant observation, I do not feel there is more I could have done.
60. I have been asked if I consider there are any structural issues (regarding police policies, procedures, methodology, training etc.) which contributed to any issues I have identified. My response is that I do not consider any particular structural issues of Nottinghamshire Police contributed, however I do feel that had the Crisis team intervened earlier in the evening of 24th May 2020 as they subsequently explained to me was their intention, Valdo Calocane may not have had cause to be arrested that same evening. Broadly speaking contacting both the Emergency Duty Team and the Crisis Team is always challenging, often requiring multiple calls and messages to be left. The experience documented in relation to custody record C20024552 (**URN: NGPF0000095**) in respect of myself and others having recorded having to leave

messages often multiple times for these services in order to then receive a call back was, during my whole period as a Custody Sergeant, very common and not limited to this case.

61. I have been asked if there 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 there are none.

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: 29/10/2025

Index to First Witness Statement of STEPHEN SWIFT

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0000077	Custody Record of Valdo Calocane, dated 14/03/2025, Nottinghamshire Police
2	NGPF0000095	Custody Record of Valdo Calocane, dated 24/05/2020, Nottinghamshire Police Force
3	NGPF0000067	Custody Whiteboard
4	NGPF0000080	Cell Observation Notes (Unknown Author and Undated)
5	NGPF0006072	Nottinghamshire Police (EMCJS) Custody Policy
6	NGPF0007406	Notts Custody Policy C2.0 2023-24