

Witness Name: ASHLEIGH SMALL

Statement No: WITN0028001

Dated: 08/11/2025

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PS ASHLEIGH SMALL

I, ASHLEIGH SMALL, will say as follows: -

1. My name is Ashleigh Small.
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. I have refreshed my memory of this matter by reference to the Incident Log Occurrence Log 22000439907 (**URN: NGPF0000003**). I have very limited independent recollection of events.

My Background

4. I joined Nottinghamshire Police in 2014.
5. Prior to joining Nottinghamshire Police, I undertook a level 5 Foundation Degree in Sports Leisure and Psychology at Nottingham Trent University. Whilst undertaking this degree I worked in a primary school to gain experience for the future. Having obtained my degree, I worked at a special educational needs school as a Teaching Assistant, before joining teaching staff providing lessons

when qualified teachers were on annual leave or unable to conduct classes. I joined Nottinghamshire Police in September 2014, completing training school and becoming operational as a police constable in February 2015 as a Response officer.

6. From February 2015 to 2021 I was stationed on response front line policing at Radford Road Police station. From 2021 to 2022 I was on a team named Operation Reacher, a pro-active internal team focused on reducing harm caused by prolific offenders in the local area. This enabled me to undertake extra responsibilities and courses such as public order training, method of entry training, further training on police intelligence systems and was a specialist role.
7. In May 2022 I passed my sergeants exams and boards, becoming substantive in the role of Sergeant in April 2022. I worked on Radford Road Neighbourhood policing team for roughly 5 months in place of a colleague who was injured on duty, until September 2022, before moving to St Anns Neighbourhood policing team in September 2022. Between September 2022 and July 2025 I held the position of Neighbourhood Sergeant at St Anns Police Station and have more recently moved to Oxclose Lane neighbourhood policing team.
8. Throughout these roles until more recently I have received limited training in relation to stalking and stalking prevention. The first training I received was at training school in 2015. From then on much of the stalking training prior to 2024 has been online and as part of a requirement known as E-learning. These consist of online packages created by the College of Policing and Nottinghamshire Police. I cannot remember precisely how many packages I completed or what was included, but I did complete them. Since 2024, the

training as part of the neighbourhood training packages has increased, with both E-learning and classroom inputs from knowledge experts.

9. Prior to the 28th July 2022, I had no knowledge of, or interactions with, Valdo Calocane, by that or any other name, to the best of my recollection.

Events of the 28th July 2022

10. As I have stated, I have refreshed my memory of this matter by reading Occurrence 22000439907 (**URN: NGPF0000003**). This occurrence was investigated by an officer, PC Barnes, who came under my supervision of the team at Radford Road Police Station in 2022. I had no prior knowledge of the occurrence on the basis that the Officer in Case (OIC) came from and carried that investigation from a previous team, known as the Managed Incident Team (MIT) who oversee the investigation of offences with low threat, harm and risk, often dealing with incidents over the phone. I did not have any involvement in the initial incident, and I did not review the Incident Log at the time of finalising the investigation, as all the information I required was on the occurrence report created by PC Barnes.
11. I was not involved in taking the original report from Sebastian GRO-B I was the Supervising Officer of PC Barnes who was responsible for investigating Sebastian GRO-B report. This information is then used to create the occurrence report and information is transferred across to the Occurrence.
12. I note that the Occurrence Log (**URN: NGPF0000003**) has an entry made by PC Barnes on the 8th August 2022 referring to a conversation with a Supervisor. I believe that must have been me. At that time, the information known was that both the suspect and victim lived in the same building and they

- went to the same gym and it was likely to have been coincidental that Mr Calocane was there at the same time. PC Barnes stated there was no CCTV and that Mr Calocane had not made any attempts to speak to or engage with Sebastian [GRO-B]. No injuries were sustained. As a result, there was no evidence to support a realistic prospect of conviction.
13. From the Occurrence Log (URN: NGPF0000003), I can see that I authorised the closing of the file on the 25th August 2022. From reading the Incident Log 0089_28072022 (URN: NGPF0000005) I see that Calocane was named; there was a previous assault by Calocane which resulted in Sebastian [GRO-B] moving from his property; that both [GRO-B] and Calocane being at the gym could have been coincidental; and that the caller saw Calocane at the gym once or twice a week. Sebastian [GRO-B] reported that, while walking home he saw someone hid behind a wall, but this person is unknown. Within the incident log are references to checks made by Force Control Room on both Sebastian [GRO-B] and Calocane. I note there were no warning markers or flags for either and both were only involved in the occurrence of the assault formerly mentioned.
 14. I can further see from the information in the Occurrence Log (URN: NGPF0000003) that this was the second time this had occurred and that, in April 2022. Calocane had followed Sebastian [GRO-B] to his home address but did not enter the building, and that Calocane does not know which flat Sebastian [GRO-B] resides in.
 15. There was no information to suggest that Calocane had made any attempts to speak to the victim, nor had he made any physical advances towards him, causing no threat, harm or risk towards the victim at this time. PC Barnes had

conducted reasonable and proportionate lines of enquiry based on the threat, harm and risk assessment and therefore my threat assessment did not deem it proportionate to arrest the suspect at that time as there no necessity to do so and no supporting evidence to put to Calocane to formally progress the matter. I merely had the honest held belief that the two incidents being four months apart from one another were coincidental.

16. I note that Sebastian GRO-B had stated he was happy for the police to speak with Calocane and advise him to stay away from Sebastian GRO-B in the future. I also note the officer's attempts to speak with Calocane and the fact she had left a card at his address asking for contact.
17. Based on all the factors above, I closed the investigation as 'Outcome 16 – Victim does not wish to support a prosecution'.
18. I have been asked what my knowledge was of any issues concerning Valdo Calocane's mental health. My response is none; I was not aware of any issues with Calocane.
19. I have been asked the question 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 the investigation did not require any safeguarding to be put in place. Accordingly, I did not contact any other organisations or Calocane's family. There was no reason to do so on the information known at the time.

20. 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 that there were no barriers.
21. I have been asked if there were any outstanding criminal matters at the time of my involvement in this matter. My response is that there were no outstanding criminal matters to my knowledge. I was unaware that Calocane had been involved in any other investigations, based on the information within incident log 0089_28072022 (URN: **NGPF0000005**) stating there were no flags or warning markers for Calocane and that he was only linked to one other occurrence, which related to the assault previously mentioned.
22. I have been asked if I am aware of the Stalking Screening Tool, whether I have received any training in this and, if so, when and what it included and what, if any, relevance it has to the incident involving Valdo Calocane. My response is that my knowledge was very limited at the time of the investigation. However, using my initiative I could have found this using the Force Intranet. Based on the information known about occurrence 22000439907 (URN: **NGPF0000003**) the Screening Tool would not have been a consideration as the threat, harm and risk levels were low and a because it seemed likely that the contact was coincidental.
23. I have been asked whether 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 the provision of appropriate medical support and whether those procedures were followed. My response is that I did not have any involvement in the assessment of Calocane.

24. 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 the ways in which these were or were not met. My response to this is that I used the National Decision Making Model (NDM) to inform my decision making in this case. I based my decision on the risk assessment carried out by the Force Control Room originally, based on an assessment of risk based on the THRIVE tool (Threat, Harm, Risk, Investigation, Vulnerability, and Engagement) and the information subsequently obtained by PC Barnes.
25. 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, while I believe the matter was dealt with correctly, I should have documented my decision-making more frequently, concisely and with clarity.
26. 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 no concerns. The officer in the case (OIC) correctly recorded the occurrence in line with National Crime Recording Standards (NCRS).
27. I have been asked if, looking back, I consider there are additional actions that I or others could have taken in respect of the incident and, if so, to set them out in detail. My response to this question is, on reflection, yes. I believe the OIC could have included more detail of previous incidents on Occurrence 22000439907 (**URN: NGPF0000003**), ensuring that previous incidents were linked or mentioned. This would have provided me with greater clarity on not just this incident in isolation but would have allowed me to consider others of a similar nature too. Equally, I could have conducted further checks on

- previous incidents myself. As a Supervisor I should have ensured that I had all relevant information before making a finalisation decision. I should have ensured that more detail was provided on NICHE so that it was clear to someone outside the organisation what was considered and what actions were taken as a result. I feel my lack of detail on the Occurrence does not show my thought processes nor my clear decision making.
28. Upon further reflection I believe that a stalking risk assessment or a harassment assessment, independent of the threat harm and risk assessment should have been completed by me and documented on NICHE. This would have shown I had considered the stalking tool. I do not believe using this tool would have changed the outcome of the investigation, however.
29. On reviewing the Occurrence and the detail documented, I can see that other than the OIC's finalisation entry on the Occurrence Log there is a lack of detail. This is something I have since addressed as a Supervisor with my officers' subsequent investigations.
30. I have been asked if I consider that there are any structural issues (regarding police policies, procedures, methodology, training etc.) which contributed to any issues I have identified. My response to this is; yes. The training delivered on stalking at the time was mainly online, through web portals and was not engaging. Most officers see this is a necessary exercise and do not pay attention nor engage with the process fully. This style of training, whilst I understand is both cost effective and timely, does not teach or inform all individuals within a multitude of learning styles.

31. With regards to structural and policy changes, Nottinghamshire Police have since applied a classroom based training initiative meaning all persons are now attending Police HQ to undertake training in person which is interactive and engaging, this alongside the online learning, which reinforces.
32. 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. My response to this question is that I have outlined a number of my recommendations in previous answers, such as the Stalking Screening Tool risk assessment to be completed upon a stalking occurrence being created and that Nottinghamshire Police have already implemented an in-person training schedule for all officers.
33. In addition, I would recommend that a way to ensure specific tools such as Stalking Screening Tools are used effectively is to build in the assessment on such offences on NICHE, which compels officers to use the Tool before being able to progress the matter. An example of this is the Domestic Abuse Public Protection Notice (DAPPN) formerly known as the DASH, which is built in the screens an officer has to complete for domestic abuse matters on NICHE.

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: 08/11/2025

Index to First Witness Statement of ASHLEIGH SMALL

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0000003	Occurrence details, dated 13/09/2023, Nottingham Police
2	NGPF0000005	Incident Details, dated 30/07/2022, Nottingham Police