

Witness Name: NEIL LANGHAM

Statement No: WITN0029001

Dated: 19.11.25

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PS NEIL LANGHAM

I, NEIL LANGHAM, will say as follows: -

1. My name is Neil Langham, Sergeant 2581.
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 Incident Log for Incident 0613_26042022 (URN: **NGPF0000004**). The incident concerned a report by Sebastian GRO-B that a former flatmate who had assaulted him previously had followed him home.

My Background

4. I joined Nottinghamshire Police in 2002. Prior to joining the police I worked in a variety of roles after leaving the sixth form, most notably in transport and logistics and completed an LLB at Nottingham Trent University via part-time study, graduating in July 2000.

5. I served as a police constable until 2005 when I was promoted to the rank of Sergeant. I have worked mainly in Response and Neighbourhood policing throughout my career.
6. Following my initial training when joining as a student officer in 2002, I have been given ongoing training regularly at what are known as Divisional Training Days where officers are allocated a full training day on given dates. Any updates to legislation or significant issues would form part of this training. I cannot recall specific dates or what content I received on which date nor the specifics of the training I received in relation to stalking offences, but I can say that I was made aware of the offence of stalking and the elements which made up the offence. On checking my training records, I have identified that I completed a Stalking and Harassment e-learning course on line in June 2019.
7. Prior to the 26th April 2022, to the best of my belief, I had no knowledge of, or interactions with, Valdo Calocane, by that or any other name.

Events of the 26th April 2022

8. I have no independent recollection of this incident. I have refreshed my memory by reading the Log for incident number 0613_26042022 **URN: NGPF0000004**).
9. I can see the Incident was created on the 26th April 2022 and assessed by the officer creating it as a Grade 3 incident, meaning it would be dealt with within the Managed Incident Team (MIT), a team of Police officers and Staff whose role it is to deal with incidents of lower, less urgent, risk as opposed to Response officers who deal with higher/more immediate risk incidents.
10. As a Neighbourhood Policing Sergeant at the time, I did not line manage the officers on the MIT but, as a Sergeant, I was responsible for trying to reduce

the number of outstanding or unresourced incidents on the Force's command and control system, SAFE. All Sergeants monitored incidents on a regular basis, usually at least once a day, and it was through doing this that I became aware of this matter. Unresourced incidents of all grades are closely monitored throughout each day and there is a constant drive to keep this number as low as possible by ensuring they are attended to.

11. By reference to the Incident Log, I believe I first became aware of it on the 9th May 2022. I would have seen that the incident was outstanding despite being 13 days old. By outstanding, I mean that the incident was live on SAFE, our command and control system and had not had an officer allocated to deal with it.
12. In my experience, some incidents can be swiftly resolved by a telephone call and will not always need officer attendance or further action being taken. In order to determine if this matter could be quickly resolved over the telephone, I rang the caller, Sebastian [GRO-B] to get more information from him. I do not recall being told any more about the incident than was written on the Incident Log.
13. I cannot recall the detail of the brief conversation I had given the length of time that has passed, but from the update I entered on the Incident Log, it would appear that I was not completely convinced that the matter amounted to stalking and the behaviour of Calocane in relation to the caller could have been merely coincidental. This was an initial assessment based on a brief phone call and had I spoken to Sebastian [GRO-B] for longer and obtained a full timeline of events and specifics my decision would have been more informed

and may have been different but in this case, the purpose of the call was to determine if I could resolve the matter by phone swiftly and I determined this not to be the case.

14. My initial risk assessment in relation to the matter was low as Calocane could have caused harm or shown aggression to the caller at the time of the incident but did not do so. There was no indication of immediate, significant, or serious harm. From my update, the caller, Sebastian [GRO-B], was not sure what action or resolution he wanted in respect of the matter. I did not fully research Sebastian [GRO-B] before calling him to look for any previous reports as my intention was to determine the detail of the report and whether it was something I could resolve with the call. This was not the case and I believed the incident should remain open for officer attendance. I requested that this be left open as I had not dealt with it, having made a call to the complainant. This still required allocation to an officer in the case (OIC) who would take a more detailed account from the victim. The purpose of my call to the victim was to gain an initial oversight and having done that, I determined that it needed dealing with in greater depth, hence my update.

15. At the time of my call, I was not aware of a previous incident between the two. Had I been the officer dealing with and finalising the incident I would have checked our systems for information in respect of both parties, which I have no recollection of doing. I have not subsequently checked any systems in relation to the previous incident so cannot say what impact this would have had on any decision I made regarding the immediate risk, if any. Checking systems would also determine whether or not there were any outstanding criminal matters for Calocane. As I had not checked systems for him, I cannot

say if he had any matters outstanding. The officer in the case should always check systems for subjects with whom they are dealing and deal with any outstanding matters accordingly. I have not subsequently checked systems and cannot confirm whether or not the officer in the case did.

16. In relation to the risk, I would have considered whether there was any immediate threat or likelihood of violence occurring. In this case, it appeared no violence had been threatened towards Sebastian [GRO-B] nor had he been followed to his address. Risk assessment is an ongoing dynamic process and risk level can be re-assessed and changed at any point. My assessment was made at the time with the information I had in respect of the immediate risk posed to Sebastian [GRO-B]. If I had checked systems before calling him, it would have given me more background to previous interactions between the two parties. The purpose of my risk assessing this incident was to assess any immediate risk to Sebastian [GRO-B] and whether the incident could be left at its current grading – Grade 3 – or whether there had been any escalation since the matter was reported and whether I should consider reassessing the risk and regrading the incident to be attended as a higher priority. From refreshing my memory by looking at the incident log for incident 0613_26042022 (URN: **NGPF0000004**), it does not appear Sebastian [GRO-B] had any further issue or escalation with Calocane in the nine days from reporting the matter to my call to him which would tend to support my initial risk assessment that the immediate risk to Sebastian [GRO-B] at that particular moment in time was low.
17. In respect of stalking, I was not personally convinced from the information on the Incident Log and the brief conversation with Sebastian [GRO-B] that this was a stalking incident as it did not appear fixated, obsessive, unwanted or

relentless behaviour. The report was that the behaviour had happened on one day and related to contact then and apparently following Sebastian [GRO-B] part way home, which in my assessment would not amount to being fixated, obsessive or relentless and could have been coincidental. A more in depth conversation with Sebastian [GRO-B] may have added weight to the suggestion that it was more than just coincidence but as I have stated previously my role in this incident was to determine the possibility of me resolving it swiftly via a phone call and when I determined that this was not possible I requested that the matter remain open for more in depth contact. That Sebastian [GRO-B] had accepted Facebook contact from Calocane would also tend to undermine the notion that the contact was unwanted. I cannot state when the Facebook contact was accepted in relation to the conduct complained of as I cannot recall the specifics of my conversation with Sebastian [GRO-B] and my memory is not helped by revisiting the text of the incident. I did not consider any other offences as I determined the matter would need to be investigated in more detail by another officer.

18. Following the conversation I had with Sebastian [GRO-B] I left the incident open for a member of the MIT to make contact with him.
19. I do not recall having any further involvement with this incident or Calocane nor do I recall discussing this incident with any other officers.
20. From reading the Log (URN: NGPF0000004), it seems that the matter was assigned to PC Beardsmore on the 12th May 2022; that he spoke to Sebastian [GRO-B] the same day and that Sebastian [GRO-B] asked for no further action to be taken. There is no update on the log that a Sergeant was spoken to in

relation to the closing of this incident but Sergeants are not routinely consulted regarding the closing of all incidents and at the time I have caused our records to be checked and this incident, due to the stalking element, was closed by a member of the supervisory team working in the Force Control Room.

21. As I was not the investigating officer dealing with this incident, I do not believe I would have gathered any further evidence relating to it or checked systems in relation to Calocane. I have no recollection of making enquiries regarding his mental health. If I had, this may have contributed to an initial risk assessment regarding Calocane and I have addressed this in paragraph 15 above. Checking would have given me more information about Calocane, but as I was not responsible for dealing with and finalising this matter, the information is more significant to the officer in the case who should always check systems in relation to the subject.

22. 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 answer would be that in this case, I did not share any information as I was not the officer finalising the matter. Had I determined any immediate high risk element when I made contact in this matter on the 9th May 2022 I would have caused the relevant parties to be updated but this was not the case. In terms of more general communication of information, should the officer in the case have concerns around the ongoing risk to or posed by a party in a matter they are dealing with they should submit a Public Protection Notice (PPN) (**URN: NGPF0007925**). This is in effect a risk assessment completed on our NICHE

crime and intelligence system. It is then reviewed by our Public Protection department and passed onto the relevant partners for any action or update. This would typically be Social Care or Health Services. Normally family (unless the subject is a juvenile) or a past educational provider (such as Nottingham University in this case) would not be updated unless a specific risk was posed to them. As a reviewing officer and not the officer in the case regarding this matter I did not submit a PPN. I have not subsequently checked systems to determine if or when any PPNs concerning Calocane were submitted but from refreshing my memory from the incident log of 0613_26042022 (**URN: NGPF0000004**) it does not appear that one was submitted.

23. When sharing information with other parties, police officers are bound by the Data Protection Act however should we identify risks to other parties with whom we do not have a data sharing agreement, we can request a Data Protection form to enable us to share the information. Subject to that, there were no barriers to sharing information.
24. I am aware of the Stalking Screening Tool. It is my understanding that it was not rolled out and in use in Nottinghamshire Police at the time of my contact in this incident in April/May 2022. Based upon my knowledge of it now, I would not have applied it in relation to the above incident had it been in place as my contact with the caller was to review the matter and determine if I could resolve it by telephone and when it became apparent that I could not do so, I ceased my involvement with the incident.

25. I have not had any other involvement regarding Calocane and so I am unable to comment on any medical or mental health assessments, drug testing nor provision of medical support.
26. I have been asked about any policies or procedures which governed my role in respect of this incident. The Nottinghamshire Police Incident Grading Policy (**URN: NGPF0007924**) applied to this incident. Current policy is that any incidents graded for the Managed Incident Team are classed as Grade 3, often shortened to G3. Current policy is that these incidents should be dealt with within 24 hours of receipt and this was the case in 2022. In this case, due to demand, we failed to meet this target. Clearly as a force, this target has not been met and this was due to staffing levels in the Managed Incident Team at the time. There was not - and is not to the best of my knowledge – any specific procedure requiring Sergeants to check, review and attempt to resolve outstanding Grade 3 incidents on the SAFE system but pressures to keep outstanding demand in check, review outstanding risk and assist victims means that Neighbourhood Sergeants did carry out this task.
27. I have been asked if I have any concerns regarding the police's actions in relation to this matter. My answer would be that had we resourced this incident in question within the initial 24 hours we may have given the caller more confidence to support any interventions the Police may have been able to make and that in the intervening days until resolved, Mr **GRO-B** desire to support positive action may have waned.
28. I have also been asked if I have any concerns in respect of the recording of this matter. Having not checked the system subsequently, I cannot confirm

exactly the actions taken by the officer in the case but it does not appear from the incident log that a PPN was submitted, nor an intelligence report. An intelligence report does not generate any risk assessment to be sent to our Public Protection department for dissemination to partner agencies but does provide background for anyone accessing the system for background or risk assessment purposes. A crime was not recorded in this case and without knowing exactly what was said by Sebastian GRO-B in full detail and doing any other work on this case I cannot comment on the officer in the case's decision. I can see from reading the incident log that the matter was reviewed by the Force's crime auditors on 13th May 2022 (with the comment NCRS reviewed) and they deemed that on the initial incident details and officer updates that a recordable crime had not been disclosed.

29. Looking back, I do not believe there are additional actions I could have taken personally in respect of the matter as I did not deal with and finalise it. My role was to determine if it was suitable for resolution over the phone and having determined that this was not the case and there was no immediate raised risk, the incident was left open for the Managed Incident Team to resolve. Reports of non-domestic stalking would still be dealt with by the MIT now, dependent upon circumstances, but not domestic related reports.
30. I have been asked whether I consider there are any structural issues (regarding police policies, procedures, methodology, training etc.) which contributed to any issues I have identified. My answer is that I do not believe there are structural issues, just the issue of the speed of resourcing of this incident.

31. I have been asked if there are any recommendations that I consider could help prevent any of the issues identified. My answer would only be to ensure the prompt allocation of incidents. I cannot comment on what exactly was said to the officer in the case when obtaining full details from Sebastian [GRO-B] and discussing the matter in full with him but, as this was 16 days after he reported the matter, I question if Sebastian [GRO-B] confidence in the police dealing with matters robustly may have been undermined and that he may have disclosed more information or supported action if we had dealt with his matter more promptly or he may have felt more confident in reporting further issues to us.

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: 19.11.25

Index to First Witness Statement of NEIL LANGHAM

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0000004	Incident Log 0613_26042022
2	NGPF0007925	PPN Web form Officer Guidance July 2018 (1).pdf
3	NGPF0007924	PD 580 Incident Grading Resolution Policy - Copy (1).pdf