

Witness Name: RACHEL WAKEFIELD

Statement No: WITN0039002

Dated: 28 February 2026

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF PC RACHEL WAKEFIELD

I, RACHEL WAKEFIELD, will say as follows:-

1. My name is Rachel Wakefield.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the “**Inquiry**”) with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 25th February 2026 (the “**Request**”).
3. In making this statement, I have refreshed my memory by reading the Incident Log for incident 0581_05072021 (**URN: NGPF0000044**), the Occurrence Log 21000375087 (**URN: NGPF0000043**), paragraph 11 of the witness statement of Amy Pannell (**WITN0015001**), her Pocket Notebook Entry (**URN: NGPF0000045**) and paragraph 40 of the witness statement of Sebastian (**WITN0151001**). I have no/very limited independent recollection of this incident.

Role As Tutor To Amy Pannell

4. I was the tutor of PC Amy Pannell, to the best of my recollection, from 16th June 2021 to 31st August 2021.

5. I was PC Pannell's second tutor after she had an initial period of tutorship for 10 weeks with another tutor.

6. The main roles and responsibilities of a tutor are to mentor the probationer officer while they complete a performance pack, which has a series of points that the probationer has to demonstrate to show competence across a number of core areas, including attending a range of incidents commonly encountered by police officers. The probationer officer also has to be able to demonstrate effective use of police systems. Due to PC Pannell having already had a previous 10-week probationary period, she was already familiar with a number of the core points, which meant that my supervision did not have to be as rigorous in low level, non-complex investigations and incidents. I do not recall any specific oversight of PC Pannell on the 5th July.

Events of 5th July 2021

7. I have been asked if I recall being at the front counter of Radford Road on the 5th July 2021 at 17:34 and my response is that I do not.

8. I cannot recall any involvement with Sebastian on that date and I do not recall any supervision of PC Pannell in her dealings with him on that day. Given the length of tutorship that PC Pannell had by that date and the fact that this was a grade 2 incident with the initial report being that of a low-level offence, it would not have been uncommon for PC Pannell to speak to the victim alone and take the initial account.

9. I have no recollection of meeting Sebastian on the 5th July 2021 and do not recall any advice given.

10. I have been asked what checks, if any, were undertaken on NICHE as a result of Sebastian's complaint of assault and who undertook these checks. I do not have any recollection of carrying out any checks on Sebastian on NICHE.

11. I have also been asked if such checks were not undertaken, what the reasons were for this. I am unable to comment on whether any checks were carried out.

12. I have been asked whether I consider PC Pannell had sufficient training and experience on the 5th July 2021 to undertake checks of the NICHE system. In my opinion, PC Pannell would have had sufficient training and experience to complete any relevant checks on police systems and come to a conclusion.

13. I have been asked to set out what checks were made of VC's offending history, including what checks, if any, were undertaken of the PNC system as a consequence of Sebastian's complaint and to provide the results of any such

checks. I have also been asked what, if checks were not undertaken, the reasons for this were. My response is that, where I am able to, I will always look into a person's history on police systems to see if they have any past incidents reported. However, I do not recall if any checks were made on VC's offending history as a result of this incident.

14. I have been asked if I can recall advice being given to Sebastian that he should make VC's mental health team aware of the incident when they next called at his flat and, if such advice was given, set out why it was given and by whom. I have no recollection of this matter and so cannot recall any advice given to Sebastian. However, I would comment that the advice for Sebastian to speak to VC's mental health support workers would seem like a sensible idea due to the fact that he lives with VC and is able to witness his behaviour and would then be able to explain his concerns directly to them.

15. I have been asked what, if any, consideration was given by either me or PC Pannell to contact being made with the Street Triage Team or to Mental Health Crisis Teams and/or the team which visited VC at home. My response is that, while I have no recollection of being involved in this matter, typically the Street Triage Team work on the basis of immediate concerns arising from an incident attended by officers in respect of the mental health of either the person reporting or the suspected offender. In this case, given that the incident had concluded, the criteria for the Street Triage Team to attend would not have been met.

16. In relation to the suggestion of trying to speak to VC's own health workers, I would not have known how to have identified his health workers.
17. The Crisis Team, I believe, are primarily intended to deal with immediate concerns for a person's mental health. While I see there is mention of a concern about VC's mental health, I do not believe that on the basis of the information we had, that the Crisis Team would have been engaged.
18. I have been asked to detail why, irrespective of any views expressed by Sebastian as to how the incident should be handled, consideration was not given to visiting VC in order to further investigate the circumstances. My response is that the incident in question is a report of a low-level assault in which Sebastian's account was that his flatmate grabbed him by the shirt sleeve and pushed him against a wall. According to the Occurrence Log, Sebastian attended the police station and spoke to PC Pannell. An account was taken from Sebastian, who appears to have stated that he did not wish to provide a statement to the police or take the matter further by supporting a prosecution. I cannot recall any involvement in the incident and I am unable to say if consideration was given to speaking to VC.
19. I have been referred to NGPF0000045 and asked to explain the circumstances in which this pocket notebook entry came to be made. I will say that this is an entry made in the pocket notebook of PC Pannell. It is a 'negative' pocket notebook entry, which is a small statement obtained from the victim in an investigation. It will detail what happened in a few sentences and record that the victim does not wish to take

the matter any further or attend court. The PNB is then signed by the victim and it is then scanned on to police systems.

20. I have been asked what advice was given to Sebastian as to what he should do if he encountered further issues with VC and who gave the advice. I do not recall speaking to Sebastian at all.

21. I have been asked if I was aware of a message sent by Sebastian to PC Pannell on the 14th July 2021 which reads: "Good morning, Thanks for your help on this issue. My flatmate tried to come into my room at 5am this morning without knocking, but left again when he realised it was locked. I was wondering if this is something worth reporting to the police as well?" My response is that I was not aware of any text message sent by Sebastian to PC Pannell.

22. I have been asked to set out my involvement in the disposal of the complaint of assault made by Sebastian including whether there were any discussions or guidance given by you to PC Pannell as to how it should be finalised; and whether as PC Pannell's tutor it was part of my responsibilities to have played a role in how the complaint was finalised. My response is that, as this was reported as a low level assault and that Sebastian appeared not to support a prosecution, then given the length of time that PC Pannell had in tutorship I would have allowed her to come to the conclusion on her own. I would have had a discussion about her approach and I would have provided her with advice as required.

23. I have been asked if I had any discussions with Sergeant Price as to how the complaint should be investigated and/or finalised. My response is that I do not recall any specific conversation with either PC Pannell or PS Price in relation to this investigation. However, my experience suggests that, taking into consideration the fact that the victim was not supporting prosecution, that it was a low-level assault with no visible injuries or damage to any items of clothing, the most likely outcome for the investigation would have always been for it to be recorded and then closed down.

24. I have been asked if, when I attended to assist in the execution of the Mental Health Warrant on 3 September 2021, I made the connection with the earlier report of assault of Sebastian and, if so, what action did I take. I had never seen VC before the 3rd September 2021 and so I did not make any connection between the two incidents. I can say that, on the 3rd September 2021, the name VC meant nothing to me.

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: 28/02/2026

Index to Second Witness Statement of RACHEL WAKEFIELD

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0000044	Incident Report regarding Valdo Calocane, dated 05/07/2021, NGPF
2	NGPF0000043	Occurrence details (Occurrence: 21000375087), dated 13/09/2023, NGPF
3	WITN0015001	First Witness Statement of PC Amy Pannell, Nottinghamshire Police
4	NGPF0000045	Witness Statement re assault by VC
5	WITN0151001	First Witness Statement of Sebastian