

Witness Name: DAVID MYERS

Statement No: WITN0042001

Dated: **31/10/2025**

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PC DAVID MYERS

I, DAVID MYERS, will say as follows: -

1. My name is David Myers.
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 NICHE Occurrence 21000512528 (**URN: NGPF0000027**) and Case file 31CF1215321 (**URN: NGPF0000017**).

My Background

4. Prior to joining the Police I attended the University of Salford between 1997 and 2001 where I graduated with a Bachelor of Engineering Degree in Electroacoustics. I joined Nottinghamshire Police in August 2001 and after my

- initial training I was posted to Radford Road Police Station, Nottingham, where I completed my probationary training as a Response officer.
5. In January 2004, I completed my standard response driving training. This was a three-week driving course that enabled me to travel to incidents using emergency equipment (blue lights and sirens) when incidents had been graded as requiring an immediate response.
 6. Throughout my policing career I have attended regular officer defence training which included training in the use of ASP batons, handcuffing and incapacitant spray. This training covered both situations involving compliant subjects, where tactical communication could be used to obtain a satisfactory result, and those involving non-compliant subjects, in which it may be necessary to use a degree of force in compliance with the law.
 7. In 2006 I trained as a Public Order officer and throughout my career I have been deployed to various public disorder incidents involving protests, rallies and the G8 conference in Northern Ireland.
 8. In July 2020 I undertook a three day 'Taser' Course which authorised me to use and carry a Taser which is a weapon that fires electric bars at a target in order to incapacitate a subject. I stopped being an authorised user in around Mid-2023 and up to that time I did not have any requirement to use my Taser.
 9. In September 2003 I became the Beat Manager for the New Basford area and I stayed in that role until September 2005. After that, I returned to Response Policing which is where I remained until 2022. A Response Police Officer primarily deals with day-to-day demand attending 999/101 calls and taking on various investigations that are generated by attending incidents.

10. Between September 2005 and January 2022, I worked at several Nottingham City conurbation Police Stations, but the vast majority of my time was spent at Radford Road Police Station.
11. In January 2022 I moved to the City Centre Operation Reacher role which was a pro-active team dealing with issues that affected Nottingham City Centre as well as other roles including Policing football matches, night-time economy, proactively dealing with local issues in the City Centre (namely prolific shoplifters) and supporting other departments for various search functions. The team was based at Central Police Station, Byron House Nottingham. I remained in that role until May 2024, when I moved to the Public Protection Unit again based in the City conurbation.
12. Prior to the 21st March 2022, 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 3rd September 2021

13. I had no involvement in the events of the 3rd September 2021 concerning Valdo Calocane. I have refreshed my memory of the events to which I speak by reference to NICHE Occurrence 21000512528 (**URN: NGPF0000027**) and the Case file (**URN: NGPF0000017**). This is the crime report and subsequent investigation into the assault on an emergency worker, PC 3576 Pritchard that occurred on 3rd September 2021. From this crime report a Casefile (reference 31CF1215321) was generated. I have also read NICHE Occurrence 22000554223 (**URN: NGPF0006093**) which was subsequently generated to record that Calocane had failed to attend Nottingham Magistrates Court on the 23rd September 2022 as a result of the summons that was issued from the

investigation into the assault on PC Pritchard. At the time of the assault, PC Pritchard was a member of the City Centre Operation Reacher team and so it fell to another member of that team to continue with the investigation.

14. The original offence was recorded on the Police Crime Recording Management System that is used in Nottinghamshire and the other local East Midlands Forces. This system is called NICHE. Any recorded crime is given a unique NICHE Occurrence and this assault on an emergency service worker was recorded on the NICHE Occurrence Reference 21000512528 (**URN: NGPF0000027**). Part of NICHE allows Police Officers and staff to complete Occurrence Enquiry Logs (OEL's) which give updates on the progress of an investigation so that it can be managed by a supervisor and also to allow somebody who may have a need to view the occurrence to see what the progress of the investigation is and any rationale for decisions that are made. There is also the function to send tasks to a member of Police Staff which will either inform that team member of an action that needs to be carried out or an action that has been completed. These tasks are also given a unique reference number.
15. Also within NICHE is the Casefile whereby another unique number is generated (in this instance it was 31CF1215321). This section collates all the documents that are sent to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) for use at Court. It also allows the CPS to reply to the Police with messages and decisions that they have made.
16. SAFE is the Nottinghamshire Police Command and Control System which records incidents reported to the force control room and details of the response

- /action taken is recorded. Each incident is also given a unique reference number.
17. The investigation into the assault on PC Pritchard had initially been taken on by another member of my Operation Reacher team, PC 2510 Johnson. The Police Officers who were in attendance during the said incident had submitted their witness statements. Body Worn Video (BWV) of the incident had also been collated and documented. On 12th September 2021, the case was referred to the CPS for a pre-charge decision.
 18. On the 20th March 2022, I was requested by my Sergeant, PS 2950 Louise Ellis, to take over as the Officer in the Case (OIC) in relation to the assault on PC Pritchard by Calocane. This was detailed in OEL Log Number 29 on the NICHE occurrence 21000512528 (URN: NGPF0000027) and gave a summary as to what further actions were required to be completed. By this time, I was now a member of the City Centre Operational Reacher team and PC Pritchard was a fellow team member.
 19. The reason I was asked to take over as OIC, was due to the fact that the previous OIC, PC Johnson had to go off duty GRO-B. From memory, PC Johnson GRO-B in late January/early February 2022 and initially it was unknown how long he was going to be off work for.
 20. I read the previous OEL's that had been submitted on this occurrence in order to familiarise myself with the status of the investigation.
 21. I noted that an initial submission had been made to the CPS for a charging decision on 6th October 2021. However, I saw that they had responded with a pre-charge decision action plan on 22nd November 2021. This was detailed

on Casefile 31CF1215321 within the Messages/Logs section (URN: NGPF0000017).

22. The points that the CPS wanted clarification on as detailed in the action plan were as follows:

- a. Any reason why the Approved Mental Health Professionals (AMHP) who were present during the time of the assault had not provided witness statements;
- b. Further information in relation to the suspects mental health condition so that the CPS mental health policy could be considered;
- c. Any Use of Force Forms that were generated as a result of the incident; and
- d. Any reference to the suspect breaking into two flats previously and what Police involvement there had been in relation to those.

23. I noted that some of these points had already been actioned and that the initial results of these enquiries had been updated on OEL Numbers 23 and 24 dated 9th December 2021 and 10th December 2021, respectively. The summary of the investigation had been placed on OEL Number 29 by Sergeant Ellis on 20th March 2022 and, therefore, my task was to further collate the answers for the action points and present them back to the CPS.

24. I could see that a statement had already been obtained from Dr Benjamin Lomas dated the 27th January 2022 (URN: NGPF0000017). He was the doctor who was present during the events of the 3rd September 2021. That statement had been obtained by another member of our team, PC 3126

- Pinnock. The doctor's account was consistent with the attending officers' accounts, but Dr Lomas was reluctant to provide any details of and comment about the suspect's diagnosis and prognosis.
25. From memory, I was informed by PC Pinnock verbally that Dr Lomas had stated that after his original statement had been obtained on the 27th January 2022, a further Section 135 Mental Health Act 1983 Warrant was due to be executed on Calocane. Dr Lomas had said that he would ask Calocane whether he would sign a medical consent form that would enable the Police to access his medical records in relation to his current mental health. However, by the time that I took over as the OIC, no further communication had been received from Dr Lomas.
 26. I carried out a search of the Police SAFE incident system and found the details of previous incidents when the police had been requested to assist in the execution of warrants issued under s.135 Mental Health Act 1983 in relation to Calocane.
 27. The first was on the 19th January 2022 (SAFE Incident Log 0247_19012022), when police officers attended and detained Calocane without any force being required. The second was on the 28th January 2022 (SAFE Incident Logs 0294_28012022, 0564_28012022, 0626_28012022 and 0756_2801/2022) but my understanding from the SAFE Incident Logs is that no officers were actually required to attend or deployed to assist on this occasion. I added these five Incident Logs to the Document section on Casefile reference 31CF1215321(URN: **NGPF0000027**) on the 12th April 2022
 28. I noted from the OEL Number 29 dated the 20th March 2022 and submitted by Sergeant Ellis that there had been difficulty in obtaining Use of Force Forms

completed by the officers who had attended the incident on 3rd September 2021, but by the time I took over the file, they had been retrieved and I added them to the NICHE casefile on the 12th April 2022 in the Documents Section **(URN: NGPF0000017)**.

29. I also conducted a search of the SAFE incident recording system to identify any incidents in which Calocane had been suspected of breaking into flats, but I was unable to identify any. I am unable to recall what terms I used to complete this search.
30. On the 24th April 2022 I completed the MG6 form **(URN: NGPF0000017)**. This is the Casefile Evidence and Information Form that is used by the Police to give information to the CPS on a specific case. In this document I gave my response to the four action plan points that the CPS has requested. I did not take any accounts from any witnesses during the course of the investigation.
31. Also on the 24th April, I completed OEL Number 31 updating the NICHE occurrence that the file had been re-submitted to the CPS for a further charging decision.
32. On the 25th April 2022 I sent the completed file to the Force File Preparation Unit (FPU) through Task Number T2201460029 and informed them that all the outstanding actions had been completed and that the file was ready for re-submission to the CPS.
33. On the 9th May 2022, the CPS responded with their updated Pre Charge Advice on form CM02 **(URN: NGPF0000017)** and through Task Number T2201938730.

- The CPS stated that a charge of assaulting an emergency worker (namely PC Pritchard) had been authorised.
34. On the 28th May 2022, I sent Task Number T2202243168 on the Casefile to PS Ellis asking that she complete the 10-Point Checklist Form (this is a list of ten tasks that a Sergeant has to review and confirm that they have been completed so that it meets the standards for a file to be submitted) (**URN: NGPF0000017**) and then the file was sent to the File Preparation Unit for a Postal Requisition to be generated. A Postal Requisition is a notification to a suspect that a charge has been laid and gives details of the date, time and place (i.e. court) on which the charge will be heard.
 35. On the 28th May 2022, I electronically signed the Form MG5 Case Summary indicating that the Casefile was completed (**URN: NGPF0000017**). The MG5 is a document that details the summary of the case, what each witness will state as part of their evidence, a summary of the interview and brief details as to whether there is any forensic evidence, injuries and visually recorded evidence.
 36. On 6th June 2022 Sergeant Ellis sent Task Number T2202348281 on Casefile 31CF1215321 asking the FPU to generate a summons for Calocane to attend Nottingham Magistrates Court in relation to the assault on PC Pritchard.
 37. On 11th June 2022, through NICHE occurrence 21000512528 (the assault on PC Pritchard), I sent Task Number T2202336574 to Sergeant Ellis asking her to mark the crime as finalised on the system since all enquiries had been completed. Only supervisors have the authority to do this. The effect of doing so was to remove the crime from my list of active crime investigations.

38. On the 30th September 2022, I received Task Number T2204067850 on NICHE occurrence 22000554223, which notified me that Calocane had failed to appear (FTA) at Court and that an arrest warrant task had been sent to the department within the Police to update Calocane's PNC record that he was wanted for the said failure to attend. This came through to me as a low priority task and was for my information as the OIC for the occurrence which Calocane had failed to appear for. On NICHE, when a task designated as HIGH or MEDIUM is sent through for an officer's attention, the task cannot be recorded as completed until it has been signed off by (for example) a Supervisor or the File Preparation Unit. However, when a Task is designated LOW importance, it does not need to be completed as it is just for information. The usual practice is for a further NICHE Occurrence to be generated in respect of the warrant, this being NICHE Occurrence 22000554223 (URN: **NGPF00006093**). However, this occurrence was not allocated to me to action. This is not unusual in that, to the best of my knowledge, I have not previously had FTA warrants directly given to me to take action on. If a NICHE occurrence is placed on my workload to manage then I would complete any tasks required. I am not aware of the precise way that FTA warrants are allocated or managed within Nottinghamshire Police. I am not aware, nor have I been given any training surrounding the NPCC Matrix for timescales for executing warrants.
39. On the 20th January 2023, I sent an e-mail to PC Pritchard to make him aware that the warrant was still outstanding (URN: **NGPF0005699**). I believe, but cannot recall, I checked the Occurrence to see whether there had been any progress and identified that the warrant was still outstanding. I told PC

Pritchard that if Calocane was still wanted by the following week then we (our City Centre Operation Reacher Team) could try and locate him. No further task or occurrence was generated for me to actively look to arrest Calocane for the FTA. However, shortly after sending the e-mail, our entire City Centre Operation Reacher Team was tasked to assist the policing of the Clifton area of Nottingham due to an increase in policing demand in that area. This took our entire Teams focus while we researched the problems in Clifton, the suspects who were thought to be responsible, before then producing plans to tackle this as an ongoing problem. The work also coincided with still completing our normal taskings around Nottingham City Centre as well as the nighttime economy, searches and football Policing. This work became the main focus for the team throughout 2023 until I left the team in May 2024. In relation to the FTA warrant for Calocane, my belief was that the Operation Reacher Team or Beat Team for the area that he resided in (i.e. Radford Road Police Station) would make continuing enquiries into arresting Calocane.

40. The Beat Team or any Proactive Team for the area in which the postal requisition address is based would usually be responsible for enforcing the warrant. My belief is that warrants are managed in this way, because if a person who has failed to appear live on the other side of Nottinghamshire, then from a time management and operational point of view, it would be inefficient for officers to travel what may be a considerable distance for an arrest attempt. Also, I primarily work at the instruction of our local Inspector for the City Centre and so would be directed by them to deal with any outstanding FTA's or problems that were affecting the City Centre. At the time of me being

made aware that Calocane had failed to appear until May 2024, I was still part of the City Centre Operation Reacher Team.

41. In relation to the postal requisition, I did not receive any information back from the File Preparation Unit (FPU) asking for any clarification as to whether this address was still current. The address used for Calocane was the most recent and verified on Police systems. That address was Flat 15 Madison Court, Derwent Way, Nottingham, NG7 2EG. It was assumed that he either still lived there or that any correspondence would be returned to sender if he no longer did. It is possible that Calocane had moved from the address and that he had no knowledge of the summons being issued against him. However, once Calocane failed to appear at Court, then a warrant would automatically have been issued for his arrest. The existence of the warrant would have been recorded on the Police National Computer (PNC) so that, if he had come into contact with the Police and his details checked through the PNC, then he would have shown as wanted and could have been arrested and brought before the Court.

42. I have been asked what my knowledge of any issues concerning Valdo Calocane's mental health was. My response is that I was aware that Calocane had been the subject of at least three detentions under section 135 Mental Health Act 1983 due to the incidents that were reported to the Police asking for assistance in detaining Calocane. These detentions were on 3rd September 2021 when PC Pritchard was assaulted, 19th December 2021 and 28th January 2022. I was not made aware of any further information by Dr Lomas.

43. I did not notify any other agency or organisation that Calocane was to attend court for the offence. Mental health services were already aware of the allegation and that he was under investigation for an assault on an emergency service worker. On the information known to me at that time, considering the offence that was being investigated and the fact that at that point Calocane had not been convicted of any offence, I did not believe that this would justify giving disclosure to the University. Due to the fact that Calocane was an adult I did not feel that there was any requirement to inform or update his family in relation to the investigation or summons being issued. Any disclosure that would be given would have to be necessary and lawful.
44. I am not aware of any barriers to the sharing of the information to various other agencies as long as any information shared is done so in a legal manner that would comply with the Data Protection Act.
45. During the time that I was investigating that assault on PC Pritchard, I was not aware of any outstanding criminal matters for Calocane.
46. I have not had any involvement in any sort of assessment of Calocane. I am not aware of what procedures are in place in respect of the assessment of medical, mental health issues and drug testing. I cannot say whether these procedures were followed. I have had no knowledge of any issues concerning Calocane's mental health. The statement obtained from Dr Lomas did not give any detail of his mental health at the time that the assault on PC Pritchard took place.
47. 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 to set out the

ways in which I consider these were or were not met. My response is that my actions and decisions were primarily informed by the Police Code of Ethics and the National Decision Model (NDM). The NDM is the national police framework for making ethical and proportionate decisions. I also had regard to the evidential ingredients of Section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018 which informed the steps I took to gather evidence to support a charging decision for the offence.

48. 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 answer is that I do not have any concerns in respect of the Police's actions taken on 3rd September 2021. From what I have read in the OELs on Occurrence 21000512528, the decision not to arrest Calocane on 3rd September 2021 for the assault on PC Pritchard appears to have been made with the sound reasoning that due to him being detained under the Mental Health Act, all the enquiries surrounding the assault could be made in 'slow time' due to his detention and the same outcome (i.e. Calocane being summonsed to Court) was still achieved.
49. I do not have any concerns in respect of the recording of the assault on PC Pritchard.
50. Looking back and upon reflection, I could have made further enquiries with Dr Lomas as to whether a medical consent form had been signed by Calocane when he was being detained under the Mental Health Act on 28th January 2022. However, due to the offence that was being investigated, I feel that what was actually needed from Dr Lomas were details of Calocane's mental capacity on 3rd September 2021 when the assault took place. Even if a medical consent

form had been completed, there could have been the argument subsequently from Calocane that he was asked to sign it whilst being detained under the Mental Health Act and therefore may not have known exactly what and why he was signing it.

51. I have been asked if I consider there are any structural issues (regarding police policies, procedures, methodology, training etc.) which contributed to any issues you have identified. My answer is that, with hindsight, there was no system at the time for determining who actually is responsible for executing FTA warrants. When I worked as a Beat Manager and also during my time on Operation Reacher, my team would have a list of people who were wanted on FTA warrants and lived on the area that we policed. Periodically, we would make attempts to execute those warrants and update any result on the system that was being used at that time. I have known instances in the past where a team that I was serving on was aware of a warrant for a person living off our area and we have not executed it because it would take us away from our own workloads. As Calocane's home address on the postal requisition was in the Radford Road beat area, I would have assumed that their Beat Teams or Operation Reacher team would have made arrest attempts for Calocane as well as the other FTAs in their area. I believe this approach was a structural issue in our procedures for dealing with people who are wanted on warrants for failing to attend court.

52. I have been asked if I have any recommendations that I consider could help prevent any of the issues that I have identified in respect of this matter. My answer is that I would recommend that FTA warrants should be allocated to a specific officer (or Team with the warrant being allocated to a Sergeant to

manage) based in the area where the offender lives. In an ideal world, all postal requisitions would be hand delivered so that it could be established that it had actually been served on the person in question.

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: 31st October 2025

Index to First Witness Statement of DAVID MYERS

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0000027	Occurrence details re: Whilst detaining male under mental health warrant PC punched twice, dated 03/09/2021, NGPF
2	NGPF0000017	Discontinuation Documentation re: Assault on an Emergency Worker by VC [date unknown], provided by [unknown police force]
3	NGPF0006093	Occurrence details of VC incident, 14/06/2023, NPF
4	NGPF0005699	E-mail from Dave Myers [NGPF] to Barnaby Pritchard [NGPF], re: Calocane