

Witness Name: SARAH BARNES

Statement No: WITN0043001

Dated: 19 November 2025

## THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

---

### FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PC SARAH BARNES

---

I, SARAH BARNES, will say as follows: -

1. My name is Sarah Barnes.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the “**Inquiry**”) with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 27<sup>th</sup> June 2025 (the “**Request**”).
3. I have refreshed my memory by reading the Incident Log for Incident 0089\_28072022 (**URN: NGPF0000005**) and also the Occurrence Log (**URN: NGPF0000003**) related to the matter. I have no independent recollection of the matter, because it was so long ago.

#### My Background

4. I joined Nottinghamshire Police in 2020.
5. I am a Police Constable based in the Radford Neighbourhood Policing Team at Radford Road Police Station Nottingham.
6. Prior to joining, I worked for West Midlands Police as a Police Dispatcher in the Force Control Room for approximately 2 and a half years. During this time I

- also volunteered as a Special Constable for Warwickshire police and I carried out that role for approximately 3 and a half years.
7. During my initial training after I joined Nottinghamshire Police, I received training in relation to stalking and harassment. Since being appointed, I have also had yearly refreshers via E-learning which is an online training package supplied by The College of Policing.
  8. Prior to the 28<sup>th</sup> July 2022, I had no knowledge of, or interactions with, Valdo Calocane, by that or any other name.

#### Events of the 28<sup>th</sup> July 2022

9. On the 30<sup>th</sup> July 2022, I was working on the Managed Incident Team based at Radford Road Police Station. On this day I was working a day shift from 9.30 am to 6.30 pm.
10. The Managed Incident Team (MIT) is a team of officers who deal primarily with Grade 3 incidents. A Grade 3 incident is a non-urgent standard incident. The team aims to attend standard incidents within 24 hours or by the use of appointments, subject to the availability of the caller and the availability of officers. I was working on the MIT team because I was on restricted duties due to pregnancy.
11. On that day I was working on incident 0089\_28072022; this was a Grade 3 incident. A male by the name of Sebastian GRO-B had contacted the police to report his former flat mate following him home.

12. The incident was allocated to me because I was the only officer on the MIT team covering the Radford area at the time and any MIT incidents on the SAFE system relating to that area would usually come to me.
13. By reference to the Incident Log, I can see that the call had been marked as a stalking incident. I read the information recorded on the Incident Log and then I contacted Sebastian GRO-B to obtain further information.
14. From what I recall, I contacted him by phone. By reference to the note I placed on the Incident Log, I see that he told me that: "... this is the second time this has occurred, both parties attend the same gym, the previous incident was back in April where valdo followed him home from the gym, sabastion (*sic*) managed to lose him. this incident which occurred two days ago Valdo has followed IP home from the gym to his flat, Sabastion (*sic*) has entered another entrance to his flats to check his mail and has seen valdo walking past. Sabastion (*sic*) has noticed valdo walking by the entrance. Sabastian (*sic*) is anxious about using the gym now and going about his usual routine, causing him distress and anxiety. Valdo does not know exactly which flat is his. and did not enter the block of flats. Log can be closed"
15. Due to what he told me and having read the details from the Incident Log and also the Incident Log for the previous incident 0613\_24042022 (**URN: NGPF0000004**) I identified that there was a course of conduct and I made the decision to add a crime number on the incident of Stalking. I created an Occurrence on the NICHE system. I cannot recall whether that was during the call or straight after the call.

16. An Occurrence is a crime record that is created with the information provided and any subsequent investigation is then collated on NICHE. All investigations are recorded on this system and all police actions and work involved in any investigation is recorded on it.
17. When speaking to Sebastian [GRO-B], he stated he would like the police to speak to Valdo and ask why he was following him and for him to be told not to contact him and stay away from him. He did not support a formal police prosecution.
18. I obtained Valdo Calocane's details from the previous Incident Log.
19. By reference to an entry I put on the Occurrence Log (**URN: NGPF0000003**) on the 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2022, I spoke to a Supervisor (I have not made a note of which Supervisor, but it may have been Sergeant Small). According to the entry, we formed the view that contact could be coincidental, because Calocane and Sebastian [GRO-B] use the same gym and walk home the same way.
20. Again by reference to the entry of the 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2022, I spoke again to Sebastian [GRO-B] and he told me he was happy for police to speak to Calocane about the complaint and it is noted that I gave reassurance and advice.
21. On the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2020, I recorded an entry that I visited Calocane's address, which to the best of my recollection was on Ilkeston Road, Nottingham and knocked on his door. He did not answer so I left a card with my contact details.
22. On the 11<sup>th</sup> August 2020, I made a further Occurrence Log entry recording that I had attended Calocane's address again the day previously (**URN: NGPF0000003**). The entry states that I again knocked at his door and also at

- a neighbour's. I observed that there was no post in the letter box addressed to Calocane.
23. I cannot now recall what gym Sebastian **GRO-B** attended but I do believe that I attended the location to conduct CCTV enquiries and noted there were no cameras in the area.
  24. On the 11<sup>th</sup> August 2022, by reference to the Occurrence Log (**URN: NGPF0000003**), I submitted the file to my supervisor, Sergeant Small, for consideration for closing the file. The rationale for that was that Sebastian **GRO-B** did not want to pursue formal police action and the circumstances could have been simply coincidental, as the two men both used the same gym and lived in the same area.
  25. On the 19<sup>th</sup> August 2022, I made an entry confirming Sebastian **GRO-B** was aware the case was to be closed.
  26. I had no contact with either Sebastian **GRO-B** or Calocane after the 19<sup>th</sup> August 2022.
  27. I have been asked what my knowledge of any issues concerning Valdo Calocane's mental health was. My response is I have no knowledge of this.
  28. 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 that, at the time I do not believe there was enough information to ask our Street Triage car, which is a unit made up of a Mental Health Nurse and a police officer,

- to view the Log and make an assessment as there was no mention or indication there was a mental health concern.
29. I have been asked if there were there any barriers to the sharing of information with any of the above, or any other relevant individual, body or organisation. My answer is that there were no barriers to sharing any information I am aware of, other than GDPR paperwork that would require to be filled out if there was any sharing of personal information.
30. I have been asked if there were any outstanding criminal matters at the time of my involvement in this matter. My response is that I checked at the time of the investigation and I do not believe there were any outstanding criminal matters.
31. I have been asked if I am aware of the Stalking Screening Tool and whether I have received any training in this; and, if so, when and what did it include; and also, what, if any, relevance it has to the incident involving Valdo Calocane. My answer is that I am now aware of the Stalking Screening Tool, however I do not believe I utilised this tool in relation to this incident. I cannot recall if I was aware of the Tool for guidance when I was dealing with the incident. If I had used it, I would have recorded my decision making on a Log entry within the NICHE occurrence.
32. I have been asked if 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 provision of appropriate medical support. My response is that I was not involved in any assessment or testing of Calocane.

33. 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 answer is that during this incident, I referred to the Force's Grading Policy (**URN: NGPF0007924**); I considered the threat, harm and risk to the victim and carried out a risk assessment based on the information provided by the victim. I considered offender management and ways I could action the incident and the concerns raised by Sebastian **GRO-B**. To identify the incident as a stalking incident I referred to the test of whether it was a repeated incident, was it obsessive and if the contact was unwanted, although during this incident there was no reported contact between Calocane and Sebastian **GRO-B**.
34. I have been asked to set out any concerns I have in respect of the police's actions in relation to this matter. My response is that I do not have any.
35. I have been asked to set out any concerns that I have in respect of the recording of this matter. My response is that, having reflected on the matter, I could have been better at recording my decision making on the Occurrence, and also how I have obtained information and then what the results were and the action I then took.
36. 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 to set these out in detail. My response is the same as my response to the question above.
37. I have been asked if there are any structural issues (regarding police policies, procedures, methodology, training etc.) which contributed to any issues I have identified. My response is that at the time of the incident, I had recently moved

to a new police station and to a new department. I was the only police officer on the Radford MIT and at times there was no one to ask for support or a second opinion. Due to being the only officer on the team at the time, I had a large workload.

38. 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 is that I believe Supervisors could be more aware of and manage officers' wellbeing better and conduct quality control checks of officers' work. I will say that I think Nottinghamshire Police has improved in this area since the time of my involvement in this matter.

### **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: 19/11/2025

### **Index to First Witness Statement of SARAH BARNES**

<b>No.</b>	<b>URN</b>	<b>Document Description</b>
1	NGPF0000005	Incident Details, dated 12/05/2022, Nottingham Police
2	NGPF0000003	Occurrence details, dated 13/09/2023
3	NGPF0000004	Incident Details, dated 30/07/2022, Nottingham Police
4	NGPF0007924	PD 580 Incident Grading Resolution Policy - Copy (1).pdf