

Witness Name: SHARONJIT POWAR

Statement No: WITN0230001

Dated: 16 November 2025

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF INSPECTOR SHARONJIT POWAR

I, SHARONJIT POWAR, will say as follows: -

1. My name is Sharonjit Powar.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the **"Inquiry"**) with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 7th October 2025 (the **"Request"**).

Background

3. I am Police Inspector 3694 Sharonjit Powar of Nottinghamshire Police. My current role is as Police Inspector in the Criminal Justice department overseeing the Out of Court Resolution Team and Evidential Review Team. I have been in this position since February 2023.
4. Prior to becoming a Police Officer I worked in several health club settings in a sales role before becoming a staff officer, namely a front counter officer for West Midlands Police in a Birmingham based Police station. My education following GCSE's includes A Levels and 2 years studying History and Law at Staffordshire University.

5. I joined West Midlands Police as a Police Officer on 23rd April 2007. Following 18 weeks of Police training, I worked as a response officer covering the outskirts of Birmingham City Centre. In December 2009, I joined Handsworth Criminal Investigation Department (CID). I remained in CID and completed my National Investigators Exam (NIE) and detective training course before qualifying as a detective sometime in 2011/2012. During this same period, I passed both parts to my Sergeant's qualifications between March and November 2010.
6. In October 2013, after getting married, I transferred to Nottinghamshire Police and joined the City CID department based at Radford Road Police Station. In January 2015 I went on maternity leave and returned to work in March 2016. In July 2016 I was given the opportunity to become a temporary Sergeant on the CRIM department where I remained until I was promoted to a substantive Sergeant in July 2018.
7. On being promoted to Sergeant I moved to the City Prisoner Handling Team (PHT).
8. This department has 5 rotas/teams, and I was posted to rota 1. PHT deal with prisoners in custody who have been arrested for Professionalising Investigations Programme (PIP) 1 type investigations.
9. There are four types of police investigations within policing. These are:
 - a. PIP 1 – Priority and Volume Crime Investigations
 - b. PIP 2 – Serious and Complex Investigations
 - c. PIP 3 – Major Crime or Serious and Organised Crime Investigations
 - d. PIP 4 – Strategic Management of highly complex investigations.

10. The department was overseen by an Inspector. Each team consists of a Sergeant and approximately 5 to 8 officers. The officers within PHT had a varying level of service, knowledge and experience. Some were restricted and unable to remain on response officer duties and were suited better to an office type job.
11. There were also 2 to 3 response officers who were attached to the department for 3 months at a time to improve their skills and knowledge around PIP 1 investigations. They were mentored by substantive PHT officers until they were able to work independently.
12. The hours worked within PHT consisted of two-day shifts, two afternoon shifts and two mid shifts which were normally between the hours of 10am and 7pm. It was quite common to pick up anywhere between 5 and 10 investigations on a day shift; weekends could be much busier due to nighttime economy.
13. The investigations could vary between domestic abuse cases to drugs cases. There was a requirement that all enquiries relating to each prisoner would be complete before being handed over to the PHT. PHT would then interview and process the prisoner and complete any relevant case files. If further investigation was required following interview, the PHT officer and the response officer would work out between themselves who would be best placed to deal with them.
14. As a Sergeant on the department, it was my job to oversee my team's investigations and ensure they were progressing in a timely manner. I would complete reviews and refer cases to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) who were the final decision maker on certain cases. I would also make charging decisions on cases where police were permitted to make the decisions. These

- were normally summary type cases which could be dealt with at the Magistrate Courts.
15. In October 2019 I passed my Inspectors exam. I remained in the Prisoner Handling Team looking for a lateral move. In March 2020, I was due to move to the Professional Standards Department (PSD). Unfortunately, this move did not go ahead, however, my position within PHT had been filled.
 16. During this period, the country had gone into lockdown due to Covid 19. I became a 'spare' Sergeant for a few weeks within PHT and then worked to help the control room with grade 3 incidents and complaints for PSD.
 17. In October 2020 I accepted an offer as the acting Inspector on PHT as the Inspector at the time, Mark Stanley, was off sick. I remained as the acting Inspector until late May/Early June 2021 when Inspector Stanley returned to work.
 18. As the acting Inspector I oversaw all 5 teams within PHT. I ensured they were staffed sufficiently; investigations were progressing well, and victims and witnesses were kept updated.
 19. On returning to my role as a Sergeant on PHT, I moved over to Rota 2. In August 2021, whilst still Rota 2 Sergeant within PHT, I also became the Sergeant for a new Restorative Justice (RJ) team, now known as the Out of Court Resolution Team (OoCR) which was also overseen by Inspector Stanley. In late 2021 Inspector Stanley moved departments and Marcus Oldroyd, who has since retired, took over the department as Inspector.
 20. I remained as both PHT and RJ/OoCR Sergeant for approximately a year until September 2022 when I became the temporary Inspector on PHT following Marcus retiring. I was a temporary Inspector for a year until being successfully

promoted to substantive Inspector in September 2023. I oversaw both PHT and OoCR until February 2023 when the OoCR moved to the Criminal Justice (CJ) department. I also moved to CJ where I also took on responsibility for the Evidential Review Team (ERO) as well as OoCR. The ERO team is made up of six Detective Sergeants who review case files prior to submitting them for charging advice to the CPS.

21. I can confirm, prior to incident 0011_24052020, I had no knowledge, interaction or involvement with Valdo Calocane (by that name or any alias). I will refer to him as Calocane throughout this statement.

My Role in respect of the Incident

22. The incident date is 24th May 2020. It relates to a complaint of criminal damage to an internal door in a block of flats. At this time, I was not in any substantive post. I had left PHT to assist the control room with grade 3 incidents and PSD complaints. The Officer in the Case is PC 3287 Gail Collins who was attached to Rota 2 at the time.
23. On returning to PHT as the acting Inspector, temporary Sergeant Robert Palethorpe was the supervisor on Rota 2 and oversaw this incident and investigation. Although I was the Inspector, I cannot recall this investigation and can only recall my involvement following a review of the Occurrence Log (NGPF0000068) which relates to NICHE occurrence 20000261503.
24. I note from NGPF000068 my only involvement in this occurrence is logged under Niche OEL 14 where I have finalised the occurrence under outcome 12. OEL 14 is dated 28th September 2021 and the time stamp is 17:26 hours.

25. NICHE is the crime recording system used by Nottinghamshire Police. An OEL is the Occurrence Enquiry Log which is used by officers and supervisors when submitting updates about the occurrence.
26. At this time, I had returned to PHT as a Sergeant on Rota 2 as well as managing the RJ/OoCR team. I was therefore PC Collins' Supervisor when this occurrence was finalised. My role with this incident involving Calocane was to decide on the direction of the investigation and the outcome decision.

My Involvement

27. My first involvement in this matter is documented in OEL 14 on 28 September 2021 at 17:26 hours. I cannot recall being alerted about this incident prior to this date. I can only advise the date and time above as this is the date and time I submitted a supervisor review on the occurrence.
28. Often officers would either create a task via NICHE for a supervisor to conduct a review or they would speak to me directly about their views on the direction of the case and request for me to add a review. I cannot recall the officer speaking to me about this case, however on reviewing the occurrence 20000261503 (NGPF0000068) I have noted all the tasks associated with this occurrence and can state that this is how I believe I would have been alerted.
29. The tasks detail the following:
 - a. PC Collins initiates a task which is assigned to me on 28 September 2021 at 12:35
 - b. I provide a review at 17:26 hours on 28 September 2021 as detailed in OEL 14.

- c. I then initiated a task back to PC Collins at 17:36 with remarks stating, 'please see oel for further action required.' This further action was in relation to updating the victim and finalisation update.
 - d. On 4 October 2021 at 13:17 PC Collins adds an OEL to the occurrence with a victim update and OIC Investigation update OELS. She then sends another task to me at 13:23 hours requesting me to finalise the case under a supervisor review.
 - e. At 18:16 on 4 October 2021 I finalised the occurrence.
30. I have been asked what I was told about the incident when I was first alerted to it and by who. My response is that I cannot recall being told anything about the incident. This may be due to the time lapse and the number of incidents I review daily especially in a busy environment like PHT. My normal practice is to review all available evidence that would be attached to the occurrence and speak to the officer in charge of the case. I cannot recall if I spoke to PC Collins about this incident.
31. I have been asked what other information I received, if any. My response is that I received no other information. The only information I would have reviewed is detailed within the Occurrence Log (NGPF0000068) and the documents attached to Niche Occurrence 20000261503. These documents include the following:
- a. Arrest record which would detail the arrest and detention of Calocane.
 - b. MG11 from then PC 3482 Katie Eustace detailing the arrest of Calocane (NGPF0000075).

- c. Three photo exhibits uploaded by PC Eustace – these were photographs of the damage caused during the incident (NGPF0000071, NGPF0000072 and NGPF0000073).
- d. MG11 from witness Conor **GRO-B** – this details him hearing a loud bang and on looking through the eyelet of his flat door he saw the male from the flat below banging on the door of flat 12 and running up against it. He was using his body to put force on the door when the lock snapped off. The male then knocked on his door and started saying ‘IS MY MUM THERE.’ **GRO-B** details that he believed the male suffered with mental health and came across as totally incoherent (NGPF0000074).
- e. The Released Under Investigation document which is dated 24 May 2020.
- f. The documents also included fingerprints, DNA, Livescan and foreign national convictions report.

My Actions

- 32. Having reviewed Occurrence Log NGPF0000068 and the documents attached to the Niche Occurrence I would have been aware of the investigation that had taken place and the detail that it provides in relation to Calocane’s mental health. On Calocane being arrested he was hearing voices in his head and talking about demons and devils. I note from the occurrence log that Calocane had been taken to hospital as he was hearing voices. I do not recall reviewing the custody detention log for any more detail into this.
- 33. From the occurrence log it details three civilian witnesses. These are:

- a. Liam **GRO-B** – Liam called the Police as he heard banging from the flat below and saw the damage that had been caused. No statement appears to have been taken from him.
 - b. Conor **GRO-B** – As detailed above, he witnessed Calocane causing the damage to the flat 12 and then Calocane came to his flat asking about his mum.
 - c. Anna **GRO-B** – Anna also witnessed Calocane cause damage to flat 12. There appears to be no statement from Anna.
 - d. PC Eustace details that Body Worn Video was available. I cannot recall reviewing this footage.
34. The occurrence log details Calocane being interviewed with an appropriate adult where he states he could not remember what happened. The officer types in her summary 'He does remember' however I believe she meant 'he does *not* remember.' I do not recall speaking to her about this however from reading the rest of the interview summary I believe he could not remember what happened. The summary goes on to state that he could not remember banging on the door or causing damage and does not remember asking about his mother. He was struggling as a student at Nottingham Trent University and felt stressed out. His mother lived outside of the County.
35. He denied taking illegal or prescription drugs and did not drink.
36. The officer states that Calocane admitted his actions were reckless but not intentional. He was not aware flat 12 was empty and did not know the previous tenants. He did not know why he was at the flat.

37. I cannot recall if I questioned PC Collins in relation to the interview as I find it odd that he would state he had been reckless if he could not remember anything about the incident or even being at the flat.
38. The mental element required for criminal damage is either intention or subjective recklessness. Recklessness requires the offender to be aware of the risk and then acts unreasonably to go on and take that risk. This does not appear to be the case in this incident.
39. The occurrence log details Calocane being Released Under Investigation (RUI) from custody. PC Collins details that she RUI'd Calocane pending statements from witnesses. RUI is an alternative to Police Bail. With Police Bail a date would be given to return to the police station whilst enquiries were on going. Unlike RUI, with Police Bail conditions can be put in place. These conditions are put in place to prevent further offences from being committed and or protect witnesses/victims.
40. Following Calocane's release it is detailed within the occurrence log he is arrested a short time later for another incident at the flat complex. A mental health assessment was undertaken, and he was later sectioned and taken to Highbury Vale, a mental health institution.
41. The occurrence details PC Collins contacting the victim in relation to damages to the door.
42. There are no further updates until 22 January 2021 when PC Collins details speaking to Highbury staff who confirm Calocane had been released and she was trying to ascertain where he was now residing.
43. On 22 March 2021 PC Collins details speaking to Liaison and Diversion (L&D) who confirm Calocane had been released from Highbury but was still receiving

- treatment from them. That he had a psychotic break but was still residing in Nottingham. PC Collins details his new mobile number and wanted to speak to his doctor before calling Calocane.
44. There is a further update on 22 March 2021 from PC Collins who details she had spoken to the victim who would like the money back for the damage caused to the flat door.
 45. There is a further update on 22 March 2021 from PC Collins who updates with Calocane's new address. She had also spoken to Calocane's doctor who advised to speak to Calocane's CPN Claudia Birtles to obtain her views on speaking to Calocane again regarding the damage.
 46. There are then some general victim updates on the OELs.
 47. On 7 May 2021, PC Collins then pastes what appears to be either a letter or email from Claudia Birtles stating she had spoken to someone who she refers to as Valdo about the damages and he was shocked at the sum of £600 believing he had only caused damage to one door. He found it difficult to talk about what led up to the admission to hospital and that he was embarrassed about his actions when he was unwell. Calocane had asked if Claudia could liaise on his behalf for a rationale behind the cost and that Calocane's recollection of the damage may have been hindered by the illness at the time. That Calocane was trying to move on from the events leading up to being sectioned and that she was worried this could be triggering for him.
 48. There is then an update on 25 July 2021 from Inspector Stanley requesting an update from PC Collins.
 49. On 26 July 2021 PC Collins adds an update stating that she had passed on receipts for the damage to Claudia who will be speaking to Calocane. PC

- Collins states that she had received an email from Calocane whilst on rest days and she will be following this up with him and if he had the funds to pay for the damage.
50. There is an update on 29 July 2021 from PC Collins stating that Calocane had emailed her that he would be coming to the Bridewell police station on 29 July 2021 at 18:00 hours and that she was looking for him to complete a pilot conditional caution if he agrees to working with L&D.
 51. It is not clear if Calocane turned up and what conversation PC Collins had with him. Later that same day at 21:36 PC Collins adds another OEL stating that an email had been pasted onto occurrence 20000262821 (NGPF0000082) which relates to the incident following Calocane's release from custody.
 52. This email is from Doctor Seedat who works at Highbury. Doctor Seedat states that Calocane was sectioned under section 2 of the Mental Health Act on 25 May 2020 and currently remains as an in-patient.
 53. He goes on to state that Calocane presented with clear symptoms and signs suggestive of an acute psychotic illness. He required rapid tranquilisation at the very beginning of his stay but he had now settled and his mental health was somewhat improved.
 54. He then states that Calocane had no recollection of the events prior to his admission, and it will be his view that he was not in touch with reality around the time of his admission nor around the time of the incident of causing damage to someone's door.
 55. His last paragraph states that Calocane's judgement and awareness of his environment and actions was impaired due to experiencing an acute psychotic breakdown which was likely to have been precipitated by a combination of

- stress, sleep deprivation and social isolation. He states that it is his view that it was more than likely that he did not have the capacity to be responsible for his actions as this was not done in a clear conscious state.
56. On 30 July 2021, PC Collins adds an email to the occurrence log to the victim stating Calocane had refused to accept a conditional caution and opted to go to court. She informs the victim that should it go to court the CPS may not pursue the matter due to the suspect not being of sound mind at the time of the offence which is evidenced in his psychiatric reports.
57. This is the last entry on the occurrence log I would have reviewed prior to finalising the occurrence under outcome 12.
58. I have been asked if I took any accounts from any witnesses. My response is that I did not take any accounts from any witnesses and have no notes or statements relating to this incident. I would only have viewed the occurrence OEL entries, and the documents attached to the occurrence.
59. I have been asked what decisions were made, or action taken, by me and on what criteria. My response is that, as PC Collins' Supervisor, it was my role to review the incident and decide if the evidential test was met and if there was a realistic prospect of conviction. The evidential test forms part of the full code test which is the standard a prosecutor uses to decide whether to bring a criminal case. Although I am not a prosecutor, where criminal damage is under £5000 the decision to prosecute is a Police decision. I too need to ensure the evidential test is met.
60. In UK criminal law to determine if someone is criminally responsible for an offence two elements are required to determine if the evidential test is met:

- a. Actus Reus – this is the physical act or omission. In this incident this would mean the breaking of the door which was clear from the evidence had been caused by Calocane.
 - b. Mens rea – this is the mental state/guilty mind.
61. The mens rea for criminal damage is either intentional, or subjective recklessness. This means: did Calocane intend to commit the damage or was he reckless in that he realised the risk and still went on and took the risk?
62. Based on the letter from Dr Seedat I made the decision that at the time of the offence Calocane did not have the mens rea for criminal damage and therefore there was no realistic prospect of conviction. He is described by Dr Seedat as not having recollection of the events prior to his admission and not being in touch with reality. That his judgement and actions were impaired due to experiencing an acute psychotic breakdown.
63. The same criteria apply when authorising a conditional caution. In addition to requiring the evidential test to be met, a suspect must admit guilt and accept a conditional caution. Calocane had not accepted guilt and according to PC Collins' email to the victim on 30 July 2021, Calocane had refused to accept a conditional caution.
64. I have been asked what my knowledge of any issues concerning Calocane's mental health was. My response is that it is limited to the information detailed within the occurrence log and the email from Doctor Seedat referred to above.
65. 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

- I did not communicate any decisions personally 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.
66. PC Collins was requested to update the victim which according to her OEL dated 4 October 2021 she emailed him but received no response back.
67. I have been asked whether 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 I do not know of any barriers to communicating any decisions other than PC Collins stating the victim was not responding to any other emails.
68. I have been asked whether there were any outstanding criminal matters at the time of my involvement in this matter and, if so, what my knowledge of these was and what actions I took. My response is that I am aware from the occurrence log Calocane was arrested after being interviewed and released from custody. A mental health assessment was conducted following this arrest, and he was sectioned and taken to Highbury. According to the OEL entry I submitted on 28 September 2021, I refer to another occurrence 20000262821 (NGPF0000082) which relates to this further arrest for assault. This occurrence was finalised as outcome 12 which is used when a suspect is too ill to prosecute. This occurrence has a letter attached from Calocane's Doctor, Doctor Seedat, which I also refer to in the OEL. This letter assisted me in making my decision to finalise this incident log as outcome 12.
69. I have been asked what my knowledge of the refusal of a Conditional Caution in this case was and what, if any, relevance did it have to my decision-making. My response is that I note from the occurrence log (NGPF0000068) that on 29 July 2021 PC Collins makes an entry regarding

- Calocane attending the Police Station and that she was looking at a conditional caution with a condition to take part in a pilot with Liaison and Diversion team.
70. I am aware of this pilot as this is something that was available to the PHT department to those with a diagnosed mental health condition. I have noted from the occurrence log that his community mental health nurse Claudia Birtles had discussed the conditional caution and the compensation amount of £600 had taken him by surprise.
71. I cannot recall if this had any relevance to my decision making at the time, however, for a conditional caution to stand the evidential test must be met, he must admit guilt and accept a conditional caution. Neither of these parts of the criteria were met.
72. I have also been made aware of emails sent by Calocane to PC Collins on 23 September and 4 October 2021 stating he may be prepared to consider a caution. I cannot recall if PC Collins discussed these emails with me. It would not have changed my assessment of the case as for a caution the evidential test, as detailed within the statement, had not been met. The same evidential standard applies as if the case was going to court and there must be a realistic prospect of conviction. The full code test was not met as he did not have the mens rea. It also requires an admission of guilt. Calocane could not recall what happened prior to his arrest. His admission to being reckless is ambiguous.
73. As the mental element was not made out, the evidential test is not met and therefore there is no realistic prospect of conviction meaning we cannot prosecute or conditional caution.
74. I have been asked to explain the 'Outcome 12' process and to exhibit any policies or guidelines and to set out in full why and how the decision was

reached. My response is that Outcome 12 is the Home Office outcome code used when a suspect is too ill to prosecute. My understanding is that when submitting a matter for closure using outcome 12 it is necessary to confirm that the suspect has been diagnosed/confirmed with an illness and this condition has been confirmed by the medical practitioner who confirms that the suspect is unfit to account for their actions. I was required to declare that I had checked the Nottinghamshire Police policy in relation to outcome 12.

75. The relevant procedure and guidelines are the Nottinghamshire Police Recorded Crimes Outcomes procedure (NGPF0007922) and the Crimes Outcome Procedural Guide (NGPF0006054).
76. I cannot recall which one I reviewed, however the information in relation to outcome 12 is very limited. Since Calocane was suffering from his mental health at the time of the offence I believed this outcome is the one that was the most relevant to the closure of this occurrence.
77. On reflection, outcome 15 was the most appropriate outcome for this offence. This is used when the victim is supportive but there are evidential difficulties. In this case the victim was supportive and wanted compensation. The evidential difficulties came down to Calocane's mental state at the time of the offence.
78. I have been asked if I had any involvement in any assessment of Valdo Calocane and what procedures were in place as to assessment of medical and mental health issues and drug testing, and the provision of appropriate medical support. My response is I did not have any involvement in any assessment of Calocane.
79. 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 the two documents referred to above (NGPF0007922 and NGPF0006054) relate to the procedural elements relating to outcome codes. I believe these were met and the finalisation code 12 was used at the time as it was deemed to be the most appropriate at the time.

80. I also make mention in OEL 14 that this incident was over the 6 months statutory time limit (STL). This was an error as criminal damage is an either way offence and therefore it does not have a STL. It is a common misconception that as the damage was under £5000 and therefore would be tried summarily, it carries a STL. This is not the case and the STL does not come into play until the case is heard at court. I do not believe this played a part in my decision making as the decision was based on Calocane's mental state.
81. I also consider the Nottinghamshire Police Policy on Investigative Procedures (NGPF0007921) was relevant. This relates to the process to be followed when investigating a crime. I do not believe this was fully met as the incident lacks regular updates from PC Collins and her supervisors at the time. Supervisor reviews are required every 28 days, and this is clearly lacking from the OELs.
82. I would also refer to the Directors Guidance on Charging Sixth Edition (NGPF0007676), which details the responsibilities of the police when submitting a case for charging and sets out the full code test, evidential test as well as out of court disposals (now known as out of court resolutions in Nottinghamshire Police). I believe this was followed as the evidential test was carefully considered and due to Calocane's mental state there was no realistic prospect of conviction. He had not admitted guilt, nor had he accepted a conditional caution and therefore an out of court disposal was not suitable.

83. 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 the only concerns I have in relation to this matter are the length of time this investigation took to conclude and the lack of officer and supervisory reviews.
84. 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 do not have any concerns relating to the recording of this matter.
85. 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. My response is that, looking back, the additional action which could have been taken is to review the incident in line with policy and to provide regular updates. Although it would appear the updates would have been limited due to Calocane being sectioned, this is not a reason not to have kept the investigation updated. I also have concerns regarding the 'admission' to being reckless given what was known about his mental state and I should have recorded these concerns on the OEL.
86. I have been asked if I consider 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 this incident there was a lack of training for supervisors and officers on outcome codes. Since then, Nottinghamshire Police has done a lot of work to address these issues and has now provided supervisors with an outcomes 'tool' to aid decision making. The Tool is an app which officers can access online and which guides them through the decision making process to assist in arriving at a correct outcome. I exhibit a copy of a flowchart showing the process (NGPF0007923).

87. 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 do not have any recommendations as the concerns I have commented on in relation to outcomes have been addressed.

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: 16.11.2025

Index to First Witness Statement of SHARONJIT POWAR

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0000068	Occurrence Details, 24/05/2020, Nottinghamshire Police Force
2	NGPF0000075	Witness statement of Katie Eustace, NGPF, dated 24/05/2020
3	NGPF0000071	KE1 Mobile Data Image
4	NGPF0000072	KE2 Mobile Data Image
5	NGPF0000073	KE3 Mobile Data Image
6	NGPF0000074	Witness Statement of Conor GRO-B 24/05/2020
7	NGPF0000082	Occurrence Details, dated 29/08/2023, Nottinghamshire Police

8	NGPF0006054	Policy Document. Re: Crime Outcomes Procedural Guide, NHFT
9	NGPF0007922	PD 069 Recorded Crime Outcomes
10	NGPF0007921	PD 534 Investigations Procedure March 2025
11	NGPF0007676	Directors Guidance 6 th Edition
12	NGPF0007923	Outcomes Decision Tree - Notts