

Witness Name: Abigail Goucher

Statement No: WITN0383001

Dated: 9th February 2026

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF TEMPORARY DETECTIVE CHIEF INSPECTOR ABIGAIL DORCAS GOUCHER

I, ABIGAIL DORCAS GOUCHER, will say as follows: -

1. I am Abigail Dorcas Goucher, I am a Police officer serving with Nottinghamshire Police.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the “**Inquiry**”) with the matters set out in the Rule 9(1) Request dated 16th January 2026 (the “**Request**”).

BACKGROUND

3. I have been asked to set out a summary of my career background and any relevant education and training.

4. I joined the Metropolitan Police on 4th January 2000 and attended Hendon Police training school for 18 weeks. Following training school, I was posted to Kentish Town in the north area of London and there I conducted response policing, neighbourhood policing and gaoler duties in the custody suite.
5. I transferred to Nottinghamshire Police on 29th April 2002 where I initially worked on the local area command in the Mansfield area. My main role was reassuring and engaging the public by conducting foot patrols in the community. I was also part of a team working in the nighttime economy in Mansfield town centre at the weekend. This focused on maintaining public safety, dealing with often intoxicated people, preventing violence and disorder as well as safeguarding vulnerable people.
6. In November 2002, I applied for and successfully passed a Surveillance Training course. Following the course, I was then posted on a Pro-active Burglary Team, the main duties included intelligence gathering, foot follow surveillance, interviewing suspects, obtaining witness and victim accounts and preparing evidence to the court.
7. I then studied and passed part 1 of the National Promotion Examination in 2003 for the rank of Sergeant. In 2003 or 2004 I passed part 2 of the National Promotion Examination.
8. From November 2003 until April 2005, I was assigned to the Homicide Unit in which I conducted outside enquiries for murder investigations – namely on

Operation Octillion and Operation Havana in Nottingham city centre. Operation Octillion was the murder of male named Omar Watson. Operation Havana was the murder of a male named Donzal Munn. Both murders involved the victims being fatally shot in separate incidents in the city during a time when gun crime was high in Nottingham. My duties within this role included tracing witnesses and obtaining their accounts, conducting numerous identification procedures with multiple witnesses, identifying and ensuring safeguarding of vulnerable persons and conducting telecommunications work in prison.

9. In April 2005, I was promoted to Sergeant and was posted to the St Anns and Sneinton area of Nottingham as a Response Sergeant. Here I provided first line leadership, supervision and decision making to ensure effective frontline policing. My key responsibilities included operational leadership, investigative oversight, safeguarding, risk management, resource/demand management and upholding standards, ethics and professionalism.

10. I studied and successfully passed part 1 of the National Promotion Exam for the rank of Inspector in 2007 and later that year, I was successful in passing part 2 of the National Promotion Exam. An Inspector is a senior operation leader in policing who has many varied responsibilities, including leading, supervising and managing teams by providing day to day direction and support, ensuring the allocation of duties and resources are effective, taking command of serious and complex incidents, liaising and collaborating with partners, promoting the protection and safeguarding of the public and addressing performance management.

11. After my return from maternity leave in September 2008, I was posted as a Custody Officer with my main base being Mansfield Police Station Custody Suite, following my completion of the custody procedures and practice course. I also worked at Newark, Worksop and the Bridewell custody suites when staffing levels dictated.
12. My main duties as Custody Officer included authorising the detention of persons arrested by officers who had been brought into the custody suite. I had to ensure their detention at the Police station was both lawful and necessary.
13. I was responsible for the welfare and wellbeing of detainees and was able to assess this through a risk assessment. I ensured all staff in the Custody Suite were cognisant of the potential risk the detainees posed.
14. The role of Custody Officer whilst remaining impartial and ensuring oversight of the investigative process, is the maintenance of accurate custody records. Other duties included working alongside other professionals – solicitors, appropriate adults, health care professionals and lay visitors.
15. I ensured that the staff in the suite and all such visitors were safe and that the management of resources versus demand was monitored. I identified and responded to vulnerable persons who required safeguarding and often dealt with intoxicated, violent, and suicidal detainees.

16. In November 2016 I transferred to the Professional Standards Department (PSD). Whilst in the department, I attended Police Regulations training and 'Death or Serious Injury' (DSI) training. I was posted to work in Complaints and Misconduct, and my role was to triage and assess public complaints and conduct referrals about Police behaviour. Within this role I was also responsible for the case management of investigations, ensuring they were fair and proportionate, liaising and referring into the Independent Office for Police Conduct, maintaining clear and accurate records, as well as ensuring officer welfare and complainant updates were completed.
17. I studied for and was successful in passing the National Investigators Exam in 2018; following this I attended the 5-week Investigators course called the Initial Crime Investigators Development Programme. The course covered content to equip an Investigator to conduct lawful, ethical investigations, identify and practically put into practice lines of enquiry, decision making based on evidence available and the management of risk and vulnerability,
18. In 2019, I was posted as Detective Sergeant into Public Protection. The Public Protection area of work within Nottinghamshire Police consists of officers specially trained to investigate sexual and violent crime including rape, domestic abuse, management of dangerous people, child abuse and child exploitation.
19. The area of work my team investigated was rape and serious sexual offending as well as domestic abuse which included offences of controlling and coercive

behaviour, assaults and stalking. I provided investigative leadership for high risk and complex cases involving sexual violence and domestic abuse.

20. The role centred on safeguarding, victim care and evidence gathering. I led a team and developed investigative strategies that covered suspect management, victim care, risk management and forensic strategies. I oversaw and reviewed investigations ensuring they were trauma informed, ethical and victim centred, I also quality assured the collation of evidence considering evidence led prosecutions where appropriate.
21. During 2019, I attended the 2-week 'Investigative Supervisor - Serious and Complex Crime' course. I completed and passed the portfolio for competence. The course prepares first line Supervisors to be able to supervise serious and complex investigations, review evidence and cases, build on decision making skills, identify and manage risk and support and develop the investigators.
22. In 2020, I was posted as a Detective Sergeant in the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub where key safeguarding partners – Police, Social Care, Health, Education and Probation physically locate together. They share information quickly and make coordinated decisions about risk, its purpose is to protect children and vulnerable adults ensuring that individual receives the right support at the right time.
23. I was posted as Detective Sergeant to Stalking with the Public Protection department in August 2021. This role involved oversight and review of stalking investigations, helping officers identify stalking behaviours and ensuring risk was

identified and that victims, suspects and the public were safeguarded from harm. The aim was to review as many recorded stalking crimes as possible which allowed me to understand the stalking situation in Nottinghamshire. I have had oversight of the training delivered in relation to stalking, having also delivered some of this myself and I will make reference to the themes in paragraphs 45 to 48.

24. Within this role I assessed stalking reports and chaired suitable cases for the monthly stalking clinic. On a monthly basis, 4 cases are selected for professional discussion with partners for collaboration, information and risk management. The clinic was Police chaired, and membership of the clinic were Police, Social Care, Health, Probation, Support Services and Mental Health services. In domestic abuse stalking cases, the victim may be allocated support from an Independent Domestic Violence Advisor depending on risk level and in a non-domestic stalking case the victim is offered support from the Stalking Advocacy Service. The feedback from partners was that they found attendance beneficial from discussing cases and were able to inform their onwards decision making. The feedback from Police was that officers were grateful for the further information that other agencies provided and insight into the full circumstances of the individuals involved.
25. The case information was shared to partners and approximately 45 minutes was dedicated per case to discuss the case, share information and implement safeguarding tasks.

26. During 2021, I attended training in Child Death Response and Investigations. The training detailed management of scenes and evidence, safeguarding of remaining children, Multi-Agency working, and the compassionate treatment of families whilst maintaining investigative integrity. I also attended Nottinghamshire Police's 'Proud to Lead' learning. This training provided me with further understanding of leadership skills, self-awareness and accountability.
27. In January 2022, I was temporarily promoted to Inspector pending a formal promotion process. I was posted as a Demand Management Inspector for response policing. This role involved working a 24/7 shift pattern. I was an operational leader responsible for the management of Response Officers, and I ensured they were effectively and efficiently deployed to calls to service from members of the public and professionals. My core function was to maintain public safety, oversee incident response, provide advice for officers and improve trust and confidence by supporting officers to provide a service to the public. I was formally promoted to Inspector in June 2022. in the role of Demand Management Inspector covering the Mansfield, Hucknall, Kirkby in Ashfield, Worksop, Retford, Harworth, Ollerton, Newark, Oxclose Lane, Bulwell and Jubilee House Police stations. I also covered the City locations when required to depending on staff coverage.
28. In September 2022, I began studying for a Master's Degree in 'Police Leadership, Strategy and Organisation' through the University of Derby. The course was part time, and I did this whilst working full time which whilst a challenge, showed my commitment to policing and demonstrates my time management skills.

29. Being passionate about stalking, my dissertation focused on stalking specifically asking, 'Do UK Police response officers understand the criminal offence of stalking?' The research examined frontline officers' identification of and investigative knowledge of stalking, comparison with organisational expectations, identification of barriers and possible solutions for officers when dealing with stalking and suggested recommendations for improvement within Nottinghamshire. I will address the findings below in paragraph 121 and 122.
30. The role I was performing at the time and with which this statement refers to was as the Detective Inspector in Safeguarding. I will provide further information about this role later in this statement. I began the role in November 2023 until June 2025.
31. Whilst in this role, I attended the 3-week 'Investigative Managers - Serious and Complex Crime' course. The course details understanding the requirements for managing investigations as well as learning how to manage investigations.
32. I became a Post Incident Manager in 2024. This role is a voluntary on-call 24/7 role and Involves ensuring the integrity of an investigation following an incident where a member of the public has come to serious harm or death following direct or indirect contact with the Police. The process ensures officers are supported, evidence is preserved, the investigation process is fair and that the Police meet their legal obligations relating to Article 2 Right to Life, European Convention of Human Rights.

33. Since November 2023 and to the present date, I have been on a rota of on-call overnight Senior Detective cover for Nottinghamshire Police. This is a voluntary role. The responsibility is to provide urgent specialised investigative advice to on-duty night shift resources and attendance where necessary.
34. Examples of incidents are not exhaustive but include suspected homicides, suspicious deaths, death in custody/prison/mental health establishment where a person is required to reside and is subject of control under the state, deaths resulting from fire, death of people under the age of 18 years old, a death or serious injury following Police contact, death as a result of an attack by an animal and firearms discharges (including Police firearm discharges).
35. In June 2025, I was temporarily promoted to Detective Chief Inspector and remain in that role to the present day. The role concerns overseeing child abuse investigations, child death, child exploitation and online offending against and of children. This role involves driving Multi-Agency safeguarding work and strategic leadership of operational teams ensuring complex, sensitive serious investigations are delivered with compassion, accountability and rigour whilst being trauma informed and addressing race and racism.

Role as Force Stalking Lead As At 9th January 2024

36. I have been asked to set out my role as Force Stalking Lead. Whilst I am very passionate about stalking, have experience in stalking and was one of the main points of contact, I was not considered the Force Lead and was not appointed as

such. I have however, set out my role below relating to stalking as the Safeguarding Detective Inspector.

37. My previous role which relates to the purpose of this statement was that of Detective Inspector. It involved leading teams in safeguarding regarding suicide prevention, so called 'honour-based abuse,' domestic abuse risk assessment reviews, assisting in obtaining, monitoring and managing civil protective orders, attendance at the Multi-Agency risk assessment conference for high-risk domestic abuse and work in stalking.
38. The core function of the role required building and maintaining Multi-Agency relationships with statutory partners and other agencies to share information, manage risk and assist safety planning to safeguard the public. Meeting membership included Police, Social Care, Probation, Independent Domestic Violence Advisor, Health – Physical and Mental, Education, Substance Misuse, Housing and Support Services.
39. The stalking aspect of the role was similar to when I was a Detective Sergeant. I led the team and was involved with the review of suitable crimes of stalking for the stalking clinic. The focus whilst still was reviewing as many stalking crimes as possible, was providing advice to officers and management of civil orders.
40. I will now provide an overview of the offence of stalking in order to assist the Inquiry.

41. Stalking occurs when someone repeatedly follows, contacts, watches or tries to monitor another person in a way that is fixated, obsessive and unwanted, making that person feel scared, threatened or unsafe.
42. There are two stalking offences that are categorised due to their seriousness and the effect the stalking has on the victim. The Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 created two new offences of stalking by inserting new sections 2A and 4A into the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 as below;

Section 2A provides:

(1) A person is guilty of an offence if—

(a) the person pursues a course of conduct in breach of section 1(1), and

(b) the course of conduct amounts to stalking.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1)(b) (and section 4A(1)(a)) a person's course of conduct amounts to stalking of another person if—

(a) it amounts to harassment of that person,

(b) the acts or omissions involved are ones associated with stalking, and

(c) the person whose course of conduct it is knows or ought to know that the course of conduct amounts to harassment of the other person.

(3) The following are examples of acts or omissions which, in particular circumstances, are ones associated with stalking—

a) following a person,

(b) contacting, or attempting to contact, a person by any means,

(c) publishing any statement or other material—

(i)relating or purporting to relate to a person, or

(ii)purporting to originate from a person,

(d)monitoring the use by a person of the internet, email or any other form of electronic communication,

(e)loitering in any place (whether public or private),

(f)interfering with any property in the possession of a person,

(g)watching or spying on a person.

(4)A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 51 weeks, or a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale, or both.

(5) In relation to an offence committed before the commencement of section 281(5)of the Criminal Justice Act 2003, the reference in subsection (4) to 51 weeks is to be read as a reference to six months.

(6)This section is without prejudice to the generality of section 2.

43. Section 4A provides:

(1)A person (“A”) whose course of conduct—

(a)amounts to stalking, and

(b)either—

(i)causes another (“B”) to fear, on at least two occasions, that violence will be used against B, or

(ii) causes B serious alarm or distress which has a substantial adverse effect on B's usual day-to-day activities,
is guilty of an offence if A knows or ought to know that A's course of conduct will cause B so to fear on each of those occasions or (as the case may be) will cause such alarm or distress.

(2) For the purposes of this section A ought to know that A's course of conduct will cause B to fear that violence will be used against B on any occasion if a reasonable person in possession of the same information would think the course of conduct would cause B so to fear on that occasion.

(3) For the purposes of this section A ought to know that A's course of conduct will cause B serious alarm or distress which has a substantial adverse effect on B's usual day-to-day activities if a reasonable person in possession of the same information would think the course of conduct would cause B such alarm or distress.

(4) It is a defence for A to show that—

(a) A's course of conduct was pursued for the purpose of preventing or detecting crime,

(b) A's course of conduct was pursued under any enactment or rule of law or to comply with any condition or requirement imposed by any person under any enactment, or

(c) the pursuit of A's course of conduct was reasonable for the protection of A or another or for the protection of A's or another's property.

(5) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable—

(a) on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years, or a fine, or both, or

(b) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding the general limit in a magistrates' court, or a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum, or both.

(6) In relation to an offence committed before May 2022, the reference in subsection (5)(b) to the general limit in a magistrates' court is to be read as a reference to six months.

(7) If on the trial on indictment of a person charged with an offence under this section the jury find the person not guilty of the offence charged, they may find the person guilty of an offence under section 2 or 2A.

(8) The Crown Court has the same powers and duties in relation to a person who is by virtue of subsection (7) convicted before it of an offence under section 2 or 2A as a magistrates' court would have on convicting the person of the offence.

(9) This section is without prejudice to the generality of section 4

44. Nottinghamshire Police and the College of Policing promote the use of the 'FOUR' mnemonic (Fixated, Obsessive, Unwanted, and Repeated) outlined by the CPS in its online Guidance titled 'Stalking or Harassment.' I exhibit a copy as NGPF0010328. The mnemonic helps officers recognise stalking by focusing on patterns rather than single incidents. A 'pattern' is a course of conduct; a course of conduct is two or more occasions and so a single incident would not amount to stalking. This is set out in the Nottinghamshire Police Stalking Procedure 2021 at page 5. I exhibit a copy as NGPF0007427.
45. Stalking training is delivered in Nottinghamshire Police to newly recruited officers and staff. The training themes consist of what stalking is and examples of behaviours. It explains the offence and legislation. It describes the different types of stalker and what and how to obtain a stalking protection order. It details the FOUR mnemonic and identifies expectations of officers - they are not to treat incidents in isolation, stalking incidents must be reviewed with their Supervisor, they must take positive action, and it provides safeguarding advice. It links officers into support and guidance. The training also provides awareness and knowledge concerning two national stalking cases and one local case of stalking. The benefits of using case studies in training makes the learning practical and relevant and increases engagement and retention.
46. Since 2019, wider training has been developed to capture staff who previously had not received the input whilst also serving as a refresher for those previously trained. The training focused on behaviours of stalking and the FOUR mnemonic to assist in identifying stalking. It goes into the detail of what is fixated, what is

obsessive, what is unwanted and what is repeated. It concentrates on the effort a suspect needs to make for an offence to be classed as stalking. It also details the impact and effect the actions of the suspect has on their victim. The training highlights the link between stalking and mental health and identifies that stalkers can often have poor social skills. The training also included case studies as mentioned in paragraph 45. One of the cases was the case of 24-year-old Alice Ruggles who was stalked and murdered in October 2016 by her ex-boyfriend, after ending their brief but increasingly controlling relationship. Following the breakup, he carried out a relentless campaign of sending threatening messages, leaving unwanted gifts, hacking her social media, and repeatedly appearing at her home. He travelled some distance and broke into her flat and killed her. He was convicted for murder with a minimum sentence of 22 years. This exposed serious failings in Policing and the recognition of stalking which led to submission of the super complaint as referenced in paragraph 49.

47. In 2024, I developed a refresher stalking training package for Divisional Training for Response Officers and Neighbourhood Policing and the Criminal Investigation Department. The training was designed as a refresher which focused on how to identify stalking, the FOUR mnemonic and how to put in safeguards for the victim.
48. It was intended to increase the awareness of stalking and stalking protection orders with a view to improving the number of stalking protection orders applied for and obtained. Where stalking protection orders are obtained and policed, they can prevent escalation in stalking cases which allows victims to feel safer, prevents reoffending and assists officers in fulfilling their safeguarding obligations. Civil

orders are integral to the prevention strategy, which is to have fewer victims, fewer offences, seeing less demand on policing and using a partnership-oriented problem solving approach. The training also details a new 'Improving Investigations into Stalking' template as a guidance for officers on the crime recording system Niche (Exhibit NGPF0010366). For ease of understanding, the stalking slides have been extracted from the main divisional training PowerPoint.

49. As referred to in paragraph 46, a super complaint was made by the Suzy Lamplugh Trust about National failings into the identification and investigations into stalking. His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS), the College of Policing, and the Independent Office for Police Conduct released a joint response in 2024 acknowledging changes would be made. Nottinghamshire Police have been working on and have now published an action plan. This details our internal changes, one of which is the daily briefing of all new reports of stalking, this is reviewed and tasked by Senior Officers providing scrutiny and focus.
50. Nottinghamshire Police published information about stalking on its intranet for all staff and officers to view and navigate through the information available (Exhibit NGPF0010337).
51. Along with the Detective Sergeant and/or Police Staff Investigator (PSI) Kate Reece, I attended regional stalking meetings to share information, identify challenges and solutions and share best practice with other local force area which included Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Leicestershire Police.

Best practice included utilising our stalking clinic, the introduction of the stalking screening tool and examples of stalking protection order requirements.

52. The team and I took general enquiries from members of the force regarding stalking, obtaining protective orders and general safeguarding advice. The team assisted officers in obtaining orders and recorded them on a database in order to monitor them and task out for compliance visits with offenders to ensure they were compliant with the prohibitions and requirements implemented by the courts.
53. On 1st July 2022, Nottinghamshire Police took part in the second phase of piloting the Stalking Screening Tool (SST) which is yet to be nationally rolled out. The SST helps the police identify if stalking is present or if alternative offences need to be considered. The SST does not provide an overall risk measurement, because academic experts of stalking emphasise that all cases involving stalking should be high risk. The SST should be reviewed by a supervisor as soon as practicable. The Nottinghamshire Police SST includes additional information than the one provided to police by the national lead at the time Deputy Chief Constable Paul Mills. This is detailed within the Stalking Screening Tool guide (Exhibit NGPF0010340).
54. I am aware that training in the SST was integrated into existing divisional training to the force in order to keep officers up to date with new processes relating to stalking. The training explained what the SST was and informed officers that it was a standalone document within Niche. As time progressed and by 2024, the SST became integrated into the Public Protection Notice (Exhibit NGPF0010341).

55. Since 2019, information on stalking has been available on the intranet and has been subject to updates since this time. On the stalking intranet page there is an information section that relates to the SST. It explains the SST in detail and provides guidance on how to access the public protection webform. It also provides screenshots of what the different sections of the SST look like for ease of completion and reference and a video showing the process.
56. On the 15th October 2024 Nottinghamshire Police went live with the SST on the Niche web form. The relevant guidance can be found on the intranet (Exhibit NGPF0010337).

Independent Reviews of Prior Incidents Involving Valdo Calocane

57. On 10th January 2024 at 1417 hours, I received an email from Detective Chief Inspector (DCI) Clare Dean asking me to conduct an initial assessment and provide my opinion on 3 incidents that had been reported to the Police. DCI Dean's email originated from a request made by Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) Griffin (Exhibit NGPF0007832).
58. All 3 incidents related to a member of the public called Sebastian, who had reported incidents involving a male named Valdo Calocane.
59. Following receipt of the email request, I arranged to review these with Police Staff Investigator Kate Reece who worked in the stalking department with me at the time and is very knowledgeable regarding stalking

60. We reviewed both the crime recording system 'Niche' and the incident recording system 'Safe.'
61. We conducted the review by understanding firstly what was required, what had been asked of the review and what its purpose was. I looked at each of the 3 cases one by one, starting at the earliest recorded incident. I established the facts of the incident by referring to the Safe (incident) record and the Niche (crime report). Based on the information, I checked that the crime recorded was correctly classified using my understanding of the law. Based on the information available, I assessed safeguarding and the voice of the victim. I responded back to DCI Clare Dean at 1521 hours on 16 January 2024 shortly after the review meeting with Kate by email with my responses (Exhibit NGPF0007832).

Incident 1

62. In order to provide the summary of this incident for this statement, I have since revisited Niche and Safe and provide a summary as below.
63. I will now detail the first incident I reviewed as detailed in paragraph 934 of Deputy Chief Constable Griffin's statement WITN0074001.
64. The first report was received on 5th July 2021 from a male named Sebastian. This report was recorded as a crime of 'Assault – ABH/Common assault' which at the time of the review had been closed and filed. The incident was initially recorded under Safe log 0581_05072021(NGPF0000044) and updated as 'no offences' by the officer in the case.

65. This was reviewed by the National Crime Recording Standards team in Nottinghamshire Police and an email sent to the officer. The email stated that based on the initial disclosure of assault on the incident from Sebastian, a crime could not be negated, there was a crime reported and it should be recorded. The officer subsequently recorded the allegation as an ABH/Common assault under Niche Occurrence 21000375087 (NGPF0000043).
66. As per my email within exhibit NGPF0007832 I outlined this as “crimed as assault. Assessed as LOW risk on THRIVE? No positive Police action taken.” The Safe incident records that a male by the name of Sebastian went to the police station to speak to officers and explained that a male named Valdo Calocane who he shared a flat with had approached him earlier that day. Sebastian described that sometimes Valdo Calocane is friendly and sometimes he is quiet. On this occasion he behaved aggressively.
67. Sebastian reported that Valdo Calocane was regularly visited by NHS staff, and that Sebastian thinks they are Mental Health Nurses. Sebastian stated that Valdo Calocane was mumbling to himself earlier that day and said to Sebastian that “people will be contacting you and in case that happens, then you should tell these people that I will contact them.” Sebastian also said that Valdo Calocane told him that he “needs to be careful and that they are coming for you.” Sebastian reported that Valdo Calocane pulled violently at Sebastian’s t-shirt to get his attention. Sebastian was not injured and did not wish to make a complaint or provide an evidential statement. He simply wanted officers to be aware. Sebastian signed the

officer's pocket notebook confirming this. It is not recorded that Valdo Calocane was spoken to regarding this incident.

68. As per Deputy Chief Constable Griffin's statement (WITN0074001), paragraph 975, the incident was closed with no positive police action being taken, this is accurate.

Incident 2

69. The second report was received on 26th April 2022 at 1812 hours from Sebastian as noted in paragraph 939 of Deputy Chief Constable Griffin's statement (WITN0074001).
70. Sebastian visited the police station and a crime was not recorded for this incident. The incident was recorded on a Safe log 0613_26042022 (NGPF0000004).
71. Sebastian reported that he had made a previous report of assault by his former flat mate and that today he had been approached and followed home from the gym by the same male: Valdo Calocane. The Police Staff member asked Sebastian questions about stalking and harassment. Whilst Sebastian said he felt frightened, the behaviour was not assessed as persistent, fixated or obsessive by the staff member, nor was it having a substantial impact on the day-to-day activities of Sebastian.

72. It is recorded as being assessed as low risk of harm through the police prioritisation of vulnerability tool known as THRIVE which stands for 'Threat, Harm, Risk, Investigation, Vulnerability, Engagement.'
73. According to the Safe log, the incident was reviewed by Sergeant 2581 Langham who rang Sebastian at 1410 hours on 9th May 2022 to glean further information. Sebastian said to the Sergeant that he had seen Valdo Calocane at the gym, spoken to him and accepted Facebook contact with him (NGPF0000004). This suggests that Sebastian was content with the conversation with Valdo Calocane and consented to the contact through Facebook. Valdo Calocane would not necessarily be aware that any contact would be unwanted due to the Facebook acceptance. The reviewing Sergeant had also considered this incident to be low risk as per THRIVE as highlighted in my original review (Exhibit NGPF0007832) and documented on the safe log NGPF0000004.
74. Sebastian and Valdo Calocane no longer lived together, and the report suggests that Valdo Calocane would not have known where Sebastian lived. Sebastian stated that earlier that day he left the gym and Valdo Calocane left shortly after, appearing to follow him on his way home. Sebastian stated that he turned off his route and Valdo Calocane did not follow him.
75. The Safe log 0613_26042022 (NGPF0000004) states that Police Constable 1053 Beardsmore contacted Sebastian. At 1112 hours on 12th May 2022, Sebastian told the officer that he was wary of Valdo Calocane. Sebastian told

Police that he wanted the matter recording and that he did not want police to speak to Valdo Calocane about it.

76. To confirm, paragraph 976 of Deputy Chief Constable Griffin's statement WITN0074001, is correct; the incident was updated that Sebastian was provided with advice, and no further police action was taken. Based on my review of this incident and consideration of the facts and my knowledge and experience of stalking this incident is not stalking. This is a singular incident. I will provide further reflections about this later in this statement.

77. This was a singular incident and not a course of conduct; it is not fixated, obsessive, unwanted or repeated behaviour as per the definition outlined above.

Incident 3

78. The third report was received on 28th July 2022 at 0803 and a Safe log 0089_28072022 was created (NGPF0000005). This is detailed in Deputy Chief Constable Griffin's statement WITN0074001, paragraph 940.

79. Sebastian reported being followed home from the gym by Valdo Calocane again. Sebastian said that he often saw Valdo Calocane at the gym and that it could be coincidental, he said that he finds himself looking over his shoulder.

80. Sebastian also said he saw someone hiding behind a wall but didn't see who it was. He could not confirm it was Valdo Calocane. Sebastian reported that Valdo Calocane followed him home to his flat complex from the gym but stated Valdo

Calocane doesn't know his flat number and did not enter the flat building. He said that their old address was closer to the gym than Sebastian's new address and so thinks that Valdo Calocane going to the area of Sebastian's new address would have been out of his way.

81. Sebastian told Police he was feeling anxious, distressed and frightened. The Control Room asked Sebastian questions about stalking and harassment and assessed the behaviour as not persistent, fixated or obsessive.
82. The Officer in the Case recorded the offence as stalking in Niche Occurrence 22000439907 (NGPF0000003).
83. Sebastian did not wish to support an investigation. The Officer in the Case attempted to speak with Valdo Calocane. The Niche log states that the officer tried to ring Valdo Calocane on the phone and visited his address on two occasions getting no response from him so did not speak to him or see him. I do not believe based on the information that this is an offence of stalking as per my reflections in NGPF0007832.
84. Within NGPF0007832 I made the following observations which relate to all 3 incidents.
85. More information should have been obtained, and the Stalking Screening Tool should have been used. The following lines of enquiry would have helped to establish whether the behaviour met the threshold for a stalking offence. They

would have assisted in determining if Valdo Calocane was fixated and obsessed with Sebastian.

86. These are the questions and comments I would have suggested be answered to be able to inform the crime recording and risks present in these incidents:

- a. How does the victim and suspect know one another i.e. only through accommodation, did they attend educational premises together etc? How long have they known each other for?
- b. IP and suspect use to be flatmates: unknown what the accommodation arrangements where: student accommodation? How many people resided there?
- c. Did anyone else have any issues/concerns with the suspect whilst in the accommodation?
- d. Does the victim have any vulnerabilities?
- e. Apart from the incident of assault reported on the 5th July 2021 it is not known what sort of relationship the IP and the suspect had i.e. mates, acquaintances, flatmates only. How did they get on? Not sure when the victim moved from 20 Flat 2, Middleton Street, NG7 2SL to **GRO-B**
GRO-B?
- f. Not sure what has happened between the IP and suspect between the 5 July 2021 to the 26 April 2022? Any other incidents/behaviours of note? Incident log states "caller has spoken with the male and accepted Facebook contact"
- g. When did the IP join the gym?
- h. When did the suspect join the gym?

- i. Who was at the gym first on the dates in question?
- j. What dates and times do the victim and suspect both attend the gym? Do these cross over often?
- k. How long did the suspect follow the IP and on how many occasions?
- l. No CCTV or house-to-house enquiries were completed.
- m. No enquiries completed with the gym.
- n. What route home from the gym would the suspect go and how would he travel i.e. walk only? What is the distance from the suspects gym to his home address?
- o. No real chronology of the history between the IP and suspect and what has happened.

87. Obtaining this information would have assisted in determining stalking by understanding if Valdo Calocane was fixated and obsessed with Sebastian. It would have provided context as to the contact, what the purpose and motivation was.

88. My points noted here in my review reflect the recording and understanding as per paragraphs 977, 978 and 979 of Deputy Chief Constable Griffin's statement (WITN0074001) in that I believe there were missed opportunities to gather contextual information that may have assisted in determining whether an offence of stalking had taken place and what risk Valdo Calocane posed.

89. I will give my reflections of these incidents below.

Relevant Policies

90. I reviewed the 3 incidents based on my knowledge and experience in both policing and stalking. I did not document specific policies that I considered at the time. However, on revisiting the review of the incidents and to inform this statement, I would consider the following policies to be relevant.

- a. PS105 Information Management Policy, 2018 (Exhibit NGPF0010343).
- b. PS158 The Vulnerability Policy, 2018 (Exhibit NGPF0010344).
- c. PD776 The Stalking Procedure, 2021 (Exhibit NGPF0007427AG/2).
- d. PD620 'Dealing with Persons with Mental Health procedure', 2019 (Exhibit NGPF0010329).

These will be discussed in the following paragraphs of this statement alongside the reflections I have from reviewing the policies.

Reflections

Incident 1

91. When revisiting incident 1 for the purpose of this statement, I noticed that Valdo Calocane's date of birth was not added to the crime report. I have made enquiries with the force Niche police Sergeant, Stephen Swift. I wanted to understand what data was inputted at the time of the crime being created as Valdo Calocane's police held record has since been linked to Niche occurrences 21000375087 and 22000439907.

92. Sergeant Swift informed me that at the creation of both Niche occurrences 21000375087 and 22000439907, Valdo Calocane's date of birth had not been inputted. Due to this, there has been a duplication in the nominal records on both occasions (incident 1 and incident 3). The initial nominal profile was therefore at the time not linked and therefore not recognised as being the same person. Until the records were linked, the record would not give an accurate representation of the nominal and any previous incidents or risk.
93. This lack of researching the nominal record in the first place would affect any further searches. There is the potential that critical information would not be linked such as intelligence, history of the individual, previous incidents and safeguarding issues. This can increase the likelihood of harm, compromise officer safety and have a detrimental effect on an investigation. The Information Management Policy says that Nottinghamshire Police recognises that recording the right information and ensuring that it is available to the right people in the most appropriate format is an essential support function for operational policing (Exhibit NGPF0010343).
94. This issue is a data quality issue by the officers which the Inquiry should be aware of. This is not a one off as it is also replicated in the third incident and the officers would have been aware that they had not completed the full details for Valdo Calocane by omitting to enter a date of birth for him.
95. Sergeant Swift provided me with documents to demonstrate the NICHE records at the time of the incidents. I will refer to these as Exhibits NGPF0010331 and

NGPF0010332. Whilst it would not have an impact on the crime recording it might have had an impact on how an investigation proceeded as it would have provided previous incidents and antecedents.

96. I note that Valdo Calocane was not spoken to regarding this incident. Further reflections I have in relation to this is that it is plausible to argue that as Valdo Calocane had not been spoken to, he may not have been aware of any wrongdoing or upset caused. A test of fairness would ask 'would the person have acted differently moving forward if they had been told of the wrongdoing at the time?' This observation is therefore significant to the subsequent incidents. I would have expected the officer to speak to Valdo Calocane to conduct a safe and well check on him if nothing else due to the mention of mental health concerns.
97. There is mention of Valdo Calocane moving out of the flat. Upon revisiting Niche and Safe, I believe this information is confused and it should read that Sebastian was moving out. It also states that the officer advised Valdo Calocane to speak to the Mental Health Nurses about the incident when they next saw the nurses and to keep a distance from Sebastian. I believe it should read that officers advised Sebastian to speak to the Mental Health Nurses about the incident and for Sebastian to keep a distance from Valdo Calocane.
98. This makes more sense but would need to be clarified with the officer who recorded this information. This information would not have altered my view and opinion about the crime classification.

99. Sebastian told the Police that Valdo Calocane has regular visits by NHS staff who he believes are Mental Health Nurses. There is clearly a concern from Sebastian who lived with Valdo Calocane about his mental health. The Police did not complete or submit an 'Adult Concern Public Protection Notice.'
100. A Public Protection Notice is a police form that is used in the crime recording system Niche. It is tasked to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub for review. The purpose of the Public Protection Notice is to share information with other agencies. The information should be sufficient to inform and understand the circumstances of the concern so they can make informed decisions and take appropriate and necessary action to safeguarding and support an individual.
101. Nottinghamshire Police have a 'Public Protection Notice Advice' document. This states; Nottinghamshire Police use Public Protection Notices for all areas of concern including:
- a. Adult at Risk
 - b. Child Concern/Child Sexual Exploitation
 - c. Domestic Abuse/Stalking & Harassment
 - d. Honour Based Abuse (this will be used to support the above areas and the Karma Nirvana process).
102. Submitting a Public Protection Notice on Niche ensures the relevant agencies are notified of the concern and the correct package of support is made available to the person or persons requiring it. In order to tailor this support, it is vital that the officer completing the Public Protection Notice completes the form in full, providing as

much detail as possible. This is extremely important when it comes to the 'officer's observation' section within the Public Protection Notice. This acts as a crime report log and sufficient information should be inputted in order to provide the relevant agency with enough information to understand the circumstances and reasons for the concern and to give them necessary information to take applicable action (Exhibit NGPF0010333).

103. The 'Adult At Risk Document' found on Nottinghamshire Police intranet outlines that an Adult Concern Public Protection Notice should be considered for submission when an officer has concerns about a vulnerable person who may be a risk, need care and support needs even without their consent. I will now refer to the document as exhibit NGPF0010334.
104. Due to Sebastian reporting his concerns about Valdo Calocane's poor mental health, an Adult Concern Public Protection Notice would be the most fitting notice to complete.
105. An adult will be asked to provide consent and this is desired for their information to be shared with agencies for support. However, under the Care Act 2014, the Police can override consent to share information if it is deemed the adult lacks capacity to consent or there is a significant concern (Exhibits NGPF0010333 and NGPF0010334). In this incident, because Valdo Calocane was not spoken to, it is not known whether firstly the officer had concerns or not and if they did, it is not known whether Valdo Calocane would have consented to having his information shared or indeed if this would have been overridden.

106. The Adult Concern is tasked automatically upon completion through the Niche occurrence to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub who assess the concern. If there was only a safeguarding concern or care and support needs, they would share the information with the Local Authority.
107. In the case where the threshold for sharing is not met, i.e. the concern does not satisfy either of the concerns, there would be no onwards sharing of information. If the concern related to mental health only, the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub would send onwards to the Police Mental Health Street Triage team for their assessment. The Mental Health Street Triage Team are based at Police Headquarters. The team consists of police officers and a Mental Health Nurse. My knowledge of that team from working in the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub in 2021 are that they should assess the Public Protection Notices that concern mental health and process as required. The officer did not see Valdo Calocane and so will never be able to understand if there were any concerns on this occasion. If there had been a concern, looking at it from a mental health perspective, I would want to understand what was happening in Valdo Calocane's life and see if this differed from when they engaged with him – this may have changed their approach to him resulting in other pathways to support or medication.
108. I believe the officer asked Sebastian to speak to the Mental Health Nurse about his concern about Valdo Calocane which reinforces there was concern around Valdo Calocane's mental health. I deem this to be an inappropriate suggestion by

Police to Sebastian as he was effectively the victim in the situation and this may have put him at further risk of harm. It is not known when the NHS staff tended to visit Valdo Calocane or what the set up was in the flat and so putting the onus on Sebastian put him in a difficult position, for example: would Sebastian have been able to speak freely to them? Would Valdo Calocane have been present?

109. It is important to note that Police Officers have a duty of care that is underpinned through legal and ethical responsibilities. The Police should take reasonable steps to protect the public from foreseeable harm and known risk. This applies to both victim and suspects and also the wider public. Regardless of the purpose or possibility of a prosecution in the future, the Vulnerability Policy states “that this should not inhibit an officer from basic communication with the vulnerable person to determine their welfare, as this is our priority. Care should be taken, however, to ensure that speaking to the person is confined to establishing the person’s safety and welfare using open questions to obtain the minimum amount of information to enable the person to give a brief account of anything that has occurred, e.g. identify any offences, suspect(s) and ensuring the scene and any evidence is preserved. As soon as the welfare of the vulnerable person has been established or the officer/staff member has determined that the person is at risk of harm or has been harmed, the conversation should be brought to a close so that it does not constitute an interview” (Exhibit NGPF0010344).

110. Version 2019 of the policy PD620 entitled ‘Dealing With Persons with Mental Health’ (Exhibit NGPF001010329) states that “*officers and staff may attend incidents or come into contact with persons who, while not presenting an*

immediate risk to themselves or others, are nevertheless believed to be in need of care or support. In such circumstances details of the person, together with the grounds for concern, should be passed on to the local Social Services department via a Public Protection Notice. The consent of the person concerned should be obtained before such information is passed on to other agencies unless the circumstances are such that this may not be practicable or we can override consent (e.g. if concerns relate to the level of care and support provided by a 'carer' who is present at that time). Officers may also consider advising the person to arrange a GP appointment urgently or get in touch with their community psychiatric nurse if they have one." Again, due to the officer not speaking to Valdo Calocane at the time, it is unknown whether they would have been able to follow this guidance and submit a Public Protection Notice.

Incident 2

111. I am in agreement that based on the information available there were no offences reported by Sebastian.

112. The report of assault nine months previously would not factor into the decision making or evidence relating to a stalking. This is because there must be a pattern of behaviour that must be persistent and cause fear, alarm or distress. An assault is treated as a single completed offence, additionally a long gap tends to break the 'course of conduct.'

113. I do not believe this is stalking because based on the information reported, the behaviours are not fixated or obsessive. This is a singular incident so is also not repeated.

114. I do not believe the officers could or should have done anything further based on the information available on the Safe log. I also note there were no concerns raised in this incident about any poor mental health.

Incident 3

115. When reviewing incident 3, I note again that Valdo Calocane's date of birth was not added to the crime report. I have noted above in my reflections for incident 1, that I made enquiries with the force Niche Sergeant who confirmed that again due to the date of birth not being inputted, it led to yet another duplication of the nominal record (Exhibit NGPF0010332). This again, therefore, did not give an accurate representation of the nominal record and any previous incidents or risks.

116. My reflections relating to the third incident are that the officers should have asked further questions as per exhibit NGPF0007832. These questions would have provided context for both the second and the third incidents. Whilst the second incident was an (apparently) isolated event, answers to the questions noted in my review/email would have provided more information. This would then inform the third incident, potentially identifying stalking and allowing the police to understand the bigger picture regarding Valdo Calocane and Sebastian.

117. The answers to the questions, or the officers utilising the Stalking Screening Tool, would also have informed them if they were dealing with an offence of stalking. The Stalking Screening Tool which I referred to above, went live on 1st July 2022, this was after the second incident and before the third incident.
118. My expectation would be that officers would have been professionally curious to obtain those answers. I would expect officers to conduct any investigative action or enquiry that would be relevant and proportionate to establish the facts of the situation regardless of whether this points towards or away from a suspect. What is reasonable is different in each case and will depend upon the circumstances of that incident (Exhibit NGPF0010335).
119. The Stalking Procedure (Exhibit NGPF0007427) provides advice on reasonable lines of enquiry and avenues to explore in relation to stalking offences. This procedure along with the Stalking Intranet pages provide guidance and support to officers in such investigations.
120. I consider the questions as per the Exhibit NGPF0007832 to be reasonable because they would be able to confirm either way if the behaviours of Valdo Calocane and the impact on Sebastian would have amounted to stalking or not. Had they established the answers, it would have given context to the situation which would have informed the crime report. I feel in this case stalking was prematurely assumed without consideration of the facts. The behaviours as reported were not fixated or obsessive and it also cannot be said due to the Facebook contact that they were unwanted.

121. The officer recorded an offence of stalking without having in-depth understanding of the circumstances and effect on Sebastian. The officer then did not speak to Valdo Calocane in order to understand any intentions or fixations. The crime was then filed by the Supervisor who noted 'this is not in the public interest' and no further action is taken. The Supervisor in my view was not thorough and did not:
- a. Identify the lines of enquiry expected and;
 - b. Authorised its closure knowing the officer had an outstanding action of having only attempted to speak to Valdo Calocane.

Recommendations

122. As mentioned above, I completed my dissertation on Stalking. My main findings showed that Nottinghamshire Police Officers do have an understanding of stalking and how to safeguard victims from further harm. My research showed that officers have an interest in stalking alongside the variety of other incidents they are required to attend. It highlighted insufficient training in recognising stalking and noted that challenges around safeguarding reduce its overall effectiveness.
123. My research recommended improving how Nottinghamshire Police deal with and invest in stalking, this includes the focused continuous professional development through training and having a specialised unit to support victims and investigate stalking. Implementations of those recommendations should contribute to the improvement of stalking investigations and ensure victims are supported and safeguarded. I was awarded a merit for this Degree in 2024.

124. Whilst in my role as Detective Inspector, I have had involvement and been able to influence stalking training as mentioned above. Providing refresher training on stalking is both valuable and necessary and this training built on what knowledge already existed. It improved in that it has been focused on behaviours, safeguarding and obtaining stalking protection orders to prevent further offending. It was also delivered to the criminal investigation department, a group who hadn't previously been included in the divisional training.

Other Observations

125. The officers that dealt with these incidents are Uniformed Response Officers. My experience shows me that a culture exists in Response that some Response Officers do not see themselves as Investigators. I think this is often because they are the first to respond to 999 calls and that their fast-paced role and the demands put on them to get to the next call is quite different to having a detailed heavy workload.

126. Although they may not be trained Detectives and can sometimes lack confidence—which understandably feeds into that mindset—they *are* trained investigators. The investigative process begins the moment the Response Officer arrives at the scene. When responsibility isn't taken at that first point of contact, it can create real risks: early evidence may be missed, key risks may go unidentified, and—as in this case—the full circumstances of an incident reported to Police may not be properly captured. It's vital that response officers recognise the importance of their role and the impact their actions can have on the entire investigation.

127. It is essential that both Response Officers and First Line Supervisors recognise the importance of their roles in an investigation. Strong supervision, clear expectations, and accountable first attendance are critical to safeguarding victims, securing evidence, and ensuring that investigations begin on the right footing.

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** T/OC12558.

Dated: 9th February 2026

Index to first witness statement Abigail Goucher

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0010328	Guidance Document, Stalking or Harassment, Crown Prosecution Service
2	NGPF0007427	Policy document Re: Stalking Procedure of NGPF
3	NGPF0010366	DASU Risk Assessment and ENCOMPASS Refresher 2024, Nottinghamshire Police
4	NGPF0010337	Guidance Document on Intranet, Stalking
5	NGPF0010340	Guidance Document, Stalking Screening Tool, National Police Chiefs' Council
6	NGPF0010341	Example of PDF PPN Report, Nottinghamshire Police

7	NGPF0007832	Email from Robert Griffin ACC [NGPF] to Fern Jones [NGPF], re: Calocane
8	WITN0074001	First Witness Statement of T/DCC Rob Griffin, Nottinghamshire Police
9	NGPF0000044	Incident Report regarding Valdo Calocane, dated 05/07/2021, NGPF
10	NGPF0000043	Occurrence details (Occurrence: 21000375087), dated 13/09/2023, NGPF
11	NGPF0000004	Incident Details, dated 12/05/2022, Nottingham Police.
12	NGPF0000005	Incident Details, dated 30/07/2022, Nottingham Police.
13	NGPF0000003	Occurrence details, dated 28/07/2022, Nottingham Police.
14	NGPF0010343	Policy Document, PS 105 Information Management, May 2018
15	NGPF0010344	Policy Document, PS 158 Vulnerability Policy, April 2018
16	NGPF0010329	Policy Document, PD 620 Dealing with Persons with Mental Health (Consolidated Procedures), Nottinghamshire Police
17	NGPF0010331	Niche 21000375087 Webform
18	NGPF0010332	Niche 22000439907 Webform
19	NGPF0010333	Quick Guide regarding PPNs, Section 47 Strategy Discussions and Initial Child Protection Conferences, Nottinghamshire Police, June 2020
20	NGPF0010334	Guidance Document, Social Care Adult at Risk Definition- Care Act 2014
21	NGPF0010335	Guidance Document, Reasonable Lines of Enquiry

