

**REPLY BY THE PRESIDENT OF
THE COMMITTEE FOR HOME AFFAIRS
TO QUESTIONS ASKED PURSUANT TO RULE 14 OF THE
RULES OF PROCEDURE BY DEPUTY CURGENVEN
30TH DECEMBER, 2025**

The Committee *for* Home Affairs answered materially similar Rule 14 questions on 31st October, 2025 and therefore for ease has, where appropriate, cross-referenced to those original responses which may be found [here](#).

In responding to these questions, and consistent with previous answers, the Committee can only provide information that is within its knowledge and remit. Consequently, it cannot address queries arising from interpretations of individual complaints or investigations as, in accordance with the legislation, these matters are not dealt with by the Committee (unless they concern a senior officer) but by Guernsey Police, with oversight from the Police Complaints Commission where appropriate. The Committee is concerned that this separation is not clearly understood, and there is a misconception that the Committee has access to the details of individual complaints, or oversight of the detailed operational processes in place with Guernsey Police. This is not the case. Neither would it be appropriate, or permissible under the Data Protection (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law 2019 for such information to be shared.

The Committee has committed to, and commenced, a review of the Police Complaints regime. The review will consider the effectiveness, transparency, and accessibility of the current arrangements, with a view to ensuring that the regime reflects best practice and meets public expectations. This work will include engagement with key stakeholders, including Guernsey Police, the Police Complaints Commission, and previous complainants. The Committee anticipates that recommendations arising from this review will be brought to the Assembly in the second half of 2026.

The Committee would however note that since September 2025, the Committee has considered, in total, some 44 informal or parliamentary questions on this particular subject. While the Committee recognises, and is open to, the scrutiny of the wider Assembly, and has set up a political review group specifically to allow wider participation, such a volume risks detracting resources from the substantive and important work of the review itself.

The Committee wishes to reaffirm its position as set out in the earlier Rule 14 questions: it has not seen any evidence to suggest intentional wrongdoing intended to avoid addressing misconduct, as implied by these questions. That said, if any Member of the Assembly believes they hold information that may indicate such wrongdoing, they are encouraged to share their concerns, whether with the Committee, the Chief of Police, or His Majesty's Procureur, so that the matter can be appropriately considered.

On 31 October 2025, in response to Rule 14 queries, the President of the Committee for Home Affairs (the CfHA) declined to confirm whether Guernsey police had been making a procedural error when handling complaints. Yet, on 3 November 2025, the President confirmed, via social media (Facebook), that “there was a procedural error identified” in how Guernsey police handled complaints (identified by the Isle of Man Constabulary).

1. On what date was last term’s CfHA informed of the procedural error?

There are no records that indicate that the former Committee was advised of any procedural error which may have arisen as a result of how police officers may have discharged their responsibilities under the Police Complaints (Guernsey) Law, 2008 (“the Law”). As noted in the Committee’s response to the Rule 14 responses provided on 31st October, there would be no expectation that the Committee would receive such an update. A review, such as that undertaken into an individual complaint by the Isle of Man Constabulary, takes place at the invitation of the Chief of Police as a statutory official and it is for the Chief of Police to address, as needed, any procedural errors identified as part of his responsibilities of the direction and control of the Police.

2. On what date was this term’s CfHA informed for the procedural error?

The first reference to a “procedural error” was in the previous Rule 14 questions.

The Committee reiterates the response to question 1 and the responses to Rule 14 questions on 31st October that “The Committee has not been briefed on any procedural errors arising from complaint investigations, this would be a matter for the Chief of Police to consider.” In line with the response to question 6 of the Rule 14 questions provided on 31st October 2025, there would be no expectation that information arising from individual complaints would be shared with the Committee.

3. Who informed the CfHA of the procedural error on each occasion (as above)?

As noted in response to question 2 the Committee became aware of the suggestion of an operational ‘procedural error’ as a result of political questions submitted.

4. Can the President confirm whether the procedural error was an isolated incident; or rather, was the procedural error a process which had been routinely applied in complaints investigations up to that point?

The Committee refers to its response to question 2. It has not been briefed, nor would it expect to be on the findings of a report commissioned some two years ago by the then Chief of Police on an operational matter.

5. Can the President confirm whether the effect of the procedural error was to curtail the formal investigative element of a police complaint?

6. Can the President confirm whether the procedural error saw complaints closed without conducting the investigation required by law?

7. Can the President confirm whether any police officers involved in the procedural error knew, or should have known, at any point, that the effect of their actions would be to close complaints (regardless of intent) not in accord with the law?

For ease, the Committee has provided a single response for questions 5 to 7.

The Committee reiterates its response to questions 1 and 2 of the Rule 14 questions provided on 31st October, 2025 “No, the Committee cannot confirm this but is comforted that the independent process being discharged appropriately” and “The Head of Law Enforcement has provided assurance that any procedural errors identified which officers discharge their duties are addressed. Further, he is satisfied that there is no evidence that any deviation from the complaints regime set out in the Law has occurred in order to avoid addressing misconduct.”

The Committee would further note that the Police Complaints legislation, while requiring review, does contain some safeguards. For example, a complainants’ right to appeal if dissatisfied provides opportunity for independent challenge and, for example, a direction by the Commission for appropriate remedial activity to be taken to address any procedural errors.

8. Who informed the CfHA that there was “no evidence of any attempt at trying to cover up complaints” (as stated, via Facebook, by the President)?

The Committee refers to its response to question 1 of the Rule 14 questions provided on 31st October, 2025; “The Head of Law Enforcement has provided assurance that any procedural errors identified while officers discharge their duties are addressed. Further, he is satisfied that there is no evidence that any deviation from the complaints regime set out in the Law has occurred in order to avoid addressing misconduct.”

9. On 3 November 2025, the President wrote (Facebook): “Our new [Chief Officer of police] ... has confirmed that” there is no evidence “that the police were unlawfully filtering out complaints.” Can the President confirm the date the Chief Officer stated this; and to whom?

The comment quoted in question 8 was provided to the Office *of the* Committee for Home Affairs in preparation of the Rule 14 responses to questions submitted on 3rd October.

10. The President went on to say: “the CfHA cannot answer questions via rule 14 that do not sit within its mandate. These are the rules... I cannot speak for the police or PCC...”. If the Guernsey police and the Police Complaints Commission (the PCC) do not sit within the CfHA’s mandate, which Committee’s mandate do they sit under?

The Committee refers to the response provided to the Rule 14 questions provided on 31st October. “It would not be appropriate for the Committee to comment on or speak on behalf of either the Guernsey Police, who are necessarily operationally independent of the Committee, or the Police Complaints Commission (“the Commission”), which is an

independent body established under the Police Complaints (Guernsey) Law, 2008 (“the Law”) in order to carry out a specific role and functions provided for under the statutory police complaints framework.”

The Committee has mandated responsibility to advise the States and to develop and implement policies, and legislation, on matters relating to its purpose including Law Enforcement and for overseeing the delivery of the operation of Law Enforcement. However, this does not mean that it is appropriate or lawful for the Committee to insert itself or seek to influence how the Guernsey Police or the Commission discharge their respective statutory obligations. This would be contrary to the intention of the Assembly in approving a clear statutory framework enshrining clear roles for the management of complaints.

11. In relation to an earlier question under Rule 14, the CfHA asked for an extension of time to reply (31 October 2025). In answering, the CfHA stated that, in its existence (2011 to present day), the PCC has upheld only one police complaint appeal on the grounds it disagrees with the police determination made – on what date was this appeal upheld?

12. In relation to this single, upheld appeal, did the PCC consider that any further action needed to be taken by Guernsey police?

13. Police complaints legislation was amended on 16 August 2025 (statutory instrument 2024, No. 63) to, inter alia, state: ‘if the Appropriate Authority concludes that the [police] complaint falls into one of these categories it must refer the complaint to the PCC, and if the Commission agrees with the finding of the appropriate authority, the complaint shall be dismissed’. Since 16 August 2025, under these newly amended Regulations:

(a) How many complaints have been referred to the PCC?

(b) How many complaints have been upheld by the PCC?

(c) How many complaints have been dismissed by the PCC?

Questions 11, 12 and 13 relate to the Police Complaints Commission. The Police Complaints Commission is established under the Police Complaints (Guernsey) Law, 2008, and as it falls outside of the Committee’s mandate and it would not be appropriate for it to answer.