

Government of Jersey
Union Street | St Helier | Jersey | JE2 3DN

Catherine Curtis
Chair of the CEHA Panel

By email only

15 July 2025

Dear Deputy Curtis,

Follow-up matter from the Public Hearing on 2nd July 2025

Thank you for your letter dated 4 July 2025. I have answered your additional questions below.

You have noted that we agreed to provide some additional information in respect of one of your question areas. I include that information below.

- **Confirmation of whether any requests from sex offenders to move to Jersey have been refused in the past three years.**

In the last 3 years there have been a total of 3 requests and none have been refused.

- **The Chief of Police advised that he could write to the Panel with information about arrangements regarding work of the Offender Management Unit regarding supervision of sex offenders who move to Jersey.**

Any medium or low risk UK Registered Sex Offender (RSO) who move to Jersey are managed on an informal basis by prior agreement between Police forces and/ or the Probation Service if the offender is serving a community-based sentence. The RSO will initially be visited by the Offender Management Unit (OMU) and reminded of their Notification requirements to ensure compliance. OMU take on responsibility to ensure documentation is completed in line with Notification requirement, i.e. travel conditions, change of details and Annual Registration etc.

In addition, for higher risk offenders, Article 15 and 16 of the Sex Offenders (Jersey) Law 2010 allows for an application to the AG (via Royal Court) for those offenders to formally be made subject to Notification requirements in Jersey if deemed necessary.

Change in Licensing Laws

1. **Minister, with the projected reductions to the State of Jersey Police (SoJP) budget falling from £30.1 million in 2025 to £27.4 million by 2028 do you have confidence that the SoJP will be adequately resourced to manage the evolving demands placed upon them?**

The [Budget 2025-2028 annex](#) sets out the revenue budget for the States of Jersey Police as below:

Statement of Comprehensive Net Expenditure				
£'000	2025 Estimate	2026 Estimate	2027 Estimate	2028 Estimate
Revenue				
Levied by the States of Jersey	-	-	-	-
Earned through operations	168	168	168	168
Total revenue	168	168	168	168
Expenditure				
Social benefit payments	-	-	-	-
Staff costs	27,558	27,371	27,371	27,371
Other operating expenses	2,795	2,772	2,751	2,751
Grants and subsidies payments	-	-	-	-
Impairments	-	-	-	-
Finance costs	-	-	-	-
Total expenditure	30,353	30,143	30,122	30,122
Net revenue expenditure (near cash)	30,185	29,975	29,954	29,954
Depreciation and amortisation	650	650	650	650
Net revenue expenditure after depreciation	30,835	30,625	30,604	30,604

The Panel will note that the figures above do not align with those quoted in this question. For the avoidance of doubt, the above represent the correct values in the Budget 2025-28 as agreed by the States Assembly.

Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the States of Jersey Police face significant budgetary pressures within this allocation. These pressures are the subject of ongoing discussions.

I will be closely monitoring the situation to ensure that the States of Jersey Police can continue to meet evolving demands. However, it should be acknowledged that any reduction in the budget available to SOJP will necessarily impact upon the delivery of policing services.

Jersey Police Complaints Authority (JPCA) Annual Report

- Under the new Police (Complaints and Conduct) (Jersey) Law 202- , the Jersey Police Complaints Commission will be able to make formal recommendations to the SoJP. What steps will be taken to make sure these recommendations are considered, and learning is put into practice?**

The Jersey Police Complaints Commission will play a vital role in ensuring accountability and transparency within our policing system. When the Commission issues a formal recommendation, it is expected that the Chief Officer, Deputy Chief Officer, the relevant Connétable, or the Attorney General give it due consideration. Furthermore, the Commission is empowered to request a reconsideration should those recommendations not be initially accepted.

The legal framework also allows for the States to introduce Regulations enabling the Commission to disclose the nature of its recommendations and any follow up requests. Importantly, the Commission may also report on the responses it receives in its annual report to the Minister, thereby reinforcing transparency and oversight.

In terms of continuous improvement, the forthcoming Regulations will introduce a Reflective Practice Review process. This initiative is designed to support professional development by allowing staff to learn constructively from mistake where previously disciplinary action might have been taken. This approach promotes a culture of fairness, learning, and accountability within the service.

3. The JPCA Annual Report (the Report) highlights that some complaint cases are complex and may need an external police force to investigate. What arrangements are in place to make sure these investigations remain independent, timely and properly supported?

It is very rare that an external force is required to investigate complaints. The decision to do so is not taken lightly as such investigations must be paid for by the Government of Jersey (normally from the SOJP budget as the JPCA has no direct budget of its own). Should such an investigation be required, the external force acts independently, but the PSD investigation team facilitates its access to evidence and the relevant officers.

A JPCA member will be allocated to oversee the investigation and can assess, via an agreed external force contact, progress. The investigation will also be monitored in the regular review meetings between the SOJP and the JPCA. There is not an established policy framework for external investigations, each potential case is judged on its merits and protocols established to suit the specifics. The JPCA fulfils its accountabilities by following its standard approach to monitoring complaints whilst recognising that it cannot dictate the pace/progress of the external investigation which has to be both thorough and proportionate.

4. The Report also mentions that a higher number of complaints are now being resolved through informal resolution. How do you make sure that this process is working fairly and that serious complaints are not being handled inappropriately or outside independent oversight?

In the new Regulations the informal resolution procedure will be replaced by the “Agreed Resolution of Complaints”. This will be a more effective approach to resolving complaints where the Deputy Chief Officer is satisfied that formal investigation or criminal proceedings are not required. This new process will be more structured and transparent.

This process will also provide the complainant with the right to request the Commission to review the outcome of any complaint dealt with by Agreed Resolution. The Commission may then request that the Deputy Chief Officer consider whether a formal complaint would be more suitable.

It should be noted that, the purpose of informal resolution is that it is informal and not encumbered by the process and bureaucracy surrounding the formal complaints process. Any complainant can insist on the complaint being addressed formally, no one is forced to agree to informal resolution. The Authority report that generally the SOJP manages informal resolution proportionately and effectively. If they did not, it would be picked up in review and the Authority can ask for a complaint to be reopened.

On a quarterly basis the JPCA examine the complaints log, identify where and why a complaint has been dealt with informally to satisfy themselves that the complaint issues have been addressed. If

necessary, the Authority may look at the evidence file but typically if the complainant is satisfied then the JPCA does not carry out further analysis.

5. The JPCA raised concerns about late activation of body worn cameras in some incidents. Please can you inform the Panel on what action is being taken to ensure officers activate cameras in good time and that video evidence is available when needed?

The States of Jersey Police acknowledges the concerns raised by the JPCA regarding the prompt activation of Body Worn Cameras (BWCs) during certain incidents. In response, several key measures have been implemented to ensure officers activate their cameras promptly and that video evidence is reliably available when needed.

The Body Worn Video Policy was updated in January 2025 to provide clearer guidance and reinforce expectations. Officers are now required to activate their BWCs at the earliest opportunity during any meaningful operational encounter. This includes all initial interactions with the public that relate to a policing purpose.

To support this, all BWCs now include a 30-second pre-record function. This feature continuously buffers video and audio, capturing the 30 seconds prior to manual activation. This ensures that even if an officer activates the camera slightly late, the crucial lead-up to the incident is still recorded. The use of this pre-record function is now mandatory and considered the standard method of activation.

In addition to policy changes, officers received comprehensive guidance on the correct use of BWCs, including when and how to activate them. These steps are part of a broader effort to enhance transparency, protect both the public and officers, and maintain public confidence in policing. The SoJP remains committed to continuous improvement in the use of body worn video and welcomes ongoing feedback from the JPCA and other stakeholders.

Yours sincerely



Deputy Mary Le Hegarat
Minister for Justice and Home Affairs