

Witness Name: DANIEL CLARKE

Exhibits: DC/01 – DC/11

Dated: 31st July 2025

THE SOUTHPORT INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF DANIEL CLARKE

I, **DANIEL CLARKE**, will say as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. I am Police Sergeant Daniel Clarke of Cheshire Constabulary.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Southport Inquiry (the “**Inquiry**”) with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 10 July 2025.

INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

3. I am a Police Sergeant with Cheshire Constabulary. I joined Cheshire Constabulary on 5 December 2022 via transfer from Lancashire Constabulary.
4. Prior to joining the police, I obtained a degree in Journalism from De Montfort University in Leicester in 2012. Following graduation, I worked part-time in a local public house before I joined Greater Manchester Police (“GMP”) in January 2013 as a call handler, answering 101 and 999 calls. I became a Police Community Support Officer (“PCSO”) at GMP in 2014. I hadn’t planned to join the police as a Constable however quickly found I was skilled in many of the disciplines necessary to be successful in the industry so I joined Lancashire Constabulary on 3 October 2016 as a Constable. I remained in a uniformed response role for much of my policing career within Lancashire Constabulary.

5. In 2017 and 2018 I worked in a department called Early Action. Early Action was a department created to engage, divert, and help persons who were 'high intensity users' of the police or people on the periphery of criminality. The clients I would assist would be highly vulnerable people such as alcoholics or frequently missing or non-engaging children. My ethos was that if I could avoid criminalising juveniles, that would be a good thing for them and for society. After leaving Early Action in 2018 I returned to response in Skelmersdale as a Constable.
6. In March 2021 I passed my Sergeant's exam, and in June 2021 I became a Police Sergeant and began in the role of an immediate response Sergeant covering the Chorley area.
7. I left Lancashire Constabulary on 5 December 2022 and transferred to Cheshire Constabulary, where I worked in a front-line uniformed role on the area investigation team dealing with persons in custody, and then back on immediate response. I am now in the neighbourhood department based at Knutsford.

FACTUAL NARRATIVE OF INVOLVEMENT

8. On 17 March 2022, I was an immediate response Sergeant covering Skelmersdale. I was working on an early shift from 07:00 to 16:00. My call sign was 'SB20E'. The make-up of the call sign is such that 'SB' denotes Skelmersdale, '20' denotes Sergeant and 'E' denotes that I was on the early shift.
9. I would like to point out that my posting at the time of the incident was a response Sergeant covering Chorley. However on 17 March 2022, due to staff shortages, I was asked to cover Skelmersdale.
10. An immediate response Sergeant's role in 2022 in Lancashire Constabulary broadly included the following:
 - a) Ongoing incident management,
 - b) Ongoing staff management,
 - c) Missing from home ("MFH") management (typically involving 1-5 MFH persons per shift),
 - d) Team investigation management,

- e) Case management (which would involve reviewing files for CPS, pre-charge decisions etc) and
 - f) Management of prisoners in custody (which would involve allocating officers to conduct prisoner interviews and reviewing the evidence of these investigations to establish the best method of disposal from custody.)
11. I should say that the role I was performing on 17 March 2022 in Lancashire Constabulary is now effectively covered by 4 Sergeants in Cheshire. These are as follows: response Sergeant who proactively manages incoming incidents; Force Incident Sergeant ("FIS") who reviews all incoming incidents as well as managing resources; Area Investigation Team ("AIT") Sergeant, who deals with prisoner and custody enquiries and ongoing investigations; and Police Decision Maker ("PDM") who reviews all case files for submission to the CPS.
12. I need to start by saying that my memory of 17 March 2022 is almost non-existent. I have had the chance to review several documents that I will exhibit in this statement to help refresh my memory of the incident.
13. At 11:15 on 17 March 2022, a call was received from AR's father reporting AR as missing. The initial report from AR's father as recorded on incident log LC-20220317-0431 was that he had left the address at 08:30 and returned at 10:30 to note that AR had left. AR's father said that AR suffered with anxiety, depression and autism. I exhibit incident log LC-20220317-0431 (LC-51) as DC/01 – LANC000045
14. There is an entry at 11:44 on incident log LC-20220317-0431 which was added by the Force Control Room saying that they had tried to advise me of the incident log but that they had no response from me. I cannot say now why they were unable to contact me at this time. It is possible that I may have been dealing with other ongoing incidents or speaking with officers about other incidents that they were dealing with.
15. I can see from incident log LC-20220317-0431 that PC 8620 David Fairclough, a Constable on the team I was supervising on that day, was deployed to AR's address to obtain information to assist with the MFH investigation. I can see from the log that PC Fairclough arrived at the address at 12:22.
16. At 12:35 I called PC Fairclough on his radio. I know that I called PC Fairclough as I have been provided with a log of outgoing calls that I made on my radio on 17 March 2022 (LC-

197) which I exhibit as **DC/02 – LANC000255** The duration of this call was 23 seconds. I cannot now remember the details or nature of the call. It would not be common practice to update or make a record of point-to-point calls between officers and supervisors. It is effectively a telephone call using our radio.

17. I have also been provided with a log of outgoing calls made from PC Fairclough's radio on 17 March 2022 (LC-196) which I exhibit as **DC/03 – LANC000254** The duration of this call was 324 seconds. From this log, I can see that at 12:38 PC Fairclough called me. I cannot now remember the contents of the call or whether it related to the MFH investigation.

18. I can see from the log of outgoing calls made from PC Fairclough's radio (LC-196) that at 13:47 PC Fairclough called me again. The duration of this call was 124 seconds. I cannot now remember the contents of the call and whether it related to the MFH investigation.

19. I can see from the log of outgoing calls made from PC Fairclough's radio (LC-196) that at 14:16 PC Fairclough made a further call to me. The duration of this call was 35 seconds. I cannot now remember the contents of the call and whether it related to the MFH investigation.

20. At 14:40 hours, a call was received into the control room from Stephen Dunscombe from Holmeswood Coaches reporting a male on a bus. It was reported that a male had got on the bus and had begun to get stropky. A description was given of the male and it was said that he was refusing to get off the bus. It was reported that his demeanour was causing concern. Incident log LC-20220317-0735 (LC-62) was created by the Force Control Room which I exhibit as **DC/04 – LANC000046** I exhibit the call made by Stephen Dunscombe into the Force Control Room (LC-63) as **DC/05 – LANC000084**

21. When incident log LC-20220317-0735 was created, I reviewed the log and I noticed that the description was similar to that of AR (as had been obtained as part of incident log LC-20220317-0431). At 14:56 the Force Control Room typed an update onto incident log LC-20220317-0735 which shows that I made a radio transmission asking that someone call Stephen Dunscombe back to obtain a better description as I thought that it was going to be AR. I have listened back to the radio transmission that I made at 14:55 and within that radio transmission I can be heard to say: "LOG 735 I HAVE JUST CLOCKED IT. I BELIEVE THAT IF WE CAN GET A PROPER DESCRIPTION OF HIM, THAT THAT MAY BE OUR MISPER AXEL FROM LOG 431".

22. I then made another radio transmission at 14:56 which I have listened to and in which I said, "YEAH ROGER I THINK CAR 9 WAS ALLOCATED TO THE MISPER, HE WAS DOING ENQUIRIES, CAN WE ASK HIM TO MAKE OVER".
23. I made a third radio transmission at 14:57 which I have listened to and in which I said, "DAVE JUST A QUICK ONE, THE ER, THE DESCRIPTION WE HAVE GOT FROM THE SECOND LOG IS THAT HE IS BASICALLY WEARING ALL GREY BLACK. SORRY GREY TRACKSUIT WITH BLACK TRAINERS. DO WE KNOW EXACTLY WHAT AXEL IS WEARING?".
24. I asked the Force Control Room over the radio if they would call Stephen Dunscombe back to keep observations on the male on the bus. I have listened to the transmission at 15:00:03 and I said, "DO YOU MIND JUST RECALLING THE INFORMANT, IF HE'S STILL PARKED UP, IF HE CAN KEEP OBSERVATIONS AND MAKE SURE IF THIS THIS LAD WALKS AWAY WE GET A DIRECTION OF TRAVEL AND WHATNOT". There is an entry on incident log LC-20220317-0735 at 15:00, which was typed by the Force Control Room which reflect the radio transmission that I made. I exhibit these radio transmissions (LC-165) as **DC/06 – LANC000423**
25. There is then an entry at 15:03 on the incident log which is typed by an operator in the Force Control Room. The update says that the operator had called Stephen Dunscombe back and confirmed that the male was still sat at the back of the bus. Stephen said that he had to leave the bus but that the bus was waiting in the same place. I exhibit the call that the operator made to Stephen Dunscombe to obtain more information (LC-65) as **DC/07 – LANC000085**. I was then informed over the radio of the update from Stephen Dunscombe. I exhibit the radio transmission of me being informed of the update from Stephen Dunscombe (LC-166) as **DC/08 – LANC000424**
26. I can see from incident log LC-20220317-0735 that PC 1719 Eve Rhodes and PC Fairclough arrived at the bus at 15:05. PC Rhodes updated over the radio that she was with the male on the bus and confirmed that it was AR. I exhibit the radio transmission of PC Rhodes and PC Fairclough arriving at the bus and updating over the radio that they were with AR (LC-167) as **DC/09 – LANC000422**.
27. The log of outgoing calls from my radio (LC-197) shows that at 15:07 I called the radio of PC Eve Rhodes. The call duration is shown as being 105 seconds. I cannot remember

who I spoke to or what was said during that call. I would assume that if I called the radio of PC 1719 Rhodes that I would have spoken to her, however as stated above, I cannot confirm that this was the case.

28. Incident log LC-20220317-0735 shows that at 15:10 PC Fairclough updated over the radio that AR had been in possession of a small knife and that he and PC Rhodes were going to get into the same police vehicle and take AR home. I have listened to the recording of that radio transmission and I can hear that, after PC Fairclough provided that update, the Force Control Room updated me over the radio. I acknowledged the radio transmission and confirmed that I had already spoken to PC Fairclough about it. I exhibit the radio transmission of PC Fairclough providing the update over the radio and me confirming that I was aware (LC-168) as **DC/10 – LANC000426**
29. At 15:26 PC Rhodes called me on my radio. I know that PC Rhodes called me as I have been provided with a log of outgoing calls from PC Rhodes' radio made on 17 March 2022 (LC-199) which I exhibit as **DC/11 – LANC000285**. The duration of this call was 179 seconds. I cannot now remember the details or nature of the call. I would assume given the time of the call made, that this call would have been about AR, however as stated above, I cannot confirm that this was the case.
30. I note from the incident log an entry at 15:53 that PC Fairclough says that he consulted with me as to the course of action. I cannot recall having any conversation with PC Fairclough about this particular incident or decision. However, it would not be unusual for me as the immediate response sergeant to liaise with response PCs about potential courses of action.
31. That was the end of my involvement. As this wasn't my normal area or team, any ongoing activity would be retained by PC Fairclough and managed by his Sergeant.
32. I have been asked what information I received from the Force Control Room after requesting additional information. The only requests that I am aware that I made are detailed in paragraphs 21 to 24. These requests are when I asked for a better description of the MFH and asked for direction of travel if the MFH was to leave the bus. I am only aware of one update that the Force Control Room provided to me, which is detailed in paragraph 25. This update related to the current location of AR and the bus.

33. I have been asked whether I was aware that AR had (i) previously admitted to taking a knife into a school in order to stab someone (ii) said he was 'pretty certain' to use it, and (iii) made reference to teachers getting murdered (LANC000041/LC-041). I cannot recall being aware of this information. I do not think I was aware of any of this information.
34. I have been asked if I was aware AR had previously been convicted in 2020 for possession of a bladed article, possession of an offensive weapon, and assault occasioning actual bodily harm, as a result of an incident in which he brought weapons, including a knife, into his former school and assaulted a pupil. I have no recollection of being aware of any of that information, and I do not think I was aware of this information. That information would have been on the Police National Computer system ("PNC"). I would not routinely use PNC for missing persons because, whilst it has details of previous arrests, convictions, warning markers etc, the majority of the information I require for a MFH is carried on local systems, such as previous locations they were found, who their associates are, and linked addresses, for example. I am told that this information was also on Connect, the local force investigation management tool, however I do not remember if I had checked Connect for this MFH.
35. I have been asked whether I am aware that, as at 17 March 2022, AR had been referred to Prevent on three occasions (5 December 2019, by a teacher at his then-school, in relation to exclusion from prior school for carrying a knife and searching for mass school shootings on the internet; 1 January 2021, by a teacher at his previous school, as a result of concerning posts on social media; 26 April 2021, by a teacher at his then-school, as a result of internet searches for 'London Bomb' and his interest in the Israel/Palestine conflict, MI5, and the IRA). I was not aware of the Prevent referrals. In my experience, Prevent referrals are not readily accessible to front line officers due to the sensitive and confidential nature of them. I have never been made privy to any prevent referrals for any individual in my policing career.
36. I am asked, in the light of my knowledge gap, whether I had sufficient information about AR's forensic history and the risk he posed to third parties. With regards to both the MFH incident and AR being located on the bus with a knife, I am unable to recall exactly what information I had on AR. However, it is apparent from the information above that I did not have all of the available information about AR's forensic history or risk posed to third parties. Any additional information regarding an individual will always assist with enquiries in locating a MFH, as well assessing the risk posed by them and to them.

37. I am asked whether my discussion with PC Fairclough involved me directing him not to arrest, or whether he and I jointly decided not to arrest, or whether I agreed with his proposed course of action not to arrest AR in respect of his possession of a knife on 17 March 2022. Simply put, I do not remember. However, I typically secure the views of the officers on scene, who can see, hear and engage with the people involved, prior to making a decision.
38. I am asked what my rationale was for 'directing/advising/agreeing with' PC Fairclough as regards not seeking a criminal justice outcome (i.e. arresting or taking any other step with a view to a charge or out of court disposal) in respect of AR's possession of a knife on 17 March 2022. My answer is that I do not remember any conversation regarding whether an investigation should take place or not. From reviewing investigation report 04/53346/22 (LC-72), I can see that PC Fairclough requested to close this investigation on 22 March 2022, which was subsequently reviewed and agreed to be closed by another Sergeant. I was not involved with the disposal of this offence.
39. I am asked what training, policy or guidance (from Lancashire Constabulary or otherwise) I utilised when making decisions or giving advice about how to deal with AR after he was found in possession of a knife. I cannot remember the conversation that I had with PC Fairclough which resulted in a decision being made to return AR home, however based on the information that I knew at the time, it seemed to have been an appropriate course of action.
40. I am asked whether Lancashire Constabulary has or applies any policy in relation to individuals found in possession of knives or weapons. I am not aware of any such policies. I have been advised that Op Sceptre is a proactive week of action to tackle knife crime through knife amnesties, educational inputs and proactive targeting of habitual knife carriers. There are two separate weeks throughout the year when Op Sceptre is active. I was not aware of Op Sceptre whilst working within Lancashire Constabulary.
41. I am asked if I was not aware of AR's history of possession of weapons and use of violence, whether that would have been a factor in whether or not to seek a criminal justice outcome. I was not aware of AR's history. As stated above, I did not have any involvement with the actions taken by officers after AR was returned home and the subsequent ongoing investigation. However, if someone has previous convictions for related offences, an out of court disposal is less likely to take place, and therefore referral for a criminal justice outcome is more likely.

42. I am asked whether I was informed that subsequent to the decision not to arrest AR, he said to PCs Fairclough and Rhodes that, "I want to stab someone". I cannot remember whether I was told this, however, I believe I was not because if I had been advised that he said he wanted to stab someone, coupled with the fact that he had been found in possession of a knife, it may have been necessary to take action to prevent injury to another person. If this necessity was met then I may have moved more in favour to arrest in order to safeguard the public from any immediate risk. Each additional piece of information I receive (the reference to wanting to stab someone, the reference to poison and the 3 Prevent referrals) would have influenced my decision making, making me reassess whether an arrest is necessary, legal, proportionate, and in the public interest. If the information I receive increases my perception of the risk involved then it will also increase my likelihood of advising in favour of an arrest. Therefore all of these pieces of information together might have caused me to more favour an arrest.
43. I am asked whether I was informed that subsequent to the decision not to arrest AR, he said to PCs Fairclough and Rhodes that he had thought about poisoning people (with his interest in poison subsequently being corroborated by his mother). I cannot remember whether I was told this, but I doubt that I was because poisoning is very unusual and I feel I would have remembered had I been told about poisoning. Throughout the more than 8 years that I have been a police officer, I have only ever had involvement with one poison related incident. This involved a male who had been growing a ricin plant in his home address. I do not remember poison being mentioned in AR's case.
44. I am asked whether, if I was informed of either or both of the above (AR saying "I want to stab someone" and AR saying that he had thought about poisoning people), it caused me to reconsider the chosen course of action, and if so how? If it did not, ought it to have? As stated above, I simply cannot remember. Please refer to my answer in paragraph 42.
45. I am asked whether if I was not informed of either or both of the above, ought I to have been. I think I, or the next Sergeant on duty, bearing in mind I finished at 16:00, should have been informed of both the stabbing and poison comment made by AR. This is pertinent information, and I believe that a supervisor should have been made aware. I am also asked whether if I had been so advised, would it have caused me to reconsider the chosen course of action and if so how? Regarding the comment of stabbing, I believe I have answered this in paragraph 42. Regarding the comment of poisoning, I likely would have escalated this incident. Whilst the mention of thoughts of poisoning alone isn't

necessarily sufficient to constitute an offence, it does suggest an increased risk to those around him, whether through administering or by proxy through manufacturing. Obviously, I would require more information to determine how exactly I would escalate the matter and how immediate this needs to be, however I would consider contacting a CBRN (chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear) trained officer, advising the Division Resource Inspector of this information, as well as organising a strategy meeting with Children's Social Services.

46. I am next asked whether I would have directed or advised a search of the premises for weapons or poison had I known of the intention to stab and / or mention of poisoning. I do not believe I would have directed or advised officers to search for poison without ascertaining further information. This is due to the inherent risk without being CBRN trained or having the correct equipment to allow the officers to safely complete such a search. With regards to searching for a weapon, I would have advised officers to conduct a search of his bedroom to ensure that no additional weapons were readily accessible to AR. I cannot recall if I offered this advice to officers. If AR was arrested, there would then have been a power of search under sections 18 or 32 of Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984.

47. I am asked whether I was aware that PC Rhodes gave advice to AR's parents about locking knives away. I have no recollection of being told about that advice.

48. I am asked whether that advice was in accordance with good practice, and/or any relevant training/guidance or policy. I am not aware of any such practice, training, guidance or policy. I think the advice was common sense and therefore good practice. But I acknowledge that AR could obviously have taken steps to acquire a knife elsewhere: he could shoplift a knife or buy a knife online or have gone to his school and pick up a knife from somewhere like the canteen. There are numerous ways in which a determined child can obtain a knife out of his home address.

49. I am asked whether that advice could address any access to knives not in the possession or control of AR's parents. This advice was obviously not capable of addressing the prevention of AR obtaining another knife from other sources.

50. I am asked whether at any stage I considered other options short of a criminal justice outcome, such as seeking a Knife Crime Prevention Order ("KCPO") or a referral to the Violence Reduction Network ("VRN"). I did not know about the KCPO or VRN then, nor

did I until I read this question. I have been advised that KCPOs were not in operation in Lancashire at this time.

51. I am asked whether, if consideration of options such as a KCPO or referral to the VRN was not my responsibility, whose was it. I was not aware of KCPO's or the VRN and therefore cannot answer this.

52. I am asked what I expected to occur as a result of the high-risk vulnerable child referral (also referred to as a high-risk Protecting Vulnerable People ("PVP") referral). In terms of the high-risk vulnerable child report that PC Fairclough submitted in relation to AR, I was not privy to this and had not seen this referral until I was provided with a copy of it for the purposes of answering the Rule 9 questions. In terms of the general process of submitting a high-risk vulnerable child PVP, I would expect this to be reviewed by the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub ("MASH") for the police and partner agencies to address further appropriate support needs.

53. I am asked whether having regard to the Inquiry's Terms of Reference and the expectation on all witnesses to give a candid account, there are any other relevant matters that I wish to draw to the Chair's attention. I have thought about this but I have nothing further to add.

REFLECTION ON EVENTS

54. I am asked insofar as I was involved with other relevant agencies, my reflection dealing with them in relation to the events under investigation and I am asked to address matters such: as any joint working arrangements; information sharing and the effectiveness of communication; and the degree of openness between agencies. My involvement was confined to the chronology above on 17 March 2022. I did not have direct contact with other relevant agencies regarding this event.

55. I am asked whether on reflection, I consider that (a) I and (b) Lancashire Constabulary could have done more or done things differently as regards my involvement with AR on 17 March 2022 and I am asked to take into account the knowledge I had at the time and, if different, now with the benefit of hindsight and/or wider understanding of the events. At the time of the incident, with the information at hand, there was no reason for me to disagree with the decision that was made not to arrest AR as it appeared to have been the most appropriate option. However, with the benefit of hindsight and the further information now available to me, I believe that AR could alternatively have been dealt with in a more

formal, criminal manner to assist with diversion away from the path of criminality he was taking. Courts, or the Youth Offending Service if dealt with out of court, can mandate certain rehabilitation methods, courses, or work that the young person has to carry out, otherwise they face prosecution. This work can include things such as: rehabilitation orders (which includes work conducted with the individual to help them understand the impact of their actions); mental health assessments that can help diagnose and treat ongoing, extensive, or complex mental health issues; or issue and supervise detention or training orders. This work can help formalise and understand the full risk an individual may pose, as well as help with rehabilitation, diversion, and management of that individual. In my opinion I believe that investigating these options might have been beneficial to AR following the incident on 17 March 2022. Further to this, the Police National Computer "PNC" appears to have been utilised in the beginning stages of the incident at 11:33:35 (LC-51), however a full record of the results don't appear to have been published on the incident log, which would have provided an increased view of the risk involved.

56. I am asked whether I consider that the (a) guidance; (b) training; and (c) resources available to me were adequate for the nature of the involvement I had in the events under investigation and I am asked to answer this both with the knowledge that I had at the time and, if different, now with the benefit of hindsight and/or wider understanding of the events. I cannot recall ever receiving or being aware of any specific guidance or training regarding missing from home investigations, or youth offending. In terms of resources, it would have been preferential to have more resources as this was a report of a vulnerable missing child, who had a single officer PC Fairclough conducting all the enquiries at the time in order try to locate him.

IMPROVEMENTS

57. I am asked whether I am aware of relevant improvements that have been made by Lancashire Constabulary since these events. As I have transferred from Lancashire Constabulary, I am not aware of any improvements made.

58. I am asked to set out any improvements that could be made relevant to my own area of involvement that would be practicable and make an effective difference.

59. I have had the privilege of working for the police for nearly 13 years, both as a staff member and police officer, over three separate police forces. Within all the forces unfortunately the same issue persists: resourcing. When working in Lancashire Constabulary, I have

previously had to, on several occasions, cover three separate areas, managing three separate teams, on two separate radio channels.

60. In Cheshire Constabulary I have seen officers still in their probation required to tutor others also in their probation. In my experience, staffing levels are always at the minimum level, regardless of area or force. A single illness, medical, or other issue can result in areas being understaffed to deal with the basic demand, let alone attempt to be proactive in crime prevention. Not only does this lead to significant stress and pressure on all police staff and officers, but it also leads to increased danger and poorer service to the public. Officers are forced to make potentially life-changing decisions one-after-the-other, day-after-day, often without breaks or appreciation. They are expected to solve crime, prevent crime, find missing persons, engage with victims, staff scenes, deal with public order incidents, riots, and abuse on and off duty. They do all of that whilst not knowing whether there is going to be another unit free to help them in a time of need. Greater resources would mean that officers have more chance, opportunity, and time to conduct the vital work that the public deserve and that we, as police officers, wish to provide to the public.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are 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 in its truth.

Signed:  **Signature**

Dated: 31st July 2025

Index to the Witness Statement of Daniel Clarke

Exhibit No.	Inquiry reference No.	Document description
DC/01	LANC000045	Incident log LC-20220317-0431 dated 17 March 2022 (LC-51)
DC/02	LANC000255	Log of outgoing calls made on PS 8515 Clarke's radio on 17 March 2022 (LC-197)
DC/03	LANC000254	Log of outgoing calls made from PC Fairclough's radio on 17 March 2022 (LC-196)
DC/04	LANC000046	Incident log LC-20220317-0735 dated 17 March 2022
DC/05	LANC000084	Call made by Stephen Dunscombe into the Force Control Room dated 17 March 2022 (LC-63)
DC/06	LANC000423	Radio transmission of PS 8515 Clarke asking for additional information dated 17 March 2022 (LC-165)
DC/07	LANC000085	Call that the Force Control Room made to Stephen Dunscombe to obtain more information dated 17 March 2022 (LC-65)
DC/08	LANC000424	Radio transmission of PS 8515 Clarke being informed of the update from Stephen Dunscombe (LC-166)
DC/09	LANC000422	Radio transmission of PC Rhodes and PC Fairclough arriving at the bus and updating over the radio that they were with AR dated 17 March 2022 (LC-167)
DC/10	LANC000426	Radio transmission of PC Fairclough providing update that AR was in possession of a small knife and that he was being taken home and PS 8515 Clarke confirming that he was aware dated 17 March 2022 (LC-168)
DC/11	LANC000285	Log of outgoing calls made on PC 1719 Rhodes radio on 17 March 2022 (LC-199)