



Response Date:05/12/2025

2025/1195 - Outstanding arrest warrants

In response to your recent request for information, figures are based on manual searches of our system and a review of every warrant summary. This has taken close to or exceeding 18 hours, hence a breakdown of further data regarding convicted vs pre trial etc won't be possible. The cost of retrieving the information exceeds the 'appropriate level' as stated in the Freedom of Information (FOI) Fees and Appropriate Limit regulations 2004.

Therefore, in accordance with the FOI Act 2000 the information you have requested is exempt under Section 12 (1), and this letter acts as a Refusal Notice under section 17 (5) of the legislation.

Although excess cost removed the forces obligations under the Freedom of Information Act, as a gesture of goodwill, I have supplied information, relative to your request, retrieved or available before it was realised that the fees limit would be exceeded. I trust this is helpful, but it does not affect our legal right to rely on the fees regulations for the remainder of your request.

This request concerns outstanding arrest warrants issued due to failure to appear in court, breach of bail, pre-trial absconding, or post-conviction absconding.

To minimise cost/time burden and avoid broad searches, all questions request existing, routinely held datasets or policy documents only.

Please provide the following:

A. Current Outstanding Warrants (as of your latest available month) The total number of individuals with outstanding arrest warrants.

As of 26/11/25, NWP had 324 'active' wanted occurrences relating to 308 individuals.

A breakdown of these warrants by:

a. Offence category (e.g., murder, rape/sexual assault, child sexual offences, GBH, fraud, domestic abuse, drugs offences)

Primary Offence	Count
Arson	1
Assault - Minor (S39)	13
Assault - Serious (S39 DV & Aggravating & S47)	12
Assault - Severe (S20+)	2
Aviation offences	1

Pencadlys yr Heddlu,
Glan-y-Don, Bae Colwyn LL29 8AW
www.heddlugogleddcymru.police.uk

Police Headquarters,
Glan-y-Don, Colwyn Bay LL29 8AW
www.northwales.police.uk

AWOL	1
Breach - Court Order	1
Breach - Suspended Sentence Order	5
Child Abduction - Parental	1
Communications Offences	1
Criminal Damage	12
Currency Offences	2
Drugs Offences - Possession	14
Drugs Offences - Supply/Production	19
Fail to Comply - Community Order	11
Fail to Comply - Community Reqs Suspended Sentence	10
Fail to Comply - Post Custody Supervision	11
Fail to Comply - Suspended Sentence Order	4
Fraud Offences	7
Misc - Scottish Offences	1
Motoring – Alcohol	32
Motoring - Death	1
Motoring – Drugs	45
Motoring – Other (Incl. Documents, Manner & Disqual)	20
Obstruct/Resist Offences	3
POCA - Non payment	4
Prison Offences	1
Public Order – Minor	2
Public Order – Serious (Incl. Racial/Religious Agg)	4
Sexual Offences - Cause/Incite (Child)	3
Sexual Offences - Indecent Images (Child)	1
Sexual Offences - Rape (Child)	1
Sexual Offences - Sexual Assault (Adult)	6
Sexual Offences - Sexual Assault (Child)	2
Stalking & Harassment	2
Theft Offences – Burglary	4
Theft Offences – Commercial	3
Theft Offences - Finding	2
Theft Offences - Going equipped	2
Theft Offences – Handling	2
Theft Offences – Making Off	4
Theft Offences – Person	5
Theft Offences – Shop	36
Theft Offences – Vehicle	4
Trademark Offences	1
Weapons Possession – Bladed	5
Grand Total	324

b. Warrant type (failure to appear / breach of bail / pre-trial / post-conviction)

Majority are pre-trial FTA warrants. We are unable to confirm exact status of every warrant without manual review of every occurrence and associated research via Police and/or Court Systems. As advise above this is above the 'appropriate level' as stated in the Freedom of Information (FOI) Fees and Appropriate Limit regulations 2004.

c. Year of issue (e.g., pre-2000, 2000-2009, 2010-2019, 2020-present)

1995	1
1997	1
1999	1
2003	1
2005	1
2006	1
2007	1
2010	2
2011	3
2012	4
2013	1
2016	4
2017	4
2018	7
2019	2
2020	5
2021	14
2022	21
2023	42
2024	50
2025	158
Grand Total	324

The year of the oldest currently outstanding warrant and the offence category associated with it (no personal identifiers required).

1995 – Threat to commit criminal damage with intent to endanger life and deception offences

B. Trends (Existing, Recorded Data Only) For each of the past five calendar years (2019-2023), please provide:

a. Number of warrants issued

2019 – 1181 NWP Categorised ‘Warrant’ Occurrences created

2020 – 982 NWP Categorised ‘Warrant’ Occurrences created

2021 – 910 NWP Categorised ‘Warrant’ Occurrences created

2022 – 1057 NWP Categorised ‘Warrant’ Occurrences created

2023 – 1244 NWP Categorised ‘Warrant’ Occurrences created

b. Number of warrants executed

(If exact annual figures are not held, please supply the closest equivalent routinely held statistic.)

2019 – 876 NWP ‘Warrant’ Occurrences endorsed ‘Executed’ (figure does not include withdrawn warrants)

2022 – 768 NWP ‘Warrant’ Occurrences endorsed ‘Executed’ (figure does not include withdrawn warrants)

2023 – 873 NWP ‘Warrant’ Occurrences endorsed ‘Executed’ (figure does not include withdrawn warrants)

**C. Policies, Risk Assessments & Procedures Does your force have a formal policy or SOP for reviewing, prioritising or executing outstanding warrants?
If yes, please provide the document or the relevant excerpt.**

Concerns have been raised in disclosing the full document into the public domain. A Freedom of Information Act request is not a private transaction. Both the request itself, and any information disclosed, are considered suitable for open publication. This is because, under Freedom of Information, any information disclosed is released into the wider public domain, effectively to the world and not just to one individual.

Therefore, Section 31 (1) (a) Law Enforcement is to be considered as part of the Public Interest Test. A Public Interest Test has been carried out to weigh up the reasons for and against disclosure of the information requested, to ensure the release is in the interest of the public as a whole and not just the applicant.

Section s31(1) Law Enforcement

Section 31 (1) is a prejudice based qualified exemption, therefore there is a requirement to articulate the harm that would be caused in confirming or not that the information is held as well as carrying out a public interest test.

The Harm Test process requires North Wales Police to consider any possible harm that might arise as a result of placing the requested information into the public domain. This process considers the potential harm to:

- Individuals
- The community as a whole
- North Wales Police and the wider policing service
- Other bodies

Harm in respect of s31(1) Law Enforcement

North Wales Police are charged with enforcing the law, preventing and detecting crime and protecting the communities we serve.

While we appreciate you will have no ill meaning behind your request, disclosure could be used by those with criminal intent in relation to warrants to obtain law enforcement tactics and operational practise to undermine policing efforts. It is not in the public interest to disclose information that could be used to assist in the planning of criminal activity and leave individuals at risk due to an adverse FOIA disclosure

Public Interest Test:

Factors favouring Disclosure - The use of police resources and tactics is a matter that the force should hold up to public scrutiny as the police are accountable for public funds and public safety; therefore there is a public interest in justification of how the public are kept safe.

Factors favouring Non-Disclosure - Disclosure would lead to Policing tactics and operational practise becoming obsolete and putting those subject to a warrant at large. This could in turn lead to a loss of confidence in the North Wales Police and our ability to protect individuals.

The risks to individuals is likely to be significant if the information is used by those with the necessary criminal intent to undermine the very purpose information is held (crime prevention)

Balance Test

The strongest reason favouring disclosure is increasing public knowledge of a policing conversation and North Wales Police being open and transparent.

The strongest reason favouring non-disclosure is to not undermine law enforcement tactics and operational practise by virtue of an adverse FOIA disclosure.

On weighing up the competing interests I have determined that the disclosure of the full document would not be in the public interest. I consider that the benefit that would result from the information being disclosed does not outweigh the considerations favouring non-disclosure.

This decision has been made on the understanding that the public interest is not what interests the public but is what would be of greater interest to the public as a whole, should the information be disclosed.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, this letter acts as a Refusal Notice under section 17 (1) of the legislation.

Please find attached the redacted version of the Court Issued Warrant Management Practice Guide.

What risk assessment criteria are used to determine warrant priority? (e.g., offence severity, threat to life, repeat offending, safeguarding concerns)

All warrants are categorised according to the offence and whether the subject is a juvenile and/or VISOR nominal. Wanted nominals are also subject to a 'Nominal Risk Triage' once initial arrest attempts have been exhausted to assess them as either 'High' or 'Standard' risk nominals, based upon any wider risk they may present.

Does your force maintain a dedicated team/unit for locating individuals with outstanding warrants?

If yes, please state its name and staffing level (if recorded).

No

D. Use of Databases and Inter-Agency Cooperation Are all outstanding warrants routinely entered onto the Police National Computer (PNC)?

Yes all outstanding warrant nominals are entered onto PNC.

Does your force use external databases (e.g., NHS, DVLA, credit reference agencies, Passport Office, benefits databases) for warrant tracing where legally permitted?

Where legally permitted, we will seek information from a variety of sources.

Please summarise any policies or agreements concerning information-sharing with other UK forces, NCA, or Interpol, where relevant.

We have a number of information sharing agreements with partners and other Law Enforcement Agencies enabling dissemination and receipt of information and intelligence. International Enquiries are maintained through Nationally recognised protocols with NCA and Interpol/Europol.

E. Victim Communication and Safeguarding Does your force have a policy for notifying victims when a suspect or convicted offender subject to a warrant remains unlocated?

Victim Contact is managed in line with VCOP and victim contact agreements.

How many individuals with outstanding warrants (current total) are convicted but not yet sentenced?

Majority are pre-trial FTA warrants . We are unable to confirm exact status of every warrant without manual review of every occurrence and associated research via Police and/or Court

Systems. As advise above this is above the 'appropriate level' as stated in the Freedom of Information (FOI) Fees and Appropriate Limit regulations 2004.

THIS INFORMATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000, AND IS CORRECT AS AT 03/12/2025



**HEDDLU
GOGLEDD CYMRU
NORTH WALES
POLICE**

COURT ISSUED WARRANTS PRACTICE GUIDE

Document Type:	Practice Guide
Practice Guide Owner:	Director of Intelligence
Department:	Crime Services
Practice Guide Writer:	DI Paul Byron
Version:	1.0
Effective Date:	18/09/2024
Recommended Review Date:	18/09/2027

PRACTICE GUIDE

Version No	Date	Author	Changes

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. 'STAGE 1' – INITIAL PNC BUREAU MANAGEMENT & DISSEMINATION.....	2
3. 'STAGE 2' – LOCAL POLICING AREA ADOPTION AND MANAGEMENT	3
3.1 'HIGH' RISK SUBJECTS	5
3.2 'STANDARD' SUBJECTS	7
4. 'STAGE 3' – OUT OF FORCE AND INTERNATIONAL ENQUIRIES	7
4.1 'UK Enquiries & Arrests'	8
4.2 'International Enquiries & Arrests'	8
5. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	9
5.1 Court Issues Warrants Process Maps	9

1. INTRODUCTION

In certain circumstances, the Courts may issue arrest warrants in relation to individuals who have failed to comply with a requirement that has been set by the Court.

In most cases, a warrant will be issued following a failure to attend a Court hearing; commonly known as a 'Fail to Appear (FTA)' warrant.

Warrants may also be issued in circumstances where individuals have breached the requirements of specific Court orders and/or conditions that may have been imposed upon them.

Arrest Warrants are a 'legal order' that allow the lawful arrest of an individual in relation to proceedings; once issued, it is the responsibility of the Police to undertake relevant lines of enquiry to locate and arrest the subject, thereby 'executing' the warrant.

The purpose of this practice guide is to provide a structured foundation by which North Wales Police can manage Court issued warrants and ensure consistency in approach.

Three distinct 'stages' of management have been devised, each detailing standardised operating procedures in the pursuit of wanted individuals:

- Stage 1 – Initial PNC Bureau Management and Dissemination
- Stage 2 – Local Policing Area Adoption and Management
- Stage 3 – Out of Force and International Enquiries

2. 'STAGE 1' – INITIAL PNC BUREAU MANAGEMENT & DISSEMINATION

When a defendant fails to appear before a North Wales Court, a 'Fail to Appear (FTA) Warrant' will be issued; it will then be uploaded electronically to a common platform facility and the Force PNC Bureau will be alerted to its existence. There will also be occasions when warrants are issued as a result of particular 'breaches' of Court imposed conditions.

Upon receipt, the PNC Bureau should review and conduct a severity assessment of the warrant by categorising it according to the 'Warrant Priority Matrix' summarised as follows:

Category A

- 'Serious' Offences (as defined within the Priority Matrix*),
- Hate Crimes,
- Matters relating to IOM Offenders,
- Matters relating to Registered Sex Offenders & Dangerous offenders (including MAPPA & VISOR nominals**),
- Matters relating to those who are subject of the NIM Force Control Strategy and/or those involved in criminality defined within same, and;
- Crown Court and Youth Court matters.

Category B

- Other recordable crime matters, Including;
- Motoring offences involving alcohol & drugs.

Category C

- Any other FTA matters issued with bail,

Including;

- Minor motoring and Road Traffic Act offences.

**Please refer to the PNC Policy for reference to the NPCC Priority Matrix.*

***Although specific to FTA warrants, categorisation will also be applied to any breaches of court orders or directions relating to MAPPA nominals.*

Once categorised, a 'Warrant Occurrence' should be created on the NICHE Record Management System (RMS) which will contain all relevant details appertaining to the warrant and the 'wanted subject'; the associated 'Occurrence Enquiry Log (OEL)' will subsequently act as the 'record' for any enquiries conducted in relation to any attempts to locate them. At the time of creation, a 'wanted' flag should also be created upon the subject's Master RMS record to highlight their status and the original offence occurrence should be linked to the relevant 'Warrant Occurrence'; a single 'Master Task' will be created at this stage. The PNC Bureau should conduct basic checks via RMS and PNC to corroborate or verify any associated address(es).

Once suitably categorised, the warrant should then be 'circulated' on the Police National Computer (PNC) with immediate effect where it will be recorded against the master PNC record of the subject to whom it relates with details of the offence for which they are wanted, the relevant court, dates and associated case reference(s). The circulation will remain 'live' until such time as the subject is either apprehended or the warrant is withdrawn.

Once preliminary administrative tasks are complete, the warrant should then be disseminated for action to the relevant 'area'. That dissemination will be determined by the location of the subject's associated address(es) and whether any CURRENT address is known.

Where a CURRENT address is not immediately known, i.e. in the case of a someone who may be of 'no fixed abode' (NFA), preliminary research should be conducted to ascertain any last known address or previously linked addresses that may act as a starting point for any subsequent enquiries.

Where no address(es) can be identified from that preliminary research, the 'Warrant Occurrence' and associated 'Master Task' should be disseminated to the relevant 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'RMS pot' for the area in which the warrant was originally issued, thereby entering it into STAGE 2 of the process (see below).

Where an address is identified but is located OUTSIDE the North Wales area (i.e. a foreign force), the PNC Bureau should disseminate an 'arrest request' to the relevant force, including details of the warrant (and its categorisation), subject (and any associated warnings) and the address at which arrest attempts are to be made. The 'Occurrence Enquiry Log' (OEL) should be used to document any actions and the 'Warrant Occurrence' and 'Master Task' should be transferred to the 'OUT OF FORCE WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'RMS pot' thereby entering it into STAGE 3 of the process (See below).

Where any identified address is located WITHIN the North Wales area, the PNC Bureau will disseminate the 'Warrant Occurrence' and the associated 'Master Task' to the relevant 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'RMS pot' for onward local management as part of STAGE 2.

- **NWP Area A Warrant Management – Flintshire & Wrexham**
- **NWP Area B Warrant Management – Denbighshire & Conwy**
- **NWP Area C Warrant Management – Gwynedd & Anglesey**

3. 'STAGE 2' – LOCAL POLICING AREA ADOPTION AND MANAGEMENT

Warrants appertaining to subjects who are suspected or believed to be in the North Wales area should be allocated to the relevant 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'pot' for the area in which their last known address is located and the 'Warrant Occurrence' and associated 'Master Task' should be transferred to that pot for local management and investigation. The 'Master Task'

should remain with the Occurrence in whichever 'pot' it is subsequently transferred to, to clearly denote 'ownership'.

Area Intelligence Units (AIUs) should conduct a 'daily sweep' of their respective 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'pots' to identify any newly issued warrants from the past 24 hours. The pot should also be subject of a daily review by District Inspectors and/or their appointed Support Sergeant and the duty Patrol Inspector.

Having identified any 'new' warrants, the AIU should then conduct an initial '**Primary Review**' of the warrant and its associated subject to confirm the veracity of any identified address(es) and where necessary undertake any other basic preliminary research; any further information that may be of relevance to any subsequent enquiries should be endorsed within the OEL. A 'wanted' bulletin should also be circulated locally to publicise the existence of the warrant amongst frontline officers.

Any newly disseminated warrants should be raised at '**Daily Tasking**' where the relevant resources can be identified and allocated to progress any arrest attempts, in line with prescribed timescales for the execution of warrants according to their categorisation (as per the Priority Matrix);

- **Category A14 Days**
- **Category B21 Days**
- **Category C28 Days**

**Category A warrants should remain subject of discussion within Daily Tasking for the first 7 days of their existence or until the subject is apprehended (whichever comes first).*

Local arrest attempts should then be coordinated in order to locate the subject and execute the warrant within the prescribed timescales and those attempts should be focused and managed within the District to which they appertain. In conjunction with the daily tasking process, the relevant District Inspector and/or appointed Support Sergeant should allocate responsibility for arrest attempts to a specific 'rota' for onward management by their respective Patrol Inspector who should ensure that all relevant arrest attempts are undertaken in a timely fashion. Where attempts during a shift have been unsuccessful, 'handovers' may be necessary to ensure that momentum and continued 'ownership' are maintained.

In the event of an arrest, the arresting officer will be responsible for notifying the PNC Bureau by means of a 'Detained Report' and thereafter updating and finalising the 'Warrant Occurrence' and 'Master Task' to ensure it is closed and ultimately finalised. The written notification to the PNC Bureau must be made as soon as is reasonably practicable following the arrest, but in any event **within 2 hours**. The PNC Bureau will ensure that the relevant PNC 'Wanted' circulation is then cancelled, the 'Warrant Log' is endorsed as 'executed' and any 'RMS flag' is removed.

Where enquiries at any known address(es) have been exhausted and the initial arrest attempts have been unsuccessful, the 'Warrant Occurrence' should be endorsed within the OEL as UNEXECUTED and the AIU should be tasked with conducting a '**Secondary Review**'. All lines of enquiry and arrest attempts should be documented within the OEL [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Requests for an AIU 'Secondary Review' should be made via a general task to the AIU; the Master Task must NOT be re-allocated from the 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' pot for these purposes and must remain with the 'Wanted Occurrence'.

The AIU 'Secondary Review' should be conducted by the relevant AIU Detective Sergeant or in their absence the relevant AIU Detective Inspector and should be documented fully within the associated OEL. It should comprise of;

- a. An initial review in respect of the arrest attempts and any information gleaned as a result [REDACTED]

b. A **'Subject Risk' Triage**; this triage should focus upon the level of risk that the **subject** may present to themselves or the public whilst they remain outstanding. This assessment differs from the initial categorisation of the warrant in so much as it should focus upon the **person** and the wider harm they may present as opposed to just the offence for which they are wanted. The assessment should take the nature and type of the 'wanted' offence into account as well as any other information relating to offending behaviour; be that from intelligence, arrest & conviction histories, third party information etc. Where indicators of any of the following offences or behaviours exist, the subject should be identified as a **'HIGH' risk** subject:

- Sexual offending,
- Domestic Violence, including Controlling & Coercive behaviour,
- Stalking & Harassment offences,
- Any other VAWG offences,
- Involvement in the exploitation of others,
- Serious Violence (Section 18 OAPA and above) or the likelihood/possibility thereof (i.e. kidnap, robbery, active threats etc)
- Terrorism,
- Credible history of self-harm and/or suicidal ideations,
- Credible history of untreated mental health problems which may give rise to any act of violence towards themselves or others.

***The assessment should be subjective and not limited to those indicators alone. Any assessment must be documented accordingly with rationale within the OEL. Where the above criteria isn't met and no other obvious risk of serious harm to the subject or others is identified, the risk should be assessed as STANDARD.*

c. A **'Research and Development' Strategy** which should comprise of an initial 'suite' of intelligence checks to be conducted, including:

[REDACTED]

**Note – the list of tactics is not exhaustive and any other available research capabilities should be considered.*

***All subsequent research and results should be documented within the OEL . The results of any such enquiries may give rise to a need to re-assess the subject's risk grading; as such the progress and outcome of those enquiries should be monitored and reviewed by the AIU DS to ensure that no relevant information is missed which may otherwise affect the subject's risk grading.*

3.1 'HIGH' RISK SUBJECTS

Where, following the Secondary Review, a subject is identified as HIGH RISK, the 'Warrant Occurrence' and associated 'Master Task' should be allocated to a dedicated investigative

'owner' to ensure that all possible lines of enquiry are pursued and that continued momentum is maintained during the lifetime of the warrant. Following the review, the AIU DS should raise the existence of a 'High' risk subject within their local policing area and, where timing permits, enter them into the **Level 1 Tactical Tasking and Coordination Group (TTCG)** where a decision should be sought with regards to lifetime ownership of the warrant and associated enquiries required to locate the subject. Suitable 'owners' may include; CID, PVPU (including Amethyst), Proactive Crime Teams, SOCU (via Level 2 TTCG channels) and any other specialist investigation teams, and any decisions regarding adoption should be made on the merits of severity, departmental capability and the requirement for specialist skills and resources. In certain circumstances it may be appropriate for the owner(s) of the original investigation for which the subject is wanted to assume responsibility for any subsequent enquiries to locate them, particularly where there may be an ongoing requirement to comply with Victim Codes of Practice or an in depth knowledge of the subject and/or investigation which facilitate locating them. **In instances where there may be an unreasonable delay created in awaiting the next TTCG, the subject should be raised by exception with the area Detective Chief Inspector (DCI) for review and discussion at local SMT level regarding allocation.**

Once an 'investigative owner' has been identified, the 'Warrant Occurrence' should be reallocated from the relevant 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' pot to that particular investigation team for ongoing management whilst the warrant remains live and a 'workflow' should be created (*OIC to investigate & Report – Sgt to close*). The 'Master Task' should remain within the AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT pot and should be renamed accordingly by the AIU to reflect the risk grading and owner; i.e. **'HIGH – with Eastern CID'** allowing them to maintain a record of its active existence and provide ongoing support to the investigation team where necessary; they should also set a weekly alert (RMS & PND) in respect of the subject to identify any new intelligence and/or occurrences to which they may be linked which can then be disseminated to the investigation team in a timely fashion.

Once under 'investigative ownership', the Warrant should be treated as an active investigation and the investigation team should consider and pursue all pertinent and possible lines of enquiry, giving due cognisance to the scope and extent of those enquiries and the required level of proactivity. The AIU should maintain a 'watching brief' of any developments and provide support to the investigation team where necessary. Additional support may also be required from other Force assets included the **Tactical and Strategic Analysis Section (TSAS)** and the **Force Intelligence Bureau (FIB)**. Enquiries should be instigated and directed by the investigation team to avoid the possibility of duplication and/or compromise. Updates should be recorded within the associated Occurrence Entry Log (OEL) to ensure transparency and enable subsequent reviews and/or re-allocation.

The investigation team will retain ownership of the 'investigation' for the entire time that the warrant remains 'live', unless there is a need for the matter to be re-allocated to another resource, particularly where specialist skills may be required. Requests for re-allocation should revert back to the TTCG process to ensure that the right resources are identified. The investigation should be subject to regular ongoing supervisory review and in any event should be subject to a formal **'Detective Inspector Review' at 3 month intervals** to ensure that lines of enquiry remain relevant and focused.

Where a potential address for the subject is identified, it will remain the responsibility of the investigation team to co-ordinate arrest attempts. This includes such attempts that may be required in another Local Policing 'Area' or outside North Wales. Given the level of identified risk (HIGH) and the potential for compromise, the investigation team will be best placed to co-ordinate any arrest attempts and engage directly with any other stakeholders, including internal & external departments and/or UK Police Forces. Where the investigation team identify that the subject is residing outside the UK, they may seek assistance from the Force Intelligence Bureau (as set out at **STAGE 3** - see below). In such instances, the investigation team will retain ownership of the enquiry and associated occurrence but will seek the support of FIB to act as a conduit with Interpol. The investigation team will also retain responsibility for engaging with CPS and the NCA, obtaining the necessary Trade and Co-operation Agreement (TACA) warrant(s) and ultimately coordinating any subsequent arrest and extradition.

3.2 'STANDARD' SUBJECTS

Where the risk presented by the subject is identified as STANDARD, the 'Wanted Occurrence' & associated 'Master Task' will remain under active ownership of the relevant 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'pot' until such time as a new address is identified and/or the subject is located, or the warrant is withdrawn. The AIU should rename the 'Master Task' to reflect the Risk grading and current status, i.e. '**STANDARD – Address currently unknown**' and maintain a 'watching brief' of the subject and momentum with local circulations and intelligence collection. A weekly alert [REDACTED] should be created [REDACTED] that may give rise to further enquiries or instigating renewed arrest attempts.

The AIU DS should conduct a review of the wanted occurrence at 3 month intervals to ensure that no opportunities have been/are being missed. The previously devised 'Research and Development Strategy' created during any earlier 'Secondary Review' should be renewed and all pertinent lines of intelligence research should be undertaken with a view to identifying any new leads. A Detective Inspector review should be undertaken at 12 month intervals to review any progress and ensure that all possible opportunities have been pursued. Where necessary, any new intelligence and/or occurrences identified as a result of the weekly alerts and/or Detective reviews should give rise to a re-assessment of risk. Should that risk change to HIGH, then the guidance outlined at STAGE 2.9 should be implemented and a dedicated investigative 'owner' sought.

If at any point, AIU enquiries lead to the identification of a 'new' address for the subject, arrest attempts should be co-ordinated via the area Patrol Inspector and the process should revert back to that outlined at STAGE 2.5 onwards (see above). If it appears that the subject is residing permanently in another area of the Force, the AIU may transfer ownership of the Master Occurrence and Master Task to the associated 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' pot; but only in consultation and agreement with the relevant AIU and Patrol Inspector 'Lead' for that area beforehand.

Where an address is identified in the UK, but outside the North Wales Police area, the AIU should transfer the 'Wanted Occurrence' and 'Master Task' to the 'OUT OF FORCE WARRANT MANAGEMENT' pot for onward management as part of STAGE 3 (see below). Transfer should only occur once a SPECIFIC address is identified; localities or general areas will not suffice. Transfer to STAGE 3 may also occur where it is CONFIRMED that a subject has left the UK and is currently abroad. Whilst a specific address is not required, the AIU must provide a basis as to why it is believed that the suspect has left the UK and mere suspicion will not suffice; [REDACTED]

4. 'STAGE 3' – OUT OF FORCE AND INTERNATIONAL ENQUIRIES

Warrants appertaining to subjects who are believed to reside outside of the North Wales area should be allocated to the 'OUT OF FORCE WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'pot' and the 'Warrant Occurrence' and associated 'Master Task' should be transferred to that pot to enable management thereof. Such occurrences will originate from three distinct 'feeding' mechanisms;

- a. Directly from the PNC Bureau (following on from STAGE 1)
- b. From an 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'pot' following identification of a SPECIFIC address within the UK, outside the North Wales area (following on from STAGE 2) – **STANDARD Risk cases only.**
- c. From an 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' 'pot' following confirmation that the subject has left the UK – **STANDARD Risk cases only.**

*****HIGH Risk Cases must remain with their 'Investigative Owner'. Requests for support including International Enquiries should be generated through the normal FIB and International Liaison Officer (ILO) Channels.***

The 'OUT OF FORCE WARRANT MANAGEMENT' pot will be routinely monitored by the Force Intelligence Bureau and PNC supervisors who will identify any new occurrences that enter it and conduct a preliminary review of the occurrence to establish what the associated requirements are. In the case of occurrences that have been transferred from 'Area pots', a full update of enquiries conducted and the rationale that has led to the transfer must be documented. Requests for UK arrests must clearly be endorsed by the AIU or submitting officer and if not, they will be returned for a full update to be provided. Likewise, requests for 'International Enquiries' should be endorsed accordingly with sufficient information to enable further enquiries to be conducted.

4.1 'UK Enquiries & Arrests'

Where arrest attempts are sought via another UK Force, the PNC Bureau will disseminate the request to the relevant force area with any accompanying information that may be of relevance including any warnings in respect of the subject (unless already completed at Stage 1.8).

The Force Intelligence Bureau should then maintain an oversight of the request and conduct a continuous 7 day review to ensure that any arrest attempts and/or associated enquiries are being progressed in a timely fashion. Where necessary an FIB Supervisor will engage directly with the assisting 'Home Force'.

In the event of an arrest, the PNC Bureau will ensure that the relevant PNC 'Wanted' circulation is cancelled, the 'Warrant Log' is endorsed as 'executed and any 'RMS flag' is removed. An FIB Supervisor will oversee the finalisation of the associated 'Master Occurrence' and 'Master Task'.

In the event of an unsuccessful arrest attempt, the PNC Bureau will confirm whether the Home Force have been able to identify any further addresses as a result of their arrest attempts. Once any associated address(es) are negated, the 'out of force' enquiry will conclude and details of same will be endorsed in the OEL. The 'Master Occurrence' and 'Master Task' should then be transferred back to the relevant 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' pot for the area in which the warrant was issued and enter/re-enter STAGE 2.8 for continued management by the relevant AIU. 'New' Warrant Occurrences that have not previously been allocated to an area, should be subject to the full AIU Secondary Review as detailed in STAGE 2.8 (See Above).

4.2 'International Enquiries & Arrests'

Where it is believed that the subject is currently outside the UK confirmation will need to be sought from the Reporting Officer (RO) for the original 'index' offence for which they are wanted (or in their absence, a suitable replacement from their department) as to whether a Trade and Co-Operation Agreement (TACA) warrant is in place and/or whether one can be obtained.

Where the Reporting Officer confirms that a TACA warrant has been obtained and is in place, it will be their responsibility to liaise with CPS and [REDACTED] to co-ordinate any subsequent steps towards arrest and extradition and the associated 'Warrant Occurrence' and 'Master Task' should also be re-allocated to the reporting officer.

[REDACTED]

In the event of a successful International arrest, the RO will be responsible for notifying the PNC Bureau by means of a 'Detained Report' and thereafter updating and finalising the 'Warrant Occurrence' and 'Master Task' to ensure it is closed and ultimately finalised. The written notification to the PNC Bureau must be made as soon as is reasonably practicable following the arrest, but in any event within 24 hours. The PNC Bureau will ensure that the relevant PNC 'Wanted' circulation is then cancelled, the 'Warrant Log' is endorsed as 'executed and any 'RMS flag' is removed.

In the event of an unsuccessful International arrest attempt, the 'Warrant Occurrence' and 'Master Task' should remain allocated to the relevant RO until such time as all enquiries to locate and arrest are exhausted, the subject is arrested, the warrant is withdrawn or the subject returns

to the UK. In any of those eventualities, the Occurrence may be reallocated to the relevant 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' pot for further research and development as per Stage 2.8, but only in consultation and agreement with the relevant AIU in the first instance. Where required, the ILO will continue to provide support and co-ordinate enquiries within the International community as directed by the RO.

Where it is believed that the subject is currently outside the UK, but a TACA warrant is NOT in existence, the RO for the original 'index' offence should be notified of the fact of the subject's whereabouts

The RO will be required to liaise with CPS to establish whether a TACA warrant can be obtained in their respective case. If it can, then the enquiry should revert back to STAGE 3.7 onwards. If it is not possible to obtain a TACA warrant, International arrest attempts will not be possible and the subject will remain wanted until such time as they return to the UK. In that instance, the Master Occurrence and associated Master Task should be re-allocated to the 'AREA WARRANT MANAGEMENT' pot for the area in which the warrant was issued and revert back to STAGE 2.8 for ongoing management.

5. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

5.1 Court Issues Warrants Process Maps



Court Issued
Warrants Process Map