

SCHEDULE 2

POLICE AND OVERSIGHT: LAW NOT APPLIED, PROTECTION NOT PROVIDED

Protective safeguards withheld; no effective accountability or practical protection

A. Introduction: policing without protection, oversight without accountability

The Schedule identifies the protective legal safeguards which, on Mrs Lawrence’s case, should have operated before, during and after the police attendance at Parkview, Horton Lane, Epsom, on 14 July 2021.

The Schedule is not advanced as a final finding of criminal liability, police misconduct or professional misconduct. It is advanced as a record-based schedule of alleged failures requiring independent investigation.

The central allegation is that police powers were used coercively but not lawfully explained, limited, recorded, justified or reviewed. Officers entered a private home, assisted a private property exclusion, searched the home and vehicles, interfered with property and a phone, arrested or removed an occupier, and left the family dispossessed, while the legal powers said to justify those acts have never been properly identified.

The protective framework that should have applied was extensive: the Protection from Eviction Act 1977, PACE 1984 and the PACE Codes, the Human Rights Act 1998, the Equality Act 2010, the Police Conduct Regulations 2020, body-worn-video retention duties, mandatory referral duties to the IOPC, police complaint review powers, and the PCC’s oversight duties.

On Mrs Lawrence’s case, the balance between police powers and public rights collapsed. The force of policing was applied; the safeguards of policing were not.

The complaint materials allege that officers attended without a court order, warrant, writ of possession or certified court bailiff; entered through or over the fence line; searched the home, vehicles and occupants; interfered with a phone and 999 call; handed possession to private individuals; withheld or lost body-worn video; and failed to identify over 200 alleged PACE breaches.

The oversight failure is said to have compounded the original police failure. Surrey Police PSD allegedly investigated itself and found no wrongdoing. The complaint materials say the mandatory IOPC referral threshold was engaged by allegations of serious assault, race-aggravated conduct, serious corruption, relevant offences and same-incident conduct, yet the matter was not independently investigated at the outset.

The result is alleged to be a closed loop: police power was used; the legal power was not identified; evidence was missing or withheld; PSD found no breach; the PCC did not secure accountability; the IOPC was not properly engaged at the outset; and late review points were then used to resist scrutiny.

B. What the police allegedly did

No.	Police act alleged	Protective law or safeguard engaged	Failure alleged	Consequence
1	Attended a private residential property with private actors seeking possession/control.	PEA 1977; PACE; common law limits on police involvement in civil disputes.	Officers allegedly treated a private property dispute as a basis for coercive police intervention without identifying a court order, warrant, writ or lawful power.	Police power allegedly became the instrument of private dispossession.
2	Entered the property/grounds by force or through the fence line.	PACE Code B; criminal damage law; property rights; Article 8/A1P1.	No warrant, court order, statutory power or written authority has been identified as justifying forced entry.	Entry remains legally unexplained.
3	Assisted or facilitated eviction/exclusion of occupants.	Protection from Eviction Act 1977 ss.1–3.	Officers actually removed residential occupiers without a possession order, court bailiff or lawful eviction authority.	The family was removed while the law designed to protect against unlawful eviction was not applied.
4	Accepted the position of private actors over the occupants’ title/proof.	Equality Act 2010; PACE fairness and non-discrimination duties; professional standards.	White/private actors’ assertions were allegedly accepted while Land Registry/title documents proving black ownership and Black family’s objections were dismissed.	Racialised unequal treatment is alleged.
5	Searched the home.	PACE Code B: police powers of entry, search and seizure.	No search warrant, consent record, statutory search power, written notice, search record or lawful objective has been identified.	Home privacy and property rights were allegedly violated without the statutory protection of Code B.

Schedule 2 — Police and Oversight: Law Not Applied, Protection Not Provided

No.	Police act alleged	Protective law or safeguard engaged	Failure alleged	Consequence
6	Searched vehicles and/or persons.	PACE Code A; Code B where premises/vehicles searched; requirement for grounds and records.	Searches were conducted without grounds, proper information, proper records, or copies of search documentation.	The family was searched but not protected by search safeguards.
7	Searched for or took a gate fob/keys/access device.	PACE seizure safeguards; property rights; evidence preservation.	The purpose was allegedly to enable private actors to gain access, not to investigate crime.	Police allegedly acted as agents of the private exclusion rather than protectors of the occupants.
8	Confiscated or interfered with a mobile phone during/around a 999 call.	PACE seizure powers; Article 8; right to seek emergency help; evidence preservation.	No lawful seizure power or record has been identified. The 999 call has allegedly not been disclosed.	The means of recording/seeking help was allegedly removed.
9	Arrested or removed Mrs Lawrence.	PACE Code G arrest necessity; Code C detention rights; Article 5 liberty.	Arrest was allegedly unnecessary, unsupported by a proper offence, not followed by custody safeguards, and ended in de-arrest/release away from the property.	Liberty was restricted while arrest safeguards allegedly did not operate.
10	Used force and restraint.	PACE; common law necessity/proportionality; Police Conduct standards; Article 3/8.	Injury-causing force and manhandling were allegedly recorded in contemporaneous police logs and complaint materials.	Serious-force issues were not treated as requiring independent investigation.
11	Threatened or frightened children / invoked social services.	Safeguarding duties; Article 8; proportionality; professional standards.	Threats concerning children are alleged to have been used as coercion during a property dispute.	Children were allegedly traumatised and left homeless without safeguarding scrutiny.
12	Made racialised comments or acted on racialised assumptions.	Equality Act 2010; Article 14; PSED; Police Conduct standards.	Complaint materials allege comments about race, property value, Mercedes vehicles, "big house" and disbelief that a Black family could own or occupy the property.	Racial-discrimination safeguards were not applied in substance.
13	Failed to preserve/disclose body-worn video.	BWV retention/evidence integrity; complaint-handling duties; PACE/CPIA principles.	Only a fraction of expected BWV was allegedly disclosed; footage from key officers was missing; BWV was said to be saved but later unavailable.	The central evidence needed to test the complaint was missing or withheld.
14	Failed to record or investigate theft/loss of property and vehicle.	Duty to record/investigate crime; A1P1 property protection; professional standards.	Loss of property and a vehicle was allegedly not recorded or investigated effectively.	Property loss was left without police protection.
15	Told occupants not to return / allowed private actors to retain possession.	PEA 1977; property rights; Article 8/A1P1.	Police allegedly converted a disputed private claim into physical exclusion backed by threat of arrest.	The family was left excluded with no immediate protection route.

C. Protective aspects of the law allegedly not applied

No.	Protective law / standard	What it protects	How it was allegedly not applied
1	Protection from Eviction Act 1977	Protects residential occupiers from unlawful eviction and harassment.	Police carried out the exclusion without court authority and without treating the matter as potential unlawful eviction.
2	PACE Code B	Protects occupiers from unjustified entry, search and seizure.	Forced entry, search of home, vehicles and seizure/interference with property allegedly occurred without warrant, power, consent, notice, record or necessity.
3	PACE Code A	Protects against unjustified stop/search of persons and vehicles.	Searches of persons/vehicles were allegedly not justified, explained, recorded or documented.
4	PACE Code C	Protects detained/arrested persons through custody records, rights, caution, legal advice and treatment safeguards.	Mrs Lawrence was allegedly removed without custody safeguards, rights, caution or proper custody process.
5	PACE Code G	Protects against unnecessary arrest.	Arrest was allegedly used as a tool of exclusion/removal rather than because arrest was necessary for a genuine criminal investigation.
6	Human Rights Act / Article 8	Protects home, private life and family life.	Home entry, family removal, searches and child-related threats allegedly proceeded without legal basis or proportionality analysis.
7	A1P1 property protection	Protects peaceful enjoyment of possessions.	Home, vehicle, keys, personal belongings and commercial assets were allegedly lost without effective state protection.
8	Article 5 liberty	Protects against arbitrary detention.	Arrest/removal and detention in a police van/car park release were allegedly not lawfully justified.
9	Article 14 / Equality Act	Protects against discriminatory treatment in public functions.	Alleged racial comments and differential acceptance of private actors' claims over Black owners' documents were not properly examined.
10	Equality Act 2010 s.149 PSED	Requires public authorities to have due regard to eliminating discrimination, advancing equality and fostering good relations.	Police/oversight decisions allegedly failed to address race as a central issue, not a peripheral allegation.
11	Police Conduct Regulations 2020, Schedule 2	Establishes Standards of Professional Behaviour, including honesty, integrity, authority, duties and equality/diversity obligations.	PSD allegedly found conduct met standards despite alleged unlawful entry, force, search, racialised comments and missing evidence.
12	Evidence preservation / BWV integrity	Protects accountability and the ability to test contested police conduct.	Missing BWV, missing 999 call, incomplete footage, and lack of audit trail allegedly disabled accountability.
13	Mandatory IOPC referral under Regulation 7	Ensures serious complaints are independently referred where threshold categories are engaged.	Serious-assault, discriminatory-conduct, corruption/integrity and relevant-offence triggers allegedly required referral but were not treated accordingly.

Schedule 2 — Police and Oversight: Law Not Applied, Protection Not Provided

No.	Protective law / standard	What it protects	How it was allegedly not applied
14	IOPC review / call-in powers	Provides independent scrutiny where local handling is inadequate.	The complaint materials allege the IOPC did not investigate substantively, or that call-in/initiative powers were not exercised despite seriousness.
15	PCC oversight duties	Requires democratic police oversight and holding the Chief Constable to account.	The PCC allegedly endorsed or failed to disturb a “met professional standards” outcome and failed to secure accountability.

D. PACE and evidence-integrity failures

No.	Failure alleged	Safeguard that should have operated	Why it matters
1	No identified warrant, order or statutory entry power.	Code B / PACE entry safeguards.	Without a lawful entry power, all downstream search/seizure/use-of-force questions become unsafe.
2	No proper explanation of search purpose.	Code B requires justification and search powers to be exercised fairly and responsibly.	Occupants could not know or challenge the legal basis.
3	No written notice of powers/rights or search record identified.	Code B notice/search record safeguards.	Prevents later accountability and damages claims.
4	Search of premises and vehicles without identified power.	Code B / Code A.	Converts a property dispute into arbitrary search.
5	Phone interference during emergency call.	Seizure must be legally justified; right to seek emergency help must not be obstructed.	Suppresses both assistance and evidence.
6	Arrest/removal without Code G necessity analysis.	Code G arrest necessity.	Arrest appears to have functioned as eviction support rather than policing necessity.
7	No custody process or Code C safeguards.	Code C detention rights.	Deprives arrested person of legal advice, custody record, reasons and review.
8	Alleged 238+ PACE breaches.	PACE Codes A, B, C, D, G.	The number alleged points to systemic disregard, not isolated error.
9	Missing or withheld BWV.	BWV integrity and evidence-retention duties.	Prevents independent verification of police conduct.
10	Missing 999 call.	CAD/999 records and disclosure.	The very call said to justify police reaction is not available for review.
11	Missing audit trail for BWV.	Evidence lifecycle accountability.	Without audit records, loss/deletion/withholding cannot be distinguished.
12	PSD reliance on incomplete evidence.	Reasonable and proportionate complaint outcome.	An outcome cannot be safe if decisive evidence was absent.

E. Mandatory referral failure

No.	Referral trigger alleged	Source / basis	Referral failure alleged
1	Serious assault / injury-causing force.	ICAD entry allegedly records arm injury, “nearly broke my arm”, and unnecessary manhandling.	Surrey Police allegedly treated it locally instead of triggering independent referral assessment.
2	Race-aggravated conduct.	Contemporaneous complaint allegedly recorded treatment “as they are black” and comments about Mercedes / large house.	The race element allegedly triggered Regulation 7(1)(d) but was not referred.
3	Same-incident conduct.	Entry/search/eviction/use of force occurred in the same incident as serious-assault/race allegations.	Same-incident bundling was allegedly ignored.
4	Serious corruption / integrity issue.	Missing BWV, alleged camera deactivation, evidence suppression and misleading records.	Integrity issues were allegedly not independently investigated.
5	Relevant offence allegations.	Unlawful eviction, false imprisonment, assault, theft/property loss, criminal damage and phone interference were alleged.	Referral assessment allegedly failed to ask whether conduct, if substantiated, met referral categories.
6	Failure to preserve evidence.	Occurrence records allegedly stated BWV existed and was saved/expected to be attached.	Later “lost” or missing footage created a referral/integrity issue that was not independently resolved.
7	Abuse of police power for private purpose.	Officers allegedly assisted private actors, not certified bailiffs, in a civil matter.	Police-specific corruption/improper exercise of powers was allegedly not treated as a mandatory referral issue.

F. PSD investigation failures

No.	PSD failure alleged	Protective function defeated	Consequence
1	Investigated locally despite seriousness.	Independent scrutiny of serious police misconduct.	The force allegedly judged its own conduct.

Schedule 2 — Police and Oversight: Law Not Applied, Protection Not Provided

No.	PSD failure alleged	Protective function defeated	Consequence
2	Failed to identify any PACE breach.	Legal safeguards against arbitrary entry, search, arrest and seizure.	PACE protections were treated as though they did not matter.
3	Failed to identify criminal-law issues.	Referral/prosecution accountability.	Potential criminality was converted into “professional standards met.”
4	Failed to identify or investigate PEA 1977 issues.	Protection against unlawful residential eviction.	Police-assisted exclusion was not tested as unlawful eviction.
5	Failed to address missing BWV.	Evidence integrity.	Missing evidence became a gap against the complainant, not a reason for scrutiny.
6	Failed to secure/produce the 999 call.	Verification of the emergency-call/arrest narrative.	The factual basis for police conduct remained untested.
7	Failed to investigate racialised comments/assumptions.	Equality and anti-discrimination protection.	Race was allegedly treated as unproved because evidence was missing or not examined.
8	Failed to test private actors’ authority.	Legal basis for possession/exclusion.	Police allegedly relied on unsupported private assertions.
9	Failed to assess conflict between BWV/CCTV/officer accounts.	Reasoned fact-finding.	Contradictions were not resolved independently.
10	Concluded “met professional standards”.	Professional accountability.	Alleged unlawful entry, search, force, eviction and evidence gaps were normalised.
11	Failed to provide meaningful reasons.	Transparency and appeal/review rights.	The complainant was left without a reasoned route to challenge.
12	Created confusion about IOPC involvement.	Informed review rights and time limits.	Delay was allegedly caused or materially contributed to by misleading institutional communication.

G. IOPC and review-process failures

No.	IOPC / review failure alleged	Protective function defeated	Consequence
1	No independent investigation at the outset.	Serious complaints involving police criminality, race and evidence integrity should receive independent scrutiny.	Local PSD process controlled the outcome.
2	Failure to exercise call-in / initiative powers.	Police Reform Act 2002 Schedule 3 powers exist to bring serious matters into independent oversight.	Serious allegations remained outside full independent investigation.
3	Timeliness used against the complainant.	Regulation 29 discretion to accept late review where special circumstances exist.	Time limits risk shielding the alleged misconduct caused by the force’s own handling.
4	Earlier letters not treated as substantive review requests.	Access to justice for litigants in person and traumatised complainants.	Substance was allegedly sacrificed to procedural wording.
5	Failure to compel or require BWV audit trail.	Ability to distinguish loss, deletion, withholding or failure to record.	Evidence black hole remained.
6	Failure to require 999 call disclosure.	Testing whether arrest/phone seizure narrative was lawful.	The key emergency call remained unexamined.
7	Failure to require full PSD file and decision logs.	Review of whether PSD outcome was reasonable/proportionate.	The basis for exoneration remained opaque.
8	Failure to address mandatory referral breach as a threshold issue.	Ensures forces cannot avoid independent scrutiny by not referring.	Non-referral became self-protecting.
9	Failure to address race/equality as a core issue.	Public confidence in police complaints involving BAME complainants.	The complaint was experienced as institutional non-protection.
10	Failure to provide practical protection or accountability after years.	Effective oversight.	Complaint process became retrospective, slow and non-remedial.

H. PCC oversight failures

No.	PCC failure alleged	Legal / oversight function	Consequence
1	Failure to hold Chief Constable to account.	PCC governance role.	Force-level failures remained uncorrected.
2	Failure to respond substantively to pre-action correspondence.	Public accountability and pre-action fairness.	Silence or non-engagement compounded the accountability gap.
3	Failure to interrogate PSD “met standards” outcome.	Oversight of complaint handling.	Internal exoneration was allowed to stand.
4	Failure to address race/equality dimension.	PSED / equality accountability.	Alleged discrimination was not treated as a systemic issue.
5	Failure to require mandatory referral or independent scrutiny.	Police complaints governance.	Serious allegations remained locally controlled.
6	Failure to require disclosure / evidence preservation.	Evidence integrity.	Missing BWV and records remained unresolved.
7	Failure to protect public confidence.	PCC democratic oversight.	The complainant experienced the PCC as part of the closed loop.

I. Oversight closed loop

Stage	What should have happened	What allegedly happened
1. Police attendance	Officers identify legal authority before entry/search/removal.	No warrant, order, writ, certified bailiff or statutory power was identified.
2. Entry/search	PACE Code B powers, notice, grounds, records and proportionality applied.	Entry/search allegedly occurred without PACE safeguards.
3. Eviction/exclusion	PEA 1977 protections applied; police prevent unlawful eviction.	Police allegedly facilitated exclusion instead.
4. Arrest/removal	Code G necessity and Code C rights applied.	Arrest/removal allegedly used to remove occupier from property.
5. Evidence	BWV, CAD, 999 call, logs and records preserved.	BWV and 999 materials allegedly missing, withheld or incomplete.
6. Complaint recording	Serious complaint recorded and independently referred.	Complaint allegedly remained local despite mandatory referral triggers.
7. PSD investigation	PACE, equality, criminality and evidence-integrity questions tested.	PSD allegedly found no wrongdoing.
8. PCC oversight	Chief Constable held to account; equality/public confidence addressed.	PCC allegedly failed to disturb or interrogate the outcome.
9. IOPC oversight	Call-in/review/initiative powers used to secure independent scrutiny.	IOPC review/call-in allegedly resisted, delayed or refused.
10. Effective remedy	Family receives protection, investigation, accountability and disclosure.	Family remains without restored property, full evidence, or police accountability.

J. Comprehensive list of failures alleged

1. Failure to require a court order, warrant, writ of possession or certified enforcement authority before supporting exclusion.
2. Failure to treat the incident as a potential unlawful eviction under the Protection from Eviction Act 1977.
3. Failure to identify any lawful power for forced entry.
4. Failure to identify any lawful power for searching the home.
5. Failure to identify any lawful power for searching vehicles.
6. Failure to identify any lawful power for searching or restraining occupants.
7. Failure to identify any lawful power for seizing or interfering with the phone.
8. Failure to preserve or disclose the 999 call.
9. Failure to preserve or disclose complete body-worn video.
10. Failure to provide BWV audit logs, retention records or deletion explanations.
11. Failure to record search grounds and provide search documentation.
12. Failure to provide proper arrest grounds.
13. Failure to apply arrest necessity.
14. Failure to take the arrested person to custody and provide Code C protections.
15. Failure to investigate whether the arrest was used as a mechanism of removal.
16. Failure to investigate whether police assisted private actors without lawful authority.
17. Failure to investigate criminal damage to the fence, gate or locks.
18. Failure to investigate loss of possessions and vehicle.
19. Failure to provide a crime reference for alleged property loss or theft.
20. Failure to consider Article 8 home rights.
21. Failure to consider Article 5 liberty rights.
22. Failure to consider A1P1 property rights.
23. Failure to consider Article 14 and race discrimination.
24. Failure to apply the Equality Act and PSED in substance.
25. Failure to identify, investigate or discipline racialised remarks.
26. Failure to examine differential treatment between private actors and Black occupants.
27. Failure to identify over 200 alleged PACE breaches.
28. Failure to treat missing BWV as an integrity issue.
29. Failure to treat missing 999 call as an integrity issue.
30. Failure to treat officers' own alleged admissions as requiring independent scrutiny.
31. Failure to make mandatory IOPC referral.
32. Failure to produce the recorded referral decision or rationale.

33. Failure to apply Regulation 7 at the threshold stage by asking whether alleged conduct, if substantiated, triggered referral.
34. Failure to treat same-incident conduct as part of the referral assessment.
35. Failure by PSD to investigate the substance rather than exonerate.
36. Failure by PSD to give adequate reasons.
37. Failure by PSD to address professional standards individually.
38. Failure by PSD to address collective officer conduct.
39. Failure by PSD to address supervisory responsibility.
40. Failure by PSD to address evidence lifecycle.
41. Failure by PSD to address race as central, not peripheral.
42. Failure by PCC to hold Chief Constable to account.
43. Failure by PCC to address PSED and public confidence.
44. Failure by IOPC to call in or exercise initiative powers despite seriousness.
45. Failure by IOPC to treat earlier substantive requests as attempts to obtain independent scrutiny.
46. Failure by IOPC to require decisive disclosure before determining validity or review.
47. Failure by IOPC to prevent time limits becoming a shield for institution-caused delay.
48. Failure by all oversight bodies to identify what lawful protection exists for the family.

K. Materiality: why these failures matter

49. Each failure matters individually. Taken cumulatively, they show that the family was left with no operational protection, no evidential protection, and no effective oversight.
50. Operationally, police power allegedly displaced the family from their home.
51. Evidentially, missing BWV, missing 999 call records, missing search documentation and missing legal-power justification disabled the ability to prove what happened.
52. Procedurally, PSD's "met professional standards" outcome converted untested allegations into institutional closure.
53. Structurally, non-referral to the IOPC prevented independent oversight at the stage when evidence could still be secured.
54. Constitutionally, the case raises a direct equal-protection issue: a Black family alleges that state power was used to remove them from property, while the very safeguards designed to control state power were not applied.

L. Conclusion — law not applied, protection not provided

55. The Schedule identifies a complete protection failure.
56. At the police stage, coercive power was used without the legal power being identified.
57. At the evidence stage, the materials needed to test the police narrative were missing, withheld or unexplained.
58. At the PSD stage, serious allegations of unlawful entry, unlawful search, unlawful eviction, force, arrest, racialised conduct, PACE breaches and evidence loss were treated as consistent with professional standards.
59. At the mandatory-referral stage, the allegations and contemporaneous records appear to have triggered Regulation 7 categories, yet the matter was not independently referred at the outset.
60. At the IOPC stage, review/call-in mechanisms did not provide the practical independent scrutiny required.
61. At the PCC stage, democratic oversight did not secure accountability.
62. The result is not merely an unresolved complaint. It is an accountability vacuum.
63. The protective law existed on paper. It did not protect in practice.
64. The final question is therefore direct: What protection remains for a citizen where police power is used to enter, search, exclude and dispossess; where the legal power is not identified; where body-worn video and 999 evidence are missing; where PSD finds no wrongdoing; where mandatory referral is not made; where the IOPC does not secure timely independent scrutiny; and where PCC oversight does not hold the force to account?
65. On the record identified in the Schedule, the answer is that no effective protection was provided.