



18 September 2014

H Rogers
fyi-request-1896-7522bb82@requests.fyi.org.nz

Dear H Rogers

Pre-Charge Warnings OIA Request

Thank you for your Official Information Act request of 14 August 2014, seeking the following:

- Pre-charge warnings manual
- Pre-charge warnings guidelines
- Pre-charge warnings policy manual chapter
- A breakdown of the categories and numbers of pre-charge warnings given for the past 6 month period
- The number of pre-charge warnings given to people who subsequently re-offended within 6 months of the warning

The first three parts of your request are all covered by the same document; namely, the Pre-Charge Warnings chapter in the Police Manual. I attach the chapter to this reply e-mail, for your information.

In relation to the fourth part of your request, the table below shows the number of pre-charge warnings issued by Police from 1 February – 30 July 2014, by offence category. During the period you are interested in, the main offence types for which pre-charge warnings were issued were: disorderly behaviour, shoplifting, possessing small amounts of cannabis, common assault, fighting in a public place, wilful damage, trespass and so on.

Category	Number of PCWs issued
Violence (typically common assault)	569
Sexual Offences (typically exposing self in public)	5
Drugs and Anti-Social Offences (typically, disorderly behaviour)	4802
Dishonesty (typically shoplifting under \$500)	1099
Property Damage and New Drugs (typically wilful damage)	171
Property Abuses (typically trespass)	661
Administrative (typically false statement that offence committed)	22
Incident/Task (typically drunk custody/detox)	35
Traffic / Infringement (possessing/consuming alcohol in a banned area)	50

Safer Communities Together

In relation to the last part of your request, Police does not routinely assess re-offending following a warning or a prosecution. This is because regular monitoring statistics are not suited to this purpose. Re-offending rates cannot be attributed to a specific type of resolution (ie issuing a PCW or a Prosecution) without removing differences in conditions between those being given each resolution type so they can be compared evenly. This requires comparison with a matched control group. However, re-offending analysis was undertaken in 2011/12 to review whether PCWs were being issued in appropriate circumstances (ie to low level offenders who are less likely to re-offend). The analysis showed that offenders who had received a PCW re-offended significantly less frequently and less seriously than those prosecuted for the same offence types. Note that this conclusion should not be used to suggest the less frequent and less serious re-offending occurs because a PCW was used, but instead demonstrates that PCWs are being appropriately targeted to low-level offenders who are less likely to re-offend anyway.

I hope this answers your questions.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'W Haumaha', written in a cursive style.

Superintendent Wallace Haumaha,
Deputy Chief Executive: Maori