



Lucy Slade <Islade@justiceinnovation.org>

Meeting request: Discussing the Impact of Respect Orders (Crime & Policing Bill) on vulnerable groups

1 message

Lucy Slade <Islade@justiceinnovation.org>

Wed, Oct 8, 2025 at 1:02 PM

To: DAVIDSONB@parliament.uk

Cc: Hiba Jahangir <hjahangir@justiceinnovation.org>

Hi Barbara,

It is sadly Hiba's last week with us, so I am following up on your email.

I'm very pleased to hear that Respect Orders is already on Baroness Doocey's radar, and that we are aligned on the issues.

We'd be very happy to answer your questions, and are supportive of the two amendments you propose:

- A two year maximum length of an order seems sensible, we agree that an 'indefinite' amount of time hanging over someone is not justified, and significantly increases the chances of breach and the person being drawn into the justice system.
- We also agree that the clause that includes "threatening to engage in ASB" should be removed. It is not a fair response that someone could end up in court, with a criminal record and a serious criminal outcome, without even having engaged in anti-social behaviour. We would also be concerned that this will be used against the low hanging fruit, people who are on the streets, because they are young or homeless. Our briefing outlines some more effective and less punitive ways of preventing ASB, such as community hubs and mentoring.
- The third amendment sounds sensible but as we are not lawyers so we couldn't comment further. This also means that we are not able to answer your question on legal aid. You may already be in touch with her, but Andrea from JUSTICE is doing lots of work in this area and will certainly be able to help. Her email is afrazer@justice.org.uk.
- Two additional ways to ameliorate harm:
 1. We are calling on the Government to ensure that Respect Orders are piloted with safeguards and data collection to minimise the risk they will be used disproportionately against specific groups. We want to see a Government collection strategy to show how the use of the powers, and who receives them, will be monitored. We are concerned that the pilot will replicate the piloting of the Knife Crime Prevention Order, a new civil order that was designed to respond to knife crime in London. The evaluation of the pilot was conducted by UCL, but it was not made publicly available, and we were forced to FOI the Met. It is so important that this does not happen with Respect Orders, and there is full transparency on how they are used, as well as on their efficacy.
 2. One additional clause we want to draw your attention to is section C1 and subsection (4), which enables Respect Orders to impact people's housing status. These clauses permit landlords to refuse tenancies and expedite evictions where a Respect Order has been imposed, and exclude individuals from their home where there is "significant risk of harm from the respondent to other persons". We are very concerned about the potential to displace people from their home without addressing the underlying issues behind anti-social behaviour. This is likely to relocate the problem, and may worsen it if stable housing arrangements are lost. We would also argue that where an individual presents a risk to their neighbours safety, the police already possess sufficient powers to intervene. Therefore we recommend withdrawing it.
- Our briefing points to the evidence that shows how comparative ASB orders have been used to over-police specific communities. The Knife Crime Prevention Order pilot is a specific example of where these powers have been used disproportionately on minoritised communities. The evaluation found concerns amongst practitioners that using the KCPO would most likely end up penalising individuals from specific communities without helping them move away from knife crime. The FOI data that we received showed that 64.5% of KCPOs were given to people of a Black ethnicity, and were mainly given to young males under the age of 25.

I have attached our briefing, as well as the evaluation and data set of the Knife Crime pilot. Please let me know if I can be of any additional help.

Best wishes,

Lucy

Lucy Slade

Policy Officer

Centre for Justice Innovation

lslade@justiceinnovation.org

+44 (0)7710006189

[Click here](#) to sign up to our bulletins, which provide regular updates on innovative practice in the sector.

On Fri, Oct 3, 2025 at 11:09 AM Hiba Jahangir <hjahangir@justiceinnovation.org> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **DAVIDSON, Barbara** <DAVIDSONB@parliament.uk>

Date: Thu, Oct 2, 2025 at 6:33 PM

Subject: Re: Meeting request: Discussing the Impact of Respect Orders (Crime & Policing Bill) on vulnerable groups

To: Hiba Jahangir <hjahangir@justiceinnovation.org>

Hi Hiba, firstly my apologies for the long delay in getting back to you. As you may or may not know, we had a policing motion we were trying to get passed at the recent Lib Dem conference and, together with background work for the Bill, that's taken up all my time.

Secondly, thanks for getting in touch with Dee. In terms of Respect Orders, she will indeed be speaking on these at committee stage and I am currently putting together a briefing on the key issues, many of which you also cite. From what I've read in your email I think we are on the same page!

There are a number of important general points I think we'd like to make, and then a number of specific points on the Respect Orders.

In general terms - yes, we will question why more orders are needed despite the huge range of existing and overlapping civil orders, to the point where there is already confusion and uncertainty among the public, relevant authorities and courts about what exactly is what. There are obviously concerns about the misuse of these existing orders, including asbis and CPNs - we're concerned the same will happen with the new orders. We still don't know if people will be able to access legal aid to defend themselves - do you know anything more on this point? We'll also make the basic argument that these orders are to a civil standard of proof yet risk up to 2 years imprisonment for breach, so an unhelpful widening of the net without the safeguards. We'll be pointing out this legislation is not properly evidence-based given the paucity of data on existing ASB orders; and we want to push back on the idea these are not largely punitive by asking where the support services are to satisfy positive requirements. We'll also point out the additional pressure on an already logjammed CJS.

Currently we're planning to address much of the above by retableting a previous Lib Dem amendment proposing that these Orders aren't introduced before an independent review of existing ASB legislation. However working on the assumption the Govt will press ahead regardless, I think we are also minded to propose one or two more specific amendments. We haven't decided exactly how to approach this yet, but are looking at the following:

- In clause 1, section A1 (4) it states the Orders may effectively be 'indefinite', with no maximum period a Respect Order can be imposed for. We think a maximum of 2 years should be specified on the face of the order.
- Then there's the fact this legislation uses the 'just and convenient' test when courts are more familiar with the 'necessary and proportionate' test, potentially risking serious overreach.
- Also concerned they could be used to target not just behaviour that's taken place but potential future behaviour as implied by the current wording 'or threatens to engage in anti-social behaviour'.

I don't know if you'd like to share your views on any of these, or which you think should take priority if we were to table an amendment?

If we are working on the basis that these orders are going to happen and we therefore now need to try to ameliorate any potential harm, what would your own priorities be?

Are there any key arguments you'd like to see us make that haven't been covered by the above? For example, around the concern these Orders will most likely be imposed on already overpoliced sections of the community, have you got anything I could use in that area?

I think you mentioned that you'd sent a briefing to Dee in your email but I can't seem to find it - would you be able to forward that again?

I'm sorry we haven't got scope for in-person meetings at the moment. But please do stay in touch and reach out at any point if you'd like to discuss anything that comes up in future. In the meantime I look forward to hearing your ideas on this issue!

Thanks Hiba and again my apologies for my slow response,

Barbara

From: Hiba Jahangir <hjahangir@justiceinnovation.org>

Sent: 10 July 2025 17:08

To: DOOCEY, Baroness <DOOCEYD@parliament.uk>

Cc: Lucy Slade <lslade@justiceinnovation.org>; DAVIDSON, Barbara <DAVIDSONB@parliament.uk>

Subject: Re: Meeting request: Discussing the Impact of Respect Orders (Crime & Policing Bill) on vulnerable groups

Dear Baroness Doocey,

Thank you for letting us know. We look forward to hearing from Barbara next week.

Best wishes,

Hiba Jahangir
Policy and Communications Intern
Centre for Justice Innovation

hjahangir@justiceinnovation.org

UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.

--

Hiba Jahangir
Policy and Communications Intern
Centre for Justice Innovation

hjahangir@justiceinnovation.org

3 attachments



Crime and Policing Bill.pdf
149K



KCPO evaluation.pdf
27K



knife-crime-prevention-orders-pilot-scheme (1).xlsx
12K