

Arrests and Drug Treatment History

Introduction

We have examined 100 selected arrests from a specific period in time covering a range of offences that include a mixture of violence, acquisitive and other crime categories. Data protection means that we cannot identify any individuals in this analysis and therefore we have been limited in how much information we can use to paint a picture of offending behaviour and its relationship to past or present substance misuse.

Main findings

The sample of Arrests provided for analysis has revealed a very complex picture. The Arrests were made for a wide range of offences and not just those acquisitive crimes that result in a drug test. Of the one hundred examined, 66% are known to DIP (drug interventions programme). This means that there is a record of them on the Mi-Case system. However of this 66, 39 had more than a basic record created in custody suggesting some form of engagement either at the initial assessment stage of subsequent follow ups and those that actively engaged in drug treatment.

Of those 39 only ten are currently in treatment:

- Two active with DIP (cocaine);
- One DIP client each in Middlesbrough and Darlington;
- One active but not engaging with DIP Stockton;
- One active but not engaging with DIP but with ROB (restriction on bail);
- Two on DRR orders;
- One HCC; and,
- One PPO.

A further 20 had a previous treatment episode prior to the sample arrest.

Nine more were referred to DIP in one or more instances but failed to engage

Of the 38 arrested for acquisitive crime we found evidence that a drug test had been carried out for 31 of them (we are looking at what has happened to the seven missing cases). Of this 31, 19 (61%) were negative, 4 positive for cocaine, 2 for opiates and 5 positive for both opiate and cocaine and one aborted test. This is slightly higher than the ration of positive tests we see for a full sample each month (72% negative from April to July 2012)

Of those arrested for non acquisitive crime 4 were known to drug treatment for cocaine use only, one for cannabis and 4 known to have had opiate or crack issues including one PPO client, one DRR client, one active Middlesbrough DIP client and one who was last in treatment in 2006. This suggests that there is little correlation between wider, non-acquisitive offending behaviour and drug misuse with the possible exception of cocaine although it is impossible to say from this analysis if the use of cocaine had contributed to the offending behaviour on this instance.

David Morton