Use of Mechanical Restraint (including handcuffs and defacto equipment ie sheets/procedures)

1) Does your Authority use Mechanical Restraint?
Yes secure services only

2) If so, what form does this take ie handcuffs, soft cuffs, emergency response belt, seclusion etc
Handcuffs

3) In what circumstances are mechanical restraint techniques applied
When prescribed by the ministry of justice for the transport of remanded or sentenced offenders or where there is an assessed risk of absconding and or violence during transport.

4) How many incidents of the use of mechanical restraint have been recorded by your Authority over the last three years?
Please note: As of 1 April 2017, North Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust (NEP) and South Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust (SEPT) merged to form one new organisation known as Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust (EPUT).
A question was added to the incident reporting system in August 2017 to capture if mechanical restraint was utilised. The table below therefore covers the period 01/08/2017 – 27/03/2019.

The information prior to the Mechanical Restraint question being added in August 2017 may be contained within the description of the incidents. However there are more than 4000 incidents in which restraint was utilised and to collate the requested information would involve a manual trawl through each of these incidents which would exceed the time and cost limits, as set out in the Act. The Trust is therefore applying Section 12 of the Act (where cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit).

In addition the NEP incident reporting system did not capture this level of data and is therefore not included in the 2017 period (01/01/2017 – 31/03/2017) prior to the merger with SEPT to create EPUT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanical Restraint Utilised</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note that in each of the incidents detailed in the above table the use of mechanical restraint was initiated and implemented by police with no reported incidents of EPUT or SEPT staff utilising any form of mechanical restraint.
5) The number of injuries/fatalities incurred by both Service Users and Staff during the use of mechanical restraint in the last three years. 

None

Applied Exemption:

Section 12 (Exemption where cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit):

(1) Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the authority estimates that the cost of complying with the request would exceed the appropriate limit.

(2) Subsection (1) does not exempt the public authority from its obligation to comply with paragraph (a) of section 1(1) unless the estimated cost of complying with that paragraph alone would exceed the appropriate limit.

(3) In subsections (1) and (2) “the appropriate limit” means such amount as may be prescribed, and different amounts may be prescribed in relation to different cases.

(4) The Secretary of State may by regulations provide that, in such circumstances as may be prescribed, where two or more requests for information are made to a public authority—

(a) by one person, or

(b) by different persons who appear to the public authority to be acting in concert or in pursuance of a campaign, the estimated cost of complying with any of the requests is to be taken to be the estimated total cost of complying with all of them.

(5) The Secretary of State may by regulations make provision for the purposes of this section as to the costs to be estimated and as to the manner in which they are to be estimated.