

In cases where the perpetrator is identified and admits to the crime, a resolution outside of the courtroom can be reached for offenders of low-level crime and antisocial behavior, such as vandalism and graffiti. Only low-level repeat offenders are appropriate candidates for the OOC. There has been an increase in out-of-court dispositions for adults and minors since 1998. For many years, out-of-court penalties and other similar interventions have been available to deal with minor offenses without the need for a court appearance (O'Brien, 2019). There have been formal and informal versions of the "police caution," An officer warn an offender about their conduct and record it, both dating back to the dawn of policing for decades. Traffic offenses likespeeding are routinely dealt with by using a fixed penalty notice issued by the police, allowing the offender to discharge liability for the offense by paying a monetary penalty or requesting a court hearing. In the early stages of criminal behavior, out-of-court dispositions for repeat offenders are an "important tool." They allow the police to deal with them swiftly and without the courts for minor offenses. To make the most efficient use of officers' time, they can provide a satisfactory outcome for the public while allowing officers to devote more time to front-line duties, such as tackling more serious crime" (Neyroud, 2018). Out-of-court dispositions currently have six formal outcomes that police can use when an individhgful receives one. There is also a wide range of positive, rehabilitative informal diversionary activity outside the formal out-of-court disposition framework. It has been suggested that the Ministry of Justice, in its Sentencing White Paper published in September 2020, consider a simplified two-tiered framework with an "upper tier" or "lower tier" disposal that would replace the current system's complexity and inconsistency (Griffiths and Norris, 2020, P.26). Here, in this paper, we outline some of the key lessons that must guide the implementation of this reform—most importantly, to use it to de-escalate individuals' contact with the criminal justice system and inform better and compensate victims. For low-level offenses, this means that out-of-court resolutions are often a more appropriate and effective response than court prosecution. De escalation is the process of halting an individual's upward trajectory through the criminal justice system, which is why out-of-court dispositions are most effective (Booth et al., 2012). As a best-case scenario, de-escalation means that people who would have gone to court and those who would have received a formal out-of-court disposition get a lesser, shorter diversion (Padfield, 2010, P.6). A court fine or conditional discharge is rarely more problem-solving than an out-of-court settlement when it is properly implemented. They give people a chance to address and resolve the underlying causes of criminal behavior. This includes everything from helping people get treatment for drug, alcohol, and mental health issues to helping them understand the impact of their crime and make reparations to victims and the community. This would appear to be a much fitting process in relation to reduction of ctme and allowing crime to be resolved before reaching the criminal courts. This also helps reduce the cost to the government and appears to be a more positive approach. Suppose people's contact with the criminal justice system is minimized. In that case, out-of-court dispositions can be an effective and appropriate response to low-level crime. As a result of these changes, the police and others who implement them will not have to start from the ground up. For out of-court settlements to live up to the White Paper's promise of a more intelligent approach, we must build on the growing body of evidence and practice from which we derived our seven lessons.

Investigating this essay led me to the conclusion that Out Of Court Disposals are an effective way of managing offenders in relation to the prevention of re-offending. As previously stated studies have proven that OOCDS are a positive way of reducing harm to the victims and the offenders whilst reducing re-offending figures.

Fixed penalty notices are a way of disposal and will continue to be used however studies show that OOCDS are having a wider impact on the community and are the preferred method of disposal by officers also. OOCDS can have conditions attached to them which ensures the offender has to abide by certain rules or an agreement, this has educational value and allows offenders to see the impact they have had on their victim.

It is clear that OOCDS are still very new to police forces but are being used significantly more throughout the UK. Restorative Justice can be used to benefit both the victim and the offender which is why it is more commonly used. I have investigated studies available and as a result I found that to use Restorative Justice the offender has to plead guilty to the offence and that Restorative Justice can only be used in certain circumstances, this depends on the seriousness of the crime and the offenders criminal history. Conducting research into Restorative Justice and OOCDS area clearly a useful tool and benefit all persons involved on most occasions.