Former PC Ted Andrews

WILTSHIRE POLICE

OUTCOME OF SPECIAL CASE HEARING

NOTICE under Regulation 63 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Date of Hearing:	5th January 2026
Persons Present	
Officer Subject of Proceedings:	Former Police Constable 70914 Ted Andrews
Chief Constable Hearing the Case:	Director of People Mr. Iain Gibson
Other Person(s) Present:	PSD Investigator Lucas Wysocki, Detective Chief Inspector Deb Hatch (Federation). PC Rachel Gunn (PSD) observing.
Allegation 1:	On Saturday 20th September 2025, you were driving your vehicle in Swindon on the Magic Roundabout and were involved in some form of RTC. When passing officers have stopped to help, you have exited the driver's seat of your vehicle, a white Skoda index JA05TAA. Due to your alleged erratic behaviour, the alcohol smelt on your breath and the officers suspicion you might be under the influence of alcohol, a roadside specimen of breath was taken. You provided at the roadside, a specimen reading of 66ug and then you were arrested on suspicion of drink driving by PC 70037 Smith and then taken to Abingdon Police custody in Oxfordshire. When you have arrived at custody, you have then provided an evidential reading of 59. You were then interviewed under caution where you confirmed you were driving your vehicle which subsequently led to you being charged for 'Drive motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit', contrary to Section 5 Road Traffic Act 1988. On Tuesday 4th November 2025, the matter was heard at Oxford Magistrates Court, and you pleaded guilty to the above offence. The sentenced issued was a 16-month driving ban and along with court costs, a fine of £250 was given. **Finding:** Proven

Contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely:

- Discreditable Conduct

Rationale for Finding(s):

1. Assessing the seriousness of the misconduct:

(the officer's culpability for the misconduct; the harm caused by the misconduct; the existence of any aggravating factors and the existence of any mitigating factors)

In preparation for and during this accelerated misconduct hearing, the chair considered the following:

1 The bundle produced for the chair by the Appropriate Authority which included the following documents and items with relevant bundle page numbers shown. This bundle was read and considered in advance of the Accelerated Misconduct Hearing.

- Special Case Certificate - Page 3
- Special Case Memorandum - Pages 4 & 5
- Accelerated Misconduct Investigators report - Pages 6 - 10
- Regulation 17 Notice – PC Ted Andrews - Pages 11 - 15
- MGDD/A – Custody Drink/Drugs Procedure document - Pages 16 - 34
- MG15 – Interview record - Pages 35 - 36
- MG11 – Witness statement from PC Samual Whettam - Pages 37 - 38
- MG11 – Witness statement from A/PS Max Smith - Pages 39 - 40
- MG04 – Charge sheet - Pages 41 - 45
- Regulation 54 Response –PC Ted Andrews - Pages 46 - 47
- Mitigation offered by PC Ted Andrews - Pages 48 - 50
- Annex A – Supporting document for mitigation - Pages 51 - 56
- Letter provided by counsellor Andy Perry – 2nd November - Pages 57 -58
- Letter provided by counsellor Andy Perry – 15th December - Pages 59 - 60
- Character reference provided by PS Ryan Price - Page 61
- Character reference provided by Luke Alford - Page 62
- Character reference provided by Tony Warrington - Page 63
- Character reference provided by Fiona Bate - Page 64

2. The submissions provided by the Appropriate Authority
and former PC Andrew's representative during the Accelerated Misconduct Hearing on the 5th January 2026.

3. It should be noted that former PC Andrews elected not to attend this hearing. He was represented at the hearing by DCI Hatch who stated that she was content that the hearing proceeds in the absence of the officer.

British Policing is founded on public co-operation resulting from approval and respect for officer behaviour. The legitimacy of the service is strengthened when the public have faith in the professionalism of officers and staff; conversely it is undermined by behaviour that

erodes trust and confidence.

The public expect police officers and police staff to protect them; that is their role, and the public deserve nothing less. Public trust and confidence is essential for policing to be able to provide the best possible service. It is a privilege that must be earned and then maintained by the highest possible professional standards. Public trust and confidence is not a right – and it must be revered and respected. RV Bolton v. Law Society (1994) *"A profession's most valuable asset is its collective reputation and the confidence which that inspires"*.

In considering this hearing, the chair was mindful of the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes of Misconduct Proceedings 2022 (published in 2023). This guides that assessing the seriousness of police conduct lies at the heart of the decision on outcome under Parts 4 and 5 of the Conduct Regulations.

Whether conduct would, if proved, amount to misconduct or gross misconduct for the purposes of Regulation 14 of the Conduct Regulations is also a question of degree (i.e., seriousness).

The guidance explains that there are three stages to determining the appropriate sanction:

- assess the seriousness of the misconduct
- keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions
- choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

In assessing the seriousness of the proven conduct, the guidance gives reference to:

- the officer's culpability for the misconduct
- the harm caused by the misconduct
- the existence of any aggravating factors
- the existence of any mitigating factors

The guidance provides further assistance when considering the outcome. First it is necessary to assess the seriousness of the misconduct, taking account of any aggravating or mitigating factors.

The most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession. This dual objective must take precedence over the specific impact that the sanction has on the individual whose misconduct is being sanctioned.

Burden and Standard of Proof

The burden of proof rests entirely with the Appropriate Authority. Former PC Andrews did not need to prove anything. The standard of proof is on the balance of probabilities; whether what is alleged is more likely than not to have happened.

Allegation

The chair recognises the devastating impacts that drink driving can have on individuals, other road users and the community at large.

The chair notes that former PC Andrews has admitted to this criminal offence, and to the evidence provided by the AA, relating to the criminal conviction handed down by Oxford Magistrates Court on 4th November 2025. The chair also notes the submission

Magistrates Court on 4th November 2025. The chair also notes the submission by former PC Andrews in his Reg 54 response where he admits this allegation, its seriousness and offers some personal reflections as to the possible reasons. The chair was therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

The Appropriate Authority alleges that this conduct amounted to a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely:

1 **Discreditable Conduct** - Police Officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the Police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

The chair found that the proven conduct amounted to a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour alleged by the Appropriate Authority for the following reasons:

The proven actions of former PC Andrews, as tested in a criminal court, and admitted by former PC Andrews, in relation to his drink driving offence.

Finding of Gross Misconduct

The hearing chair had regard to the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings in his determination of the seriousness of the allegations found as proved. He noted that this guidance identifies certain categories of misconduct as being especially serious.

In making this determination, the chair has given regard to the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes on Police Misconduct Proceedings to assist him in his assessment of the seriousness of former PC Andrews actions.

Culpability

In his assessment of culpability, the chair was assisted by paragraphs 4.9-4.16 of the guidance.

Paragraph 4.9 states that culpability denotes the officer's blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions.

The chair concluded that the actions of former PC Andrews engaged this element of culpability as his actions and conduct were entirely of his own undertaking and responsibility.

Seriousness arising from conviction or caution for a criminal offence

The chair then considered his assessment of seriousness arising from a conviction or caution for a criminal offence, as detailed in paragraphs 4.17-4.25 of the guidance.
This was engaged by virtue of former PC Andrews being convicted of a criminal offence of driving a motor vehicle with alcohol levels above the legal limit.

Paragraph 4.17 of that guidance deals with cases where officers break the criminal law themselves. The guidance states that a sentence imposed by a criminal court following conviction is not necessarily a reliable guide to seriousness in misconduct hearings which

conviction is not necessarily a reliable guide to seriousness in misconduct hearings which are principally directed towards maintaining public confidence in the profession of policing. Paragraph 4.21 of this guidance states that any criminal conviction will be serious and will likely have an adverse impact on public confidence in policing.

The chair notes the sentence handed down by the court to former PC Andrews. In accordance with Paragraph 4.17, he does not rely upon that sentence in his determination of seriousness for these proceedings.

The chair concluded that the actions of former PC Andrews engaged this element of seriousness and that public confidence in policing would be negatively impacted by the conviction of former PC Andrews for a criminal offence.

Seriousness arising from harm

The chair then considered his assessment of seriousness arising from harm and was assisted by Paragraphs 4.63-4.65 of the guidance.

Paragraph 4.64 states that the types of harm caused or risked by different types of police misconduct are diverse. Victims may suffer a range of impacts including the risk of physical harm.

Paragraph 4.66 states that harm will likely undermine public confidence in policing. It states that a hearing should take into account the likelihood of how an officer's actions would be considered by the public if they were to know about it when assessing the impact of that harm.

Furthermore, paragraph 4.68 of the guidance states that "where no actual harm has resulted, consider the risks attached to the officer's behaviour, including the likelihood of harm occurring and the gravity of harm that could have resulted".

Paragraph 4.74 of the guidance states "where gross misconduct has been found and the behaviour has caused – or could have caused – serious harm to individuals, the community and/or public confidence in the police service, dismissal is likely to follow. A factor of the greatest importance is the impact of the misconduct on the standing and reputation of the profession as a whole".

The chair noted in their evidence the statements from PC Samuel Whettam and Acting Police Sergeant Max Smith, which detailed the road traffic collision and the damage to former PC Andrews car. The risks of harm to other road users and members of the public are clear to the chair. The chair therefore concluded that the actions of former PC Andrews engaged this element of seriousness.

Aggravating factors

The chair then considered his assessment of aggravating factors in this case and was assisted by Paragraphs 4.75-4.78 of the guidance.

Paragraph 4.76 lists a number of factors which indicate a higher level of culpability or harm. Of those factors, it was the chairs assessment that none of these were engaged.

Mitigating Factors

The chair then considered his assessment of mitigating factors and

The chair then considered his assessment of mitigating factors and was assisted by paragraphs 4.79-4.82 of the guidance.

From his review of Paragraph 4.81, it was his assessment that the following mitigating factors were engaged:

1 misconduct confined to a single episode or brief duration
2 open admissions at an early stage
3 evidence of genuine remorse, insight and/or accepting responsibility for one's actions

The chair noted former PC Andrews proactiveness in seeking counselling for his ADHD, his progress in completing the drink driver course offered via the magistrates court and his own personal reflections contained within his submissions.

The chair noted former PC Andrews in his submitted mitigation has stated he was diagnosed with ADHD. This condition has the potential to be a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010 on the basis of being a disability. The chair is subject to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, which prohibits discrimination, harassment or victimisation of people with protected characteristics. The chair bore this in mind even though there was no actual medical evidence contained in the bundle to support this diagnosis. However, it is not the function of the chair to carry out an assessment as to whether former PC Andrews had a disability within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010. But this did not mean that the chair should disregard this issue either. The chair considered his obligations under the Equality Act 2010 not to discriminate against former PC Andrews based on potential disability, the medical evidence, and what former PC Andrews had said about his condition in the written material in the bundle. The chair was mindful of all of this when making his decisions to ensure that his decisions were fair and consistent.

Decision

Based on all the information made available to and considered by the chair and in accordance with the guidance set out above, it was his decision that the behaviour of former PC Andrews was at the upper end of the range of seriousness.

On that basis, the chair determined that the proven actions of former PC Andrews amounted to Gross Misconduct.

2. Determination of outcome:

The purpose of the police misconduct regime is threefold:

- to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
- to uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct and
- to protect the public

The most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole.

The above outlines my decision that the actions of former PC Andrews amount to Gross Misconduct.

Regulation 62 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

62.—(1) Where the person conducting or chairing the accelerated misconduct hearing finds that the conduct of the officer or special constable to whom the case relates

that the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to gross misconduct, they must impose disciplinary action, which, subject to the provisions of this regulation, may be—

(a) a final written warning;

(b) reduction in rank, or

(c) dismissal without notice.

3. The sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose in light of the seriousness of the conduct:

Pursuant to Regulation 62(1) and given that the chair found that proven actions of former PC Andrews amounted to gross misconduct, the chair was required to imposed disciplinary action.

Former PC Andrews has already submitted his resignation from Wiltshire Police and left the force. As such, the imposition of a final written warning or reduction in rank is not engaged as a disciplinary option for consideration.

The chair concluded that had former PC Andrews not already resigned then the only proportionate outcome in this case, which satisfies the purpose of the regulatory regime; and due to the severity of the unprofessional behaviour, and the potential impacts upon the trust and confidence of our communities in policing, specifically Wiltshire Police, is the dismissal of former PC Andrews without notice.

Disciplinary Outcome: Dismissal without notice

Reasons for Decision:

In the rationale provided earlier in this document, the chair has outlined the proven actions and behaviours of former PC Andrews. In addition, the chair has provided a documented assessment and rationale for his determination of the level of seriousness in this case.

Policing is a privilege, and the actions of former PC Andrews has fallen so far below of standards of professional behaviour that dismissal without notice is, the sanction which most appropriately fulfils the need to maintain the trust and confidence of the public.

Representations by the Chair as to Publication on the Police Barred List

Insert any representations:

Following the chairs request for submissions on this point from former PC Andrews representative, none were advanced.

The hearing chair has no representations to make as to why former PC Andrews should not be placed on the Police Barred List with immediate effect.

Signature of Hearing Chair: Iain Gibson **Date: 05/01/26**

I acknowledge that I have been served with this Notice. I have read and had the document explained to me.

Signature: **Date**:

Right of Appeal

1 You may appeal to a police appeals tribunal against:-

(a) The finding; or

(b) The disciplinary action, if any, imposed in consequence of that finding; or

(c) Both.

2 A police officer may not appeal to a tribunal against a finding where that finding was made following acceptance by the officer that his conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct.

3 The grounds of appeal are:-

(a) That the finding or disciplinary action imposed was unreasonable; or

(b) That there is evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the original special case hearing which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action; or

(c) That there was a breach of the procedures or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.

4 If you wish to appeal, you must give notice of the appeal before the end of 10 working days beginning with the first working day after the day on which you are supplied with a written copy of the relevant decision.

5 The notice of appeal shall be given in writing to the relevant local policing body.

6 You may request a transcript of the proceedings (or part of the proceedings) at the original hearing in your notice of appeal.

7 This rule applies where a police officer who wishes to appeal to a tribunal wishes to give notice of the appeal after the end of the period mentioned in paragraph 4 above. A police officer may give notice of the appeal within a reasonable time after the end of such period, and the notice shall be accompanied by the reasons why it was not served within such period and the reasons for the officer's view that it has been served within a reasonable time after such period.

8 Upon receipt, the relevant local policing body shall supply a copy of the notice and the reasons to the chair who shall determine:-

(a) Whether it was reasonably practicable for the notice to be given within the period mentioned in paragraph 4 above; and

(b) Whether the notice has been given within a reasonable time after the end of such period.

9 If the chair determines either that it was reasonably practicable for the notice to be given within such period or that the notice has not been given within a reasonable time after the end of such period, the appeal shall be dismissed.

10 Where the appeal is not dismissed under paragraph 9 above, the appeal shall proceed and the chair shall give directions for the application of the rules to the appeal.

Your appeal should be given in writing to the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner in accordance with the Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020 (Postal Address: The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, Police Headquarters, London Road, Devizes, Wiltshire SN10 2DN