# MISCONDUCT HEARING OF PC TIMOTHY MASON

# HELD AT FORCE HEADQUARTERS ON 18 DECEMBER 2025

# RECORD OF DETERMINATIONS

## Introduction

1. This is the record of determinations made by a panel at misconduct proceedings brought under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended ("the Regulations"), against PC Timothy Mason ("PC Mason").

## The allegation

2. The panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in relation to PC Mason which stated as follows:

"It is alleged that your conduct as [sic] breached the standards of professional behaviour as follows:

**1. Facts**

1.1 You were employed by Nottinghamshire Police having commenced employment on17 [sic] January 2014. At all material times, you were employed as a response officer.
1.2 On 18 December 2023, you submitted a request for annual leave on the Force system Crown DMS for 4 July 2024 to 19 July 2024.
1.3 You were rostered to work 14 July 2024 between 0700 and 1700 hours.
1.4 Sunday 14 July 2024 was a restricted absence day and as such your request for leave on this date was refused. All other dates you had requested were authorised.
1.5 On 19 December 2023, you spoke with PS Wake via telephone and requested that she look at the annual leave request that you had made, as a single day, namely 14 July 2024, had been declined as that date had been identified as a date when annual leave was restricted.
1.6 Thereafter at 2137 hours, you sent an email to PS Wake and confirmed those details at paragraph 1.5. above and restricted whether the restriction relating to annual leave *could be overridden*.
1.7 You confirmed within the same email that you were yet to have booked a holiday.
1.8 You thereafter booked a holiday on or about 3 January 2024, to take place between 5 July and 15 July 2024.
1.9 At 1434 hours on 30 January 2024, PS Wake sent an email to the duties team requesting that the decision to decline your annual leave request be reviewed. That email was provided to Chief Inspector Collings who replied that unless further rationale was provided *at this stage I'll have to decline.* PS Wake was provided with that email at 1458 hour [sic].
1.10 Thereafter at 1715 hours, PS Wake sent you an email confirming that she was *getting some push back* and requested that you provide further

information so that she could go back to the Chief Inspector with the same.

1.11 You viewed that email at approximately 1914 and/or 1919 and/or 1920 hours.

1.12 You did not provide a response to that email.

1.13 You failed to provide any further information to PS Wake or Chief Inspector Collings.

1.14 You checked the Force system Crown DMS on 24 June 2024 and/or 25 June 2024 and/or 26 June 2024. The information contained on the system confirmed that your request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised and/or it showed that you were rostered to work on 14 July 2024 between 0700 to 1700 hours.

1.15 You knew and/or ought to have known that you were due to attend your rostered shift on 14 July 2024.

1.16 You knew and/or ought to have known that your request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised.

1.17 You failed to attend work on 14 July 2024.

2. **Particulars of misconduct**

2.1 Your conduct between paragraphs 1.10 to 1.17

2.1.1 Lacked integrity as you knew that your annual leave had not been authorised and that you were due to attend work on 14 July 2024, but you failed to attend

2.1.2 Is likely to undermine public confidence in the police

2.1.3 Failed to carry out your duties efficiently as you failed to attend work when you were rostered to do so

3. **The conduct if proved amounts to gross misconduct for the following reasons**

3.1 Your conduct undermines public trust and confidence

3.2 Your conduct undermines the trust and confidence that the Force can place in you as you failed to attend work when rostered to do so

3.3 Your conduct was sustained as you knew that your request for leave had been refused but failed to take any steps to update the Force as to your position

4. **Standards of Behaviour engaged are**

4.1 Honesty and Integrity

4.2 Duties and Responsibilities

4.3 Discreditable Conduct”

**Representation**

3. Throughout the hearing the Appropriate Authority (‘AA’) has been represented by Ms Briggs. PC Mason was represented by PC Jasmine Chaplain.

**Regulation 31 response**

4. PC Mason's Regulation 31 response summarised his position as follows:

"PC Mason acknowledges that he failed to attend work on 14 July 2024, a date for which his leave request had been declined. He accepts that this was an error and that it fell short of the standards expected. However, he firmly denies any dishonesty or intention to deceive. He submits that his actions do not constitute Gross Misconduct but rather amount to a breach at the level of Misconduct. TM states that he had the honest held belief that the leave was authorized based on his conversation with T/Insp Wake in December 2023."

5. At the outset of the hearing PC Chaplain confirmed, on PC Mason's behalf, that:
    a. as to the facts, he:
        i. admitted paragraphs 1.1 to 1.14 and 1.17 of the Regulation 30 notice;
        ii. denied paragraphs 1.15 and 1.16 of the Regulation 30 notice;
    b. as to the "particulars of misconduct", he:
        i. denied paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of the Regulation 30 notice;
        ii. admitted paragraph 2.1.3 of the Regulation 30 notice;
    c. he denied Gross Misconduct in its entirety;
    d. he admitted breaching the Standard relating to Duties and Responsibilities to the level of Misconduct, but denied breaching the Standards relating to Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct.

**The panel's approach**

6. The Panel took the following approach:

    a. First, to consider the facts of the case and to make findings in relation to each of the facts alleged by the AA;
    b. Second, to determine whether those facts found proved constituted one or more breach(es) of the relevant Standards;
    c. Third, to determine whether the conduct found proven against PC Mason amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct;
    d. Fourth, if appropriate, to decide what the outcome should be.

7. The panel reminded itself that the burden of proof is on the AA throughout and that the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities, namely what is more likely than not.

8. The panel also reminded itself of the Home Office Guidance and, in particular, paragraph 9.10 which reads as follows: "In deciding matters of fact, the persons conducting the misconduct meeting or hearing must apply the standard of proof required in civil cases, that is, the balance of probabilities. Conduct will be proved on the balance of probabilities if the persons conducting the meeting or hearing are satisfied by the evidence that it is more likely than not that the conduct occurred. The balance of probabilities is a single unvarying standard (i.e. there is no sliding scale). The seriousness of the allegation of misconduct and/or the seriousness of the consequences for the officer do not require a

different standard of proof, merely appropriately careful consideration by the panel before it is satisfied of the matter which has to be established. The inherent probability or improbability of the conduct occurring is itself a matter to be taken into account when deciding whether, on the balance of probabilities, the conduct occurred."

9. The panel had before it a bundle of evidence adduced by the AA. In addition it was provided at the outset of the hearing with a bundle of testimonials in support of PC Mason.

10. During the hearing the panel heard oral evidence from PS Wake and from PC Mason himself.

## Character

11. The panel noted the evidence before it of PC Mason's good character and noted that such evidence was potentially relevant to his credibility as a witness and to his propensity to behave in the way alleged, per Collins J in *Wisson v Health Professions Council* [2013] EWHC 1036 (Admin) at [44]: "As it seems to me, good character must always be likely to be relevant for the panel where there is a substantial issue of fact to be decided and where credibility of the registrant in the evidence that he gives, is an issue and it can also go to whether it is likely that he did what is alleged against him. Both aspects were prima facie material in relation to the findings that the panel had to make and the circumstances of this case."

## The panel's findings

### Alleged facts

Paragraph 1.1-1.14 and 1.17

12. The panel found paragraphs 1.1 to 1.14 inclusive, and 1.17, proved on the basis of PC Mason's admissions, which it considered proper, unequivocal and wholly consistent with the evidence before it.

Paragraphs 1.15 and 1.16

13. The panel then considered paragraphs 1.15 and 1.16 of the Regulation 30 notice. It took the view that both of these paragraphs addressed essentially the same issue in different terms. It was the AA's case that PC Mason "knew and/or ought to have known that [he was] due to attend [his] rostered shift on 14 July 2024" precisely because "[he] knew and/or ought to have known that [his] request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised".

14. Neither paragraph 1.15 nor paragraph 1.16 of the Regulation 30 notice specified clearly the point at which the AA alleged that PC Mason "knew and/or ought to have known" that his request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised, and therefore that he was due to attend his rostered shift on the same date. Nevertheless it appeared from the way in which the AA's case

had been presented, the crux and principle "mischief" (set out in paragraph 1.17 of the Regulation 30 notice) of which related to PC Mason's alleged (and admitted) failure to attend work on 14 July 2024 – and indeed from paragraphs 1.15 and 1.16 themselves – that the key point at which his state of knowledge was relevant and had the potential to become a matter of misconduct was 14 July 2024 itself.

15. In order to consider PC Mason's state of knowledge on 14 July 2024, however, the panel felt it necessary to consider his state of knowledge as to whether (both) his leave request had been authorised, and (therefore) whether he was required to attend his rostered shift on 14 July 2024, throughout the period leading up to that date after he submitted his request for annual leave on 18 December 2023.

16. It was not in dispute that PC Mason knew in December 2023 that his request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised when he received a notification to that effect.

17. Subsequently, however, following a telephone conversation with PS Wake on 19 December 2023, it was his evidence (as set out in his Regulation 18 response) that he came to believe that his request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 was authorised:

    "Due to the length of time between then and now, I cannot remember the exact words used during the conversation, but I know that Inspector Wake was very supportive of my leave, and I left the conversation with the belief that she was sorting it, and it was authorised."

18. At PS Wake's request, PC Mason then (later on 19 December 2023, at 2137 hours) sent an email to PS Wake in the following terms:

    "Ma'am,

    As discussed, tried to book my two weeks leave for our family holiday. Had the 14th July rejected right in the middle due to Euro 24 staffing.

    Haven't booked anything yet, but if this could be overridden, it would be very much appreciated.

    I've cc'd in Nathan of the Lewis variety [PC Mason's then line manager] for reference."

19. PS Wake's oral evidence to the panel was that she had been clear on the telephone with PC Mason on 19 December 2023 that she could not herself authorise his annual leave request in relation to 14 July 2024. She said in her witness statement:

    "I advised PC 3749 MASON whilst on the phone that I could not authorise his request myself and it would need to go to Silver Command for review. I informed PC 3739 MASON to explain the reasons why he was requesting the

leave on a restricted date and I would put the request forward to RMU for review on his behalf. I asked PC 3749 MASON to confirm the details via email as I get numerous requests for annual leave from officers on a daily basis."

20. PS Wake told the panel that in nine out of ten cases she was able to authorise annual leave herself, rather than having to refer a request elsewhere for approval.

21. The panel noted that, although PC Mason emailed PS Wake as requested later the same day, PS Wake did not contact RMU in relation to his request until 30 January 2024.

22. The panel considered very carefully whether, as at the end of December 2023, PC Mason knew that his request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised, and therefore that he was due to attend his rostered shift on the same date. On the balance of probabilities the panel was not so satisfied. Although PS Wake was certain in her oral evidence that she had made it clear to PC Mason that it was not her "gift to give", the panel noted that her witness statement – to similar effect – was dated 20 November 2024, some 11 months after the telephone conversation to which it related. The panel was provided with no contemporaneous notes of the conversation, and indeed was informed by Ms Briggs that no such notes existed. In the panel's view this undermined the extent to which it could safely rely on PS Wake's recollection of her telephone conversation with PC Mason. PC Mason, on the other hand, had been consistent in his evidence – beginning with his Regulation 18 response, dated 12 August 2024, and then at interview in October 2024 and to this panel – that PS Wake gave him the impression that his leave request for 14 July 2024 was authorised. The panel found persuasive PC Mason's explanation in oral evidence that the reason he subsequently requested, in his email to PS Wake dated 19 December 2023, that his declined leave request for 14 July 2024 "be overridden" was because he considered the only issue outstanding to be the administrative overriding of the DMS. Given that PS Wake did not subsequently contact or speak to PC Mason about his email, until hers dated 30 January 2024, and given the evidence before it that PC Mason then proceeded to book his family holiday in early January 2024, the panel considered it more likely than not that, as at the end of December 2023, PC Mason believed that his request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had been authorised.

23. The panel was presented with an email, dated 30 January 2024 at 1434 hours, from PS Wake to "RMU Events" (copied to PC Mason) in the following terms:

"Hi RMU Events,

Please can the below request be considered in order for them to be able to book a family holiday, it is a Sunday dayshift and he has had the leave authorised the set before and after that one day.

Please can this be looked at accordingly.

Kind regards

Vanessa”

24. The panel noted that, later on 30 January 2024, having received an email from RMU containing Chief Inspector Clive Collings’s rejection of this request, PS Wake emailed PC Mason in the following terms (as a reply to PC Mason’s prior email dated 19 December 2023):

“ Tim,

Can you give me a bit more in relation to the below, as in this is the only time you and your wife can get the time off together because of what she does etc etc, I'm getting some push back and I'd like to have a bit more ammunition to go back to the CI with.

If you can get it to me tonight then I can chase it again tomorrow as I'm on days.

Thanks

Vanessa”

25. It was not disputed – indeed, the panel had already found proved on the basis of PC Mason’s admission – that PC Mason viewed PS Wake’s latter email quoted above at 1914 hours, 1919 hours and 1920 hours on 30 January 2024. The technical audit data before the panel did not assist it with the length of time the email was viewed on PC Mason’s computer screen, or whether (or when) it was viewed on any other occasion, but PC Mason’s evidence was that he could not recall having seen the email at the time it was received (or since, prior to July 2024), but that he may have viewed it on screen very briefly while navigating between other messages in his inbox on the evening of 30 January 2024.

26. The panel considered very carefully whether, in the light of PS Wake’s emails, as at the end of January 2024, PC Mason knew that his request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised, and therefore that he was due to attend his rostered shift on the same date. On the balance of probabilities the panel was not so satisfied. Notwithstanding the (agreed and proven) fact that PC Mason did view PS Wake’s latter email at 1914 hours, 1919 hours and 1920 hours on 30 January 2024, the panel noted that PC Mason did not reply to it. It also accepted PC Mason’s evidence that, had he read it and had he therefore known that his request for annual leave had (still) not been authorised, he would have done something about it, and could have spoken to PS Wake, provided a compelling rationale for the consideration of Chief Inspector Collings, or indeed amended the dates of his holiday (for which he had only, at that point, paid a deposit). The panel considered that the fact that he did not take any of those actions supported his contention that, as at the end of January 2024, he did not know that his request for leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised.

27. The panel further considered whether PC Mason knew that his request for annual leave had not been authorised, and therefore that he was due to attend his rostered shift on the same date, as at 14 July 2024. It was the AA's contention that he must have done so, given the undisputed (and indeed admitted) fact that he "checked the Force system Crown DMS on 24 June 2024 and/or 25 June 2024 and/or 26 June 2024", and that "the information contained on the system confirmed that [PC Mason's] request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 had not been authorised and/or it showed that [he was] rostered to work on 14 July 2024 between 0700 to 1700 hours.

28. Although PC Mason accepted that he had "checked the Force system Crown DMS on 24 June 2024 and/or 25 June 2024 and/or 26 June 2024", his evidence was that he had significant difficulties accessing Force computer systems around that time and that, even if he had viewed his duties "workbench" on DMS on one or more of those dates, he did not notice prior to departing on leave in early July 2024 that his request for annual leave on 14 July 2024 continued to display as unauthorised. He told the panel that he did not think he would, at that point, have seen on his screen the complete entry in relation to 14 July 2024 in any event, as only a certain number of days were typically displayed at a time. Although the AA adduced technical audit data exhibited by an analyst as to PC Mason's (apparently repeated) access to DMS in the last week of June 2024, it did not consider that this assisted it in determining whether or not the evidence given by PC Mason was correct.

29. The panel did, however, hear evidence that PC Mason had been open with colleagues before departing on annual leave in early July 2024 that he was travelling with his family to Marrakesh, and indeed that he was in contact with his Sergeant while there. It also noted contemporaneous evidence which corroborated PC Mason's assertion that his access to Force systems had been limited during the days preceding his departure on leave, and accepted PC Mason's evidence that he had experienced a number of challenging and indeed traumatic events in the course of duty during the period between January 2024 (when he booked his family holiday) and July 2024 (when he took it).

30. The panel also noted the significant quantity of evidence before it as to PC Mason's character, much of which described him as dedicated to his role, helpful to others, honest, hard-working and professional. It gave this evidence some weight in support of both his credibility as a witness and his propensity to commit misconduct, which the panel considered to be low.

31. In all the circumstances, having reviewed all the evidence before it, the panel was not satisfied that the AA had proved that it was more likely than not that, as at 14 July 2024, PC Mason knew that his request for annual leave in relation to that date had not been authorised, or that he was due to attend his rostered shift on the same date. Indeed, given his unashamed openness about his family holiday, his continued contact with colleagues while away, and his having not at any point taken further steps to secure its authorisation after December 2023, the panel considered it more likely than not that he did not, and that his surprise on returning to duty and being served with misconduct papers in relation to his absence on 14 July 2024 was genuine.

32. The panel was, however, satisfied that PC Mason ought to have known both that his request for annual leave in relation to 14 July 2024 had not been authorised, and that he was due to attend his rostered shift on the same date. Its basis for this finding is the emails he received from PS Wake on 30 January 2024, which made clear that, as at that date, his leave remained unauthorised. Although the panel accepted PC Mason's evidence that he had not – as a matter of fact – read or digested the contents of those emails on that date (or at all, until he departed on leave in July 2024) it was in no doubt that he should have done so. The panel agreed with PC Mason that "personal administration" is important and is indeed a vital enabler of his important frontline policing responsibilities. It should have been obvious to PC Mason, following PS Wake's emails of 30 January 2024 (and indeed in the light of the DMS "workbench", which showed 14 July 2024 as unauthorised when he departed on leave earlier that month), that his annual leave request for 14 July 2024 had not been authorised. The fact that it was not was down to him.

Particulars of misconduct

33. The panel then went on to consider whether, as a matter of fact, it found the pleaded "particulars of misconduct" in the Regulation 30 notice proved.

34. Paragraph 2.1.1 of the Regulation 30 notice stated that PC Mason's "conduct between paragraphs 1.10 to 1.17 … [lacked] integrity as [he] knew that [his] annual leave had not been authorised and that [he was] due to attend work on 14 July 2024, but [he] failed to attend". PC Mason denied this paragraph. Given the panel's findings, set out above, that PC Mason did not know that his annual leave had not been authorised and that he was due to attend work on 14 July 2024, the panel was not satisfied that this paragraph of the Regulation 30 notice was proved. In its view, no lack of integrity arose.

35. Paragraph 2.1.2 of the Regulation 30 notice stated that PC Mason's "conduct between paragraphs 1.10 to 1.17 … [is] likely to undermine public confidence in the police". PC Mason denied this paragraph. In the panel's view, however, PC Mason's conduct at paragraphs 1.15, 1.16 and 1.17 (taken together) would undoubtedly undermine public confidence in the police. Given their important role in ensuring public safety, the public would expect police officers to take care to ensure they understand whether their requests for annual leave have been authorised, and – therefore – to attend work when rostered to do so. The fact that PC Mason did not take such care, and did not therefore attend duty as required, must therefore inevitably undermine public confidence in the police, albeit not to a high level.

36. Paragraph 2.1.3 of the Regulation 30 notice stated that PC Mason's "conduct between paragraphs 1.10 to 1.17 … [failed] to carry out [his] duties efficiently as [he] failed to attend work when [he was] rostered to do so". PC Mason admitted this paragraph, and the panel agreed.

**Alleged breaches**

37. Having made its findings of fact, the panel then went on to consider whether those facts it had found proved amounted to breaches of one or more of the Standards of Professional Behaviour identified in the Regulation 30 notice.

38. The panel noted the AA's allegation that PC Mason's conduct breached the Standards relating to Honesty and Integrity, Duties and Responsibilities, and Discreditable Conduct.

39. The panel made no finding that PC Mason's conduct lacked integrity. In the light of its conclusion that he did not know that his annual leave request was not authorised on 14 July 2024, and that he was therefore required to work his rostered duties on that date, the panel was not satisfied that PC Mason's conduct breached the Standard relating to Honesty and Integrity.

40. As to the Standard relating to Duties and Responsibilities, the panel accepted PC Mason's admission – which it found both proper and unequivocal – and was entirely satisfied that, by the facts it had found proved under paragraphs 15 to 17, taken together, he breached the Standard relating to Duties and Responsibilities.

41. The panel further considered the AA's allegation that PC Mason's conduct breached the Standard relating to Discreditable Conduct. Given its finding that his conduct at paragraphs 1.15, 1.16 and 1.17 (taken together) would undoubtedly undermine public confidence in the police, the panel had no alternative but to find that PC Mason's conduct also breached the Standard relating to Discreditable Conduct.

**Gross Misconduct/Misconduct**

42. Having found breaches of the Standards as set out above, the panel has carefully considered whether those breaches amounted to gross misconduct or misconduct. Under the Regulations, misconduct means a breach of the Standards that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action and gross misconduct means a breach of the Standards that is so serious as to justify dismissal (Regulation 2(1)).

43. The panel reminded itself of the full circumstances of this case and the breaches of the Standards that it has found.

44. The AA's position was that PC Mason's conduct amounted to gross misconduct. On his behalf, PC Chaplain submitted that it did not, but that he accepted his admitted conduct amounted to misconduct.

45. In determining this matter the panel made an assessment of the seriousness of PC Mason's proven conduct, taking into account what it considered to be his culpability and any harm caused by his conduct, and including any relevant aggravating and mitigating features (excluding personal mitigation).

46. In the panel's view, PC Mason's conduct involved a relatively low level of culpability. His proven wrongdoing was not deliberate and involved no

malicious intent, although the panel was clear that it was entirely avoidable had PC Mason checked and maintained his email inbox with more care. Similarly, the harm caused by his wrongdoing was at a relatively low level: the reputational consequences to Nottinghamshire Police of an officer failing to attend work as required on a single occasion, having failed to effectively manage and monitor his annual leave requests, are real but not of the most damaging kind; and there was no evidence before the panel that his absence on 14 July 2024 had any impact on policing and/or public safety.

47. After careful consideration the panel was satisfied that PC Mason's proven conduct was so serious as to justify disciplinary action, but was not so serious as to justify dismissal. It therefore found his conduct to amount to misconduct, but not gross misconduct.

## Outcome

### Principles

48. In considering the appropriate disciplinary outcome the panel reminded itself of, and reviewed, the latest version of the Outcomes Guidance.

49. It also considered the three-stage, structured approach in *Fuglers LLP v SRA* [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin) when assessing outcome, at paragraph 28:

> "There are three stages to the approach which should be adopted by a Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal in determining sanction. The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the misconduct. The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose for which sanctions are imposed by such a tribunal. The third stage is to choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question."

50. This three-stage approach is reflected in the Outcomes Guidance. As to the first stage (seriousness), the Outcomes Guidance directs attention to four central reference points, as stated in *Fuglers* at paragraph 29 and now repeated in the Outcomes Guidance at part 4:
    a. The officer's culpability for the misconduct;
    b. The harm caused by the misconduct;
    c. The existence of any aggravating factors;
    d. The existence of any mitigating factors.

51. The second stage requires the panel to keep in mind the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime, namely to:
    a. maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
    b. uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct;
    c. protect the public.

52. As set out in part 4 of the Outcomes Guidance: "The most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the policing profession as a whole. This dual objective must take

precedence over the specific impact that the sanction has on the individual whose misconduct is being sanctioned".

53. The panel reminded itself that the object of misconduct proceedings is not to punish police officers and that it should consider less severe outcomes before more severe outcomes, choosing the least severe outcome which adequately addresses the issues identified while protecting the public interest. It has kept in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions and the need to choose a sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

**Matters relevant to outcome**

54. The panel has considered all of the relevant evidence in this case and the entirety of the factual context. This included evidence relating to PC Mason's record of service and character.

55. The panel noted that the evidence presented to it at the outcome stage on behalf of the AA included some references to other recent concerns about PC Mason's conduct. Given that those concerns had not been considered at a hearing and were disputed on behalf of PC Mason, and having heard no material submissions in relation to them on behalf of the AA, the panel recognised their potential prejudicial effect and determined to disregard them.

56. The panel also carefully considered the oral submissions of both parties, for which it was very grateful.

**Culpability**

57. As to PC Mason's culpability, the panel considered the following matter listed in the Outcomes Guidance (only) to be relevant:

    a. PC Mason should reasonably have foreseen the risk of harm arising from his conduct (Outcomes Guidance, paragraph 4.11).

58. It therefore considered PC Mason's culpability to be towards the lower end of the spectrum.

**Harm**

59. As to the harm caused by PC Mason's conduct, the panel accepted that there was no evidence before it as to any actual harm suffered by any individual or group, or to policing on 14 July 2024, or to public safety. The panel heard that adequate staff were available to deliver the policing service in Newark on 14 July 2024, and no requirement was set for PC Mason to undertake any other specialist role which meant that public safety was compromised by his absence for one day. Nevertheless, PC Mason's conduct did give rise to such a risk. Furthermore, it was the panel's view that PC Mason's actions would, if known to the public, undermine its confidence in the police, albeit not to a high level.

60. The panel therefore considered the level of harm that could result from PC Mason's proven conduct to be towards the lower end of the spectrum.

**Aggravating and mitigating factors**

61. The panel then considered the relevant aggravating and mitigating factors.

62. It did not consider any of the aggravating factors listed in the Outcomes Guidance to be relevant.

63. It considered the following mitigating factors to be relevant:

    a. PC Mason's misconduct related to a single incident, a single date of unauthorised absence from duty.
    b. PC Mason's involvement in the misconduct was limited in extent.
    c. PC Mason made open admissions at an early stage.
    d. PC Mason had demonstrated genuine remorse and insight and had accepted responsibility for his actions.

64. The panel also took into account the extensive personal character evidence adduced on PC Mason's behalf. It noted that there was no evidence of any prior incidents of misconduct and that he was described by numerous colleagues and others as a highly effective police officer. Nevertheless it noted the guidance at paragraph 6.4 of the Outcomes Guidance that the weight to be given to these factors (relating to personal mitigation) was necessarily limited.

**The purpose of imposing sanctions**

65. The panel kept in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions, namely:
    a. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;
    b. To uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct; and
    c. To protect the public.

**Conclusion**

66. The panel has already explained its conclusion that the level of both PC Mason's culpability and the harm liable to be caused by his wrongdoing was relatively low.

67. In determining the appropriate disciplinary outcome, the panel first considered whether a Written Warning would maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service, uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct, and protect the public. In all the circumstances, in the light of its findings as to seriousness, the panel concluded that a Written Warning would be sufficient to satisfy these purposes. A Written Warning would send a message to PC Mason that his conduct was serious and must not be repeated, and would convey to the wider police service and to the public the importance placed by Chief Officers of Nottinghamshire Police on officers attending

rostered duties as required and managing and monitoring effectively and efficiently their annual leave requests.

68. The panel did consider whether a Final Written Warning was necessary, but concluded that such an outcome would be disproportionate to the culpability and harm involved in this matter, and was not the least severe outcome necessary to achieve the purpose of imposing a sanction.

69. That concludes the panel's determinations.

**Assistant Chief Constable Gary Hooks**
**Chair**

**Colin Braziel**
**IPM**

**Louise Graham**
**IPM**

**18 December 2025**