IN THE MATTER OF POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (as amended)

RE: Former Constable (Officer A)

Friday 19th December 2025

DECISION OF THE PANEL

1) The Alleged Conduct is set out in the Regulation 30 Notice and is said to be in breach of the Standards relating to Honesty and Integrity, Authority, Respect and Courtesy, Orders and Instructions and Discreditable Conduct.

2)Response to the Allegations

In correspondence dated the 13th of June 2025, PC A stated through his legal representatives that he did not intend to contest the three allegations against him. The former officer was interviewed on two occasions and provided no comment interviews. He has provided a limited response to the regulation 30 notice via his solicitors.

3)The Standards of Professional Behaviour are contained in Schedule 2 of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020:

a. Honesty and Integrity

Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

b. Authority, Respect and Courtesy

Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.

c. Orders and Instructions

Police officers only give and carry out lawful orders and instructions.

Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders.

d. 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.

Police officers report any action taken against them for a criminal offence, any conditions imposed on them by a court or the receipt of any penalty notice.

e. The Panel additionally considered the appropriate paragraphs pertaining to the Standard as set out in the Home Office Guidance and the Code of Ethics.

4) Preliminary Issues

Prior to the hearing the Chair made the following directions:

(a) That the hearing be in public,

(b) That Notice of the hearing be published,

(c) That the officer be granted anonymity and referred to as Officer A, in order to safeguard the welfare of vulnerable third parties and the former officer himself. This was an exceptional decision made after consideration of representations and extensive medical evidence.

(d) That no witnesses were required to attend the hearing.

5)The Panel's Approach

The Panel determined it was: -

a. Required to consider the facts of the case and to make its findings of fact in relation to the disputed allegation;

b. Determine whether those findings of fact found constitute a breach of the relevant standard;

c. Determine whether the conduct, if found proven against the officer amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct.

The Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof is on the Appropriate Authority throughout, and that the standard of proof is the balance of probability, namely what is more likely than not.

d. The Panel also reminded itself of the relevant paragraph from the Home Office Guidance: - "2.265. The more serious the allegation of misconduct that is made or the more serious the consequences for the individual which flow from a finding against him or her, the more persuasive (cogent) the evidence will need to be to meet that standard. This does not mean that the standard is higher. It means only that the inherent probability or improbability of the conduct occurring is itself a matter to be considered when weighing the probability and deciding whether on balance the conduct occurred.

2.266. Therefore, in deciding whether the alleged conduct of a police officer is proven or not, the person(s) conducting the misconduct meeting/hearing will need to exercise reasonable judgement and give appropriate careful consideration to the evidence."

e. Purpose of misconduct meeting/hearing

The purpose of a formal misconduct meeting/hearing is to:

Give the Police Officer a fair opportunity to make his or her case having considered the

investigation report including supporting documents and to put forward any factors the Police Officer wishes to be considered in mitigation (in addition to the submission which must be sent in advance to the person(s) conducting or chairing the meeting/hearing for his, her or their consideration).

Decide if the conduct of the Police Officer fell below the standards set out in the Standards of Professional Behaviour based on the balance of probabilities and having regard to all of the evidence and circumstances.

6)Proceeding in PC A's absence

PC A resigned from Merseyside Police on the 2nd July 2023.

Ms Ashcroft on behalf of the AA invited the panel to proceed with the hearing in the absence of former officer. In determining whether to adjourn the hearing or proceed in the absence of the former officer the panel had regard to the purpose of police misconduct hearings, the overall interests of justice and fairness to both the former officer and the AA.

Regulation 37(3)(b) provides authority for the proposition that the proceedings may be proceeded with and concluded in the absence of the former officer. The Panel considered whether he had expressly or impliedly evidenced an intention not to take part in the proceedings and that any decision to proceed in the absence of the former officer should be made with the upmost care and caution.

The panel noted that PC A had set out in his Regulation 54 Response that he would not attend the hearing. The Panel is satisfied that as such he has voluntarily absented himself.

The panel considered the strong public interest in the expeditious conclusion of cases of this nature and the impact of further delay on the wellbeing of the former officer.
The panel therefore concluded that it was both fair and in the interests of justice to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the former officer.

Accordingly, the proceedings will take place as per the modifications set out in Schedule 1 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

7) The Facts

In our deliberations, we make it plain that the Panel reviewed and considered the entirety of the facts and evidence presented to us.
The burden is on the AA throughout to prove its case. Mr A does not have to prove (or disprove) anything. The Panel were cognizant of this throughout, particularly as the former officer was not in attendance.

8)Background

PC A joined Merseyside Police in April 2004. His last posting was as part of a Roads Policing attachment.

9) Findings of the Panel

Our findings are as follows: -

A) Allegation One

This relates to the former officer allegedly having contacted sex workers on various dates between the 9th of December 2020 and the 4th of August 2022.
This took place whilst he was on and off duty, 31 contacts being whilst on duty and 8 whilst off duty.
On the 4th of June 2022, there is CCTV footage that demonstrates that the former officer was in part police uniform when visiting a sex worker and that, on the same day, he visited a sex worker that he had previously stop checked in the course of his duties.

Analysis of billing date from a mobile number attributed to the former officer shows that between the relevant dates he had been in mobile phone contact via calls and SMS messages with numbers which have been attributed to adult sex workers and escorts. Some of those identified were classed as vulnerable adults.

There were more than 80 instances where the former officer contacted the relevant numbers, and a significant number took place when he was on duty.

A trawl of his internet search history showed that he frequently accessed adult web sites on which some of the sex workers advertise their services.

A covert investigation discovered that the former officer visited locations that were associated with sex workers at or around the time that he was also in contact with phone numbers attributed to them.

A production order was obtained in relation to the former officer's bank accounts for the period 1st November 2020 to the 15th of June 2022. There were 147 ATM cash withdrawals during the relevant period.

A pattern was identified between the various strands of evidence, such as ANPR, cash withdrawals, cell site data and calls that show withdrawals of cash at or around the time the former officer contacted sex workers or was in areas frequented by them.

One such sex worker is, by her own admission, a drug user and engages in sex work to fund her addiction. She also suffers with poor mental health. Billing data shows that the former officer contacted her on 11 occasions using two different numbers attributed to her between February and June 2022.

B) Decisions on the facts alleged.

The Panel reminded itself of the burden and standard of proof.

On the totality of the evidence, the Panel is entirely satisfied that PC A was in regular contact with and accessed the services of sex workers whilst largely on duty but also whilst off duty and that the contact was not for a proper policing purpose. The Panel considers that the former officer behaved as he did for his own sexual gratification.

The Panel finds this allegation proved to the requisite standard.

Decision on the Standard relating to Discreditable Conduct

a. Having made findings of fact, we moved on to consider the standard in relation to Discreditable Conduct. This says amongst other points that a police officer should avoid any behaviour which could discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

b. The Panel are satisfied that members of the public could reasonably perceive the former officer's actions to be a breach of his duty to protect the vulnerable and deliver upon his Safeguarding responsibilities on behalf of the public. Several high-profile cases involving police officer misconduct have severely damaged public confidence, particularly amongst women and girls. This behaviour damages the former officer's reputation and has the potential to damage that of policing and is incompatible with the role of police officer.

c. His engagement in activity involving the provision of commercial sexual services could have exposed him to an increased risk of corruption.

d. The sex industry is recognised as an environment that is conducive to the abuse or exploitation of those working within it. His actions could have contributed to exploitation and harm. the Panel are cognisant of the fact that those working in the sex industry can have limited confidence in policing.

C) Decision on the Standard relating to Honesty and Integrity

The Panel is satisfied that the former officer breached this Standard. The Panel have considered the test for dishonesty as set out in (Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd (trading as Crockfords) (2017) UKSC67).

a. In accessing the services of sex workers when he was on duty and should have been serving the public, he failed to act with honesty or integrity. Police officers are expected to be diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities and accessing the services of sex workers during rostered working hours on multiple occasions was unacceptable.

An officer of PC A's experience must have known of the capacity of sex workers to be vulnerable, and his duty was to protect them rather than compromising his integrity and exploiting them. Trust and confidence can only be built with sex workers and indeed the wider pubic if officers retain impartiality and deliver upon their safeguarding responsibilities. The former officer failed in this regard.

b. Decision on the Standard relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy

In arranging to meet sex workers whilst on and off duty, the former officer failed to treat vulnerable women with respect or courtesy. His actions were incompatible with the force's position of supporting these women and building trust and confidence with them.

D) Allegation Two

a. This relates to a Notice of Intended Prosecution (NIP) in respect of a speeding offence that was issued to the former officer.

On the 28th of February 2022, he was deployed with colleagues to the Devon and Cornwall Police area as part of a county lines task force and was the driver of a hire vehicle registration number [redacted] He was part of a 7-vehicle convoy of Merseyside police officers.

b. Whilst travelling on the M5 in the Avon and Somerset area, the former officer activated a speed camera at 93mph in a 70-mph zone. Two other officers were also captured driving in excess of the speed limit.

There were no operational requirements for exceeding the speed limit.

c. The other two officers accepted responsibility for their actions, one attending a speed awareness course and the other receiving three penalty points on his driving license and a fine.

d. However, on the 5th of April 2022, the former officer contacted Avon and Somerset Police about his NIP, stating that the reason for his speed was that he was responding to a cross-border call relating to county lines and that he was on route to an incident. He was advised to forward further detail.

e. Later that same day, the former officer sent an email to the camera enforcement department at Avon and Somerset attaching to the NIP a document inferring that there was an operational reason for driving in excess of the speed limit. He attached a letter of thanks from ACC Fielding from Avon and Somerset Police, sent to Merseyside Police to acknowledge the support and mutual aid that they provided.

f. Telephony demonstrates that the former officer and his colleagues had discussed their speeding and all intimated that they would accept responsibility. However, PC A ultimately had his ticket quashed as a result of his email suggesting that he was travelling to an incident and acting in an operational capacity.

g. Decision on the facts alleged.

The Panel is satisfied to the appropriate standard that PC A deliberately misled Avon and Somerset Police to have his ticket quashed. This was despite his colleague's accepting responsibility and the former officer suggesting that he would follow suite.

h. On the 20th of April 2022, the former officer met with [redacted] and [redacted] and put forward no reason or excuse for his excessive speed.

Despite being ordered by an Inspector to have the NIP reinstated and any subsequent fine and penalty points, he failed to do this, thus ignoring a lawful order.

i. There were no exemptions that applied to the former officer at the time and no policing purpose for him driving at an excessive speed.
He then wrote and submitted a misleading and inaccurate report to Avon and Somerset police to have the NIP quashed.

j. Decision on the Standard relating to Honesty and Integrity

The Panel is satisfied that the former officer breached this Standard.
Honesty and integrity are fundamental requirements of any police officer and underpins lawful policing, public confidence, and the criminal justice system itself.
The former officer abused his position by submitting a misleading and false report to another force area to successfully have his NIP quashed and to avoid points and a financial penalty for speeding.

k. Decision on the Standard relating to Orders and Instructions

Having had his NIP quashed, the former officer failed to follow a lawful order to have it reinstated, thus aggravating his dishonest behaviour. He further failed to obey orders and instructions in relation to the driving of hire vehicles in a lawful and appropriate manner.
The Panel is satisfied that the former officer breached this standard.

l. Decision on the Standard relating to Discreditable Conduct

Policing by consent will fail if the public cannot have confidence that the police will behave honestly and with integrity. If the public were aware of the former officer's conduct it would

be likely to damage public confidence in policing. An informed and reasonable member of the public would likely be considerably disappointed that this officer used his position to falsely avoid potential points on his driving licence and a fine.

E) Allegation Three

a. During the investigation into the former officer's conduct, a mobile device attributed to him was seized and examined. This identified a conversation between the former officer and his partner dated the 7th of February 2021. Messages and images showing bruising on his partner's arm were sent to the former officer by his partner. The messages detail that, during an argument, the former officer had caused the bruising by grabbing hold of his partner's arm in anger to move her from a doorway.

b. During the conversation, the former officer apologised to his partner saying "you know I'm sorry and love you to bits I would never hurt you I just wanted to get out the door as I was so angry xxxxx I'm sorry love it won't happen again xxxxx (crying emojis).

c. Decision on the facts alleged.

The Panel is satisfied to the appropriate standard that the former officer assaulted his partner in anger during the course of an argument. The messages and images provide a compelling account of what took place, and the former officer apologised for his conduct.

d. Decision on the Standard relating to Discreditable Conduct

The assault upon his partner comes within the definition of domestic abuse. Causing physical injury to his partner in anger has the potential to discredit policing and damage public confidence. He failed to exercise self-control or show respect to his partner and this

undermines public confidence in the role of the police in supporting the vulnerable and protecting women and girls.

10) Decision on Misconduct or Gross Misconduct

a) Having found a breach of the Standards in relation to Honesty and Integrity, Orders and Instructions, Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct, the Panel has carefully considered whether the behaviour amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither. We have again reminded ourselves of the full circumstances of this case.
b) The Panel are entirely satisfied that PC A's behaviour amounts to Gross Misconduct.
c) For the avoidance of doubt, the following factors are present: -

As a police officer it was the former officer's duty to protect those most vulnerable in our society, not use them for his own personal gratification. The public expect this of police officers, whether on or off duty.

His actions were inconsistent with the commitment of policing to address violence against women and girls. To engage in activity which may be linked with the sexual exploitation of women is totally unacceptable. His actions undermine public trust and confidence in policing and do not reflect the values of the Police Service or the hard work and determination of the vast majority of those within it to protect the vulnerable from possible exploitation and the integrity of the police service from possible corruption.

Knowing the potential for sex workers to be linked with organised crime groups, PC A should have realised the risk this posed to his integrity as a police officer.

Honesty and integrity are fundamental to policing and essential professional qualities without which policing cannot lawfully or effectively operate. In providing false information to another police force in order to avoid a penalty for speeding and then failing to follow a lawful order

to have the NIP reinstated, the former officer failed to act in a manner that is fundamental to his role as a police officer.

In addition, his use of the services of sex workers whilst on duty demonstrates a lack of honesty and integrity as he should have been performing his proper policing duties.

In causing physical injury to his partner in anger and committing an assault upon her, he failed to treat her with respect and courtesy.

The former officer behaved in a manner which would undoubtably discredit the police service and undermine public confidence, thus breaching the Standard in relation to Discreditable Conduct.

We considered the potential impact on the public, who can rightly expect to trust the police. Police officers and staff have immense power in virtue of the role they hold in society. When the police betray this trust, it can have a devastating impact on their confidence in the police. As Lord Bingham rightly said: “A profession’s most valuable asset is its collective reputation and the confidence which that inspires” (Bolton v Law Society 1993).
If the public were aware that an officer had conducted himself in the manner that the former officer did, we consider that it would damage public confidence and trust.

In totality, his conduct brings discredit upon the police service and only undermines the hard work of the vast majority of police officers, who do incredibly difficult work with a clear intent to serve and protect the public.

11) In conclusion, the Panel is satisfied that the breaches of the Standards found amount to Gross Misconduct.

OUTCOME CONCERNING FORMER OFFICER A

1)The Panel must now determine outcome.

Outcome Approach

a. Having made its determination on the facts of the case and on finding gross misconduct regarding the former officer, the Panel moved on to consider outcome. The panel was provided with the officer's service record as personal mitigation.

b. The former officer provisions apply. The potential outcomes are provided in reg 42, as modified by para 32 of sch 1.

Paragraph 20.66 of the Home Office Guidance 2020 states:

where there is a finding of gross misconduct, the panel can only consider two potential outcomes: disciplinary action or no disciplinary action.

where there is a finding of gross misconduct and disciplinary action imposed it can only be that the former officer would have been dismissed if they had still been a member of a police force. If the panel determines that the matter does not justify the sanction that the former officer would have been dismissed, no action will be taken, and the finding of gross misconduct recorded.

c. As the Panel have found that the breaches of the Standards amount to gross misconduct, in considering outcome the decision is . whether to impose a disciplinary sanction (the only available sanction being a finding that Constable A would have been dismissed if he had not ceased to be a member of a police force).

2) In assessing the seriousness of this case, we are required by Fuglers LLP v SRA [2014] EWHC (as usefully summarised in the College of Policing Guidance) to keep at the forefront of our minds the purpose and objective of these proceedings, which is to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the Police, uphold high standards, deter misconduct and to protect the public. We appreciate that the objective is not to punish the officer (although it may have that effect) and that we should therefore do no more (although also no less) than that which is necessary to satisfy the key objectives of the proceedings. We must (and we have) considered the seriousness of the misconduct, the purpose of sanctions and have chosen outcomes which most appropriately meets that purpose. Assessing the seriousness is to be approached in terms of the four factors set out in the Fuglers decision which we have carefully considered and will come onto in some detail in a moment.

3) Fuglers LLP v Solicitors Regulation Authority [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin), paragraph 29 states: 'In assessing seriousness the most important factors will be (1) the culpability for the misconduct in question and (2) the harm caused by the misconduct. Such harm is not measured wholly, or even primarily, by financial loss caused to any individual or entity. A factor of the greatest importance is the impact of the misconduct upon the standing and reputation of the profession. Moreover, the seriousness of the misconduct may lie in the risk of harm to which the misconduct gives rise, whether the risk eventuates. The assessment of seriousness will also be informed by (3) aggravating factors (e.g., previous disciplinary matters) and (4) mitigating factors (e.g., admissions at an early stage or making good any loss).'

4)The Panel have therefore followed the structured approach as set out in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings.

a. In summary, the Panel:

Assessed the seriousness of the conduct and the behaviour of the officer by reference to 4 factors ((i)the officer's culpability for the misconduct; (ii) the harm caused by the misconduct; (iii) the existence of any aggravating factors; and (iv) the existence of any mitigating factors)

-Reminded itself of the purpose of imposing sanctions, namely:

Maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;

Upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct and protecting the public.

Arrived at an Outcome which most appropriately fulfils the purpose of imposing sanctions in the light of the seriousness of the officer's conduct (that is, to act proportionately).

5)Culpability

We first assessed the culpability of former PC A arising from his conduct and specifically the following paragraphs within the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes:

a. Para 4.9 -Culpability denotes the officer's blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions. The more culpable or blameworthy the behaviour in question, the more serious the misconduct and the more severe the likely outcome.

b.The Panel consider that former PC A's conduct was deliberate and intentional, therefore more culpable than conduct that has unintended consequences.

In accessing the services of sex workers when he was on duty and should have been serving the public, he failed to act with honesty or integrity.

In arranging to meet sex workers whilst on and off duty, the former officer failed to treat vulnerable women with respect or courtesy.

He deliberately misled Avon and Somerset Police in order to have his NIP quashed and submitted to them a misleading and false report.

The former officer failed to follow a lawful order to have the NIP reinstated.

The officer was engaged in repeated, reprehensible conduct.

d. Certain types of misconduct should be considered especially serious:

Misconduct involving a vulnerable person.

Factors that may give rise to vulnerability include those working within the sex industry. The Panel considers that the former officer recognised or should have recognised this, taking account of all the circumstances. He was an experienced officer who accessed the services of sex workers on multiple occasions and was on one occasion in part police uniform and thus identifiable as a police officer. This was not for a legitimate policing reason but for his own personal gratification. This has the potential to bring policing nationally into disrepute.

Violence against Women and Girls

Violence against women and girls perpetrated by a police officer, whether on-duty or off-duty, will always have a high degree of culpability, with the likely outcome being severe.

In physically assaulting his partner in anger within her home address, the former officer behaved in a wholly unacceptable manner.

In conclusion, we find former PC A's culpability to be high.

6) Harm

a. The College of Policing Guidance then addresses the harm caused by the officer's actions, indicating that this can be considered in various ways. The text refers to harm caused to particular individuals, but the guidance recognises that harm may also be caused on a wider basis:

"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."

b. Harm was caused to the former officer's partner, who sustained physical injury within her own home as a result of the former Officer A's actions. This is a place where she should have felt and been safe.
Accessing the services of sex workers has the potential to cause harm to them by perpetuating the cycle of exploitation and vulnerability.

c. How such behaviour would be, or has been, perceived by the public will be relevant, whether or not the behaviour was known about at the time.

The Panel has considered the scale and depth of local and national concern about the behaviour in question. Whether a matter is of local or national concern will be a matter for the person(s) conducting the proceedings based on their experience and the circumstances of the case.

The legitimacy and effectiveness of UK policing is built on relationships between the police and the public, but there are challenges in this relationship after several high-profile cases involving officers' misconduct. Former PC A's behaviour demonstrating a lack of honesty and integrity would likely cause great concern to members of the public who rightly expect police officers to adopt the highest standards of behaviour and is inimical to the values of modern policing and the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

Former PC A's behaviour in accessing the services of sex workers whilst on and off duty, demonstrating a lack of honesty and integrity would likely cause great concern.
He failed to protect vulnerable women working within the sex industry and put himself in a position where he was vulnerable to briebery and or corruption.
He assaulted his partner in anger.
Instead of accepting responsibility for a speeding ticket as his colleagues did, former Officer A sought to have it rescinded by providing inaccurate and misleading information to another force area.

Given the facts as found by the Panel, the risk of reputational harm to the police service is high.

7)The CoP Guidance then provides non-exhaustive lists of potential aggravating and mitigating factors.

a. The Panel considered the Guidance on Outcomes and reminded itself not to "double count" with matters already considered under culpability and harm. It concluded that the following additional aggravating features were present in this case:

continuing the behaviour after the officer realised, or should have realised, that it was improper. Former PC A was an officer of some experience and must have known the severity and potential consequences of his actions and that he was potentially causing harm to vulnerable women by accessing the services of sex workers.

multiple proven allegations and/or breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

The conduct was pre-meditated on the balance of probabilities, given its repetition.
The conduct was repeated on a very high number of occasions, over a significant time period.
There was a significant departure from instructions, polices and national guidance.

b. Mitigating factors:

The Panel have identified the following mitigating factor:

The former officer did not seek to contest the allegations.

c. In conclusion, the Panel find the level of harm to be high.

Having considered culpability, harm, aggravating, and mitigating features the Panel concluded that this is a very serious case.

8)The CoP Guidance addresses personal mitigation.

Regulation 42(14) of the Conduct Regulations requires the Panel to take account of the officer's personal mitigation, but the weight to be accorded to that mitigation: a) is less than it

would be in a criminal trial; and b) is dependent upon the extent to which the officer's misconduct threatens the public confidence.

The Panel has had regard to former PC A's record of service, and we note the previous reflective practice and management action. We were not provided with character references. The record of service does not assist the former officer.

9) Outcome

a. Having followed the steps above, the panel went on to choose the disciplinary action which most appropriately fulfils the purpose of imposing disciplinary action considering the seriousness of the conduct in question (bearing in mind the need to act proportionately).

b. With respect to the purpose of imposing disciplinary action in police misconduct proceedings:

a) The primary purpose is to protect the public confidence in and the reputation of policing;
b) The second purpose is the declaratory purpose of maintaining high professional standards by demonstrating to other officers that misconduct of a certain kind and/or a certain seriousness will be dealt with by disciplinary action of a certain severity; and
c) The third purpose is to protect the public and/or officers and staff by preventing the officer from committing similar misconduct again by excluding them from the police service.

c. In R (Green) v Police Complaints Authority [2004] UKHL 6; [2004] 1 WLR 725, Lord Carswell stated at [78]: "Public confidence in the police is a factor of great importance in the maintenance of law and order in the manner which we regard as appropriate in our polity. If

citizens feel that improper behaviour on the part of police officers is left unchecked and they are not held accountable for it in a suitable manner, that confidence will be eroded." 256. Lord Bingham (when Master of the Rolls) had previously made the same point in relation to the solicitors' profession in Bolton v Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512. In explaining the apparent harshness of sanctions imposed by the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal he identified the purpose of such sanctions and said at p.518H (emphasis added): "The second purpose is the most fundamental of all: to maintain the reputation of the solicitors' profession as one in which every member, of whatever standing, may be trusted to the ends of the earth. To maintain this reputation and sustain public confidence in the integrity of the profession it is often necessary that those guilty of serious lapses are not only expelled but denied re-admission. If a member of the public sells his house, very often his largest asset, and entrusts the proceeds to his solicitor, pending reinvestment in another house, he is ordinarily entitled to expect that the solicitor will be a person whose trustworthiness is not, and never has been, seriously in question. Otherwise, the whole profession, and the public as a whole, is injured. A profession's most valuable asset is its collective reputation and the confidence which that inspires.

d. Ms Ashcroft, representing the Appropriate Authority made the submission that the only possible sanction in view of our findings is that of dismissal without notice.

e. As the Panel have found the allegation proven to the level of gross misconduct, we consider it appropriate and proportionate to impose disciplinary action under reg 42.

10) In respect of former PC A we find that the appropriate sanction had he still been a member of the Police Force would have been that of dismissal without notice.

The Panel is also satisfied that the breaches of the standards, as we have found, would have been incompatible with his role as a Police Officer if he had still been in service and

that the need to protect public confidence in and the reputation of the police service, the need to maintain high professional standards and the need to protect the public and officers and staff by preventing similar misconduct in the future is appropriately served by the imposition of disciplinary action.

11) As a result of this Misconduct Hearing the following was found under Regulation 42(3) (b) and imposed with effect from the 19th December 2025:

"A finding that the officer concerned would have been dismissed if he had not ceased to be a member of a police force".

As a consequence of this outcome former PC A will be placed on the College of Policing Barred List.

12) Right of Appeal

The Panel is required to notify former PC A that he has a right of appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal.

To former PC A:

"You have a right of appeal against the finding and/or the outcome imposed at a misconduct hearing. You may only appeal on the grounds that: - a) The finding or disciplinary action imposed was unreasonable. b) There is evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the misconduct meeting which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action; or c) There was a serious breach of the procedures set out in the regulations or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.

Should you wish to appeal you must do so in writing to the appropriate authority, clearly setting out the grounds for the appeal within 10 working days beginning with the first working day after the receipt of the notification of the outcome of the misconduct meeting (unless this period is extended by the appropriate authority for exceptional circumstances)

The Appropriate Authority will provide you with a notice as to the procedure to be followed in that regard".

Alex Goss, ACC-Chair

Margaret Fulham-IPM

Susan Knowles-IPM

Friday 19th December 2025