IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

IN THE MATTER OF AN ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING

RE: DS 719 MOORE

DETERMINATION OF CHIEF CONSTABLE JARDINE

Preliminary matters

1 The accelerated misconduct hearing for DS Moore was held on 11 December 2025. The Appropriate Authority was represented by Andrew Picken. The Officer was represented by Steven Reed.

2 Prior to the hearing I received applications from the Officer for the hearing to be held in private, and from the Appropriate Authority to anonymise witnesses. Neither party opposed the other's application.

3 I made a decision about those applications on 10 December 2025 and circulated my reasons to the parties in a separate document. The decision that I made was that the hearing should be in public, but that there should be reporting restrictions preventing the name or any identifying feature of the Officer, or of any other person named in the proceedings, from being reported. The names of any investigations are also not to be reported.

4 No further representations were made by the Appropriate Authority, the Officer, or members of the media or public on this issue at the start of the hearing.

Allegations

5 The Officer was served with a notice of accelerated misconduct hearing proceedings outlining allegations, which if proven, were assessed as amounting to gross misconduct. Those allegations were:

- On 5th July 2024, in response to a CPS Action Plan, you produced an excerpt of mobile phone evidence, exhibit SD/1s, and a signed statement in the name of another officer, a Detective Constable, exhibiting this SD/1s. This officer was not on duty at

the time and was unaware of the production of the exhibit or exhibiting statement

- On the 8th of July 2024 the statement and exhibit were submitted to CPS as evidence in the case.

6 Those allegations were alleged to breach the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Honesty and Integrity and Orders and Instructions, at the level of gross misconduct.

7 The Officer in her Regulation 54 response:

- admits the facts of the misconduct;

- admits that she breached the orders and instructions standard;

- accepts breach of the integrity limb of the honesty and integrity standard, but denies dishonesty;

- admits misconduct, but denies gross misconduct.

Determination of conduct

8 I have assessed all relevant information made available to me in the supplied bundle. I have considered all representations made on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and the Officer. I have had regard to the relevant sections of the College of Policing Document '*Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings*' in reaching my determination.

9 Before making my determination, I reminded myself of the definition of misconduct and gross misconduct as prescribed by regulation 2.

10 I have found the allegations against the Officer proven on the balance of probabilities on the following basis:

- The Officer admits the facts of the allegations.

- The evidence in the bundle in any event proves on the balance of probabilities that the Officer created the statement and exhibit in the name of another officer, and then

submitted those documents to CPS.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

11 I have found that the above facts amount to breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour as alleged on the following bases:

- Orders and Instructions – the Officer admits breaching this standard. In any event creating and submitting a statement in the name of another officer is contrary to the Officer's training.

- Honesty and integrity:

- (i) The Officer admits that her conduct lacked integrity, and I would have found this to be the case in any event.

- (ii) I have found that the Officer's conduct was not dishonest.

- (iii) I have considered the submissions made on behalf of the Appropriate Authority, that the Officer must have realised that what she was doing was wrong, and that it does not make sense for her to say that she didn't realise what she was doing.

- (iv) I have considered carefully the submissions made on behalf of the Officer, that she was essentially performing an administrative task, and that she negligently failed to realise that what she was doing was completing a statement in the name of another officer, and thereby making a false representation to CPS.

- (v) I have been provided in these proceedings with a large bundle of glowing character references which set out that the Officer is a dedicated, careful, and detail-oriented police officer of some 20 years experience.

- (vi) I have also been advised about the effect of the Officer's good character. I have given appropriate weight to the evidence of the Officer's good character, and to its effect on both her credibility and the likelihood that she has acted in a dishonest manner.

- (vii) I find it impossible to believe that when typing over the statement of another officer DS Moore did not appreciate that what she was doing was making a false representation to CPS about the authorship of that statement and the production of the exhibit.

- (viii) I feel compelled to draw the inference on the balance of probabilities that the AA invites me to draw that the Officer's state of mind when she typed out the statement was that she must have known that she was making a false statement.

- (ix) I do not find that this was for any malicious purpose or for any personal gain. I find that the Officer created the statement in order to get the correct information to CPS in an efficient manner, but did so in the wrong way.

- (x) I have considered carefully whether an ordinary decent member of the public would consider that the Officer's conduct was dishonest, given her state of mind. I have concluded that they would not. Whilst on its face the Officer's conduct in completing a statement in the name of another officer might be thought to be dishonest, in the wider circumstances of this case, an ordinary decent member of the public would not think it was dishonest for this Officer to seek to get the correct information to CPS even though she must have realised that she was doing so in the wrong way.

Severity

12 I have found that the breaches amounted to gross misconduct on the basis that:

- an officer who writes a statement in the name of another officer, albeit for a benevolent purpose, is acting in a manner that seriously lacks integrity;

- writing a statement in the name of another officer, even for a benevolent purpose, seriously undermines public confidence in the police;

- writing a statement in the name of another officer seriously undermines good order and high standards in policing;

- accordingly these breaches are sufficiently serious to justify dismissal.

Outcome

13 Having determined that these allegations amounted to gross misconduct, I invited representations from the Appropriate Authority on the appropriate outcome in this matter.

14 Submissions were made by the Appropriate Authority that the appropriate outcome in this case was dismissal without notice:

- It was submitted that public confidence demanded that the sanction was dismissal without notice.

- This was because this was a case where the Officer had demonstrated a lack of integrity in an operational context, with reference being made to paragraph 4.26 and 5.2 of the Guidance on Outcomes;

- The Officer's rank as a sergeant aggravated the seriousness of the misconduct.

- Culpability and Harm were high in the circumstances.

15 Submissions were made on behalf of the Officer that:

- There is no finding of operational dishonesty and so *Salter* can be distinguished;

- Viewed in its context, her culpability is medium;

- There was no direct harm, and whilst it is recognised that there is some reputational harm this incident was disclosed in fullness to CPS and defence in the relevant case, and no issue arose;

- Northumbria Police aim to instil a learning culture, and the Officer has admitted her mistake and learned from it..

- The public don't need protection from Sgt Moore because she is never going to repeat this behaviour.

- There is no direct evidence of effect on public confidence. In the specific case the defence were aware and did nothing.

- Anyone can make a mistake. What the Officer did was wrong, but she was not seeking to mislead.

- It can't be properly argued that this isn't operational. In *Salter* the issue was operational dishonesty. Where the finding of operational integrity takes you is a matter for you. This is a case where you are in the best position, to assess this as a

lack of operational integrity, not dishonesty.

Culpability

16 I have considered the Officer's culpability in this case and make the following observations:

- The Officer misconducted herself because she did not think about the consequences of her actions. I have found that she must have known that she was making a false statement. I have also found that she did not intend any malign outcome from that.

- I have taken into account paragraph 4.11 of the Guidance on Outcomes, whilst the Officer intended no harm, her culpability is increased because she could and should have foreseen that there was a risk of harm.

- Her culpability is also increased by reason of her position as a supervisor.

- I have had regard to paragraphs 4.26 to 4.33 in relation to operational dishonesty, impropriety or corruption. This is agreed to be a case of operational lack of integrity. However, this is not a case in which the officer was trying to compromise the integrity of an investigation, maliciously tampering with evidence, or wilfully failing to give proper disclosure. This is a case which falls towards the lower end of culpability in the context of operational lack of integrity.

Harm

17 I have considered the harm caused by the Officer's actions in this case and make the following observations:

- There was no actual harm in this case.

- There has been no actual harm to the reputation of policing in this case at present.

- However, I have considered paragraphs 4.68 and 4.69 of the Guidance on Outcomes. I believe that a reasonable member of the public in possession of all the facts of this case would be concerned that an officer had made a statement in the name of another officer. Public confidence could be undermined to an extent, but I have dealt with many more serious cases than this.

Aggravating Factors

18 I have considered the aggravating factors listed within the guidance and any other issues outside of those which may be said to have aggravated the actions she took:

- This was a significant deviation from instructions, but I do not double count this factor, which I have already taken into account in assessing culpability;

- Because I have found that the Officer did not consider that she was doing anything wrong at the time, I do not find that she ought to have sought advice from a colleague or senior officer;

- The Officer had leadership responsibility as a sergeant, but I do not double count this factor, which I have already taken into account in assessing culpability;

- I agree with the submissions made by Mr Reed, whilst there are two allegations alleging breach of two standards of professional behaviour, in reality this is a single incident which I do not aggravate because of the multiple allegations or breaches of the standards.

Mitigation

19 The purpose of mitigation is to reduce the seriousness of the conduct. I have found that the following factors apply

- This is a single episode of misconduct;

- The Officer made admissions at an early stage;

- The Officer was attempting to do the right thing but in the wrong way, but I do not double count this factor, which I have already taken account of in relation to culpability;

- The Officer is genuinely remorseful, she has shown insight into her behaviour and has accepted responsibility for her actions as I have found them to be.

20 I have taken into account the Officer's record of service, which corroborates the picture of this Officer painted by her substantial bundle of character references.

21 I have taken as much account as I am able to of the Officer's character bundle, given what is set out at section 6 of the Guidance on Outcomes. What I take from that bundle is that this is an Officer who generally behaves with honesty and integrity who has failed to do so in the circumstances of this case as I have found them to be.

22 Any action I take today has to balance the Officer's rights proportionately with the requirement to maintain public confidence, and to deter misconduct. My role is not punitive.

23 It having been found at stage one of proceedings that the conduct constitutes Gross Misconduct, the outcomes available to me:

- A Final Written Warning;

- Reduction in Rank;

- Dismissal without Notice.

24 I have considered those outcomes starting with the least severe, as to whether they are appropriate in the circumstances to meet the purposes of these proceedings.

25 The public rightly expect police officers to act with honesty and integrity in the discharge of their duties. The vast majority of officers of Northumbria Police do uphold the high standards that are expected of them by the public and by their Chief Officers. Any lack of integrity is capable of seriously undermining public confidence in policing.

26 I find that the appropriate outcome in this case is Reduction in Rank to Constable:

- I considered whether a Final Written Warning would be appropriate in the circumstances:

- (i) This is a breach of the integrity standard which is too serious to be appropriately dealt with by a Final Written Warning. The Officer should have been aware that what she was doing was wrong.

- (ii) The Officer was in a supervisory role and setting an example to others. A Final Written Warning would not be sufficient to maintain public confidence in policing and uphold high standards in the context of a Detective Sergeant of 20 years service

who was on the cusp of becoming an Inspector.

- I then considered whether Reduction in Rank would be appropriate:

- (i) I received written representations from the Appropriate Authority that the Officer could not be deployed in the evidential chain, and that she had, since 14th August 2024, been deployed in a role not in the evidential chain.

- (ii) I have received written representations from the Officer that the Officer could in appropriate circumstances be deployed in the evidential chain, and emphasising that she had been deployed outside it for some time.

- (iii) I agree with the submissions made by the Officer. My findings should not operate as an absolute bar to the Officer being placed in a role in the evidential chain. Her suitability for such a role would fall to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

- (iv) I had regard to the fact that if I concluded that Reduction in Rank was appropriate, then this was a conclusion that this was one of the very small number of cases in which dismissal could be avoided in cases of operational lack of integrity.

- (v) I have concluded that this is such a case. My findings are that this Officer has on one occasion made a serious error of judgment in an otherwise unblemished career. She was attempting to assist in the efficient progress of an investigation, and whilst I have found that she did not appreciate that what she was doing was wrong, she ought to have done.

- (vi) This is a case which falls towards the lower end of cases of operational lack of integrity. The Officer did the wrong thing, but for the right reasons and without serious impact.

- (vii) I am satisfied that the Officer understands the gravity of her error, that she is genuinely remorseful, and that there will be no repetition of this or any similar behaviour. The Officer knows how close she has come today to being dismissed. Her dismissal would not therefore protect the public to any greater extent than reducing her in rank.

- (viii) Reduction in rank is a serious consequence for the Officer's actions. A fully informed member of the public would consider that this was sufficient to give them confidence that conduct lacking in integrity is not tolerated in the police service, but at the same time is a proportionate response to a lack of integrity which is of the less serious sort;

- (ix) Reduction in rank also serves to uphold high standards and deter misconduct. Other officers will see that even a less serious breach of the integrity standard still comes with serious consequences.

- (x) This is a case in which dismissal could have been justified, but is not required. I have accordingly given limited but appropriate weight to the Officer's bundle of character evidence, and to the skills and experience that she brings to the force with her 20 years of service.

27 I am aware of the Officer's right to appeal in accordance with the Police Appeals Tribunal Rules 2020. The Officer should provide notice of her intention to appeal to the Appropriate Authority within 10 working days of receipt of this written determination.

Reporting restrictions

28 At the conclusion of the hearing I reconsidered whether the reporting restrictions that I put in place should remain. Having heard representations from each party I considered that the rationale for restricting reporting of the Officer's name had fallen away as a result of my findings. To the extent that my findings may have any impact on any criminal proceedings, they will fall to be disclosed in those proceedings. It would be wrong to restrict the publicity of these findings on the basis that, if they were known, criminal proceedings could be affected. If the Officer's actions have any negative impact on any criminal proceedings that will have to be dealt with in the proper manner.

29 Accordingly whilst I retain the restriction on reporting the names of any other individuals referred to in these proceedings and the names of the specific operations referred to, I remove the restriction on the reporting of the name of DS Moore.

Chief Constable Jardine

11 December 2025