

**IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020**

**THAMES VALLEY POLICE**

**A MATTER CONCERNING**

**FORMER PC 5254 WILSON**

Thames Valley Police Headquarters

Oxford Road, Kidlington OX5 2NX

20<sup>th</sup> July – 21<sup>st</sup> July 2024

---

**WRITTEN REASONS FOR MISCONDUCT FINDING / SANCTION  
(REG. 43 REPORT)**

---

**A. Introduction / case background**

1. This is the final hearing of police misconduct proceedings brought by the Appropriate Authority – the Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police (“the AA”) in respect of the Relevant Former Officer, Former Police Constable Robbie Wilson (hereafter, “Mr Wilson” / “the former officer”).
2. Ms Clarke, counsel, appeared for the AA. Mr Wilson did not attend the hearing, Mr Baker of the Police Federation attended proceedings throughout in the capacity of Mr Wilson’s Police Friend.

3. This case was heard over 2 days between the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> July 2026, one day less than the time estimate set at the pre-hearing on the 17<sup>th</sup> June 2026.
4. At that pre-hearing various directions were made for the effective management of this case, summarised in the note of that pre-hearing which is attached to these reasons. The Chair directed that that it was necessary in the interests of justice for 3 witnesses (PC A, PC B and PC C) to give oral evidence before the panel.
5. Following the pre-hearing the Chair also made a ruling refusing Mr Wilson's application for a private hearing or anonymity in these proceedings, and granting anonymity for the witnesses in this case, who by virtue of that order were referred to throughout this case, and will be referred to in these reasons, through the cyphers PCs A – F and Ms G. That ruling on anonymity is also attached to these reasons.
6. As Mr Wilson did not attend his misconduct hearing, the Chair was faced with a preliminary decision about whether to proceed with the hearing in the officer's absence. In making that determination, the Chair followed the legal framework set out in more detail in these reasons below, by having regard to the purpose of police misconduct hearings, the overall interests of justice and fairness to Mr Wilson and the AA, the circumstances of the case, the submissions made by counsel for the AA and the legal advice from the LQA. Taking all those factors into account, and significantly the fact that the Chair was informed by Mr Baker that Mr Wilson knew about the misconduct hearing, had intentionally absented himself from it, but wanted it to continue in his absence, the Chair determined that the case should proceed in the absence of the former officer.

## **B. Background to the allegations**

7. The former officer was based as a police constable on a response policing team in the Thames Valley Police area. The former officer had joined Thames Valley Police in May 2020.
8. The former officer faced allegations in relation to sexually inappropriate conduct both on and off duty, relating to his interactions with three female colleagues.
9. The allegations faced by the former officer initially came about when PC A disclosed to a colleague that he had been sexually inappropriate towards her whilst they were crewed together on duty. As a result of this disclosure a Thames Valley Police Professional Standards Department (TVP PSD) investigation commenced and subsequently PC B and PC C made separate disclosures relating to the former officer's conduct.
10. During the TVP PSD investigation, the officer resigned from the police service. The former officer decided not to attend the misconduct proceedings, and the Police Federation were in attendance upon his behalf.

### *Panel's approach to assessment of the allegations*

11. In relation to the allegations the former officer faced, in his Regulation 31 response he stated he accepted that the alleged behaviour amounted to gross misconduct, however maintained that the behaviour was always consensual between him and the respective parties.
12. The former officer further detailed that he wished to rely upon the responses which he had given in his misconduct interview which he stated was his open and honest response to each of the allegations.
13. The former officer did not provide a response in relation to which of the alleged Standards of Professional behaviour he accepted had been breached.
14. Accordingly, the task of the panel was to make factual findings in relation to each of allegations. In this regard the panel noted that whilst the former officer generically admitted gross misconduct, his admission lacked specificity and

where consent was an issue he contended his conduct was consensual throughout. The panel therefore determined firstly its task was to consider the totality of each allegation and make findings of fact.

15. The panel noted that, in two of the four allegations, it was required to make findings concerning the issue of consent, and the AA conceded that for these allegations, the officer's interpretation of the situation, in other words his knowledge or belief regarding consent, was also relevant to the question of whether there were breaches of the professional standards. The panel sought representations on this issue from the parties and also received legal advice from the LQA. Based upon these submissions and advice the panel determined to apply the following tests to each allegation involving the issue of consent:
  - a. Test one – whilst this is not a criminal case, the panel drew assistance from the definition in the Sexual Offences Act 2003, section 74, which provides that a person consents to conduct “if [s]he agrees by choice, and has the freedom and capacity to make that choice”.
  - b. Test two – Based upon the former officer's interpretation of the known circumstances, was he aware there was no consent?
16. Having made findings of fact, the panel must go on to determine any breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.
17. Having established the totality of the admitted and proven allegations, the panel must then determine whether they individually or collectively amount to gross misconduct, misconduct or neither.
18. Finally, if the panel made a finding of gross misconduct, it must make a decision on the appropriate outcome and sanction
19. The panel approached its task by considering each allegation in turn and setting out its findings of fact and determination on the alleged breaches of the standards of professional behaviour. Thereafter, the panel considered collectively the totality of the seriousness of the proven conduct, by applying the recognised four step *Fuglers* test.
20. Throughout the exercise of its duties in this case, the panel was assisted and advised by the Legally Qualified Adviser (LQA), who directed the panel on the law in the way set out in attached agreed legal directions document. The panel followed these directions of law and this report should be read alongside those

legal directions, which were circulated by the LQA to the parties and approved by them.

**C. Findings of Fact - Allegations One and Two**

21. The Regulation 30 notice alleged that:

*(1) On the 24th July 2024, whilst on duty and in a police vehicle, you touched PC A's left breast and asked her to perform oral sex on you;*

*(2) PC A told you she did not want to perform oral sex on you. You responded by placing her hand on your erect penis, without her consent;*

22. As both allegations one and two were alleged to have occurred around the same time on the 24th July 2024, the panel decided to consider them collectively.

*Evidence of PC A:*

23. The panel reviewed the statement of PC A and heard live evidence from her during the course of the hearing.

24. The panel noted at the time of the alleged incidents that PC A was very junior in police service and experience, having commenced in her role in October 2023 and having only just completed her tutorship period at the time of the incidents in this case.

25. The panel noted at points PC A's evidence and recollection in the hearing was sequentially at odds with the chronology in her statement, but the panel did not find this undermined the wider credibility of her evidence or the allegations she was alleging

26. The panel noted that PC A accepted that when she had previously crewed with the former officer and they had discussed matters of a sexual nature and subsequently they had exchanged what she would describe as flirtatious messages.

27. The panel noted that PC A stated that the former officer had initiated the conversations of a sexual nature, and she had not objected to this, although had been shocked by this line of questioning from her colleague.
28. The panel noted that PC A stated that the former officer and her had exchanged and messaged some photos of each other, however she had informed him she felt uncomfortable when he sent a video of himself in boxer shorts to her.
29. The panel noted that on 24th July 2024, the former officer and PC A were crewed together on a night shift.
30. PC A stated that whilst they were in the police vehicle, she had disclosed to the former officer that she was feeling low further to an argument with her partner. She stated the former officer asked her some very personal questions about her relationship with her partner, however she did not object to this as it made her feel better about how she was feeling.
31. PC A stated that the former officer offered to give her a massage, and she thought that he was joking, and she responded that she would not mind. PC A outlined that they then had a conversation about her tattoo and she showed the former officer a picture of it, during the hearing she latterly confirmed she also sent a picture of herself in lingerie. She stated the former officer then asked her if she had any naked photos and this made her feel uncomfortable and she said 'no'.
32. PC A outlined that the former officer reached over and put his hand on her shoulder, she stated this was unexpected and she thought that he was going to kiss her. She stated he then moved his hand under her clothing and caressed her left breast; she described that she was not expecting the former officer to do. PC A in her statement outlined that she enjoyed this, however in evidence to the panel she stated this related to him putting his hand on her shoulder and not touching her breast.
33. PC A stated that the former officer then said, 'he had a hard on for her', she stated that she started to feel uncomfortable with what was happening and she moved his hand away from her breast. She described at this point the former officer attempted to kiss her, and she turned her head away and said she was not going to kiss him.

34. PC A then described that the former officer asked her to 'suck him off'. She stated this made her feel uncomfortable and she said 'no' and attempted to laugh off the situation. She stated he then told her to shut her eyes, and he placed her hand on his erect penis, stating that he had a 'hard on' and was asking her to touch it. PC A stated she felt what was happening was wrong, she was shocked and pulled his hand away and placed it on the steering wheel.
35. PC A stated shortly afterwards a car came past and this brought to an end the alleged inappropriate conduct. She stated the former officer commenced driving again and they resumed their duties without further incident.
36. PC A stated that on 22nd August 2024, she was crewed again with the former officer. She described that she felt nervous, but the conversation was normal. She outlined on this day she spoke to a female colleague – PC D and asked her if he had ever been flirty with her. PC A stated subsequently she became aware that her colleague had informed her Sergeant about the conversation.

*Statement of PC D*

37. The panel reviewed the statement of PC D, who confirmed that she had spoken to PC A on 22nd August 2024. She stated that when PC A was speaking about the former officer, she said, 'she was sick of it' and 'he's making me feel uncomfortable and he keeps making sexual comments.'
38. PC D described that PC A as physically upset, distressed and panicking about going back out with her crew mate the former officer.

*Statement of PC E*

39. The panel reviewed the statement of PC E, who confirmed that she had spoken with PC A on the 22nd of August 2024 about the former officer. She stated that PC A disclosed to her that on one occasion she had been crewed with the former officer he had touched her breast under her top and had asked her if she wanted to 'suck him off'.

*Account of the former officer*

40. The panel reviewed the misconduct interview of the former officer and his Regulation 31 response. The panel noted that the former officer generically

accepted the allegations against him amounted to gross misconduct but stated all acts had been consensual.

41. The former officer concurred that with the account of PC A concerning their initial crewing and subsequent exchange of messages and pictures.
42. The former officer confirmed that he had been crewed with PC A on 24th July 2024 on a night shift. He stated during the course of the shift PC A was showing him pictures of her in underwear and he pulled over to take a closer look at the photographs.
43. The former officer stated that he had parked at the side of the road in a rural location and the conversation between him and PC A became sexual. He said that PC A was stating that she was in pain and he offered her and she accepted a massage. He outlined that he started to massage her shoulders and stated she was really enjoying it. He stated that PC A then put her hand on his left thigh and ran her hand up his leg where she stroked his penis through his clothing.
44. The former officer stated that he asked PC A what she liked and she told him she liked having her breasts felt. He said he then offered to touch her breasts, and she agreed and he put his hand inside her stab vest and grabbed her breast for a few seconds. He stated they then stopped and PC A told him that touching her breasts had felt really nice, as had her feeling his penis.
45. The former officer described that they then resumed their duties and redeployed to another incident. He stated that the contact between them had been mutual and at no time did he believe he had been inappropriate or had made PC A feel uncomfortable.
46. The former officer stated it was his recollection that the interaction occurred in a rural layby around 2am in the morning over a period of approximately five minutes. He confirmed that he was in a marked police car at the time.
47. The panel noted that in relation to the differences in accounts between that of PC A and the former officer, in his interview at 21:06.44 he is asked about the differences, further to the interviewer summarising the statement of PC A. The interviewer informs him that it is his opportunity to give his account and he responds, 'I've given my say'.

*Conclusions on findings of fact – Allegations one and two*

48. In relation to allegation one – the panel concluded:

- a. On 24th July 2024, the former officer was on duty in a marked police vehicle in company with PC A.
- b. The panel noted that both PC A and the former officer had engaged in flirtatious behaviour and this led to him massaging her shoulder in the police vehicle with her consent
- c. During the course of giving PC A a massage in the police vehicle he proceeded to move his hand under her clothing and caressed her left breast. PC A stated this was without her consent and she realised it was wrong to do this on duty and she removed his hand from her top
- d. The panel noted that both the former officer and PC A confirmed that this interaction had taken place, therefore this element of allegation one is factually proved. The panel noted that PC A stated that whilst him touching her breast was without consent, she enjoyed this interaction.
- e. The panel noted the particularisation of the allegation did not require the panel to determine whether PC A gave consent to the former officer touching her breast. The panel determined on a balance of probabilities that the former officer believed that PC A wanted her to touch her breast at this point
- f. The panel found that the actions of the former officer touching the breast of a colleague on duty in a marked police vehicle in a public place was fundamentally unprofessional
- g. Having removed the hand of the former officer from her breast PC A gave evidence the former officer attempting to kiss her, she turned her head away and she said she was not going to kiss him. PC A described the former officer then asked her to 'suck him off'. She stated this made her feel uncomfortable and she said 'no' and attempted to laugh off the situation.
- h. The panel noted that during the hearing PC A's account concerning the former officer asking her for oral sex, was chronologically different to that in her statement, however the panel concluded this did not undermine her evidence that the former officer had asked her to undertake such an act
- i. The panel noted that during his misconduct interview, the former officer did not mention him requesting oral sex from PC A. The interviewer then gave an overview of the account of PC A and included the

allegation that he had asked her to perform oral sex upon him. The panel noted that the former officer was generically challenged about the differences in his account versus that of PC A and he responded, 'I've given my say'. The panel therefore concluded that the former officer denied that this element of the interaction with PC A took place.

- j. During the hearing PC A confirmed that she was clear in her recollection that the former officer had asked her to have oral sex and she had said no.
- k. The panel also noted the evidence of PC E who stated on 22nd August 2024, PC A had disclosed that whilst crewed with the former officer he had asked her, 'to suck him off'.

49. The panel were therefore satisfied that that the former officer did ask PC A to perform oral sex on him and did touch her breast, as alleged.

50. In relation to allegation two – the panel concluded:

- a. In line with its narrative finding for allegation one, the panel was satisfied that PC A stated to the former officer she did not want to perform oral sex on him, the panel therefore found this element of allegation two factually proven.
- b. In relation to the part of the allegation that the former officer had placed PC A's hand on his erect penis without her consent, the panel noted that PC A and the former officer gave different accounts in relation to this interaction.
- c. The panel noted that PC A stated that the former officer had told her to shut her eyes which she did and the former officer then placed her hand on his erect penis, stating that he had a 'hard on' and was asking her to touch it. PC A stated she felt what was happening was wrong and she was shocked and pulled his hand away and placed it on the steering wheel.
- d. The panel noted that the former officer stated when he started to massage PC A's shoulders she stated she was really enjoying and she then put her hand on his left thigh and ran it up his leg where she stroked his penis through his clothing.
- e. Having reviewed the available evidence, the panel preferred the account of PC A and was satisfied the former officer placed PC A's hand on his erect penis, without her consent and he could not reasonably believe she was consenting. The panel reached this conclusion based upon the

account of PC A, who stated she had ultimately removed the hand of the former officer from her breast and told him not to do this and that she did not wish to kiss him. Thereafter the panel considered it should have been obvious to the former officer that PC A was not consenting.

51. The panel therefore found allegation two factually proven – the former officer did place PC A's hand on his penis, without her consent, as alleged and on the balance of the evidence the panel found that the former officer did not believe she was consenting at this point of the interaction.

**D. Standards of Professional Behaviour – Allegations one and two**

In engaging in sexualised behaviour as described at paragraphs (1) – (3) above, you have failed to treat your colleagues with respect and courtesy. Your behaviour also brings discredit upon the police service. The Standards of Professional Behaviour engaged are: Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.

52. Having made factual findings in relation to Allegations one and two, the panel then considered each of the alleged Standards of Professional Behaviour:

*Authority, Respect and Courtesy*

53. The panel concluded the proven conduct amounted to a breach of this standard. The panel noted that PC A and the former officer had both engaged in flirtatious behaviour and based upon the background context he may have believed PC A was consenting to him touching her breast, however from the point that she removed his hand and told him she did not wish to kiss him, his actions of asking her to perform oral sex and making her touch his penis failed to treat PC A with respect and courtesy.

*Discreditable Conduct*

54. The panel concluded that the proven conduct of the former officer amounted to a breach of this standard. The panel found that if members of the public were aware that a police officer who was on duty in a police vehicle in a public space had touched the breast of his colleague, had asked her to perform oral sex on him and had placed her hand on his erect penis – they would be deeply concerned and the actions of the former officer would significantly undermine public confidence in the police service. The public concern would be even graver to learn that some of this conduct was non consensual as is the panel's finding in relation to allegation two.

### **E. Panel findings of fact – Allegation Three**

55. The Regulation 30 notice alleged that:

*(3) On a single occasion in 2021, you were on duty and crewed with PC B. Whilst in a police vehicle, you said words to the effect of, "How would you feel if I touched your leg". You then said words to the effect of, "This is your last chance to get in the back seat". The effect of your words was to imply that sexual activity could take place between yourself and PC B in the back of the police vehicle.*

56. In reaching a finding of fact the panel considered the following evidence:

*Evidence of PC B*

57. The panel reviewed the statement of PC B and heard live evidence from her during the course of the hearing.

58. The panel found PC B to be a credible and straightforward witness.

59. The panel noted that PC B had joined TVP as a PCSO in 2019.

60. The panel noted that the alleged incident occurred sometime during 2021. At this time, PC B was serving in her PCSO role and had been crewed with the former officer to undertake COVID 19 patrols. Sometime after the incident, PC B left her PCSO role to become a regular police officer.

61. PC B described that prior to the alleged incident she had never been crewed with the former officer before. She stated the former officer and her were undertaking patrols in a police car and were initially engaging in normal conversation. She described during the course of the conversation with the former officer it came up that she had recently split up with her boyfriend and he started to ask her questions about her personal life.

62. PC B stated that she made a comment that she believed the former officer may have misinterpreted differently to how she intended and his behaviour then changed and he asked her, 'how would you like it if I touched your leg'. PC B stated it was a weird comment to make and asked him what he meant. She

detailed the former officer then proceeded to move the palm of his hand up and down the thigh of his leg. PC B stated that she thought the conduct was unprofessional, however she laughed it off as she did not wish to make things awkward.

63. During the hearing PC B refuted the account of the former officer that she had touched his leg at any point.
64. PC B stated later in the shift whilst on patrol the former officer pulled the police car into a layby in a remote rural area and said to her words similar to 'this is your last chance to get into the backseat'. PC B stated she was confused by what he meant and asked him to clarify this, to which he responded, 'this is the last opportunity for us to get in the back of the car together'. PC B outlined that she felt the former officer was inviting her into the rear of the vehicle to be intimate with her. She stated she asked him what he would do if they were caught and he said confidently they would not get caught and it was just a 'bit of fun'.
65. PC B stated that at the end of the shift, she questioned whether she had given the former officer the wrong impression but concluded he was trying his luck. She further described that he was very forward and persistent.
66. PC B outlined that she told one of her PCSO colleagues what had happened and that she had described it as a weird day and that the former officer was in her opinion 'odd'.
67. The panel noted that PC B had not initially reported the matter as she thought the officer was an 'idiot' and she had not subsequently given it much thought. PC B reflected she now considered his conduct was completely inappropriate and she should have reported it earlier.

#### *Statement of PC F*

68. PC F stated that he was previously a PCSO when PC B undertook the same role and he knew her and the former officer.
69. PC F recalled that PC B told him that she had been crewed with the former officer, and she had stated an incident had occurred where the former officer had asked her what she would do if he touched her leg. PC F could not

remember any further details; but told her if she felt concerned, she should contact PSD or a Sergeant.

*Account of the former officer*

70. In his misconduct interview the former officer confirmed he had been crewed with PC B and they had got on really well. He stated they were both equally engaged in conversation and they discussed sexual matters and their private lives. He stated that PC B stated that she was single and that she wanted to have fun, and he told her that he would like to have 'a bit of fun'.
71. The former officer stated that PC B touched him on the leg in a playful way and he did the same mirroring her actions. He stated he did not believe that PC B was uncomfortable or at any point challenging him.
72. The former officer stated that he did at one point pull into a layby but does not remember suggesting that they should get into the back of the police car and did not believe that is the kind of thing he would say.
73. The former officer stated he regretted that PC B had reported he had acted inappropriately. He thought they got on well and he described the relationship between them as flirty and fun. The former officer did accept that the physical contact in the police vehicle was inappropriate.

*Panel conclusions on findings of fact – allegation three*

74. Having reviewed the available evidence, the panel conclude the following in relation to allegation three:
  - a. It was not disputed that on a single occasion in 2021 the former officer and PC B were crewed together. The panel further noted that the TVP duties showed that the two of them were crewed on a COVID 19 policing patrol on 17th April 2021.
  - b. The former officer denied that he had said, 'how would you feel if I touched your leg' to PC B. He stated that PC B had touched his leg and he had then consensually mirrored her actions by touching her leg back. PC B during the hearing denied that any touching had taken place and she had laughed off the comment as she felt uncomfortable and did not wish things to be awkward. The panel noted that PC F detailed that PC B had told him an incident had occurred where the former officer had

asked her what she would do if he touched her leg. The panel preferred the evidence of PC B and found this element of the allegation factually proven.

- c. The former officer stated he had no recollection of saying to PC B that she should get in the back seat of the police vehicle. PC B was clear in evidence that this had occurred, and the panel preferred her evidence and found this element of the allegation factually proven
- d. The panel considered whether the former officer stating 'this is your last chance to get into the back seat' was to imply that sexual activity could take place with PC B in the back of the police vehicle. The panel noted that PC B formed the opinion this was the case and the panel concurred there could be no other logical conclusion as to why the former officer would say this. The panel also noted the subsequent conversation between PC B and the former officer, where she stated they would not get caught and it was bit of fun.

75. The panel, accordingly, found allegation three proven.

#### **F. Standards of Professional behaviour - Allegation 3**

In engaging in sexualised behaviour as described at paragraphs (1) – (3) above, you have failed to treat your colleagues with respect and courtesy. Your behaviour also brings discredit upon the police service. The Standards of Professional Behaviour engaged are: Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.

76. Having made factual findings in relation to Allegations three, the panel then considered each of the alleged Standards of Professional Behaviour:

##### *Authority, Respect and Courtesy*

77. The panel concluded the proven conduct as summarised in paragraph 58 above, amounted to a breach of this standard and the former officer had failed to treat PC B with respect and courtesy.

##### *Discreditable Conduct*

78. The panel concluded that the proven conduct of the former officer amounted to a breach of this standard. The panel found that if members of the public were aware that a police officer who was on duty in a police vehicle in a public space had asked a colleague how they would feel if they touched their leg and had then invited them into the rear of the vehicle to engage in sexual activity- they

would be deeply concerned and the actions of the former officer would significantly undermine public confidence in the police service.

**G. Panel findings of fact – Allegation Four**

79. The Regulation 30 notice alleged that:

*(4) In September 2023 you engaged in sexual activity with PC C at her home address. You:*

*(a) Whilst sitting on PC C's sofa, you kissed her, touched her breasts and placed your hands around her neck;*

*(b) After PC C stood up from the sofa and moved towards the back door of the kitchen area, you followed her;*

*(c) Whilst standing near the back door of the kitchen area, you again placed your hands around PC C's neck, applying pressure, and;*

*(d) Engaged in sexual intercourse with PC C upstairs in her bedroom.*

*PC C did not give consent to being touched in the manner described at (a)-(c) above and did not consent to sexual intercourse as described at (d).*

80. In reaching a finding of fact the panel considered the following evidence:

*Evidence of PC C:*

81. The panel reviewed the transcript of the video recorded interview of PC C and heard live evidence from her during the course of the hearing.

82. The panel found PC C to be a credible and straightforward witness. The panel noted at points in her evidence she was unable to recall specific details of what had occurred and whilst this did not impact the credibility and believability of her account, these gaps needed to be considered when determining the allegations the former officer faced.

83. The panel noted that PC C disclosed her allegations concerning the former officer when she became aware he had been suspended.

84. PC C stated that she met the former officer in 2023 via a dating site. She detailed at that point she was not a police officer but was in the process of applying to join Thames Valley Police as a police constable.
85. PC C stated that prior to the incidents alleged she had engaged in messaging with the former officer and they had gone on one date, which she described as going well. She detailed at the end of the date the former officer and her had engaged in a consensual kiss and they had agreed to see each other again.
86. PC C stated subsequently that the former officer and her had arranged to go on a second date, but he had to work late, so they changed their plans and she invited him to her home for a cup of tea after he finished work. PC B stated that she trusted him as he was a police officer, however did not want him to know her address so took the precautionary step of picking him up from a nearby car park.
87. PC C stated that once back at her property she made the former officer a cup of tea and they sat down to talk together. She described that almost immediately the former officer started to kiss her, he undid her top and touched her breasts and then proceeded to put his hands around her throat, she stated that this made her feel very uncomfortable and scared. PC B stated that she tried to move away from him and made an excuse to stand up and went to the back door to let her dog out.
88. PC C described that as she moved to the back door and let her dog out and the former officer moved to stand in front of her and he grabbed her neck and started to kiss her again. PC C described that the former officer was applying pressure to her throat. She detailed she did engage in kissing him, but she was just going along with it; however, her hands were down by her side, and her body language would have been such that he would have been aware she was not enjoying the experience.
89. She described that the pressure applied to her neck caused discomfort and was not something that she would have consented to. She stated she went along with the actions of the former officer as she felt powerless and the control had been taken away from her.
90. PC C stated it became clear over the next two hours that the former officer wished to have sex with her, and she felt she had no choice as he was being very persistent. She described that the situation made her feel terrified and she

found him to be unpredictable and this made her scared. PC C outlined that notwithstanding the act of applying pressure to her neck, the former officer was not otherwise offering any violence towards her, and she did not believe that he was going to hurt her.

91. PC C described that due to the former officer's persistence, she gave in and told him to go up to her bedroom. She stated that she then sat on her sofa for between five to ten minutes and concluded the only way she could get him to leave her house was to have sex with him. PC C confirmed that she was free to leave and did have access to her mobile phone .
92. PC C stated that as she went up to the bedroom she was thinking she did not want to have sex with the former officer, but she felt scared and was not sure what he was capable of.
93. PC C described that she went into the bedroom and she got into bed with him and he started to kiss her again and put his hands around her neck.
94. PC C stated that ultimately, she ended up having sex with former officer but does not remember a lot about the build up to this. She states that she only remembers the last part of the interaction when she was at the end of the bed and recalls having sexual intercourse with the former officer behind her and that he placed his penis into her vagina. She stated that she hoped that the sexual intercourse would finish quickly and it was over within five minutes. She stated there was no conversation between the former officer and her and she just let the act happen and waited for it to be over. PC C stated that she believed this was the second occasion that the former officer had sex with her, however she had blocked out much of the details as he found it very traumatic.
95. PC C stated that she did not have a conversation with the former officer where she stated she did not want to have sex with him and viewed him as a predator who gets what he wants.
96. PC C stated that she ultimately dropped the former officer off at his car. She detailed after he left her car, she recalled crying and she felt disgusted and she thought she did not want to see him again.
97. PC C detailed over the next 24 hours she told a couple of friends what had happened; however, they attempted to minimise what had happened. She said

this made her question herself but concluded their reactions did not reflect the severity of what had occurred.

98. PC C stated a few days later she messaged the former officer and stated that she was not happy about what had happened between them. She stated the former officer suggested that they meet up to discuss what had happened. She stated they subsequently met and she told him that she had not liked him holding her neck and this his persistence had scared her. PC C detailed the former officer apologised and he had not meant to make her feel that way.
99. PC C stated when she told the former officer she was not happy with what had occurred in her bedroom, the former officer said he did not know what she was talking about and they had not had sex. PC C stated she was shocked by this.
100. PC C stated that at the time the allegations occurred she would describe herself as really impressionable.

*Statement of Ms G*

101. The panel reviewed the statement of Ms G and noted that she had been a friend of PC C for a period of approximately 12 years.
102. Ms G stated she knew that PC C was applying to join the police and she was talking to a serving police officer called 'Robbie'. She stated that prior to the incidents which form the allegations, PC C had sent her a photo of the former officer.
103. Ms G stated that she recalled around September 2023, she visited PC C at her home address and recalled she was really upset and told her that she had seen the former officer the night before. Ms G stated that PC C told her that the former officer had made her feel really unsafe in her own home and that he had been in her face the whole time and had been grabbing at her throat.
104. Ms G stated that PC C told her that she had sex with the former officer, but she had only done so as it was a way to get him out the house. Ms G stated PC C told her that the former officer had been very pushy and she had only had sex

as she thought it was her only option and she had been frightened. PC C had described to her that the sex was awful, and she wanted to get it over with.

105. Ms G stated that she was aware that PC C wanted to speak to the former officer to tell him how she felt and had subsequently met him to do so. She described that she later became aware that the former officer was on the same team as PC C and PC C told her that she did not think she could work with him due to what had happened.

106. Ms G described that the incident had really impacted the confidence of PC C and she had decided not to date since or invite males around to her home address.

#### *Evidence of Messages*

107. The panel noted that no messages were available between PC C and the former officer pertaining to the relevant period pre and post the alleged incident.

#### *Criminal investigation*

108. The panel noted that further to providing her video interview, PC C did not wish to support a criminal investigation and therefore no other investigation took place concerning alleged sexual offences.

#### *Account of the former officer*

109. In his misconduct interview the former officer, he confirmed that PC C and him had met on a dating site and they arranged to meet.

110. The former officer stated that they went on an initial date which went well and, on that occasion, they had kissed and cuddled.

111. The former officer confirmed that on a second occasion PC C had picked him up after work and took him back to her home address. He stated that at the address they had a cup of tea downstairs and then things progressed and they started kissing and cuddling and PC C performed oral sex on him. He stated by this point they had both removed their upper clothing

112. The former officer stated that PC C was an equal participant in the intimacy and appeared to be enjoying the interactions. He stated subsequently they both went upstairs and undressed and they had sexual intercourse. He stated that the sexual intercourse between them was very much consensual and at no point did PC C state she was not fully consenting. He stated after sexual intercourse they lay chatting and cuddling and PC C then dropped him off.

113. The former officer stated that sometime later they met for another date and he has no recollection of PC C challenging him about what had happened on the previous date or denying that they had sex. He detailed that after that the relationship fizzled out, although they did maintain some limited contact, which included PC C messaging him when she was at police training school.

114. The former officer admitted he did place his hands around PC C's neck in a sexual way and he stated that she enjoyed it. He stated this was something that they had spoken about either on the first date or in message exchanges. He stated that at no point did PC C indicate that she did not want to continue.

*Panel conclusions on findings of fact – Allegation four*

115. The panel noted both PC C and the former officer agreed that they had met on a dating site.

116.Both parties agreed that they went on a first date and it had gone well. The former officer stated that at the end of that date they had kissed and cuddled, PC C agreed this had occurred.

117.Both parties agreed in September 2023 a second date occurred, and the former officer was invited to the home address of PC C and they had a cup of tea. The parties agree that the levels of sexual intimacy took place as alleged, however the accounts differ in respect of whether this activity was consensual.

*Allegation 4a: Kissing and Touching breasts*

118.PC C described that whilst sat on the sofa almost immediately the former officer started to kiss her, he undid her top and touched her breasts and then proceeded to put his hands around her throat, she stated that this made her feel very uncomfortable and scared. PC B stated that she tried to move away from him and made an excuse to stand up and went to the back door to let her dog out.

119.The former officer stated at the address they had a cup of tea downstairs and then things progressed and they started kissing and cuddling. The former officer agreed that he had placed his hand around the neck of PC C but stated this was with her consent. He stated by this point they had both removed their upper clothing and PC C performed oral sex on him. The former officer stated that PC C was an equal participant in the intimacy and appeared to be enjoying the interactions. The panel noted that PC C categorically denied that she had performed oral sex on the former officer as stated by him

120.The panel noted the statement of Ms G and the disclosure that PC C made the following day to her, where she stated that the former officer had made her feel really unsafe in her own home and the whole time, he had been in her face and

had been grabbing at her throat. The panel concluded that the proximity of the disclosure provided support to the account of PC C.

121. In reaching its findings of fact, the panel broke down the respective elements of allegation 4a.

122. In respect of whether the former officer kissed and touched the breasts of PC C without her consent. The panel found her account to be credible, and she did not consent to the former officer doing this. The panel noted that PC C stated things had happened very quickly, she described that the former officer was forceful and she felt scared.

123. In relation to whether on the facts known to the former officer he would have concluded or believed PC C was not consenting to being kissed or touching her breasts, the panel found this was not proven. The panel reached this conclusion based upon the fact that, notwithstanding her inner legitimate feelings, PC C did not articulate to the former officer there was an absence of consent. Further, the evidence of the former officer was that he believed she was consenting and the actions of kissing and cuddling was a continuation of the consensual activity which had occurred on the first date between them. The panel also considered this in the context that this conduct took place over a period of a couple of hours.

*Allegations 4 a (hands on neck) b and c (hands on neck):*

124. In respect of whether the former officer placed his hands around the neck of PC C without her consent whilst kissing on the sofa and then again standing up in the kitchen, the panel found the account of PC C to be credible, and she did not consent to the former officer doing this.

125. In relation to whether on the facts known to the former officer would have concluded or believed PC C was not consenting, the panel found this was not proven. The panel noted that the former officer stated that they had discussed this type of intimacy and contended that PC C enjoyed such conduct. PC C stated no prior conversation had taken place. The panel noted that PC C stated she was scared by the actions of the former officer and had disclosed to Ms G that she was not happy with how the former officer had acted in that regard.

126. The panel noted that PC C stated she did not articulate to the former officer that she did not consent to his actions of putting his hands around her neck. The panel has already found as a matter of fact that the former officer believed PC C was consenting to kissing and sexual touching. In the absence of any evidence of outward signs from PC C that she was uncomfortable with the former officer's actions on balance the panel considered the most natural interpretation was that he believed she was consenting to be touched in this way. On that basis the panel concluded the former officer was not in a position to conclude that PC C was not consenting to his actions.

*Allegation 4d: Sexual Intercourse upstairs*

127. PC C stated it became clear over the course of two hours that the former officer wished to have sex with her, and she felt she had no choice as he was being very persistent. She described that the situation made her feel terrified and she found him to be unpredictable and this made her scared. PC C outlined that notwithstanding the act of applying pressure to her neck, the former officer was not otherwise offering any violence towards her, and she did not believe that he was going to hurt her.

128. PC C described that due to the former officer's persistence, she gave in and told him to go up to her bedroom. She stated that she then sat on her sofa for a period of 5 to 10 minutes and concluded the only way she could get him to

leave her house was to have sex with him. PC C confirmed that she was free to leave and did have access to her mobile phone .

129.PC C stated that as she went up to the bedroom she was thinking she did not want to have sex with the former officer, but she felt scared and was not sure what he was capable of. PC C described that she went into the bedroom and she got into bed with him and he started to kiss her again and put his hands around her neck.

130.PC C stated that ultimately, she ended up having sex with former officer but does not remember a lot about the build up to this. She states that she only remembers the last part of the interaction when she was at the end of the bed and recalls having sexual intercourse with the former officer behind her and that he placed his penis into her vagina. She stated that she hoped that the sexual intercourse would finish quickly and it was over within five minutes. She stated there was no conversation between the former officer and her and she just let the act happen and waited for it to be over. PC C stated that she believed this was the second occasion that the former officer had sex with her, however she had blocked out much of the details as he found it very traumatic.

131.PC C stated that she did not have a conversation with the former officer where she stated she did not want to have sex with him and viewed him as a predator who gets what he wants.

132.The panel noted the statement of Ms G and the disclosure that PC C made the following day to her, where she stated she told her that she had sex with the former officer, but she had only done so as it was a way to get him out the house. Ms G stated PC C told her that the former officer had been very pushy and she had only had sex as she thought it was her only option and she had been frightened. PC C had described to her that the sex was awful, and she wanted to get it over with.

133. The panel noted that the former officer stated PC C and him subsequently both went upstairs at the same time and undressed and they had sexual intercourse. He stated that the sexual intercourse between them was very much consensual and at no point did PC C state she was not fully consenting. He stated after sexual intercourse they lay chatting and cuddling and PC C then dropped him off.

134. The panel noted that PC C spent a short period downstairs contemplating whether or not she wished to have sex with the former officer and concluded the only way to get rid of him was to have sex and then she hoped he would leave. To that end she went upstairs and proceeded to have sexual intercourse with him.

135. The panel was clear on the basis of her evidence before them at the hearing that PC C did not want to have sex with the former officer and only did so because she felt she had no choice. To that end the panel found factually proven that PC C did not consent to having sex with the former officer.

136. In relation to whether the former officer would have known in the circumstances that PC C was not consenting, the panel determined it could not conclude, to the required standard, that he was aware or believed this to be the case.

137. In reaching this conclusion, the panel noted that PC C stated she went upstairs and although inwardly she did not want to have sex with the former officer she proceeded to do so and there was no evidence that she signalled to the former officer in any way during that time that she was not consenting (verbally or otherwise). PC C on her evidence stated she did not disclose to the former officer that she did not want to have sex with him at any point. Accordingly, it

was not proved that he engaged in sexual intercourse with PC C knowing that she did not consent.

#### **H. Standards of Professional behaviour – Allegation four**

*In engaging in the behaviour described at paragraph (4)(a) – (d) above, you have treated PC C in a degrading and disrespectful manner. Your conduct also brings profound discredit upon the police service. The Standards of Professional Behaviour engaged are: Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.*

138. In relation to the Standards of Professional Behaviour, whilst the panel did find that PC C did not consent to the actions of the former officer in each of the allegations, the panel could not be satisfied on the evidence, on the balance of probabilities, that the former officer was aware that she did not consent. On this basis, as this was off-duty sexual conduct, which the officer likely believed (incorrectly) was consensual, the panel concluded there were no breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

#### **I. Seriousness of the Proven Misconduct (Assessment of whether the admitted and proven allegations amount to gross misconduct or misconduct)**

139. Further to allegations one, two and three, being found proven, the panel considered under Regulation 41(15) (b) of the 2020 Conduct Regulations whether the conduct as found in relation to the allegations amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

140. The panel reminded itself that under Regulation 2(1) and Misconduct' meant a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify

disciplinary action. Whilst 'Gross Misconduct' meant a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.

141. The panel noted that the AA submitted that the conduct found proved overall amounted to gross misconduct. The panel noted that the former officer submitted on his partial admissions that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct.

142. The approach taken by the panel when considering seriousness was that identified by Mr Popplewell J in *Fuglers LLP v SRA* [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin) which is in these terms:

143. "In assessing seriousness, the most important factors will be (1) the culpability for misconduct in question and (2) the harm caused by the misconduct.....(3) aggravating factors .....and mitigating factors....."

#### *Culpability*

144. This panel reminded itself that culpability denotes an officer's blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions. The panel found the following to be relevant to the assessment of culpability.

145. The panel concluded that the proven conduct of the former officer was intentional and deliberate. (4.10).

146. The panel concluded that in each of the proven allegations the officer's conduct evidenced a pattern of sexual impropriety towards colleagues (4.40)

147. The panel concluded the former officer's actions of placing PC A's hand onto his penis without her consent was an example of VAWG

148.The panel concluded that overall, the level of culpability was high.

#### *Harm*

149.The panel noted that the actions of the former officer had made PC A feel uncomfortable and shocked. The panel concluded the proven conduct placed her in an invidious position where on duty alone with the former officer in a car, she had to stop the former officer touching her breasts, decline his invitation to engage in oral sex and remove her hand which he had placed on her penis. The panel also noted the evidence of PC D, who PC A had made a disclosure to and she described she witnessed PC A was upset, distressed and panicking on 22nd August 2024 when faced with crewing with the former officer.

150.The panel noted in evidence PC B described the actions of the former officer had made her feel uncomfortable, but she had not reported matters as she thought the former officer was an idiot. PC B detailed over time she had however come to reflect that his actions towards her were completely inappropriate.

151.The panel noted that during the hearing both PC A and PC B appeared to be still emotionally impacted by the conduct of the former officer

152.The panel concluded that the proven allegations, if known by the public, would have an obvious and significant impact on trust and confidence in the police service (4.66). Put clearly, if the public were aware that a police officer had engaged in a course of conduct which amounted to sexual impropriety towards two colleagues on duty, in uniform in a marked police car, in a public place, they would be rightly deeply concerned.

153.The panel also concluded that at a time of heightened national public and media concern relating to standards in policing and how the police service engages with and support women and girls, the actions of the officer, if known, would further harm the reputation of the police service.

154.The Panel found the overall level of harm to be high.

*Aggravating factors*

155.In considering aggravating factors the Panel were careful not to double count and found the factors below to be relevant:

156.The panel concluded the following were aggravating factors:

157.In relation to each of the proven allegations the former officer was motivated by sexual gratification

158.In relation to PC A the panel found the fact that she was still in her probationary period and had less than one year's policing service was a particularly aggravating factor and evidenced that the former officer had abused his position as an experienced police officer on his team

159.In relation to PC B the panel noted that she was undertaking the role of PCSO and she had in the region of two years policing service. Once again as an experienced police officer on the team it evidenced an abuse of trust

160.In respect of PC A and B the panel concluded the proven allegations amounted to a course of conduct by the former officer where he targeted junior in service female officers, took them to remote rural locations and then sexually

propositioned them. The panel concluded that the actions of the former officer placed each of his colleagues in an invidious position where they would have felt isolated and vulnerable in his presence

161. The panel concluded collectively across the proven allegations there was evidence of repeated and sustained behaviour over a period of time.

162. The panel also concluded that in each of the proven allegations it should have been clear and obvious to the former officer that his conduct was improper

163. The panel concluded there were multiple proven allegations across two of the standards of professional behaviour

#### *Mitigating factors*

164. The Panel considered carefully all the factors that are detailed in paragraph 4.79 of the Guidance. The Panel was careful to remind itself of the difference between mitigating factors and personal mitigation. Mitigating factors are those that could potentially indicate a lower level of culpability.

165. The Panel noted that the former officer did admit at an early opportunity that elements of his conduct were unprofessional and amounted to gross misconduct.

#### **J. Panel Finding on Seriousness**

166. The panel takes as a starting point that the former officer accepts in his Regulation 31 response and through his police friend at the hearing that his conduct on duty in the police vehicles (allegations 1 – 3) albeit on his account consensual, amounted to gross misconduct. The panel agrees that were this the

extent of the proven misconduct in this case it would amount to gross misconduct, not least due to the effect on the public trust and confidence in the police service. However, clearly from its factual findings above the panel's conclusions go beyond this significantly in the respect the panel has found that PC A did not consent to the behaviour in allegation two and nor did the former officer believe that she did. For the avoidance of doubt the panel consider that its findings on allegation two alone would amount to gross misconduct in addition to the admissions made by the former officer.

167. The Panel considered that overall, the proven conduct of the former officer (in respect of allegations 1-3) was such that the seriousness was high and the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour amounted to Gross Misconduct.

#### **K. Outcome - discussion**

168. Having delivered its factual ruling on the allegations and the initial seriousness assessment, on the afternoon of the second day of the hearing, the panel received submissions on the appropriate disciplinary outcome from both Ms Clarke, on behalf of the AA, and Mr Baker, on behalf of the former officer. The panel also received a copy of the former officer's service record. Again the panel were directed on the law on the imposition of outcome by the LQA according to the agreed written directions document attached, and followed those legal directions.

169. In reaching a decision regarding the appropriate disciplinary outcome, the panel gave due consideration to all the evidence and information put before them. The panel also considered the following:

- The officer's record of service
- The officer's training record

- Submissions made on behalf of the AA concerning outcome and sanction
- The Regulation 31 response of the officer and representations made by his Police Federation representative
- The nature of the allegations and findings
- The interests of the public
- The interests of Thames Valley Police.

170. In coming to its conclusion as to the appropriate outcome, the panel had regard to the College of Policing Guidance, the HOG and relevant legal authorities.

171. The Guidance made it clear that there was a 3-stage process, which the panel was required to adopt when deciding upon the correct sanction in misconduct proceedings. Case law is unequivocal that the 3-stage process should be adopted by panels in police misconduct proceedings. Accordingly, the panel adopted the 3-stage process.

172. For clarity the 3-stage process, originates from the *Fuglers* case and sets out the requirement to:

- a) assess the seriousness of the misconduct
- b) keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions; and
- c) choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

### *Seriousness Assessment*

173. The panel was assisted by the Guidance, which emphasises that there are 4 elements that the panel are required to consider when assessing seriousness, namely - culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating factors.

174. The Panel reassessed the seriousness assessment that it had completed at the findings stage. Having undertaken this process the Panel found that their assessment of seriousness remained high.

175. The panel then went onto consider personal mitigation and reviewed the service record and PDR's that had been provided:

- The panel noted the following themes from the three PDR's submitted on behalf of the former officer:
  - He was considered to be a proactive officer and was highly regarded by his supervisors
  - His investigative management and wider investigation skills were considered to be of a high level
  - He was considered to have a positive attitude and good work ethic
- The panel noted that no character evidence had been submitted by the former officer

176. The panel reminded itself that due to the nature and purpose of disciplinary proceedings the weight attributed to this material was necessarily limited, particularly having found ground misconduct. (the Guidance para 6 and *Salter v Chief Constable of Dorset* [2012] EWCA Civ 1047 Para 23).

*The purpose of imposing sanctions*

177. Having assessed seriousness, stage 2 of the structured approach required, the panel to reminded themselves of the purpose for which sanctions are imposed.

178. The three-fold purpose of sanctions is explained in the Guidance at (2.3):

- Maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
- Upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct
- Protecting the public

179. The panel considered:

- Maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service  
And
- Upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct

Were particularly relevant to the findings the panel had made in this case

*Availability of outcome upon a Panel finding of Gross Misconduct.*

180. The Panel, having reminded itself of the purpose of misconduct proceedings, were required to determine, given their finding of Gross Misconduct, the sanction that most appropriately met the purpose of the regime.

181. The Panel reminded itself of the Guidance at paragraph 2.7 that misconduct proceedings are not designed to punish officers.

182. Equally the panel reminded itself of paragraph 2.8 of the Guidance, which states:

“However, the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect, which should therefore be no more than is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings. Consider less severe outcomes before more severe outcomes”

183. As this was a case concerning a former officer, the panel reviewed paragraph 3.31 of the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceeding referred to above. This section deals with former officers. The Panel noted that where the Panel has concluded that the conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct, it can only consider two outcomes: disciplinary action or no disciplinary action. Where the finding is Gross Misconduct and disciplinary action is imposed, this can only be that the former officer would have been dismissed if still serving. No other sanction can be enforced. If the finding is Gross Misconduct but the Panel determines that dismissal is not justified, then no action will be taken, and the Gross Misconduct will be recorded.

184. To establish what the sanction would be if the former officer was still serving, the panel referred themselves to the Guidance, at paragraph 2.8 and considered the following in ascending order.

- (i) A final written warning
- (ii) Dismissal without notice.

185. The panel noted the submissions of the AA and the police federation representations. The AA submitted that if still serving the appropriate

sanction would have been dismissal without notice. The police federation submitted that an extended written warning of five years would satisfy the purpose of the misconduct proceedings.

#### *Written warning*

186. The panel considered very carefully whether a Final Written Warning would be an appropriate sanction in the case if the former officer was still serving, set against the findings which it made in relation to the serious proven conduct. The panel concluded that based upon the collective seriousness of the proven conduct the imposition of a final written warning in this case would not fulfil the purpose of police misconduct proceedings.

187. The panel came to this decision having taken into account the following aspects of its findings:

- Evidence of a course of conduct towards female colleagues which included sexual impropriety and the targeting of young in service female colleagues in remote isolated locations
- In each of the proven allegations the former officer had abused his position of trust
- The proven conduct had taken place on duty, in public, in a marked policing vehicle
- That the proven allegation relating to PC A having her hand put on the former officer's penis without her consent, was found to be VAWG  
And
- The impact of the proven allegations on public confidence if the public were to become aware of the conduct in this case

188. Set against these findings, the panel considered that the threefold purpose of the misconduct regime could only be satisfied, by the imposition of a sanction that if the officer was still serving that he would be dismissed without notice from Thames Valley Police.

**L. Outcome - decision**

189. The panel having considered all the issues, including the three principles highlighted and the serious nature of the misconduct, impose the only disciplinary action available for a former officer, namely a declaration that if he had still been serving, he would have been dismissed from the police service without notice.

190. The panel considered this sanction as the only proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aims of the proceedings, which are the purposes of the police disciplinary process as set out in the Guidance.

191. The panel now invite the Force to commence the process to place the former officer onto the College of Policing barred list.

**Chair: Paul Mills QPM – Retired Deputy Chief Constable**

**IPM: Seán McHugh**

**IPM: Gordon Woods**

**21/07/2026**

