Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

Notice of Outcome of Misconduct Hearing and any Disciplinary Action Imposed on a
Former Officer

Name:	Former Police Constable A	Former Number:	*****
Former Rank:	PC	Former Division	NHPT

Case reference number: CM/34/25

Please note this document will be published on the Force website unless the Chair of the proceedings dispenses with the requirement to do so under the Police Conduct Regulations 2020, Regulation 63 (8)(a) or (b).

ALLEGATIONS SUBJECT OF AN ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT CASE HEARING:

1. You joined Thames Valley Police on 25th July 2011

2. In January 2025 it was noted by Sergeant A and Inspector B that the tasks had not been completed that you had been assigned to complete over the Christmas period.

3. A review of DMS showed shifts that were unaccounted for with no evidence of any work being completed.

4. On 18th January 2025 you were challenged about the lack of work.

5. DMS showed Annual leave on 10th and 12th January 2025. On 15th January 2025 you completed the book on book off process to show you had worked on these days. This would require you to enter specific duty times to override the annual leave that was showing on these dates.

6. On 21st February 2025 Resource Management provided an email to Inspector B which identified 35 separate dates throughout 2024 where Annual Leave had been booked and subsequently recorded that you had worked.

7. The identified dates were reviewed to establish whether any computer activity took place by you on those dates.

8. On 19 of the identified dates from March to December and in addition to the January dates there was no computer activity on the dates in question, this indicates that you were not working on these dates but were on annual leave.

9. You have denied any dishonesty or intention to obtain additional annual leave.

10. You stated that you often cancel leave days but denied every falsifying or being dishonest within the DMS system. You are dyslexic and as a result there are work systems that you struggle with.

11. You do not challenge the data and cannot provide an explanation accepting where there was no fob or laptop data that you were not at work.

12. You resigned from Thames Valley Police on 02/02/26.

Your behaviour has breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:
By reason for the matters listed above, your behaviour did not meet the standards required by the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as to:

1. **Honesty and integrity**
You have failed to act with honesty and integrity by entering book on and off times into DMS on 19 occasions when you were on annual leave and did not work

2. **Discreditable conduct**
a) You have intentionally accrued significantly more annual leave than you were entitled to (almost 4 working weeks). This is time when you should have been contributing to serving victims, fighting crime and building trust.
b) Your behaviour brings discredit to the police service and would undermine public trust and confidence in policing.

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

FINDING: **Gross Misconduct**

FULL ACCOUNT OF REASONS FOR THE FINDING

The Chair must consider and follow the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes 2022.

The chair must apply the standard of proof in civil cases, that is the balance of probabilities. Accelerated Misconduct Hearings for former officers are brought only for allegations of gross misconduct and therefore the evidence will need to be persuasive and cogent to meet that standard for the chair in weighing the probability and deciding whether, on balance, the gross misconduct occurred. Disciplinary action at an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing can only be imposed where there is a finding of gross misconduct. If misconduct only is found, then no further action can be taken.

Former PC A was notified of the Appropriate Authority's intention to refer to an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing (AMH) on 11th August 2026. On 24th September 2026 he was provided with the AMH bundle. He provided no 54-regulation response and on 15th October 2026 and confirmed he would not be attending.

Absence of Former Officer

Former Police Constable A resigned with effect on 2359hrs on 2 February 2026.

Regulation 57 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 and the Home Office Guidance 2020 Section 3, relating to disciplinary processes and proceedings at 12.16 addresses the position and makes it clear that the hearing may proceed in his absence.

I was assured that the former officer concerned has been informed of his right under Regulation of the PCR to be legally represented at the hearing, or to be represented by a police friend where the police officer chooses not to be legally represented.

Former PC A did have a Federation Representative attend.

Pursuant to Regulation 61(15) and (16) of the PCR my task is as follows:

(15) The person conducting or chairing the accelerated misconduct hearing must review the facts of the case and decide whether the conduct of the officer concerns amounts to gross misconduct.
(16) The person conducting or chairing the accelerated misconduct hearing must not find that the

conduct of the officer concerned amounts to gross misconduct unless –
(a) they are satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this is the case, or
(b) the officer admits it is the case.

In the event that I find that the conduct amounts to gross misconduct then I am required to take disciplinary action as set out in Regulation 62. The disciplinary action can only be that of finding that the former officer would have been dismissed if they had still been a member of a police force.

This means that in the event that I find Former PC A's conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct I shall decide upon disciplinary Action.

Anonymity Order

An application for anonymity in respect of the former officer was granted prior to the hearing, having given due regard to the medical evidence relating to the former officer's mental health. The Appropriate Authority confirmed that they were satisfied that anonymity was appropriate in the circumstances. The Federation Representative has requested that the anonymity order remain in place following the conclusion of the hearing. I acknowledge that there was an agreed position on this matter, and I indicated that the hearing would continue in private and that any subsequent publication would remain anonymised

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

I confirm that I have been provided with and carefully read the following:

- A bundle of 44 pages of evidence including the Investigating Officer's report and the referral notice supplied to the former officer under Regulation 51(1)
- Opening Note from the Appropriate Authority
- A copy of the Regulation 52 notice which informs the officer of his right to legal representation and if he chooses not to do so then he may be dismissed or receive any other outcome that I feel is appropriate.
- The officer has chosen not to provide a regulation 54 response.

I have carefully considered the various documentary evidence. I have listened carefully to the overview by the Appropriate Authority.

This case is straightforward, the officer intentionally accrued significantly more annual leave than he

was entitled when he should have been at work fighting crime, serving victims and building trust with our communities. The public would expect their officers to be working for them and not dishonestly taking time off.

In assessing seriousness, I have considered Chapter 4 of the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes and have followed the four stages of assessing seriousness as set out in Fuglers LLP v Solicitors Regulation Authority [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin).

Culpability:

In this case Former PC A's culpability is high. There is evidence that his behaviour was intentional, repeated and deliberate. Not a single isolated act, it was not a mistake, as it incorporated more than ticking a box. He made no update a supervisor that he was available as an extra resource. Although he stated it was a mistake, I do not accept that.

Harm:

The level of harm in this case is high. The nature of the gross misconduct in relation to Former PC A has - or could have caused - serious harm to public confidence in the police service if the public knew that this officer displayed this dishonest behaviour which are wholly at odds with our mission, vision and values of Thames Valley Police. He has breached the trust from his supervisors in that role. He is a lazy and wholly dishonest officer.

Aggravating Factors:

Former PC A's behaviour would have escalated had TVP not intervened.

Mitigating Factors:

Former officer PC A raised that he has dyslexia. I asked about any reports that, due to his dyslexia, that could indicate that would impact his ability to update DMS. The AA answered that there were no such reports and I was re-assured that he had capacity and ability to make the decision to act in this manner. His Fed rep raised no further mitigating factors.

When assessing the seriousness in this case, I find on the balance of probabilities that Former PC A's conduct fell well below the standards of professional Behaviour in regard to **Honesty and integrity** and **Discreditable Conduct.**

It is for these reasons that I find the allegations amount to Gross Misconduct.

STANDARD(S) OF PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOUR DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN BREACHED:

1. **Honesty and Integrity**
2. **Discreditable Conduct**

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

DISCIPLINARY ACTION IMPOSED:

The Chair must consider and follow the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes 2022.

Disciplinary action can only be that of finding that the former officer would have been dismissed if he or she had still been a member of a police force. This outcome has the additional consequence that the individual will be included on the barred list. A finding of misconduct can be recorded but no further action taken.

Sanction

I have carefully considered the oral submissions by the Appropriate Authority and considered the officers personal record which is long considering his length of service to assist me with the most appropriate sanction in this case. I have at all times kept in mind the purpose of this conduct regime, which is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service, to uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct, and to protect the public. I acknowledge that the officer did not attend the proceedings; I make no judgment on that fact, but it meant that my assessment relied entirely on the evidence presented before me.

In coming to my determination for this matter, I noted the relevant case law: R (Green) v. Police Complaints Authority [2004] UKHL 6, where Lord Carswell stated: "Public confidence in the police is a factor of great importance in the maintenance of law.... 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" (paragraph 78).

Further consideration has been given in the case of R (on the application of Williams) [2016] EWHC 2708 which limits the weight to be given to personal mitigation generally.

The conduct shown by Former PC A in this case has fallen far below the standards expected of a member of the police service and what the public rightly demands.

Such conduct is completely incompatible with the values of Thames Valley Police, and the service as a whole. The public cannot have confidence in a police service where serving officers behave in this manner that was intention and deliberate. To behave in the way that Former PC A has done and to continue to hold the office of constable would erode public confidence even further. To retain an individual in these circumstances would not uphold high standards but would compromise them.

The only appropriate sanction in this case is that the former officer would have been dismissed had he remained a serving officer and his name will be included on the public barred list, as soon as practicable.

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

REPRESENTATIONS BY THE CHAIR AS TO PUBLICATION ON BARRED LIST:

Chairs have a role to play in making representations at the conclusion of misconduct proceedings as to publication of the information set out in the Barred List Regulations. As part of their remarks at the conclusion of the proceedings, they may make reference to whether any of the following factors are likely to apply:

a) Would be against the interests of national security;

b) Might prejudice the investigation or other criminal or civil proceedings;

c) Would result in significant risk of harm to any individual, including the officer themselves.

The relevant authority will then include these representations in their report to the College of Policing.

It was decided that the findings of this hearing should be published in anonymised form. The identification of this officer and that of the complainants will not be identified due to reasons raised by the AA.

The above Accelerated Misconduct Hearing was held on:	15th October 2026
The Chair of the Accelerated Misconduct Hearing:	Chief Constable Jason Hogg
Signature:	

Under Rule 6 of The Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020 an appeal may be made by a former officer in the following circumstances:

6.—(1) Subject to paragraph (3), a former police officer to whom paragraph (2) applies may appeal to a tribunal in reliance on one or more of the grounds of appeal referred to in paragraph (4) against one or both of the following—

(a) a finding referred to in paragraph (2)(a) or (b) made under the Conduct Regulations;

(b) any decision to impose disciplinary action under the Conduct Regulations in consequence of that finding,

(2) This paragraph applies to—

(a) a former police officer against whom a finding of misconduct or gross misconduct has been made at a misconduct hearing, and
(b) a former police officer against whom a finding of gross misconduct has been made at an accelerated misconduct hearing.

(3) A former police officer may not appeal to a tribunal against the finding referred to in paragraph (2)(a) or (b) where that finding was made following acceptance by the former officer that his conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct (as the case may be).

(4) The grounds of appeal under this rule are—
(a) that the finding or decision to impose disciplinary action was unreasonable;
(b) that there is evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the original hearing which could have materially affected the finding or decision to impose disciplinary action; or
(c) that there was a breach of the procedures set out in the Conduct Regulations, the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2020 or Part 2 of the 2002 Act, or unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision to impose disciplinary action."

Notice of appeal
9.—(1) Subject to rule 10, (Notice of appeal out of time) a police officer or a former police officer who wishes to appeal to a tribunal must give notice of the appeal before the end of 10 working days beginning with the first working day after the day on which the officer is first supplied with a written copy of the relevant decision.
(2) The notice of appeal must be given in writing to the relevant local policing body.
(3) The officer or former officer may request a transcript of the proceedings (or part of the proceedings) at the original hearing in the officer's or former officer's notice of appeal.

Payment of Costs
In accordance with the Home Office Guidance 2020;

26.110 All fees and expenses of the tribunal members are paid for by the local policing body – including where the administration of the tribunal has been delegated to another local policing body as the relevant person.

26.111 An appellant must pay their own costs of the appeal unless the tribunal directs that the whole or part of their costs are to be paid by the local policing body. Absent dishonesty or a lack of good faith, a costs order should not be made against the local policing body unless there is good reason to do so. In considering an award of costs against the local policing body the tribunal must balance the financial prejudice to the particular complainant, against the need to encourage public bodies to exercise their public function of making reasonable and sound decisions without fear of exposure to undue financial prejudice, if the decision were to be successfully challenged.

26.112 Where the tribunal decides to award costs in favour of the appellant, it is suggested that the tribunal sets out the reasons for this and identifies any lessons to be learned for the force as a result of the case.

SUBMISSION OF NOTIFICATION OF APPEAL (AND ALL SUBSEQUENT DOCUMENTATION)

Please note that all correspondence regarding Police Appeals Tribunal matters are to be submitted to:

PCC@thamesvalley.police.uk

or

The Police and Crime Commissioner
Thames Valley Police Headquarters
Oxford Road
Kidlington
OX5 2NX

I, MPM NAME can confirm that I have served the Former Officer with a copy of this document.

Signature of Misconduct Proceedings Manager: _____

Date: _____