



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:	Liam Yeo	Former Number:	8912
Former Rank:	Police Constable	Former Division	ICR – Team 1 Didcot
Case reference number:	CM-62-25		

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).



Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

ALLEGATIONS SUBJECT OF AN ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT CASE HEARING:

Background Facts:

1. You joined Thames Valley Police on 22 May 2023 as a Student Police Constable.
2. In October 2023, you were posted to Incident and Crime Response Team 1 at Didcot Police Station.
3. On 18 October 2024 you have been allocated an arrest handover for a drink drive prisoner who had been arrested the previous night and was in custody.
4. You have made a false and misleading entry within the MHG6 which stated that *"...XX is unable to provide a statement detailing this as when I have attempted to get this, admittedly late, he has not remembered if they were actively trying to move the vehicle"*.
5. You have also made false and misleading entries on NICHE OEL entry #39 *"Witness Statements – These do not put the suspect actively driving the vehicle"*.
6. OEL entry #40 states *"Call 1 describes 2 males near to the vehicle trying to move it with the "Driver" being all in black which would match X description – When I have debriefed XX on this he has been unsure of this at the time of my call and was not sure if they were actively trying to drive the vehicle"*.
7. Due to collapsing statutory limit time frame, the file was submitted to a Justice Gateway Officer. The officer has listened to the 999 tapes and became suspicious of the information you have put on the occurrence and the MG06C that the witness was unable to provide a statement.
8. On 22 April 2025 the JGO has created a task within NICHE for you to contact witnesses, including Mr XX.
9. On 1 May 2026 Mr Rogers has checked the OEL to see an entry that you had spoken to witnesses including Mr Taylor but with a negative result which precluded the taking of a statement. As this contradicted what the JGO heard in the 999 calls, he has become suspicious.
10. Another officer was tasked with the taking of the statement which provided key evidence to allow the case to proceed.
11. On the 6 May 2025 PS Y has called XX and asked him about the police contact. XX has confirmed to PS Y that he had called 999 at the time of the event and spoke to officers still on scene but that he had not had any other police contact since then.
12. You were then challenged by PS Y on whether you had contacted XX. You have then told PS Y that you had spoken to XX on the phone and debriefed him and that XX could not remember the incident.



Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

13. An audit on NICHE was carried out which showed on the 6 May 2025, you have amended the MG6, removing the part that said "XX is unable to provide a statement detailing this as when I have attempted to get this, admittedly late he has not remembered if they were actively trying to move the vehicle".
14. PS Y has called you back into his office and asked whether you had been truthful regarding the witness contact. You have then admitted that you had not been.
15. On 18 May 2025 you were served your Regulation 17 Notice setting out the allegations under investigation and on 20 July 2025 you have resigned for Thames Valley Police.

Your behaviour has breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

Honest and Integrity because:

It is alleged that you have knowingly made false and misleading entries on the MG6 and NICHE regarding the contact of witness. You have subsequently admitted that the information recorded was untruthful. The detail contained within the entries is inconsistent with any suggestion that you were unsure whether contact has been made. By deliberately recording information which you knew to be false and misleading, you failed to act with the honesty and integrity expected of a police officer.

Duties and Responsibilities because:

By recording inaccurate information on a force system, you have failed to carry out your duties diligently and responsibly, creating a risk that subsequent policing decisions would be based upon inaccurate information.

Orders and Instructions because:

You were tasked by the JGO to obtain a statement and update the relevant NICHE records. Instead of carrying out that instruction accurately, you have entered information which you have since admitted was untruthful. In doing so, you have failed to follow lawful instructions and comply with force policies and procedures relating to the recording of information.

Discreditable Conduct because:

By creating false records, misleading colleagues and compromising an active criminal investigation in the manner alleged, your conduct had potential to undermine public trust and confidence in the police service and bring discredit upon Thames Valley Police.



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 Yeo was notified of the Appropriate Authority's intention to refer to an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing (AMH) on 4th June 2026. He accepted in an email to the Misconduct Proceedings Manager on 29 July 2026 that his conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct. By email on 29 July 2026 Former PC Yeo provided his confirmation he would not be attending his AMH.

Absence of Former Officer

Former Police Constable Yeo resigned with immediate effect on 20 July 2025.

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 on condition I can be sure that the officer has been informed of his rights to be legally represented at the hearing or to be represented by a police friend where he chooses not to be legally represented.

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 Yeo did not have a Federation Representative, this was raised and re-assurance was provided by the Appropriate Authority to say that he had not been a police officer for over a year so did not direct a representative.

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.



Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

(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 Yeo's conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct I shall decide upon disciplinary Action.

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

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

- A bundle of 47 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's conduct has been proven, and he has admitted the behaviour.

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 Yeo's culpability is high. There is ample evidence that his behaviour was intentional and deliberate.

Harm:

The level of harm in this case is high. The nature of the gross misconduct in relation to Former PC Yeo has - or could have caused - serious harm to public confidence in the police service if the public knew



Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

that this officer displayed this behaviour which are wholly at odds with the mission, vision and values of Thames Valley Police.

Aggravating Factors:

Former PC Yeo was dishonest on an MG06 that would have led to miscarriage of justice had it not been highlighted.

Mitigating Factors:

There are no mitigating factors to this case.

When assessing the seriousness in this case, I find on the balance of probabilities that Former PC Yeo's conduct fell well below the standards of professional Behaviour in regard to Honesty and Integrity, Duties and Responsibilities, Orders and Instructions 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. Duties and Responsibilities**
- 3. Orders and Instructions**
- 4. 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 Yeo 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 Yeo 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.

No representations made

The above Accelerated
Misconduct Hearing was held on:

5 August 2026

The Chair of the Accelerated
Misconduct Hearing:

Chief Constable Jason Hogg

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.



Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

(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)



Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 63 - THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

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

Signature of Misconduct
Proceedings Manager:

A. Cooper

Date:

19 August 2026