

**Thames Valley Police**  
**Outcome of Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Former 1070 Lily Maxey**  
**Monday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2026**

On 20<sup>th</sup> July 2026 the Chief Constable presided over an accelerated hearing for the above named officer. The hearing took place in the absence of the former officer. The former officer faced the following allegations:

Former PC Maxey was a serving officer with Thames Valley Police having joined as a PCSO in December 2023 and becoming a Police Officer in July 2024. In January 2023 and March 2024 Former PC Maxey made notifiable association disclosures and was subsequently advised she was unable to be posted to Milton Keynes. In June 2024 she was posted to Aylesbury Police Station.

On 29<sup>th</sup> December 2024 Former PC Maxey entered Wolverton police station on her rest day. Whilst there she took a picture of a male nominal.

On 31<sup>st</sup> October 2024 Former PC Maxey took a photograph from an operational briefing having accessed this with no policing purpose.

In November 2025 Former PC Maxey was charged with two counts of Breach of the Data Protection Act for the images taken on 31/10/24 and 29/12/24. She was subsequently found guilty of these offences at Reading Magistrates Court and on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2026 was fined £2050 by the District Judge.

It was alleged that Former PC Maxey breached the standards of professional behaviour

1. Honesty and Integrity – Former PC Maxey failed to act with integrity and compromised her role as a serving police officer
2. Discreditable Conduct – Former PC Maxey has been convicted of two criminal offences of knowingly or recklessly accessing personal information without the consent of the controller, contrary to section 179 of the Data Protection Act 2018. Her behaviour has brought discredit on Thames Valley Police and undermined public confidence in the police service because as guardians of personal data on police databases, the public should have the trust of its staff not to access this information other than for a policing purpose.
3. Confidentiality – Former PC Maxey failed to treat the information available to her in the proper course of her duties with respect and the required confidentiality

PC Maxey resigned from Thames Valley Police on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2026.

The Chief Constable found the case proven for the following reasons:

The evidence in this is compelling, and I went on to ask a few questions. Former PC Maxey was the subject of disclosure matters relating to notifiable associations. The individuals concerned were two separate people outside of the notifiable associations. Questions were raised regarding why the information was accessed and what, if anything, was done with the information once obtained.

In relation to the Wolverton notice board incident, former PC Maxey stated that she was at her boyfriend's house when she saw an individual whom she believed she recognised. She subsequently entered the police station and saw the same male displayed on the notice board. She took a photograph of some information but did not speak to a supervisor, submit any intelligence report, or seek guidance regarding her actions. It was alleged that she showed the photograph to her boyfriend at the time. However, she later changed her account and stated that she had not done so. No intelligence submission was ever made in relation to this matter.

A further issue concerned access to Milton Keynes briefing material during HQN training. Former PC Maxey accessed the briefing and took a photograph of a male who was known within the area in which she lived. Her explanation was that she intended to submit intelligence in relation to the individual. However, no intelligence report was ever submitted.

When considering whether the actions may have been undertaken in good faith, the chair noted that the male in question had a number of highly distinctive facial tattoos and was therefore readily identifiable without the need to take a photograph. There was no evidence that the photograph had been sent to anyone.

Former PC Maxey had previously been instructed not to access briefing material relating to an area to which she was not posted. Further questioning was undertaken regarding whether access to briefings from other policing areas would also be inappropriate. It was confirmed that officers should not access briefing materials relating to areas outside their posting unless there is a legitimate policing purpose to do so.

During the proceedings, Police Federation Representative Pete Foy read a statement that former PC Maxey had requested be presented on her behalf.

At 11:09 hrs, I found that the actions of former PC Maxey amounted to Gross Misconduct. This finding was made on the balance of probabilities. The rationale for the decision was that the former officer had been convicted by a court of two criminal offences and had received a criminal sanction. I considered that members of the public would rightly view such conduct as amounting to Gross Misconduct. I also noted that former PC Maxey had entered not guilty pleas and, having considered her statement and evidence, formed the view that she was not accepting responsibility for her actions.

**Culpability:**

In this case former PC Maxey's culpability is extremely high. There is ample evidence that her 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 Maxey has - or could have caused - serious harm to public confidence in the police service if the public knew that this officer displayed this corrupt behaviour where she took photos police information for no policing purpose which are at odds with the mission, vision and values of TVP.

**Aggravating Factors:**

The Chair also noted that former PC Maxey had entered not guilty pleas and, having considered her statement and evidence, formed the view that she was not accepting responsibility for her actions. The conduct occurred on more than one occasion despite clear instructions that briefing materials should only be accessed for a legitimate policing purpose. The officer was aware she had been moved away from Milton Keynes due to her associations yet attended a Milton Keynes police station and accessed information linked to criminality. Her actions were after she had been told to not work in that area due to associative risks.

**Mitigating Factors:**

There are no mitigating factors to this case.

When assessing the seriousness in this case, I found that the actions of former PC Maxey amounted to Gross Misconduct. This finding was made on the balance of probabilities that former PC Maxey's conduct did fall well below the standards of professional behaviour in regard to Honesty and Integrity, Discreditable conduct and confidentiality and did amount to gross misconduct. The rationale for the decision was that the former officer had been convicted by a court of two criminal offences and had received a criminal sanction. The Chair considered that members of the public would rightly view such conduct as amounting to Gross Misconduct.

**Standards of Professional Behaviour Deemed to have been Breached:**

1. Honesty and Integrity
2. Discreditable Conduct
3. Confidentiality

**Sanction**

I have carefully considered the oral submissions by the appropriate authority and considered the officers personal record which is long considering her 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 Maxey 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 intentional and deliberate. To behave in the way that former PC Maxey 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.

My rationale is as follows. The former officer was found guilty at court of two criminal offences and received substantial financial penalties. As aggravating factors, the conduct occurred on more than one occasion despite clear instructions that briefing materials should only be accessed for a legitimate policing purpose. The officer was aware she had been moved away from Milton Keynes due to her associations yet attended a Milton Keynes police station and accessed information linked to criminality.

I acknowledged that she had been regarded as a hard-working officer and a standout student at Sulhamstead who had supported her peers. However, this made the misconduct all the more disappointing.

I considered that officers should be encouraged to access intelligence and briefing systems where there is a legitimate policing purpose. In this case, the officer failed to provide a reasonable explanation for accessing information, taking photographs in a station where she should not have been, or for failing to submit any intelligence report.

I found the circumstances highly suspicious. The officer did not inform a supervisor, did not self-refer to Professional Standards, and used her personal mobile phone rather than a work-issued device. While there was no evidence of how the information was subsequently used, the Chair concluded that she had breached the trust placed in her by Thames Valley Police.

I was satisfied that ANPR was used appropriately as part of an investigation into potential police corruption.

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