

IN THE MATTER OF A POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING

PURSUANT TO THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

THAMES VALLEY POLICE

Appropriate Authority

v.

FORMER PC 0785 EDWARD REED

NOTICE UNDER REGULATION 43

OUTCOME OF MISCONDUCT HEARING

Hearing Details

Hearing was listed 15th to 16th July 2026 (2 days) to commence at 10.00 hours at Thames Valley Police HQ 169 Oxford Road Kidlington, OX5 2NX.

Panel

Paul Mills QPM (Retired Deputy Chief Constable) (Chair)

Susannah Dengate (Independent Panel Member)

Micheal Fanning (Independent Panel Member)

Adeolu Odusote (Legally Qualified Person)

Representatives

Counsel for the Appropriate Authority – Mr Zander Goss

Federation Representative for former Former PC Edward Reed – Mr Rob Baker

Terminology:

“A/A” - Appropriate Authority

“LQP” - Legally Qualified Person (the legal advisor to the Panel)

“The Former Officer” - Former PC 0785 Edward Reed

“The Guidance” - College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes on Police Misconduct Proceedings.

Hearing Details

1. This Notice records the outcome of a Police Misconduct Hearing convened under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended) in respect of Former PC 0785 Edward Reed.
2. The hearing took place on 15 July 2026 at Thames Valley Police Headquarters, 169 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 2NX.
3. The hearing was conducted in person.
4. Members of the public were permitted to attend. No members of the public

attended.

5. Former PC Reed did not attend the hearing.
6. The allegations considered by the Panel were those contained within the Regulation 30 Notice and are reproduced below for ease of reference.

Background and Preliminary Issues

7. Former PC Reed served as a Police Constable on a Response Policing Team based at Cowley Police Station. He joined Thames Valley Police in December 2021.
8. During the course of the Professional Standards Department investigation, Former PC Reed resigned from the police service. Accordingly, for the purposes of these proceedings, he was a former officer.
9. By correspondence dated 22 May 2026, Former PC Reed informed Thames Valley Police that he would not engage further with the misconduct proceedings and would not attend the hearing.
10. He maintained that none of the alleged conduct amounted to gross misconduct and requested that his Regulation 31 response be treated as his response to the allegations.
11. He further indicated that he did not intend to: a. attend the hearing; b. cross-examine witnesses; or c. submit any further evidence.

12. At the outset of the hearing, the Police Federation confirmed that Former PC Reed was aware of the proceedings and had voluntarily chosen not to attend.

13. The Appropriate Authority invited the Panel to proceed in the officer's absence.

14. Having considered Regulation 37(3)(b) and all relevant circumstances, the Chair was satisfied that: a. the officer had notice of the proceedings; b. his absence was voluntary; and c. it was fair and appropriate for the hearing to proceed in his absence.

15. Prior to the hearing, the Chair granted an application by the Appropriate Authority for anonymity in respect of one witness, who was referred to as **PC A**.

16. The public hearing notice was amended to reflect that direction.

17. The Chair therefore confirmed that anonymity direction at the commencement of the hearing.

18. No witnesses were required to give live evidence.

Allegations

19. The former officer faced the following allegations:

Allegation One

On 15 September 2023, at a BP Garage in Wolvercote, you used the phrase "local talent" to describe the perceived sexual attractiveness of a female teenager at the payment kiosk.

Allegation Two

On 15 September 2023, whilst in a police vehicle, you referred to a female colleague's backside by saying words to the effect of:

"Check out the bunda."

Allegation Three

Between 13 October and 24 October 2023, while in the ICR Office at Cowley Police Station with PC Olivia Butler and others present, you:

- a. wrote your name "Ed" and your mobile telephone number in PC Butler's daybook without invitation; and
- b. placed your open hand on her upper thigh for approximately five seconds before winking at her and returning to your desk.

Allegation Four

During October 2023, in a locker room at Cowley Police Station, you made unwanted physical contact with PC A by pushing your body into her back and side between three and five times.

Allegation Five

On 13 November 2023, at BP Garage, Oxford Road, Cowley, you made a point-to-point radio transmission to PC A saying words to the effect of:

"Look at the arse on that" and "peachy" or "plumpy",

referring to her backside.

Allegation Six

Your language and behaviour described above was unwanted and/or unwelcome sexualised conduct which:

- a. violated the dignity of the women concerned; and/or
- b. created an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment.

The Panel's Approach

20. The Panel adopted the following four-stage approach:

- a. determine the facts;
- b. determine whether the proven facts amounted to breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour;
- c. determine whether any breach amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct;

d. determine outcome.

21. The burden of proof rested throughout on the Appropriate Authority.

22. The applicable standard of proof was the balance of probabilities.

23. In reaching factual findings, the Panel reminded itself that:

- a. it was not necessary to resolve every factual dispute;
- b. reasonable inferences could properly be drawn from the evidence; and
- c. findings must be based upon the totality of the evidence rather than speculation.

Documents and Evidence

24. The Panel considered an agreed hearing bundle containing 132 pages.

25. The Panel was also provided for viewing:

- Exhibit LES/01 -CCTV footage from BP Garage, Oxford Road, Cowley dated 14 November 2023.

Findings of Fact

26. The Panel then turned to consider each allegation separately and took into account the officer's Regulation 31 response and noted:

- a. partial admissions;
- b. denials of key aspects of allegations 1, 3 and 4;
- c. his contention that, even if proven, the conduct amounted to misconduct rather than gross misconduct.

27. The Panel also took account of the officer's previous good character and service record when assessing credibility and propensity.

Allegation One

On 15 September 2023 at a BP garage in Wolvercote you used the phrase 'local talent' to describe the perceived sexual attractiveness of a female teenager located at the payment kiosk.

Statement of PC TAYLOR

- 28. The panel reviewed the statement of PC TAYLOR and noted the following:
- 29. PC TAYLOR stated that on Friday 15th September 2023, he was on duty in uniform in the company of PC CHAPMAN and the former officer.
- 30. PC TAYLOR stated that around 22-00 hours, they attended a BP fuel station at Wolvercote and purchased some refreshments. He detailed that they were standing in the fuel station shop and there were numerous members of the public nearby.
- 31. PC TAYLOR stated the former officer then made a comment about 'local talent' and he saw him looking over at the payment kiosks where a female who was approximately 17 to 18 years of age was stood.
- 32. PC TAYLOR stated he considered the comment to be unprofessional, and this was particularly so, as it was said in the earshot of members of the public and the female who was only about 10 to 12 feet away and may have heard the comment.

33. PC TAYLOR further stated that the comment if heard was likely to impact on the perception of the public concerning male police officers and the Violence Against Women and Girls agenda. PC TAYLOR stated that contextually the fact the female was considerably younger added to the inappropriateness of the comment made.

34. PC TAYLOR stated he did not respond to the comment and remained silent as he did not wish to validate the comment in any way.

Regulation 31 Response of the Former Officer

35. The panel noted that the former officer provided the following response in his Regulation 31 to the allegation:

36. I deny this allegation but acknowledge certain facts inside of this. I accept the fact that I have likely used the term "local talent" in conversation with PC TAYLOR and PC CHAPMAN. I do not accept that this constitutes a gross misconduct allegation and ask that consideration be given to the notion of diminishing this to misconduct at most. I categorically deny the allegation that I have made this comment or any comment of this nature towards any person considered a much younger age than me. As I stated at my interview stage, I do not recall making this comment at a petrol station but would have possibly made such comment within the confined area of the car where no member of the public could have reasonably heard me.

Panel Findings of Fact

37. Having reviewed the available evidence:

38. The panel noted the former officer accepted that it was likely that he used the term 'local talent' in conversation with his colleagues PC TAYLOR and PC CHAPMAN, however denied that he had made it in a public setting and that it was directed towards any person considered younger than him. The panel noted that the former officer stated that it may have been made about a police officer colleague who would not have been in earshot.

39. The panel noted that the former officer challenged the version of events alleged by PC TAYLOR.

40. The panel concluded there was no reason why PC TAYLOR would make up his recollection of what had occurred and noted that he was specific concerning the public location and the presence of the female member of the public that the comment was directed towards.
41. Accordingly, the panel found this allegation factually proven and concluded the former officer had used the term 'local talent', whilst at the BP garage in Wolvercote on the stated date and the purpose of the comment was to describe the perceived sexual attractiveness of a female teenager who was at the payment kiosk.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

42. Having made its findings of fact the panel considered the alleged breached standards of professional behaviour and concluded the following:
43. Authority, Respect and Courtesy – the panel found that the former officer had failed to act with self-control and his comment about a member of the public had failed to treat her with respect and courtesy. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.
44. Equality and Diversity – the panel found that the officer had evidenced the use of discriminatory language and therefore this standard was breached.
45. Discreditable Conduct – the panel found that the former officer had behaved in a manner that if known, would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence more widely. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.

Allegation Two

**On 15 September 2023 you were in a police vehicle when a female colleague walked in front of the vehicle. In reference to her backside, you said words to the effect of 'check out the bunda'.
Statement of PC TAYLOR**

46. The panel reviewed the statement of PC TAYLOR and noted the following:
47. PC TAYLOR stated that on Friday 15th September 2023, he was on duty in uniform in the company of PC CHAPMAN and the former officer.

48. PC TAYLOR detailed that he was the driver of a marked police vehicle and sat within the vehicle with him was the former officer who was in the front passenger seat and PC CHAPMAN who was in the rear seat of the vehicle.
49. PC TAYLOR described that the vehicle was preparing to leave the car park of Oxford LPA , when the former officer made a comment similar to 'She's got the Bunda' or 'check out the Bunda'. PC TAYLOR stated that he was certain the word 'bunda' was used and he had heard the word before and was not sure exactly what it meant, however concluded he was talking about the back side of a female colleague who walked past the police vehicle when he said the former officer said the comment.
50. PC TAYLOR stated that PC CHAPMAN and him did not say anything as they did not want to validate the comment. PC TAYLOR stated that he later informed a Sergeant of his concerns and they had a conversation about the conduct of the former officer.

Regulation 31 Response of the Former Officer

51. The panel noted that the former officer provided the following response in his Regulation 31 to the allegation:
52. *I accept that I may have used the term "BUNDA" within a conversation that I was having with PC TAYLOR and PC CHAPMAN. As stated in my response to allegation 1, this would have only been within the confines of the car and highly unlikely for any unintended person to hear this comment and directed towards a Police Officer. In retrospect, I accept that making a comment of this nature is inappropriate and I apologise for any offence that I may have caused to anyone. I do not agree that this constitutes Gross Misconduct I would therefore request that consideration be given to diminishing the level of severity from Gross misconduct, to misconduct at most.*

Panel Findings of Fact

53. Having reviewed the available evidence, the panel noted:
54. The former officer accepted that he had used the term 'Bunda' in conversation with his colleagues, and he accepted that it was inappropriate.

55. Accordingly, the panel found the allegation factually proven and that whilst in a police vehicle with colleagues, the former officer said words to the effect of 'check out the bunda' when a female colleague walked in front of the vehicle.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

56. Having made its findings of fact the panel considered the alleged breached standards of professional behaviour and concluded the following:
57. Authority, Respect and Courtesy – the panel found that the former officer had failed to act with self-control and his comment about a colleague had failed to treat her with respect and courtesy. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.
58. Equality and Diversity – the panel found that the officer had evidenced the use of discriminatory language and therefore this standard was breached
59. Discreditable Conduct – the panel found that the former officer had behaved in a manner, that if known, would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence more widely. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.

Allegation Three

On a date between 13 and 24 October 2023 (inclusive) you were in the ICR office at Cowley Police Station together with PC Olivia Butler and others. Uninvited, you wrote handwrote your mobile phone number and your name 'Ed'. As you wrote this, you placed your open palm halfway up PC Butler's upper thigh, leaving it there for approximately 5 seconds before winking at her and returning to your desk.

Statement of PC BUTLER

60. The panel reviewed the statement of PC BUTLER and noted the following:
61. PC BUTLER stated that she was stationed at Cowley Police Station and at the time was fairly new in service.
62. PC BUTLER stated that on a shift sometime between 13 and 24 October 2023, she was in the ICR office at Cowley Police Station, and she was sat at a desk writing up crime reports. She stated also present in the office was the former officer.

63. PC BUTLER described that she did not know the former officer and he was sitting behind her. She stated the former officer asked her if he could use her pen which was lying on the desk. PC BUTLER stated that she thought it was an odd request but allowed the former officer to use the pen. She stated that the former officer then wheeled over his chair to her desk and proceeded to write something in her red day book which was on the desk.
64. PC BUTLER stated that at the same time he was writing, the former officer proceeded to place his hand on her upper thigh. She detailed that it was an open hand and he rested it halfway up her thigh for approximately five seconds. She stated the former officer winked at her in a flirty way and then returned to his desk. She detailed that she looked down at her red book and could see the name 'Ed' and a mobile phone number next to it.
65. PC BUTLER stated as soon as the incident occurred, she went to speak with one of the more senior officers on the team and spoke to her colleague PC KAMALEE and told him what had just happened. She later clarified that she did believe she told PC KAMALEE that the former officer had touched her leg.
66. PC BUTLER stated that at the time she did not wish to make a scene and wanted to forget the incident and therefore did not report it at the time. She stated that PC KAMALEE advised her she should move from that desk and he escorted her to get her possessions and she moved to a desk next to him and away from the former officer.
67. PC BUTLER stated that she was later approached by her supervisor Sergeant SNOWDON and was asked if anything had happened and she disclosed the incident.
68. PC BUTLER stated that in no way did she invite or encourage the actions of the former officer and she found his actions arrogant and forward. She stated that she assumed the former officer assumed she would flirt with him and she might find him attractive and therefore writing his number and touching her leg, was considered appropriate by him.
69. The panel noted that PC BUTLER provided a copy of her daybook entry with the name and telephone number of the former officer on – exhibit OGB/01.

Statement of PC KAMALEE

70. The panel reviewed the statement of PC KAMALEE and noted the following:

71. PC KAMALEE confirmed that sometime in the Autumn of 2023, PC BUTLER had sought him out and had asked to speak to him on his own during a shift. PC KAMALEE stated that PC BUTLER informed him the incident had just occurred and she relayed that the former officer had written his name in her red book and asked her to message him.
72. PC KAMALEE stated that PC BUTLER showed him the entry in her red book and she stated that she found it weird and it made her feel uncomfortable. PC KAMALEE stated at that time she did not want to raise it any further, but she wanted someone to know who she trusted.

Regulation 31 Response of the Former Officer

73. The panel noted that the former officer provided the following response in his Regulation 31 to the allegation:
- 74. I categorically deny the allegation of physically touching PC BUTLER. I have given a comprehensive account for this in interview and explained that there were physical barriers between PC BUTLER and I.*

Panel Findings of Fact

75. Having reviewed the available evidence, the panel noted:
76. In his misconduct interview the former officer accepted that he wrote his name and number in the red book of PC BUTLER, however he categorically denied touching PC BUTLER.
77. The panel found that the statement of PC BUTLER was clear that the former officer had touched her leg on the middle of her thigh for a period of approximately five seconds. The panel concluded this was a significant period of time and there was no logical reason that PC BUTLER would incorrectly remember this had happened.
78. The panel noted that PC BUTLER stated that she did inform PC KAMALEE that the former officer had touched her leg. The panel noted that PC KAMALEE did not recall this but did recollect that PC BUTLER had stated she found the situation with the former officer had been weird and uncomfortable. The panel concluded that it was satisfied that PC BUTLER did tell PC

KAMALEE that the former officer did touch her leg, but he was unable to recall this.

79. The panel concluded that the former officer did, uninvited, write his mobile number and first name in the red daybook of PC BUTLER. Whilst doing so he placed his palm halfway up her inner thigh and left it there for approximately five seconds, before winking at her and returning to his desk. Accordingly, the panel found the allegation factually proven.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

80. Having made its findings of fact the panel considered the alleged breached standards of professional behaviour and concluded the following:
81. Authority, Respect and Courtesy – the panel found that the former officer had failed to act with self-control and his actions in pro-actively without consent writing his name and number in PC BUTLER's red book whilst placing his hand on her thigh, evidenced that he had failed to treat her with respect and courtesy. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.
82. Equality and Diversity – the panel found that the officer had evidenced the use of discriminatory behaviour and therefore this standard was breached
83. Discreditable Conduct – the panel found that the former officer had behaved in a manner, that if known, which would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence more widely. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.

Allegation Four

On a date in October 2023, you made unwanted contact with PC A in a locker room at Cowley Police Station by pushing your body into her back and side 3 to 5 times before walking to your own locker.

Statement of PC A

84. The panel reviewed the statement of PC A and noted the following:

85. PC A stated that she worked at Cowley Police Station and would describe the former officer as a work colleague and not a friend.
86. PC A stated that at some point in mid-October 2023 she was in the locker room at Cowley Police Station before the commencement of her shift. She described the locker room as a large space with several rows of lockers and walkways between them. She described that when locker doors are shut there is enough room to walk past a colleague, however when a door is open you would have to 'shuffle' past another person. PC A stated that the room was well lit.
87. PC A stated on the date of the allegation in question, she was in the locker room, had put her stab vest on and was doing final checks to make sure she was ready for her duties the former officer entered the locker room. She stated that she stood close to her locker so there was plenty of room for the former officer to get by.
88. PC A stated that when the former officer got to her locker, she felt his full body come into contact with her back and side. She stated that she was not sure which part of his body was in contact with her, but it felt like most of his body and was not a push with an arm or a hand and it felt like his torso was in contact with her. PC A stated that the former officer exerted some pressure on her and this pushed her into towards her open locker and in a jokey manner he said 'I'm just trying to get through'. PC A stated that she felt the full body of the former officer push into her three to five times and the whole incident lasted in the region of five seconds.
89. PC A stated that she had no doubt it was the former officer and whilst he did not cause her physical pain, it left her feeling very uncomfortable and unsure what to do about the incident. PC A stated she did not know if there was any sexual intent meant by the pushing or actions of the former officer.
90. PC A stated that she did get on ok with the former officer and on occasion they would have a laugh and a joke in the office, however there was no reason for him to think that she would consent to him acting in the manner he had.
91. PC A stated that she did not say anything to the former officer and she left the locker room quickly and just wanted to get back into the office. She detailed at the time she did not feel comfortable enough to challenge the former officer, however she did subsequently at a later date speak to individual female colleagues about what had happened.

92. PC A stated that she was unsure how she should handle the situation and she decided to leave reporting the matter and see if anything else happened.

Statement of PC RIMEN

93. The panel reviewed the statement of PC RIMEN and noted the following:

94. PC RIMEN stated around November 2023, she recalled PC A telling her that whilst she was getting kitted up at her locker the former officer pretended to push past her and he did so he thrust himself against her.

95. PC RIMEN stated PC A appeared distressed and anxious about the incident at the locker and brought it up a number of times with her. PC RIMEN described that PC A would appear awkward when discussing the matter and wished to discuss the process for a sexual assault investigation.

Regulation 31 Response of the Former Officer

96. The panel noted and considered the Regulation 31 response made by the former officer:

1. *I accept that I engaged in what I perceived to be light-hearted, mutual workplace banter with PC A. On the occasion described, I gently bumped her with my right shoulder while passing, accompanied by an apology. This was intended as harmless interaction consistent with previous behaviour between us. Her response kicking my ankle, was received in the same light-hearted manner, and we both laughed. At no point was any concern raised to me, and I believed this interaction to be mutually acceptable based on our prior dynamic. I gave a detailed explanation of this encounter at my formal interview stage with the interviewing officers where I explained the full nature and description of this encounter. I considered this to be in line with the friendship that I perceived PC A and I having, since we would frequently pull harmless pranks on one another. I met PC A when I first joined team 4 Cowley and believed that we had a good friendship, particularly since we would speak openly about most things.*

Panel Findings of Fact

97. Having reviewed the available evidence, the panel concluded:

98. The panel noted that the account of the former officer was significantly different to that of PC A. The former officer stated that he gently bumped PC A with his shoulder and then apologized. He stated in response she kicked his ankle and the whole interaction was in line with previous behaviour between them.
99. The panel noted that PC A's account that the former officer intentionally put his body up against her and pushed into her three to five times over a sustained period of five seconds. She stated that there was no reason why the former officer would think she consented to him acting in such a manner.
100. The panel also noted that PC A was clear the incident was not a push with an arm or a hand.
101. The panel noted that PC A did not at the time feel comfortable to challenge the former officer, but she later disclosed the incident to female colleagues. PC RIMEN confirmed PC A had disclosed the incident to her and had spoken to her a number of times about it. PC RIMEN observed that PC A appeared distressed and anxious about the incident and was awkward when discussing it.
102. The panel concluded that there was no reason that PC A would be incorrect in her recollection of the incident and the reported behaviour went well beyond that which had been described by the former officer. Accordingly, the panel found that the contact was unwanted and the former officer had pushed PC A in the back three to five times and the allegation was found factually proven.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

103. Having made its findings of fact the panel considered the alleged breached standards of professional behaviour and concluded the following:
104. Authority, Respect and Courtesy – the panel found that the former officer had failed to act with self-control and his actions in pushing into PC A was unwanted behaviour which had caused her distress and evidenced that he had failed to treat her with respect and courtesy. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.
105. Equality and Diversity – the panel found that the officer had evidenced the use of discriminatory behaviour and therefore this standard was breached

106. Discreditable Conduct – the panel found that the former officer had behaved in a manner which would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence more widely. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.

Allegation Five

On 13 November at a BP garage on Oxford Road, Cowley you used a point-to point radio call to PC A to say words to the effect of ‘Look at the arse on that’ and ‘peachy’ or ‘plumpy’, referring to the PC A’s backside.

Statement of PC A

107. The panel reviewed the statement of PC A and noted the following:
108. PC A stated that on 13th November 2023 she was on night duty and needed to liaise with the former officer and his colleague PC ELDRIDGE concerning giving them a fuel card back once she had used it to fill up her police vehicle. PC A stated to that end she arranged for the said colleagues to meet her at the BP garage on Oxford Road, Cowley.
109. PC A stated that at the petrol station she filled up her vehicle and the former officer and PC ELDRIDGE were parked up close to the pay hatch in their vehicle. PC A stated that having filled up her vehicle she went to the pay hatch of the petrol station to pay the cashier for the fuel. PC A detailed that the position of the former officer’s vehicle was such that he could see her walking to pay for the fuel. PC A stated that whilst she was walking, she received a point-to-point radio call from the former officer, and he told her to ‘smile’. She stated that she gave him a jokey smile and then carried onto the payment hatch.
110. PC A stated at the payment hatch she was mid-paying when she received another point-to-point call from the former officer and he said, ‘look at the arse on that’ followed by the word either ‘peachy’ or ‘plumpy’. PC A stated that she was taken aback by what the former officer had said and said ‘challenge’ to him. PC A stated the former officer then said something like, ‘me and Tony were talking about donkeys’ which made no sense.
111. PC A stated that she was really shocked by the comment the former officer had made, and she found it completely inappropriate. She stated she

felt relieved that the radio had not been on loudspeaker, as it would have been extremely embarrassing and would have looked very unprofessional.

112. PC A stated that the comments would not have been acceptable in any circumstances and there was no doubt the former officer was talking about her as there was not anyone else around, she further detailed that she found the comment derogatory. PC A stated that her relationship with the former officer was not such that he could make comments about her body or appearance, and she did not appreciate what the former officer had said and it was worse that they had happened in a public space.

113. PC A stated back at her car she told her colleague PC BRYCE what had happened and she decided that she was going to speak to her supervisors. She stated that she found it difficult to tell her supervisors and what to say about the incident.

Statement of PC ELDRIDGE

114. The panel reviewed the statement of PC ELDRIDGE and noted the following:

115. PC ELDRIDGE confirmed on the evening of the 13th November 2023 he was crewed with the former officer, and they had attended the BP Garage on Oxford Road. The purpose of attending this location was stated to be twofold – firstly to fill their police vehicle up with fuel and secondly to share the fuel card with PC A who was also at that location.

116. PC ELDRIDGE stated at the petrol station he got out to pay for their fuel and as he did so heard the former officer point to point PC A. He stated he heard the former officer say ‘something sexy’ to PC A, but he could not recall what was said or the wider context of the conversation. He stated he did not hear any further conversation as he was away from the vehicle paying for the fuel.

Statement of PC BRYCE

117. The panel reviewed the statement of PC BRYCE and noted the following:

118. PC BRYCE confirmed on 13 November 2023 he was crewed with PC A and they had attended the BP Garage on Oxford Road to refuel and to hand the fuel card back to the former officer and PC ELDRIDGE.
119. PC BRYCE stated that PC A filled up their police vehicle with fuel and then walked over to the nighttime pay point to pay for the fuel. He described that the vehicle of the former officer and PC ELDRIDGE was positioned beyond the pumps and near to the nighttime pay point. PC BRYCE detailed that PC A walked in front of the vehicle of the former officer to pay for the fuel.
120. PC BRYCE stated that when PC A had paid for the fuel she returned to their vehicle and said words similar to 'You will never believe what Ed has just said to me' and she went on to say 'As I walked past the front of the van he point to pointed me and said check out the arse on that'.
121. PC BRYCE stated that PC A informed him that she had immediately said 'challenge' to the former officer. PC BRYCE detailed that PC A told him the former officer had said something further, but he could not recall what it was.
122. PC BRYCE stated that PC A had said she was going to inform her Sergeant and it was agreed this was the right thing to do.

Regulation 31 Response of the Former Officer

123. The panel noted and considered the Regulation 31 response made by the former officer:
124. *I accept making a comment to PC A referencing a quote from the film Hot Fuzz, delivered in what I intended to be a humorous manner. The comment in question was a phrase from a shop keeper scene "check out her (his in the film) arse. I even attempted to deliver this phrase in a clear western country accent, citing the scene from the film. This is further reinforced by my prior comment to PC Andrew Eldridge who was my crewmate for this shift, asking him if he knew why PC A appeared to be upset. My intention was to lighten the mood, as I believed she may have been upset. I accept that the comment may have been in poor taste, but it was not intended to cause offence or discomfort.*

Panel Findings of Fact

125. Having reviewed the available evidence, the panel concluded:
126. The former officer accepted that he had said words similar to 'look at the arse on that', however made no reference to the secondary peachy or plumpy words. The former officer stated that he was intending to be humorous and repeating a line from a film. He ultimately accepted that the comment 'may have been' in poor taste but stated it was not his intention to cause offence or discomfort.
127. PC A was clear in her evidence that she found the comments made by the former officer to be derogatory towards her and were aggravated by the fact they had happened in a public place. PC A stated that she had never given permission for the former officer to make comments about her body or appearance.
128. The panel noted that PC A immediately challenged the comments and decided to report them to her supervisor.
129. The panel found the allegation factually proven and that the former officer had used the point-to-point facility to say words to the effect of 'look at the arse on that' and 'peachy' or 'plumpy' and these were references to PC A's backside.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

130. Having made its findings of fact the panel considered the alleged breached standards of professional behaviour and concluded the following:
131. Authority, Respect and Courtesy – the panel found that the former officer had failed to act with self-control by making unwanted comments about the appearance of PC A and she had found the comments to be derogatory and evidenced that he had failed to treat her with respect and courtesy. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.
132. Equality and Diversity – the panel found that the officer had evidenced the use of discriminatory language and therefore this standard was breached
133. Discreditable Conduct – the panel found that the former officer had behaved in a manner which would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence more widely. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.

Allegation Six

Your sexualised language and behaviour described above was unwanted/unwelcome and had the effect of violating the dignity of the women involved and/or had the effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for others.

Regulation 31 Response of the Former Officer:

134. The panel reviewed and took into account the Regulation 31 response from the former officer:

I wish to make it clear that I have never intentionally acted in a way that would intimidate, offend, or cause distress to others. However, I recognise that perception can differ from intention. If anything, I have said or done has caused any individual to feel uncomfortable or upset, I sincerely regret that impact and apologise for how I may have made that person feel. While I respectfully deny certain allegations, I fully acknowledge others and have reflected on my behaviour. I take these matters seriously and have cooperated fully throughout this process, even following my resignation.

Panel Findings of Fact

135. The panel noted and adopted the definition of sexual harassment provided by ACAS and put forward by the AA:

1. *Sexual harassment is unwanted behaviour of a sexual nature. The law (Equality Act 2010) protects the following people against sexual harassment at work:*
 1. *employees and workers*
 2. *contractors and self-employed people hired to personally do the work*
 3. *job applicants*
2. *To be sexual harassment, the unwanted behaviour must have either:*
 1. *violated someone's dignity*
 2. *created an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for someone*
3. *It can be sexual harassment if the behaviour:*

1. *has one of these effects even if it was not intended*
2. *intended to have one of these effects even if it did not have that effect*

136. In relation to allegation one as the conduct concerned related to a member of the public, the panel did not find this proven allegation was within the scope of allegation six.
137. In relation to allegation two, the panel found that the comment concerning 'check out the Bunda' was a direct reference to an unknown female police officer's bottom in the workplace. The panel considered the words used were unwanted and had the effect of creating an environment which would have been both degrading and humiliating to the unknown officer if she had been aware of the comment.
138. In relation to allegation three, the panel found the proven conduct of writing his name and number in PC BULTERS book and placing his hand on her leg were unwanted acts in the workplace. The acts concerned violated the dignity of PC BUTLER to the extent that she sought out a colleague to report what happened and moved to get away from the former officer.
139. In relation to allegation four, the panel found the unwanted proven conduct of the former officer pushing himself up against PC A in the workplace violated her dignity and created a hostile environment for her. The panel noted the actions of the former officer were witnessed by a colleague to have made PC A appear anxious and uncomfortable.
140. In relation to allegation five, the panel found the unwanted comments by the former officer in the workplace to PC A violated her dignity and were degrading, and humiliating. The panel noted that PC A decided to report the comments to her supervisor stating they were derogatory in nature.
141. Collectively the panel noted that the former officer stated that he had not intended to *intimidate, offend, or cause distress to others*. The panel concluded when set against the ACAS definition a stated lack of intent did not provide mitigation or excuse his actions.
142. Collectively the panel concluded that allegations 2 to 5 evidenced a course of conduct which amounted to sexual harassment towards female colleagues in the workplace, accordingly the panel found the allegation proven.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

143. Having made its findings of fact the panel considered the alleged breached standards of professional behaviour and concluded the following:
144. Authority, Respect and Courtesy – the panel found that the former officer had failed to act with self-control and through his actions of sexual harassment in the workplace he had failed to treat female colleagues with respect and courtesy. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.
145. Equality and Diversity – the panel concluded that the collective proven allegation of sexual harassment towards female colleagues was a dereliction of his responsibilities under the Equality Act 2010 and the panel found this standard was breached.
146. Discreditable Conduct – the panel found that the former officer had behaved in a manner which would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence more widely. Accordingly, the panel concluded this standard was breached.

Assessment of whether the admitted and proven allegations amount to gross misconduct or misconduct

147. On the basis of the allegations as found, the panel proceeded to assess whether the proven allegations amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
148. 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.

149. The panel noted that the AA submitted that the conduct found proved overall amounted to gross misconduct. The panel noted that the officer submitted that if found proven the conduct amounted to misconduct only.

150. 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: _

151. *“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 factorsand mitigating factors.....”*

Culpability

152. 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.

153. In relation to each of the six proven allegations the panel concluded that the conduct of the officer was intentional and deliberate. (4.10).

154. The panel noted that the former officer stated that he had not intended to intimidate, offend or cause distress to others through his conduct. The panel concluded that it should have been clear and obvious to the former officer that the respective conduct in the proven allegations was likely to significantly impact on the individuals concerned and the reputation of the wider police service (4.11)

155. The panel concluded that in each of the allegations found proven there was a reoccurring persistent theme of sexual impropriety towards female

colleagues and a member of the public and this increased the culpability of the former officer.

156. The panel concluded that having found the proven conduct amounted to sexual discrimination this further increased the culpability of the former officer. ((4.54)

157. The panel concluded that overall, the level of culpability was HIGH

Harm

158. In relation to allegation one the panel found that if the teenage female or wider members of the public were aware the former officer was referring to her as local talent this would likely significantly impact on trust and confidence in the police service. Indeed, PC TAYLOR in his own evidence highlighted the potential impact such comments would have on trust and confidence and the work the police service was looking to deliver in relation to VAWG.

159. In relation to allegation two, whilst the unknown female officer had not been identified, the panel concluded it was likely she would be concerned that a male colleague was talking in such terms about a part of her body as she walked past.

160. In relation to allegation three, PC BUTLER was clearly impacted by the actions of the former officer such that she sought the help of a more experienced officer and decided to move such that she was not in his presence in the workplace

161. In relation to allegation four, PC A was clear that the actions of the former officer left her feeling very uncomfortable and she was unsure about

what to do about the incident. PC RIMEN also observed that it appeared that PC A was distressed and anxious about the incident.

162. In relation to allegation five, PC A stated that she had been shocked by the comments of the former officer, and she found them totally inappropriate. She also stated that she found the comments to be derogatory and matters were compounded by the fact they had occurred in a public place.

163. The panel concluded that the six proven allegations, if known by the public, would have an obvious impact on trust and confidence in the police service (4.66).

164. The Panel found the overall level of harm to be HIGH

Aggravating factors

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

166. The panel concluded that the six separate allegations amounted to a regular, repeated and sustained course of conduct by the former officer

167. The panel concluded that six separate proven allegations and breaches across three separate standards of professional behaviour was an aggravating factor

168. The panel concluded that it should have been clear and obvious to the former officer that it was not appropriate to make improper comments about a member of the public and colleagues.

169. The panel concluded the act of the former officer touching the leg of PC BUTLER without her consent was a particularly aggravating factor

170. The panel concluded the act of the former officer pushing his body into PC A without her consent was a particularly aggravating factor
171. The panel concluded the fact that the former officer's conduct involved three separate individuals further aggravated its findings
172. The panel found that allegation six evidenced that the officer had engaged in sexual harassment of PC BUTLER and PC A in the workplace and accordingly this aggravated the proven conduct
173. Whilst the panel did not find that the proven conduct amounted to VAWG, the panel did consider concerns in relation to the way the police service treats female members of the community was a matter of national concern and the actions of the former officer was likely to undermine the attempts of police leaders to improve trust and confidence in this area.

Mitigating factors

174. The Panel considered carefully all the factors that are detailed in paragraph 4.79-4.82 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.
175. The panel found mitigating factors were largely lacking in this case and were confined to the former officer providing some partial admissions at an early stage and reflecting that elements of his conduct were not acceptable.

Panel Finding.

176. Having listened to closing submissions and reviewed the former officers Regulation 31 response the panel considered whether the mitigating factor reduced the seriousness of the misconduct, and concluded that overall,

the conduct of the officer was such that the seriousness assessment was HIGH.

177. The panel concluded that the proven allegations amounted cumulatively to a course of conduct over the period September 2023 to December 2023. The panel considered the proven conduct was so serious as to amount to **Gross Misconduct**.

Determination of Outcome

178. Following its decision on the level of breach, the Panel was provided with submissions from parties against those same factors for the purpose of assisting them in determining the outcome in this hearing. Having heard those representations, the Panel then considered the appropriate outcome.

179. In reaching the panel's decision regarding the 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
- Four-character references
- 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.

180. 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.

181. 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.

182. 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

183. 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.

184. 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.

185. The panel also did note the submission by the AA, that having found the former officer had engaged in sexual harassment, this would have a significant impact upon the reputation of Thames Valley Police both as a service provider and an employer if known by the wider public.

186. The panel then went onto consider personal mitigation and reviewed the service record and character references that had been provided:

187. The panel noted that there were no performance development reviews for the former officer or wider evidence from his supervisors concerning his performance

188. The panel reviewed the four-character references submitted by colleagues and friends of the former officer and noted they had across them common themes concerning:

- a) They considered him to be a kind individual
- b) They considered him to be helpful, genuine and respectful
- c) They considered him to be honest and to have high levels of integrity

189. The panel noted the submission by the police federation that the former officer had experienced a number of life stressors on or around the time of the proven misconduct. The panel also noted that it was not provided with any substantive independent evidence in relation to these matters

190. 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 serious misconduct. (the Guidance para 6 and *Salter v Chief Constable of Dorset* [2012] EWCA Civ 1047 Para 23).

The Purpose of Imposing Sanctions

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

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

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

193. The panel considered all three of these purposes to be particularly relevant to its findings and considerations on sanction and the facts of this case.

Availability of Outcome upon a Panel Finding of Gross Misconduct.

194. 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.

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

196. 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”

197. 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.

198. 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.

- a) A final written warning
- b) Dismissal without notice.

199. 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

200. 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.

201. The panel came to this decision having taken into account the fact that the former officer had findings against him concerning six separate allegations, three breaches of separate standards of professional behaviour, proven conduct relating to three separate individuals and found allegations relating to sexual impropriety and sexual harassment.
202. 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.

In summary

203. 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.
204. The panel considered the sanction as a 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.
205. 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 – Susannah Dengate

IPM – Michael Fanning

23rd July 2026

