IN THE MATTER OF POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

BETWEEN

THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF DEVON AND CORNWALL POLICE

Appropriate Authority ("AA")

And

PC 18646 Michael Ireland ("the Officer")

Hearing date: 17 December 2025.

Venue: Reed Hall, Streatham Drive, Exeter EX4 4QR

ACC Craig Holden ("Chair")

Independent Panel member, Jayne Clemence, ("IPM")

Independent Panel member, Angela Lawson, ("IPM")

Legally Qualified Person, James Cross, solicitor, ("LQP")

Counsel for the Appropriate Authority, Mr. Ley – Morgan ("AA"):

PANELS REPORT OF DECISION AND OUTCOME, (REGULATION 43 OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) RULES 2024

Note:

When referenced, The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 will be "the Regulations". The Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing issued by the Home Office will be the "HOG". The College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings 2023 will be referenced as "the Guidance". When referencing a page or pages from the hearing bundle, ("HB") the reference will be in [ ] an example being [HB 85] or [HB 56-72].

Summary

1. The Officer joined the Police in 2007 transferring from Merseyside to the Devon and Cornwall Constabulary in 2022 and had been at the dates of the allegations, stationed at Newquay.

2. It was alleged that whilst on duty the Officer had arrested a male, a Mr Evans, on the 26 January 2024 and subsequently at Newquay Police Custody Centre had used unnecessary force causing injures to Mr Evans including a broken tooth.

3. The Officer had provided a statement detailing the reasons for the arrest and use of force. As to the use of force at the Custody Centre the Officer stated that Mr Evans had "lurched forward and his face connected with a wall".

4. On the 16 April 2024 the Officer was served with a Regulation 17 Notice relating to the use of force upon Mr Evans, alleging such force if proven had been assessed as amounting to Gross Misconduct.

5. A further Regulation 17 Notice was served on the Officer again on the 16 April 2024 relating to two further incidents in which the Officer was said to have used force in breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour ("SPB") and to have failed to act, in breach of the SPB, with Authority, Respect and Courtesy during an arrest. These incidents having said to have occurred on the 17 December 2023 and the 24 January 2024 respectively.

6. All three incidents were captured, together with audio on the Officers Body Worn Video camera ("BMV") and on CCTV for the incident in the Newquay Custody Centre

7. The assessment given in the Regulation 17 Notice of the Officers conduct for both the incidents, in 5 above, was that if proven, they would amount to Misconduct.

8. The Officer was interviewed under criminal caution 13 August 2024 and misconduct caution 27 January 2025.

9. In interview the Officer denied the allegations put to him relating to the incident on the 26 January 2024 relating to Mr Evans, Allegation 1. He did accept in relation to the incident on 17 December 2023, the facts as put to him having reviewed the BWV and that he had breached the SPB of Authority Respect and Courtesy in relation to Mr Harris, Allegation 2 and the facts and breach relating to the use of force when arresting Mr Ivans, Allegation 3.

10. An allegation of using unnecessary, disproportionate and unreasonable force through use of irritant spray on Mr Harris 17 December 2023 was not put to the Officer during interview.

11. On the 14 November 2025 a Regulation 30 Notice was served on the Officers Federation Representative.

12. The Allegations and alleged breaches of SPB's, appearing in the Regulation 30 Notice are reproduced below in bold, [HB 6-9].

ALLEGATION 1

13. **Alleged Facts**

1. **On 26th January 2024 you arrested Mr Joshua Evans who you knew was heavily intoxicated.**
2. **You handcuffed Mr Evans to the rear.**
3. **You conveyed Mr Evans to Newquay Custody Suite.**
4. **Whilst in the custody suite you intentionally swung Mr Evans around with considerable force causing his face/head to make contact with a wall.**
5. **Your actions caused Mr Evans to suffer injuries to his head and/or face and/or lip and/or a tooth.**
6. **As you took Mr Evans to a cell you told a colleague that Mr Evans had "just nutted the fucking door".**
7. **You subsequently made a statement in which you stated that when you took hold of Mr Evans' arm in order to take him out of the charge room he lurched forward and his face had connected with the wall.**

Alleged Breach – Use of Force

You breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour concerning Use of Force because you used more force upon Mr Evans than was necessary, proportionate or reasonable in the circumstances.

Honesty & Integrity

You breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour concerning Honesty and Integrity because you knew that:

1. Mr Evans had not "nutted" the door.

2. Mr Evans' face had not made contact with the wall as a result of him lurching forward but rather as a result of you swinging him around

ALLEGATION 2

14. **Alleged Facts**

1.In the early hours of 17th December 2023 you arrested Mr Rhys Harris who you knew was heavily intoxicated.
2.During the arrest you sprayed him in the face with irritant spray.
3.Following Mr Harris' arrest you:
(a) Said "Oh no, fuck him" when a member of the public enquired whether Mr Harris needed some water.
(b) Called Mr Harris a;
(i) Horrible creature.
(ii)Knob head.
(iii) Clown.
(iv)Dick.
(v)Rat.
(vi)Tit.

(vii) Donut.

Alleged Breach – Use of Force
You breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour concerning Use of Force because it was not necessary, proportionate or reasonable in the circumstances for you to spray Mr Harris with irritant spray.

Alleged Breach – Authority, Respect and Courtesy
You breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour concerning Authority, Respect and Courtesy because: 1. 2. You failed to treat Mr Harris with courtesy and/or respect. You failed to act with self-control

ALLEGATION 3

15. **Alleged Facts**
1.In the early hours of 14th January 2024 you arrested Mr Max Ivins who you knew was heavily intoxicated.
2.You handcuffed Mr Ivins to the rear.
3.Mr Ivins resisted being placed in the police van.
4.You did not follow the '5 Step Process' before using force upon Mr Ivins in order to get him into the van.
5.You used force upon Mr Ivins including grabbing him by the throat, pointing your finger in his face, using force on his legs, threatening to 'fold him in half in the back of the van' and placing him in leg restraints

Alleged Breach – Use of Force
You breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour concerning Use of Force because you used more force on Mr Ivins than was necessary, proportionate or reasonable in the circumstance.

16. On the 10 December 2025, the Chair considered the HB received from the AA. The Chair's decision, based on the HB and that the officer had submitted his resignation, although the Officer would still be a serving Officer until 31 December 2025 and wished to have no engagement considered, was that a Pre – hearing was unnecessary. No live witnesses had been requested nor was the Chair of the opinion, given the BWV and CCTV, that it was in the interests of justice for any witness, to attend.

Bundle/ papers / BWV and CCTV -for the hearing.

17. The Panel, before the hearing read and viewed,

i. A HB of 192 pages,
ii. The AA's Opening Note, 22 pages and dated 14 December 2025,
iii. Video of,
BWV Ivins

BWV x 2 Harris
Charge Room Full CCTV
JE threatening PC Ireland
Charge Room Clip
Custody Sgt calming JE

The Misconduct Hearing 17 December 2025

18. The Officer did not attend. He was not represented by solicitor, nor counsel and no Federation Representative had been instructed to attend for the Officer.

19. The Chair was satisfied that the Officer was aware of the hearing and the allegations. The Officer had chosen not to engage and had resigned. The Chair agreed the AA's invitation to proceed in the Officers absence, and the hearing would go ahead pursuant to Regulation 37 93) (b). The Officer was a serving officer until 31 December 2025 and would be treated as a serving officer for the hearing.

Use of Force – Allegation 2 – Mr Harris and the Chairs Determination

20. The Regulation 17 notice served on the officer in respect of Allegation 2 did not allege that the use of irritant spray was unnecessary, disproportionate and unreasonable. The Officer was not asked about it during his interview.

21. However, the AA submitted that the Officer has suffered no prejudice because by its inclusion in the Regulation 30 Notice because:
    a. The incident is captured on BWV, and
    b. The Regulation 30 notice was served in plenty of time to enable the officer to give an account.

22. The Chair accepted the AA submissions, and the Panel would determine the facts and breach as alleged in the Regulation 30 Notice and make a fining on both in due course.

The AA Submissions

23. Mr Ley- Morgan for the AA opened the case summarising his Opening Note and at the relevant Allegations showing the BWV and CCTV applicable to the Panel and making the following submissions.

24. **Allegation 1.** The AA submission was that was Allegation 1 was Gross Misconduct. That the Officer lost his temper and intentionally threw Mr Evans against the wall causing injury.

25. There was no mention of self-defence by the Officer. The Officers evidence was in conflict, particularly with that which could be seen clearly on the CCTV. The AA did not invite the Panel to

attach any weight to the opinions of PS Honeywill, [HB 78], nor PC Cartwright [HB 80]. The AA said that the CCTV spoke for itself.

26. The Officer knew when he told his colleague that that Mr Evans had *"just nutted the fucking door" was untrue.*

27. The officer then continued this false assertion in his statement when he stated that Mr Evans had *"lurched forward".*

28. The AA invited the Panel to find that the officer was intentionally dishonest on both occasions.

29. The AA further submitted that the Panel should also find that the false statement made by the Officer in his statement was operational dishonesty.

30. **Allegation 2.** The AA's case on the facts was that the BWV does not show Mr Harris doing anything that would have caused the officer to believe that he was about to become violent.

31. The officer sprayed Mr Harris as a 'punishment' and not because he believed that he was about to be assaulted.

32. The AA referred to the Officers misconduct interview on 27 January 2025 [HB 175], when the officer apologised for his actions and said that he had gone from zero to a hundred miles an hour and he should never have said the things he said to Mr Harris. Although it should be noted that he was not asked questions about using the irritant spray.

33. The officer admitted that the abuse he directed at Mr Harris was unacceptable.

34. **Allegation 3.** The AA submitted that the Officers BWV 'speaks for itself'.

35. The AA invited the Panel to accept the officer's admission that he went 'over the top' when dealing with Mr Ivins.

36. The AA further relied on the officer:
    a. Failing to use the '5 step process' [HB 137].
    b. Grabbing Mr Ivins by the throat.
    c. Pointing his finger in Mr Ivins' face.
    d. Using force on Mr Ivins' legs.
    e. Threatening to 'fold Mr Ivins in half'.
    f. Use of leg restraints.

Breaches of the SPB's

37. The AA invited the Panel to find the alleged facts proved for each Allegation and if the Panel did so then the Panel should also find that the Officer had breached the SPB's as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice.

Misconduct / Gross Misconduct

38. The AA submissions were that there were three incidents where the Officer had used excessive force whilst dealing with three different males, all of whom were intoxicated.

39. The AA suggested that the most serious of the incidents, in the AA's view, occurred on 26 January 2024 in Newquay Custody Suite. The AA alleged that this incident, of itself, was sufficiently serious to justify dismissal and consequently it amounts to gross misconduct.

40. The other two incidents, 14 January 2024 and 17 December 2023 were, in the AA's view, not so serious (when considered on their own) to justify dismissal.

41. However, the AA submission was that given the similarity between the allegations and their proximity in time, the Panel were invited to consider the allegations collectively and make one finding of gross misconduct (HOG para 11.132).

AA's clarification of the Chairs Questions relating to Facts

42. The AA clarified following questions from the Chair,
    i. That Mr Evans front tooth as shown, [HB 93 and 95] had broken following his head connecting with the custody wall.
    ii. That the Officer had arrested and presented intoxicated detainees to Custody Sergeant's at Newquay Custody Centre before 26 January 2024.
    iii. That the Officers use of force on Mr Ivins legs and placing him in leg restraint's, Allegation 3, was not force relied on by the AA as a breach of the Use of Force SPB, it was the grabbing of Mr Ivins throat, pointing the Officers finger and threatening to "fold him in half in the back of the van".
    iv. Clarification was given in respect of the Devon and Cornwall Police and the wider police guidance on use of force, [HB 137] as to "Secondary control skills Use of irritants / Taser",

43. Mr Ley – Morgan closed the case for the AA having invited the Panel to adopt the "4 Stage Approach" to make findings and determine Stages 1 – 3.

44. **The LQP provided written advice upon the issues in the matter to the Chair, Panel to the AA and to the hearing. Before their deliberation the Panel, were cognisant of the following,**

45. That the Panel should not take the non-attendance of the Officer as an admission by him of the AA's case.
46. That the Officer did not have to prove anything, and that the burden of proof as to the alleged

facts was on the AA.

47. That the Standard of Proof is the balance of probabilities, Reg 41 (16)(b), and HOG Para 9.10.

48. The purpose of misconduct hearings.

49. That the Panels duty was to find allegations 'proved' only where they are satisfied that that it is more likely than not that the matters set out in the allegations are true.

50. There was no room to decide that the matters set out by the AA 'might' have happened – it is either 'proved' or 'not proved'.

51. And that it was open to a Panel to conclude that any one of the allegations had been 'proved' but another was 'not proved'.

52. The Panel were reminded of the note 9.11 of the HOG,

> *"In making a decision whether the alleged conduct of a police officer is proven or not, the persons conducting or chairing will need to exercise reasonable judgement and give appropriate careful consideration to the evidence."*

53. The starting and ending point of the Panel's analysis of the allegations is the wording of the Regulation 30 notice. Those were the matters the AA were seeking to prove.

54. That any decision must be based on a majority of the Panel (the chair having the casting vote if necessary). But that the Panel must not indicate whether any determination was taken unanimously or by a majority.

The Panel's Approach.

55. For completeness the Panel did adopt the 4-stage approach.

    a) To ascertain the facts, whether admitted or found proven (**Stage 1**).
    b) To determine whether, based on those facts, the Officer breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour, ("SPB") as alleged (**Stage 2**).
    c) To decide whether any such breaches constitute Misconduct, Gross Misconduct or neither (**Stage 3**)
    d) Dependent on the findings and with the admissions already made by the Officer to decide on the outcome, (**Stage 4**).

Panel's Decision - Stages 1 - 3.

56. The Panel considered the evidence presented to it in the HB of 192 pages and particularly the BWV footage and CCTV, the quality of both in terms of audio and visual being very good.

57. Following the Panel's careful deliberations, the Panel found following:

Allegation 1 –

58. The Panel found all the Alleged Facts, numbered 1 – 3 in the Reg 30 Notice [HB 4-6] proved.

59. Upon Alleged Fact 4, the Panel found that the officer did intentionally swing Evans to cause his injuries. From the CCTV, the Officer had intentionally propelled Mr Evans into a wall causing the injuries to Mr Evans face, head, mouth and tooth.

60. The Panel did not believe the account of the officer that he was attempting to 'spin' Mr. Evans, in an effort to get him to the exit door.

61. For the Panel the CCTV evidence clearly showed the force and intent used and the anger that the Panel believed had beset the Officer at that moment.

62. The Panel considered the account given by the Officer regarding his unfamiliarity with Newquay custody area, (when compared to the space in other custody areas), but dismissed the Officers assertion given in his interview, [HB 152]. The Officer had brought multiple detainees into Newquay Custody Centre, including several people who were drunk and/or violent. This included the two men subject of the other allegations both of whom preceded Mr Evans' arrest and detention.

63. The Panel found Alleged Fact 6 proved.

64. Alleged Fact 7 - The Panel found that the Officer did seek to conceal his actions by deliberately verbalising a false account to his colleagues, as Mr Evans was taken to a cell, "just nutted the fucking door" and again in his statement of the incident, "lurched forward".

65. The Panel found the Officer to be deliberately dishonest, both in his verbal statement to colleagues as to what had happened and also in relation to the written statement he provided.

66. The Panel considered the Officers account that he had made his statement without viewing the CCTV or the Body Worn Video and found that this was not true. The Officer had viewed the BWV twice before submitting his written statement and had clearly had time to think about what he wrote in his statement.

67. The Panel considered but rejected the Officers account of the incident. The Panel found that the Officer was intentionally dishonest and such that his false statement was operational dishonesty.

Breach of SPB's Allegation 1.

68. Use of Force – Having found the facts as the Panel did, they found that the Officer had breached the SPB.

69. Honesty and Integrity –The Panel found that the false statements were a breach of honesty and it follows also a breach of integrity.

Allegation 2 -

70. The Panel found the Alleged Facts numbered 1 -2 in the Regulation 30 Notice proved.

71. The Facts in 3 (a) – (b) were all admitted by the Officer although the Panel noted that it was unsurprising that the Officer made his admissions since the videos the Panel viewed, and the Officer, likewise, are very clear.

Breach of SPB's

72. Use of Force - The Panel considered the use of incapacitant spray by the Officer on Mr. Harris. The Panel looked at all the circumstances in the build up to the use of the spray, including the statement of PC Cartwright in the HB, [HB 80-82], and the Officers BWV.

73. The Panel could see that Harris was drunk, and aspects of his demeanour were threatening (based on his passive aggressive actions) and could see that the situation had escalated to the point where the Officer would need to arrest Harris. Knowing this was the case the panel assessed whether the Officers' actions were reasonable, proportionate and necessary.

74. The Panel considered whether pre-emptively spraying Harris in all the circumstances was reasonable.

75. The Panel noted that the use of the spray was not prolonged, with only a short 'burst' of Spray used.

76. The Panel also considered the extent to which the Officer goaded Harris in his initial interactions and the extent to which the Officer could have de-escalated the situation.

77. The Panel concluded that the Officers attitude and words did nothing to de-escalate the situation.

78. The Panel weighed the Officers account with everything the Panel had read in the HB and seen on the BWV. The Panel considered objectively whether the force was necessary, proportionate and reasonable in the circumstances and whether a mistaken belief was held both honestly and reasonably.

79. The Panel found however, that it was the Officers behaviour that enabled the Panel to conclude that his use of incapacitant spray on Mr. Harris was unnecessary, disproportionate and unreasonable. It was in the Panel's opinion that the use of force in using the spray was excessive.

80. The Panel went on to consider whether the use of the incapacitant spray was a breach of the SPB and concluded that it was.

81. The Panel wanted it noted that, had this been an isolated incident, although a breach of the SPB, it would not be so serious as to justify disciplinary action. The breach was not however, an isolated incident. The Panel considered this point within their overall assessment of gross misconduct (when taken together with the other allegations found proven).

82. Authority Respect and Courtesy – The Panel found the language and actions of the Officer, upon the Facts admitted and proved to be in breach of this SPB.

Allegation 3 -

83. The Panel found the Alleged Facts 1 – 4 proved.

84. The Panel found what should have bene Alleged Fact numbered 5, [HB 8], (erroneously numbered 4 at [HB 8]) proved.

85. In any event the Officer made admissions in his interview on the 27 January 2025, [HB 178 – 180].

Breach of SPB Use of Force

86. The Panel considered the matter very carefully. The Panel found that the Officer in grabbing Mr Harris's throat, pointing his finger at his face and threatening to fold him in half in the back of the van and a breach of the SPB Use of Force. The force was unreasonable, unnecessary and disproportionate.

Stage 3 -Panel's decision as whether the breach/s amount to misconduct or gross misconduct or neither

87. The Panel noted that the AA had said that Allegation 1 is Gross Misconduct. That Allegation 2 on its own is Misconduct and the same for Allegation 3 Misconduct.

88. And Gross misconduct defined as being: "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal" (Regulation 2)

89. Whilst Misconduct, was defined as being: "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action" (Regulation 2)

90. The Panel than went on to assess the seriousness of the misconduct they had found by reference to that which is set out in the Guidance at paragraph 4.3,

a) The Officers Culpability
b) Harm
c) Aggravating factors
d) Mitigating factors

91. The Panel noted that the Guidance (para's 5.4 – 5.5), recognised that any case involving **operation dishonesty** is serious.

5.4 The proper approach to cases involving operational dishonesty, derived from the case of Salter, can be summarised as follows:

- dismissal will be almost inevitable in cases where operational dishonesty has been found proven
- there may be exceptions but the number of such cases will be very small
- where the person(s) conducting the proceedings concludes that a case involving operational dishonesty falls into this very small residual category, they must identify the features of the case that render it exceptional

5.5 Personal mitigation can be taken into account although its impact will be limited. This applies to all types of police misconduct

92. The Panel believed that in all the allegations proved the Officer culpability was high. The Harm was also high as were the Aggravating Factors. The operational dishonesty, the harm to the individuals concerned, of whom two were very intoxicated was completely unacceptable.

93. Whilst the Panel did find provocation by way of language and disrespect (in relation to Allegation 1), the Panel did not find that this mitigation was such as to reduce the seriousness.

94. The Panel did not accept in relation to Allegation 3 that the Officer being single crewed, as he had said in his interview [HB 179], was a factor to mitigate Allegation 3. The Officer was very familiar with the surroundings and well known to the door staff who were near him. Mr Ivins was drunk but not threatening the Officer and, in the Panel's, opinion the Officer was not vulnerable.

95. The Panel found that they would have agreed with the AA upon their assessment of gross misconduct, (nothing operational dishonesty as extremely serious), and misconduct for Allegations 2 and 3 if they had been on their own, however the Panel considered the HOG at para -11.132 and the guidance as to "MULTIPLE FINDINGS OF MISCONDUCT" which in this case there had been.

96. The Panel found that the repetition of actions of the Officer, in similar circumstances, over a relatively short period, 17 December 2023 – 26 January 2024, that it is appropriate in these circumstances for the Panel to consider matters as a whole and return a combined finding.

97. The panel therefore decided upon a combined finding of **Gross Misconduct**.

DECISION OF THE PANEL OUTCOME - Stage 4

98. Following submissions from Mr Ley-Morgan for the AA as to Stage 4 the Panel deliberated again.

99. The Panel considered the outcome adopting the Guidance and followed the HOG in coming to their decision on outcome.

100. The Panel considered paragraph 2.3 of the Guidance to re-establish for us the purpose of the police misconduct regime. The Panel considered the purpose that is stated in that paragraph, (Bolton v Law Society 1994) and the relevant case law within the guidelines. Attention being given to Para 2.7 of the Guidance.

101. The Panel having heard the AA drew to the Panel's attention what they considered to be the relevant matters and particularly given that the Panel found **operational dishonesty**, the Panel went onto apply the relevant guidelines.

102. The Panel assessed the three stages as we are required to determine the appropriate sanction, Fuglars LLP v Law Society 2014 and para 4.2 of the Guidance.

103. The Panel considered Paragraph 4.3 of the Guidance to assess the seriousness of the proven misconduct. The Officers Culpability (culpability denotes an officers' blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions). The Harm caused by the Misconduct, The existence of aggravating factors, The existence of mitigating factors. And The Officers service record, documentary evidence and submissions.

104. The Panel considered Paragraph 5.1 – to 5.5 of the Guidance**, Operational Dishonesty**.

105. The Panel reviewed the Officers service record and training.

106. Given the Officer was absent no mitigation had been put forward on his behalf.

107. The Panel, however, did note the operational difficulties for officers when dealing with intoxicated, belligerent and in some cases passive aggressive persons.

108. The Panel also noted the letter from Wellbeing Counsellor/psychotherapist Bev Becket provided by the Officer, [HB 185] and that which the Officer had said of his personal circumstances and how they had affected him, in his interview.

109. The Panel could not however, find that this was a case that fits into the category of case where the finding of **operational dishonesty** would not result in dismissal. Give the Guidance lesser outcomes were inappropriate.

110. On operational dishonesty alone, it was clear from the facts found the Officers culpability was very high. The Officer had written a false statement and made comments deliberately and dishonestly to seek to distort the facts as to the force used towards Mr Evans.

111. The Harm to Mr Evans was high and reputational harm to the service is high. There is an aggravating factor as to concealing wrongdoing. There were no discernible mitigating factors the Panel could find.

112. In this case the Panel had made a finding on the facts of **Operational Dishonesty** with a combined finding of **Gross Misconduct** for the breaches of SPB's. Having followed the steps above, the Panel chose the disciplinary action which most appropriately fulfilled the purpose of imposing disciplinary action considering the seriousness of the conduct in question (bearing in mind the need to act proportionately).

113. Without any exceptional circumstances to mitigate operational dishonesty, the Panel immediately discounted a Final Written warning (even of the maximum 5 year term). The consequence of the Panel's analysis is that **dismissal without notice** is the only proportionate and necessary outcome.

114. The public in the Panel's view, would not tolerate a police force that accommodated an officer who has behaved as the Officer had.

115. The Panel were of the view that the public would expect nothing less than dismissal without notice for the **gross misconduct** the Panel had found. Any lesser outcome would only serve to discredit the credibility of the police service and not deter other officers from acting in similar ways and would undermine the public trust and confidence in the Police.

Reporting Restrictions

116. There are no reasons why the officer's details should not appear on the publicly accessible element of the barred list. The Chair announced that details of the matter could be published on the force website in the usual way and there will be no representations made to the college of policing regarding the barred list.

117. The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and contributions to the hearing.

This Report

118. The Chair delegated responsibility for preparing this report of the hearing under Regulation 43 to the LQP. The report has been approved by the IPMs after the Chair had satisfied himself that it confirms the Panel's findings.

ACC Craig Holden

IPM Jayne Clemence

IPM Angela Lawson

Dated
19th December 2025