

DEVON AND CORNWALL POLICE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS DEPARTMENT

Regulation 63 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Name	Number	Rank
Timothy Hogg	16649	Former Police Constable

Chair of the Proceeding	Location
Chief Constable	D&C HQ Middlemoor, Exeter

Findings

The Appropriate Authority's case against former PC Hogg surrounded alleged behaviour which fell below the conduct of professional behaviour, namely honesty and integrity. It was alleged that whilst off duty engaged in a three year long extra marital affair with a vulnerable woman, it is alleged that he affectively ran a double life. In order to pursue and maintain the relationship over this long period he created a tissue of lies. Suspicious of PC Hogg the woman questioned his marital status and became more and more suspicious as his lies were uncovered. He purported to be estranged from his wife, yet there was evidence that he continued to live in the marital home, was spending time with his wife and family and took several family holidays during those three years. As the woman's suspicions rose, he fabricated an email purporting to be a legal executive acting on his behalf in divorce proceedings, a fraudulent document produced to continue the deception that he was separated from his wife. The conduct was later fully admitted by the officer, who accepts the extent of his deception and the fabrication of the legal document.

I am reminded of the College of Policing 'Guidance on outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings' of the purpose of the Police Misconduct regime:

1. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service
2. To uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
3. To protect the public

Additionally, para 2.7 - 'my additional concern should be the reputation and standing of our profession, rather than punishment of the officer'.

Honesty and integrity are fundamental requirements of a police officer, and the precedent for operational dishonesty (Salter) is very clear. However, this case involves

dishonesty in off duty conduct which is not being subject to a criminal caution or conviction.

Para 4.32 of the guidance reminds me however, that some off duty dishonesty may be very serious, particularly where it has the ability to bring the police service into disrepute or where he makes a dishonest statement in an official or otherwise solemn document. In this case he fabricated a solemn document to support three years of lies and gaslighting and therefore I consider this aspect of off duty conduct to be on the more serious end of the spectrum. I conclude that this behaviour is misconduct that is so serious that it could justify dismissal and therefore I find that it is gross misconduct.

It is not my role as Chief Constable to provide judgement over dishonesty in the private lives of officers which might be considered trivial or irrelevant to the office of Constable. I have no authority over police officers' morality and provide no observation or judgement on infidelity or extra marital affairs, on these matters even police officers have a right to a private family life and enjoy protections under Article 8 of ECHR. However, in this case the dishonesty was so grave and included the fraudulent production of a legal document that it is highly capable of seriously undermining trust and confidence in police officers and therefore the off-duty conduct becomes legitimately subject to Police (Conduct) 2020 regulations.

Standards Breached

- Discreditable misconduct
- Integrity
- Dishonesty

Outcome Imposed

Having found a case to answer for gross misconduct, I now turn to the appropriate outcome in this case. I have limited outcomes available due to the fact the officer has already resigned and had he still being serving, I would have considered a final written warning and dismissal without notice. In this case there is no presumption for dismissal, as this case is subject to the 2020 Conduct Regulations.

In determining seriousness, I again turned to College of Policing 'Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceeding' and I am reminded to apply four tests; culpability, harm, aggravating factors, mitigating factors.

Culpability

It is very clear that this conduct was intentional, deliberate, targeted and planned and frankly was cynical in it's application. The officer could reasonably have been expected to understand or foresee the risk of harm to an increasingly vulnerable victim. Whilst

this was off duty conduct, police officers maintain a position of trust which may have assisted him in maintaining his tissue of lies. I assess culpability to be high.

Harm

Miss X provides a compelling witness statement which demonstrates a decline in her mental health the longer the relationship continued as more lies were uncovered. She had clearly become more and more anxious and suffered something stopping only short of bereavement when the relationship finally ended. She is suffering grief and as a result she is under medical supervision by her GP and has had to take medication and receive courses in CBT and counselling to help her come to terms with the behaviour and conduct of this former officer. I assess the harm caused to be high.

Aggravating factors

None

Mitigating factors

I give limited weight to personal mitigation provided by the officer who claims he was under intense private pressures, albeit no evidence of any diagnosed medical condition has been offered. I note that the former officer had a clean discipline record and unblemished service history.

I conclude that the only outcome I can give in this case is to state that the officer would have been dismissed if he was still serving and I recommend he is placed on the police barred list.

Signature - Special Case Hearing Chair



James Vaughan QPM MSt (Cantab)
Chief Constable

Date: 24 February 2026

You have the right of appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal.

Circumstances in which a police officer may appeal to a tribunal - The Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020.

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

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

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

(2) This paragraph applies to –

(a) an officer other than a senior officer against whom a finding of misconduct or gross misconduct has been made at a misconduct hearing;

(b) a senior officer against whom a finding of misconduct or gross misconduct has been made at a misconduct meeting or a misconduct hearing, or

(c) an officer against whom a finding of gross misconduct has been made at an accelerated misconduct hearing.

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

(4) The grounds of appeal under this rule are —

(a) that the finding or decision to impose disciplinary action was unreasonable;

(b) that there is evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the original hearing which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action, or

(c) that there was a breach of the procedures set out in the Conduct Regulations, the Complaints and Misconduct Regulations or Part 2 of the 2002 Act or unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.

Notice of appeal

9 (1) Subject to rule 10, a police officer or a former police officer who wishes to appeal to a tribunal must give notice of the appeal before the end of 7 working days beginning with the first working day after the day on which the officer is first supplied with a written copy of the relevant decision.

(2) The notice of appeal must be given in writing to the relevant local policing body.

(3) The officer or former officer may request a transcript of the proceedings (or part of the proceedings) at the original hearing in the officer's or former officer's notice of appeal.

Postal address

Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner
Andy Hocking House
Alderson Drive
Exeter
EX2 7RP

Phone: (01392) 225555

Fax: (01392) 225567

Email: opcc@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk

You may request a transcript of the proceedings (or part of the proceedings) at your original hearing in your notice of appeal.

Legislation governing appeals following misconduct hearings is the Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020

Copies: Officer/PSD