

REGULATION 43 NOTICE OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
REGULATIONS 2020 AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
(AMENDMENT) RULES 2024

IN THE MATTER OF POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2024

Concerning;

THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF DEVON AND CORNWALL POLICE -
Appropriate Authority, (“AA”)

And

“The former officer”

Panel

- Chair – Mr Ian Saunders ACO (Retired ACC)
- LQP – Mr James Cross, solicitor
- IPM – Mr Michael Hawkes
- IPM – Mr Michael Saltern

Legal Representation

- Counsel for the AA – Mr Alan Jenkins
- Counsel for the former officer – Ms Susannah Stevens

References

- (i) The Chair – ACO Ian Saunders
- (ii) AA – Appropriate Authority
- (iii) The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (Amended) 2024 will be “the Regulations”, or as ‘Regulation’ and then the Regulation number referred to.
- (iv) The Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing issued by the Home Office will be the ‘H.O.G’ and the relevant paragraph number an example being [H.O.G 9.10].
- (v) The College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings 2023 will be referenced as ‘the Guidance’ and on occasion together with the relevant paragraph number.
- (vi) Pages from the hearing bundle will be referenced for example as [HB page1 or pages 1-3].

Hearing summary and outcome

- (i) This Police Misconduct Panel convened under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended) considered allegations relating to the conduct of a former Devon and Cornwall Police officer towards colleagues and officers under his supervision. Although the former officer resigned from the service on 30th October 2025, the proceedings continued as the matters had come to the attention of the Professional Standards Department prior to his resignation.
- (ii) In a Regulation 31 Response dated 16th July 2026, the former officer admitted the majority of the allegations and accepted that the admitted conduct amounted cumulatively to gross misconduct.
- (iii) Following those admissions, the AA confirmed that it would not pursue the remaining disputed matters removing the need for witness evidence or factual determinations on the denied allegations. The Panel therefore proceeded directly to consideration of outcome.
- (iv) The admitted conduct included inappropriate and disrespectful comments towards colleagues, behaviour amounting to bullying and controlling conduct, discriminatory and derogatory remarks and actions that caused embarrassment, humiliation and distress to a number of colleagues.
- (v) The former officer admitted his breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Equality and Diversity, Authority, Respect and Courtesy, and Discreditable Conduct.
- (vi) In assessing seriousness, the Panel found the former officer's culpability and the harm caused by his conduct to be high. Significant aggravating factors were identified including repeated and sustained behaviour, multiple victims, the former officer's leadership responsibility, victim vulnerability and multiple proven allegations. The Panel considered medical evidence relating to the former officer's mental health as mitigation but identified no other mitigating factors.
- (vii) Having assessed the totality of the admitted misconduct, the former officer's service record, and the purpose of the police misconduct regime, the Panel concluded that the seriousness of the misconduct was high and determined

that, had the former officer still been serving, he would have been dismissed without notice.

Introduction

1. This is the Regulation 43 notice of a Police Misconduct Panel held under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the 2024 amendments) into the conduct of the former officer.
2. The hearing was conducted in person at Reed Hall, Streatham Drive, Exeter on 28th July 2026.
3. Members of the public were permitted to attend. PC X and her supporting colleague were present during the hearing. The former officer was not present.
4. The Panel confirmed that despite the late submission of the hearing bundle of 283 pages (to the Chair on Friday 24th July 2026 and to the IPM's on Monday 27th July 2026, they had read all of the material provided.

Background information

5. The former officer, whilst employed by Devon and Cornwall Police as a serving police officer, faced allegations that his behaviour towards some of those that he had supervised and several of his colleagues and wider colleagues had been in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour of Equality and Diversity, Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.
6. It was further alleged that such was the effect of the former officer's alleged actions, that if proven or admitted, they would have brought discredit to the police service or undermined public confidence in it.
7. A Regulation 30 Notice was served on the former officer giving the initial date of a misconduct hearing as the 13th – 17th October 2025.

8. On the first day of that hearing, the Panel agreed to an application by Counsel for the former officer to adjourn proceedings to allow for the preparation of a psychiatric report.
9. A psychiatric report dated 15th November 2025 was served on the AA in January 2026.
10. The adjourned hearing was relisted for 27th–31st July 2026 under a newly appointed Chair.
11. The former officer had resigned from the Devon and Cornwall Police with his last day as serving as a police officer being on 30th October 2025.
12. Pursuant to Regulation 4(2)(a) and 4(3), the proceedings were continued with as the allegations had arisen, and came to the attention of, the Devon and Cornwall Police Professional Standards Department before the former officer had resigned from the police service.
13. A Regulation 31 Response dated 16th July 2026 was served upon the AA and was presented to the Panel in hearing bundle [HB page 2] for the relisted hearing.
14. Within his Regulation 31 response, the former officer made admissions to all but “those few parts” [HB page 282 para 72], of the facts alleged. The former officer also “...accepted that the admitted allegations cumulatively amounted to gross misconduct” [HB page 281 para 70].
15. Given the contents of the Regulation 31 Response, Counsel for the AA confirmed that the former officer’s admissions were acceptable. The AA further confirmed that the Panel would not be required to make factual findings on the unadmitted factual matters. Counsel for the AA submitted that the Chair would not be asked to consider the necessity of any witness attending to give evidence and that the AA would not present any evidence for consideration by the Panel in relation to the allegations which were denied.

16. On the basis of the admitted facts and the acceptance of the former officer that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct, the listed hearing was rescheduled to take place for one day only, that being on Tuesday 28th July.
17. On Tuesday 28th July 2026, the former officer's Counsel appeared at the hearing remotely via video link. Counsel's remote attendance had been agreed by the Chair in advance of the hearing. The former officer did not attend. Counsel for the AA attended the hearing in person.
18. Counsel for the former officer confirmed to the Panel the alleged facts that were accepted by him. Counsel also confirmed that the former officer admitted that he had been in breach of The Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPB) as alleged by the AA for those admitted allegations. The former officer also accepted that his cumulative breaches of the SPB amounted to gross misconduct.
19. Counsel for the AA informed the Panel that following the admissions made by the former officer, it would not seek to pursue the allegations that had previously been denied.
20. The LQP advised the Panel in open session that in accordance with Regulation 41(16), the former officer, through his Counsel, had admitted the allegations of gross misconduct and breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour as presented. Given those admissions and the position advanced by the AA, the Panel could properly accept the admissions and move to deliberations on outcome.
21. The Panel were reminded by the LQP as to the limited outcomes available for former officers.
22. The Panel was reminded that regardless of the former officer's resignation, it remained necessary to determine the appropriate outcome in line with the Guidance. In doing so, the Panel was required to evaluate the seriousness of the misconduct by considering culpability, harm, aggravating factors, and mitigating circumstances.

23. The Chair directed, pursuant to Regulation 43(1B), that the LQP prepare the Panel's report under Regulation 43 of their reason for the disciplinary action imposed.

24. This is the Panel's report, prepared by the LQP and amended by the Chair.

Anonymity

25. The Chair had received an application for anonymity for the former officer on Friday 24th July 2026. The AA did not oppose this application. Following receipt of the application and the AA's response, the Chair had provided parties with a written direction that anonymity would be granted.

26. Following the commencement of the hearing on Tuesday 28th July 2026, the LQP advised in open hearing that anonymity is not a default protective measure. He stated that it is a derogation from the ordinary rule that disciplinary proceedings should be open transparent, and if ordered it must be justified as such. It requires more than a general assertion of prejudice. It would require an identification of specific harm, an explanation of why that harm matters, and a reasoned conclusion that it outweighs the public interest in transparency.

27. The HOG 11.75 assists in relation to an officer not being named in a notice which includes the welfare of the officer. The welfare of the former officer was the key limb of the application for the former officer to be granted anonymity.

28. The LQP advised that misconduct proceedings should be conducted openly where possible, and that any decision to grant anonymity must involve a careful balancing of individual privacy rights against the public interest. Where anonymity is granted, Panels are expected to give clear and specific reasons. General references to stress, wellbeing, or reputational harm are unlikely to be sufficient on their own, as those factors apply to most officers facing disciplinary action.

29. On Tuesday 28th July 2026, the Chair was provided a consultant psychiatric report into the health of the former officer and a letter from his General Practitioner. Both

of these documents described the likely impact upon the health of the former officer should anonymity not be granted due to his current vulnerability.

30. This medical opinion had not been provided by Counsel for the former officer until the morning of the hearing and had not been available to assist the Chair in his issuance of the initial written direction granting anonymity on Friday 24th July 2026.
31. The Chair invited submissions from Counsel for the former officer in relation to this further information. The AA confirmed that they still did not oppose the application.
32. Having carefully considered this additional information and submissions from both parties, the Chair was further satisfied that the granting of anonymity for the former officer was necessary and proportionate in recognition of his current vulnerability and state of mental health.
33. When re-affirming his previous decision to grant anonymity on foot of having been provided with the two medical documents, the Chair was then mindful of the potential for sensitive medical information to be presented in the public hearing. The Chair considered this to be a further supportive rationale for his confirmation of the direction that the former officer would be granted anonymity for the hearing.
34. Following submissions and consideration of the advice given, the Chair ordered that the former officer would be granted anonymity. The Chair directed, under Regulation 39(3)(C) that the publication of the former officer's name was prohibited. The Chair further directed that nothing was to be published or reported to reveal the identity of the former officer.
35. To safeguard the former officer's anonymity, this Regulation 43 report does not bear the former officer's name. To prevent either accidental or jigsaw identification of the former officer, all other names have been anonymised in this notice.

The Panel's Approach

36. The Panel approached this hearing by:
 - (i) Firstly, deciding the facts, (**Factual Determination**);

- (ii) Secondly, determining on the facts found, if any professional standards had been breached, (**Breaches of Professional Standards**), and if so;
- (iii) Thirdly, deciding at what level, the panel assessed the seriousness of the breaches, (**Level of Breach**).

37. Lastly, deciding the outcome for the former officer, (**Decision on Outcome**).

Purpose of Misconduct Proceedings

38. Counsel for the AA reminded the Panel of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime as detailed at paragraph 2.3 of the Guidance;

- i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of the police service.
- ii. To uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct.
- iii. To protect the public.

Burden and Standard of Proof

39. The Panel was mindful that:

- (i) The burden of proof was upon the AA and,
- (ii) The standard of proof, which must be applied in this hearing was that as required in civil cases, namely upon the balance of probabilities.

Factual Determinations

40. For each allegation shown, this notice records whether it was admitted or denied by the former officer.

41. To assist the reader, the allegations against the former officer are shown below. It should be noted that the allegations are numbered in accordance with this Regulation 43 notice to further assist the reader and not as recorded on the former officer's Regulation 30 notice.

42. It should also be noted that every officer named in the allegations is referenced below by use of the identifier 'X' to prevent the accidental or jigsaw identification of the former officer.

Allegation 1

*On or about 1st February 2024 whilst you were on duty and in the company of two male officers PC X came to speak to you. She faced towards you and, in the presence of the other male officers, you said to PC X that she should turn around, bend over and take her trousers down, or words to that effect **(Admitted)**.*

Your suggestion in that regard was;

- (i) Wholly inappropriate in all the circumstances; **(Admitted)***
- (ii) Likely to cause, and did in fact cause, embarrassment and humiliation to PC X and likely to embarrass the other officers present **(Admitted)***
- (iii) A clear sexual reference **(Denied)***

Allegation 2

*On or about 3rd January 2024 you communicated with PC X whilst she was working from home because of a chest infection **(Admitted)***

*You asked how she was by asking a question about her breasts **(Admitted)***

Your actions in that regard were;

- (i) Wholly inappropriate, given that she had a chest complaint, and not a breast condition. **(Admitted)***
- (ii) Likely to cause embarrassment to PC X, given that her complaint had not been relating to her breasts **(Admitted)***
- (iii) A clear sexual reference **(Denied)***

Allegation 3

*On a date in about December 2023 whilst on duty at the police station you spoke to PC X whilst she was unpacking her bag. Whilst PC X was present you moved behind PC X and said, "I could slap you on the arse with this", or words to that effect (**Denied**).*

*Despite PC X asking you not to do anything you then hit her with something on the upper thigh, just below her bottom (**Denied**).*

Your actions in that regard were:

- (i) Wholly inappropriate in all the circumstances (**Denied**)*
- (ii) Likely to cause, and did in fact cause, embarrassment and humiliation to PC X, and likely to embarrass the other officer present (**Denied**)*
- (iii) A clear sexual reference (**Denied**).*

Allegation 4

On numerous occasions you made inappropriate and disrespectful comments about colleagues. Those comments included

- (i) Calling the South Devon team "wankers" (**Admitted**).*
- (ii) Calling Chief Inspector X a "wanker" (**Admitted**).*
- (iii) Calling PC X a "prick" and a "wanker" (**Admitted**).*
- (iv) Calling PS X "Balls Deep" (**Admitted**).*
- (v) Calling other officer's "cunts" (**Admitted**).*
- (vi) Saying, on several occasions and in front of her and other officers, that PC X had "mugged you off" (**Admitted**).*
- (vii) Telling PC X to "release her flower" in front of a member of staff on an occasion when PC X had said that she needed to use the loo. (**Admitted**).*
- (viii) Saying that "women should not be in the job", or words to that effect, on a regular basis, but in particular on 22nd December 2023 when PS X asked for help to locate a maternity form (**Denied**).*
- (ix) Calling PC X a "paedo", because of his haircut, and encouraging others to comment on PC X's hair and to bully him (**Admitted**).*
- (x) Saying of PC X, who had dyslexia, that he had a "retard disease", or words to that effect (**Admitted**).*

- (xi) *Threatening to end PC's career if he complained about your actions **(Admitted)**.*
- (xii) *Saying that PC X would pass a bike course because she had "tits and a fanny" **(Admitted)**.*

Allegation 5

On numerous occasions you displayed bullying and controlling behaviour towards colleagues, including the members of the team under your supervision. That behaviour included

- (i) *The actions in paragraphs 3 to 10 above (amended to (i)-(xii) for this notice) **(Former officer's responses as shown above)**.*
- (ii) *Making comments as set out in paragraph 11 (amended to (i)-(xii) for this notice) above but also included brushing off any concerns raised by others as to your comments or behaviour' **(Admitted)**.*
- (iii) *Getting angry and shouting at colleagues, including those who you were managing and/or supervising, without good reason **(Admitted)**.*
- (iv) *Physically confronted male constables, with an implied threat of violence, including PC X, PC X and PC X **(Admitted)**.*
- (v) *Hitting PC X **(Admitted)**.*
- (vi) *And then boasting to others about having done so **(Denied)**.*

Allegation 6

- (i) *You struck PC X on the head whilst he was dealing with a detainee in the custody unit **(Admitted)**.*
- (ii) *You later boasted in front of other officers and colleagues about having hit PC X on the head **(Denied)**.*

43. On the basis of the former officer's admissions to the allegations set out above, the Panel found the facts relating to those admitted allegations to be proven.

44. In accordance with the submission made by the AA who confirmed that they were not inviting the Panel to consider the allegations that had not been admitted, the Panel determined that those matters would not be addressed in their determination of fact.

Breaches of Standards of Professional Behaviour

45. The former officer accepted that his admitted actions had breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour
- (i) Equality and Diversity.
 - (ii) Authority, Respect and Courtesy (excluding the denied sexual conduct).
 - (iii) Discreditable Conduct.

Level of Breach

46. The former officer “accepted that the admitted allegations cumulatively amount to gross misconduct” [HB page 281.para70].
47. In accordance with Regulation 41(16), the Panel accepted the admissions of the former officer and found that his admitted behaviour cumulatively amounted to gross misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

48. The Chair invited further submissions from respective Counsel and asked for the former officer’s record of service before the Panel retired to consider an outcome.
49. In accordance with the Guidance, the Panel’s first task in determining the appropriate sanction was to assess the seriousness of the admitted misconduct.

50. The Panel did so by reference to the former officer's culpability, the harm caused by his misconduct, the existence of any aggravating factors and the existence of any mitigating factors.
51. Culpability - The Panel found that the former officer was entirely blameworthy and responsible for his admitted actions. The Panel found that the former officer's actions were either deliberate or that he should have foreseen the risk of harm of his actions when they were not so intended. Having carefully considered the submissions made both Counsel for the AA and Counsel for the former officer, the Panel found that the former officer had a high degree of culpability for his misconduct.
52. Harm - The Panel found that the former officer's admitted misconduct would harm public confidence in policing. They also determined that the former officer's admitted misconduct would have caused significant personal harm to a number of individuals affected by his actions. The Panel found that the former officer's admitted misconduct caused a high level of harm.
53. Aggravating factors— Following careful consideration of respective submissions, the Panel found the following aggravating factors were engaged in their assessment of the seriousness of the former officer's misconduct:
- (i) The targeting of particular officers for comments or abuse.
 - (ii) An abuse of position.
 - (iii) Regular, repeated or sustained behaviour over a period of time.
 - (iv) The vulnerability of a victim.
 - (v) Multiple victims.
 - (vi) Leadership responsibility where there is an expectation of acting as a role model.
 - (vii) Multiple proven allegations.

54. Mitigating factors

- (i) The Panel were provided with a psychiatric report and a GP's letter in relation to the former officer. In the report, the Panel noted a prolonged history of mental health related matters that they found MAY have affected the former officer's ability to cope with the circumstances in question.
- (ii) The Panel also noted the former officer's submission [HB page 268-269] in which he described how his communication style and inappropriate conduct may have been linked to some trauma he experienced in his childhood. He further stated that this childhood trauma had been compounded by 'years of trauma in his role as a police officer....'.
- (i) The Panel were unable to identify any other mitigating factors in their determination of the seriousness of the former officer's misconduct.

55. Having carefully considered the submissions from the parties the Panel determined that the seriousness of the former officer's admitted misconduct was HIGH.

56. The Panel then reminded itself of the purposes for imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings as defined at paragraph 2.3 of the Guidance:

- (i) To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
- (ii) To uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
- (iii) To protect the public

57. The Panel also reminded itself of paragraph 3.30 of the Guidance that the only available outcomes for a former officer are:

- Disciplinary action
- No disciplinary action

58. The Panel also noted paragraph 3.31 of the Guidance. This states that where a former officer's conduct amounted to gross misconduct and disciplinary action

is imposed the only sanction can be that he would have been dismissed if still serving.

59. Having determined that the seriousness of the former officer's misconduct was high and that it was determined to be gross misconduct by his own admission, the Panel determined that disciplinary action must be imposed.

60. The Panel were also mindful of paragraph 7.4 of the Guidance that less severe outcomes should be considered before severe outcomes.

61. The Panel reminded themselves that the more serious the conduct found proven against an officer, in this case freely admitted by the former officer, the more likely it would be that that dismissal would be justified.

62. The Panel did not consider that had the former officer still been employed, the imposition of a final written warning or a reduction in rank would have been appropriate given the seriousness of the facts and breaches admitted.

63. The Panel determined that public confidence in the police service would be undermined if an officer who had engaged in, and admitted to, such conduct would have been retained within the organisation.

64. The Panel therefore found that the public would have expected nothing less than dismissal of the former officer without notice for the gross misconduct admitted had he still been serving.

65. The Panel found that any lesser outcome would only serve to discredit the credibility of the police service. The Panel also found that any lesser outcome would not deter other officers from acting in similar way and would further undermine the public trust and confidence in the police.

66. The Panel also noted paragraph 3.24 of the Guidance that they must have regard to the former officer's record of police service when considering the

outcome. The Panel were provided with the officer's personal record and record of service which was carefully considered in their deliberations.

67. Having assessed the totality of the proven breaches, the former officer's service record, the contents of the Guidance and the purpose of the police misconduct regime, the Panel determined that **the former officer would have been dismissed without notice if he were still serving.**

Barred List.

68. The Chair had already directed that the former officer would be granted anonymity for the hearing. In continuation of that direction, the Chair had further directed that nothing was to be published which could result in the former officer being identified.
69. Having invited representations as to the barred list, the Chair asked the AA to take note of his decision as to the prohibition of the former officer's name being published and to treat the Chair's comments and direction as the Chair's notice under Regulation 42 (16) to the AA, that the former officer's name should NOT be included on public section of the Barred List.
70. The Chair thanked the parties for their assistance during the hearing and their respective very helpful submissions.

Chair – Mr Ian Saunders ACO

IPM – Mr Michael Hawkes

IPM – Mr Michael Saltern

Dated: 4th August 2026

END.