I will deliver my findings with brief reasons now. I have carefully considered all the written and material submitted, along with the submissions heard at the Hearing itself.

I have followed the staged approach as set out in the guidance. Firstly, to consider findings as to the facts.

FACTS

I am satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the facts in this case are proven:

> In a trial concluding 24th June 2026 the officer appeared before Sussex (Central) Magistrates and was convicted of stalking (without fear/alarm/distress) contrary to Section 2a(1) of the Protection From Harassment Act 1997.

In making this finding, I note the PNC Printout confirming the conviction.

STANDARDS

I have then considered whether this amount to a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour with respect to Discreditable Conduct.

- The Standard relating to Discreditable Conduct as set out in Schedule 2 of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 states that the expectation that: *"Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty."*
- I find that the conduct of PC Mullarkey was describable, behaviour of a criminal nature discredits the police and undermines public confidence in it.

SERIOUSNESS

I have then considered the severity of this breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour and whether it is at the level of misconduct or gross misconduct (that is, misconduct so serious as to justify disciplinary action or misconduct so serious as to justify dismissal).

Considering the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes for the purposes of assessing seriousness at this stage, I find:

- The former officer has a high level of culpability. The officer has been convicted of a criminal offence which by its nature is intentional, deliberate, targeted and planned.

- The conduct has a high level of harm. Stalking is a highly impactful offence, and I consider first the harm and potential harm to the victim of the criminal offence. I also note the reputational harm to policing. This case could significantly undermine public confidence in and the reputation of the police service.

- There are significant aggravating factors; the conduct was predatory in nature, for malign intent; it was regular and repeated and sustained; it continued after the officer realised or ought to have realised that it was improper; it involved violence against women and girls. an area of national concern where policing has come under significant public scrutiny.

- I find no mitigation, I note the officer's concerns over their counter allegations, but it is not for this Hearing to question the criminal conviction.

Having considered the severity of the misconduct, I find the breach of this standard to be at the level of gross misconduct.

OUTCOME

Following the findings, I have gone on to consider the most appropriate outcome for the proven gross misconduct. In addition to the written evidence supplied and the submissions at the Hearing itself, I have also considered the officer's service record.

In this matter, the I have followed the structured approach as set out in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes.

I reminded myself first of the purpose of imposing sanctions as set out in the College of Policing Guidance:

1) To uphold public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
2) To uphold high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and
3) To protect the Public.

I then reminded myself that, as per section 2.8 of the Guidance, any sanction imposed must be "… no more than is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings" and therefore less severe outcomes must be considered before more severe outcomes. In this case the sanctions are limited to a final written warning or dismissal without notice and placed on the Police Barred List.

I then considered once more the severity assessment noted my previous findings with regards to the seriousness of the breach of the standards, notably:

- High Culpability, high Harm, multiple Aggravating factors; and no Mitigating factors

I note in particular from the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes the provisions regarding criminal convictions in sections 4.17 though to 4.24 and those regarding Violence Against Women and Girls in sections 4.60 through to 4.62.

I find that no sanction below dismissal would satisfy the purposes of imposing sanctions as set out in the guidance. Plainly speaking conviction for a predatory criminal offence is incompatible with holding the office of constable. The officer's behaviour has a significant risk of undermining confidence in policing in an area of national concern. The alternative to dismissal of retaining this officer in the police service on a final written warning, would undermine public confidence in the police's ability to deal with violence against women and girls and predatory officers, it would fail to deter misconduct and potentially put the public at risk.

As such PC Mullarkey is dismissed without notice and will be placed on the College of Policing Barred List.