



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

Notice of Outcome of Misconduct Hearing and any Disciplinary Action Imposed

Name: Andrew ADAMS Force Number: 40197
Rank: Police Sergeant Dept: _____
Case reference number: CM/014/19

Allegations subject of Misconduct Hearing:

Alleged Facts

1. The allegations set out in the Regulation 21 notice are as follows.
2. You joined Surrey Police as a PCSO in 2006 and then commenced service as a police officer on 2 February 2009 maintaining the rank of Constable until you were acting as Temporary Sergeant between 28 August 2016 and 28 August 2017 thereafter being promoted to substantive Sergeant on 29 August 2017. You held this rank at the time the below allegations were made. During your police training and throughout the 13 years of your policing career you have received training so as to ensure your awareness of the standards of professional behaviour that should be upheld by every police officer.
3. During the time of the allegations you were the Police Sergeant supervising members of the Mole Valley Neighbourhood Support Team, working out of Pippbrook Council Offices in Dorking. Since December 2018, you had been responsible for the supervision of a female PCSO, referred to as AT.
4. On 11 April 2019 you became involved in a sexual relationship with AT. On the same day, you undertook mandatory NCalt abuse of process training which dealt with the issue of inappropriate relationships. However, you continued to pursue a sexual relationship with AT, whilst on duty, who continued to be under your line management.
5. On 12 June 2019 Surrey Police Professional Standards Department (PSD) were contacted by Inspector Coyne who advised disclosures had been made by a member of her team. The disclosure concerned information of a sexual relationship between you and AT, whilst on duty.
6. As part of the investigation members of the Neighbourhood Support Team at Mole Valley were contacted and accounts were obtained.
7. Statements were taken including one from PC 2799 Gargini who recalls you checked she was aware of AT's domestic vulnerabilities impacting on her at work. PC Gargini was asked sometime in the Spring this year to keep an eye on her as she would be working alongside



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

Allegations subject of Misconduct Hearing:

her. The witness was unaware a relationship had developed between you and following a conversation with AT who was very upset, emailed you on 4 June 2019 setting out welfare and boundary concerns. It was only later that the witness was made aware of the relationship.

8. Within your Regulation 16 you have admitted having a personal relationship and sexual activity on three occasions, whilst on duty. You deny that your interactions with AT interfered with your duties and responsibilities or that your relationship with a PCSO under your direct supervision amounts to a conflict of interest or improper relationship.
9. You suggested two lines of enquiry that may indicate you were not aware of any vulnerabilities before or at the time of developing the relationship with AT. These were followed up with PS 2411 Wells and Inspector Coyne.
10. PS Wells recalled handing over supervision to you around December 2018 and that during a brief discussion he made you aware that there had been domestic related issues with AT although he did not elaborate on the detail. He indicated a vulnerability in her private life that could impact her at work and her well-being and he also stated that you were aware adjustments had been made in the team for her not to be assigned DA matters or the DA car.
11. Inspector Coyne recalled a discussion towards the end of 2018 that she made sure you were aware AT suffered from anxiety and had previously self-harmed and that she was experiencing marriage difficulties. She also confirmed you had submitted an occupational health referral form following AT's absence from work in February 2019 which related to depression. The witness also added that her expectation in the circumstances would be that you support the member of staff and keep line management notes of concerns.
12. You have made admissions in a conduct interview on 24 September 2019 but also raised defences to some of the allegations made. You stated that you were sorry, it should not have happened and that you had learnt huge lessons from it and that nothing like this will happen again.
13. The College of Policing and National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) guidance on appropriate personal relationships and behaviours in the workplace guidance was published during the course of your relationship with AT.
14. It is alleged that your conduct over the course of your interactions with AT breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour and amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct as follows: -
 - a) Between April and May 2019, you formed a sexual relationship with AT, whilst aware of her personal and welfare issues, whilst you continued to act as her line manager. Such behaviour amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional behaviour: Authority, respect and courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct;
 - b) Between April and May 2019, you conducted a sexual relationship with AT whilst on duty,



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

Allegations subject of Misconduct Hearing:

namely you engaged in oral sex on two occasions with AT inside a Surrey Police vehicle. Such behaviour amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional behaviour: Authority, respect and courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct;

- c) Between April and May 2019, you conducted a sexual relationship with AT whilst on duty, namely you engaged in sexual intercourse with AT at Leatherhead Fire Station. Such behaviour amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional behaviour: Authority, respect and courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct;
- d) Between April and May 2019, you failed to declare your sexual relationship with AT to a supervisor or line manager. Such behaviour amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour: Authority, respect and courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities, & Discreditable Conduct.

15. The Appropriate Authority has assessed that, if proven and there is a case for you to answer, the matter is one of Gross Misconduct and the proceedings are therefore taking the form of a Misconduct Hearing.

FINDING: GROSS MISCONDUCT

Full account of reasons for the finding

1. This misconduct hearing took place on 26 February 2020, after the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 came into force. However, it relates to "pre-commencement allegations". Whilst it makes no practical difference, we have therefore applied the 2012 Regulations in conducting these proceedings. It makes no practical difference because our task remains the same, namely to find the facts and consider whether the officer's conduct amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither. Gross misconduct means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.
2. The allegations and relevant background can be taken from the Regulation 21 notice set out



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

above. The four allegations of misconduct which we have to consider are as follows:

- a) Between April and May 2019, PS Adams formed a sexual relationship with AT, whilst aware of her personal and welfare issues, whilst he continued to act as her line manager. Such behaviour amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional behaviour: Authority, respect and courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct ("Allegation No.1");
 - b) Between April and May 2019, PS Adams conducted a sexual relationship with AT whilst on duty, namely he engaged in oral sex on two occasions with AT inside a Surrey Police vehicle. Such behaviour amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional behaviour: Authority, respect and courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct ("Allegation No.2");
 - c) Between April and May 2019, PS Adams conducted a sexual relationship with AT whilst on duty, namely he engaged in sexual intercourse with AT at Leatherhead Fire Station. Such behaviour amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional behaviour: Authority, respect and courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct ("Allegation No.3");
 - d) Between April and May 2019, PS Adams failed to declare his sexual relationship with AT to a supervisor or line manager. Such behaviour amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour: Authority, respect and courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities, & Discreditable Conduct ("Allegation No.4").
3. We heard live evidence from Inspector Coyne, PS Wells and PC Gargini for the Appropriate Authority and live evidence from PS Adams in his own defence. We also had regard to the witness statements in the bundle from witnesses A, B and C as well as the statements of PC Marriott and PCSO Sadler.
 4. The live evidence was predominantly concerned with the extent of PS Adams' knowledge of AT's vulnerabilities. We shall return to this issue to set out our findings of fact shortly, but on the primary facts, there was no dispute. PS Adams accepted in his Regulation 22 response that i) he formed a sexual relationship with AT whilst acting as her line manager; ii) that he engaged in oral sex with her on 2 occasions whilst on duty in a Surrey police vehicle between April 2019 and May 2019; iii) he had sexual intercourse with her whilst on duty at Leatherhead Fire Station between April and May 2019 and iv) he did not disclose the relationship to his supervisor or line manager. Save for Allegation No.1, he further admitted that such conduct amounted to misconduct but denied that it amounted to gross misconduct. In relation to AT's alleged vulnerabilities, PS Adams denied that "*he knew anything like the whole of her personal and welfare issues in the earlier part of the relationship*". However, he admitted that "*In the earlier part of the relationship AT told him of intermittent depression and historical, minor, self-harm*". Notwithstanding that knowledge, PS Adams did not accept that "*the mere fact of a sexual relationship with AT in the circumstances that existed at the time amounted to misconduct*".



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

5. Turning then to what PS Adams knew about AT's vulnerabilities and when, we find as follows. We find that PS Adams became AT's supervisor in December 2018. He admitted that he was already aware that AT was having marital difficulties as a result of gossip within the office. He denied that PS Wells mentioned any "domestic" incidents when he handed over line management responsibility for AT in December 2018. We are prepared to accept that part of PS Adams' evidence but we accept PS Wells' evidence that he did flag up AT's marital difficulties. Further, PS Adams accepted that he was on notice from October 2018 that AT was not to be assigned to the DA (Domestic Abuse) car. Bearing in mind that PS Adams is a DA mentor, we consider that this information was sufficient to put him on notice of AT's marital difficulties. However, the issue of vulnerability goes beyond marital difficulties. In his interview, PS Adams admitted receipt of an email from AT just before Christmas (2018) "*where she did make mention ... she was going to be late to work because she was having her anti-depressants re-managed or a new prescription or something similar*". PS Adams denied that this put him on notice of her depression. We are somewhat sceptical about this denial but in our judgment it makes no difference to the outcome of this case because PS Adams accepted later on in the interview that he knew about AT's "*intermittent depression*" and history of self-harm *before* any sexual relationship with AT started. We find that PS Adams had this knowledge by the end of March 2019 at the latest following a "one-to-one" which he had with AT on her return to work following 3 days' leave of absence beginning on or about 18 March 2019. In our judgment, this means that PS Adams knew that AT was vulnerable and/or had significant "personal and welfare issues" (to use the language of Allegation No.1). Whilst the term "vulnerable" is broad, it is generally well understood, particularly by someone with PS Adams' training, and it seems to us that PS Adams' own email dated 7 June 2019, albeit after the event, shows that he was fully aware of AT's vulnerabilities.
6. We turn then to consider the four allegations. We propose to deal with Allegations 2 and 3 first and then Allegations 1 and 4.
7. Allegation No.2. The primary facts are accepted. We have to decide whether the admitted facts amount to gross misconduct as defined. We have no hesitation in concluding that they do. PS Adams admits engaging in oral sex on two occasions whilst on duty, in uniform in a marked police car. It was suggested that because the encounter took place on a quiet, rural byway known as Wolvens Lane, it was unlikely that they would have been seen by a member of the public. It may have been unlikely but it was certainly not impossible and in any event what matters is that PS Adams was engaging in sexual activity whilst on duty in a public place. This necessarily distracted him from his duties and responsibilities, at a time when he might have been called upon to respond to an emergency. Had either of their encounters been witnessed by a member of the public, we have no doubt that there would have been public outrage, and rightly so, and flowing from that significant reputational damage to the police service. Furthermore, we are satisfied that after what PS Adams described as their first kiss on 11 April 2019, which took place on Wolvens Lane, there was a significant degree of planning on the part of PS Adams to engineer further occasions when he might be on duty alone with AT and able to go to Wolvens Lane for sexual activity.
8. The Code of Ethics imposes the following requirements on officers:



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

Authority, respect and courtesy

2.3 According to this standard you must:

- *Ensure that any relationship at work does not create an actual or apparent conflict of interest*
- *Not engage in sexual conduct or other inappropriate behaviour when on duty;*
- *Not establish or pursue an improper sexual relationship or emotional relationship with any person with whom you come into contact in the course of your work who may be vulnerable to an abuse of trust or power*

Discreditable Conduct

9.1 As a police officer ... you must keep in mind at all times that the public expects you to maintain the highest standards of behaviour. You must therefore always think about how a member of the public may regard your behaviour, whether on or off duty.

9.2 You should ask yourself whether a particular decision, action, or omission might result in members of the public losing trust and confidence in the policing profession.

9. We regard the admitted facts in relation to Allegation 2 as amounting to breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour ("SPB") relating to Authority Respect and Courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct. We further find that these admitted facts amount to gross misconduct. No other conclusion is sensibly open to us on these facts, involving as they do sexual activity by a sergeant with a fellow officer in a public place whilst on duty and in uniform in dereliction of his duty to the public. On any view, and having regard to the Code of Ethics, which applies to every person working in policing, this behaviour discloses breaches of the SPB so serious that dismissal would be justified.
10. Allegation No.3. We The primary facts are accepted. We have to decide whether the admitted facts amount to gross misconduct as defined. We have no hesitation in concluding that they do. PS Adams admits engaging in sexual intercourse whilst on duty. The location was not a public place but this does not detract from the seriousness of the misconduct. Whilst engaged in sexual intercourse with AT, PS Adams would necessarily have been distracted from his duties and responsibilities. In these circumstances, the potential for serious reputational damage to the police service is obvious and cannot be underestimated.
11. We regard the admitted facts in relation to Allegation 3 as amounting to breaches of the SPB relating to Authority Respect and Courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct. We further find that these admitted facts amount to gross misconduct. No other conclusion is sensibly open to us on these facts, involving as they do sexual conduct by a sergeant whilst on duty and in uniform in dereliction of his duty to the public. On any view this behaviour discloses breaches of the SPB so serious that dismissal would be justified.



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*

www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

12. Allegation No.1. We have found it difficult to disentangle this allegation from Allegation No.4. It seems to us that much of the difficulty here arises from the fact that PS Adams did not disclose his relationship with AT to his supervisor. That meant that the apparent conflict of interest that arose from this relationship could not be managed. However, it went further than this. We accept that there was a power imbalance between PS Adams and AT, who was a PCSO. We further accept, for the reasons set out above, that AT was vulnerable and/or suffering from significant personal and welfare issues to the knowledge of PS Adams when they began their sexual relationship. In the circumstances, we have concluded that PS Adams has embarked on a relationship with AT who was vulnerable to an abuse of power or trust and in circumstances giving rise to an apparent conflict of interest. He was her supervisor. He was a substantive sergeant and had acted up as an Inspector. He was able to allocate tasks to her, appraise her work, authorise leave, and more. The potential for a conflict of interest once the sexual relationship started was obvious. She had a history of depression and self-harm. Having regard to the Code of Ethics set out above, and PS Adams's seniority and training, we conclude that this relationship was entirely inappropriate and discloses breaches of the SPB relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct so serious that dismissal would be justified.
13. Allegation No.4. The facts are admitted. No disclosure was made but PS Adams contends that there was no misconduct here. We beg to differ. Non-disclosure compromised PS Adams and AT. More importantly, it compromised the ability of the police service to manage the situation. Further, PS Adams was clear that he deliberately kept the relationship secret and had no intention of making any disclosure. He could have made a confidential disclosure. He said nothing. We conclude that the failure to disclose amounts to breaches of the SPB relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct so serious that dismissal would be justified.
14. We are satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the conduct of PS Adams as detailed in the allegations above amounts to gross misconduct.

STANDARD(S) OF PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOUR DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN BREACHED:

Authority, Respect and Courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities, Discreditable Conduct



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

DISCIPLINARY ACTION IMPOSED: DISMISSAL WITHOUT NOTICE

REASONS

1. In determining the appropriate sanction the Panel have followed the 3-stage approach identified by Popplewell J in *Fuglers LLP v SRA* [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin) at paragraph 28 which is in these terms:

"There are three stages to the approach which should be adopted by a [...] disciplinary tribunal in determining sanction. The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the misconduct. The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose for which sanctions are imposed by such a tribunal. The third stage is to choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question".

2. In applying the above-mentioned 3-stage approach and arriving at our decision on the appropriate sanction, we have also given careful consideration to the '*Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings*' ("the Guidance") published by the College of Policing.
3. The relevant parts of the Guidance are as follows. At paragraphs 1.3 and 1.4 the Guidance states:

"The guidance does not override the discretion of the person who is conducting the meeting or hearing. Their function is to determine the appropriate outcome and each case will depend on its particular facts and circumstances.

Guidance cannot and should not prescribe the outcome suitable for every case. Instead this guidance outlines a general framework for assessing the seriousness of conduct including factors which may be taken into account. These factors are non-exhaustive and do not exclude any other factors that the persons conducting the proceedings may consider relevant".

4. At paragraph 2.1 the Guidance states:

"...outcome should be sufficient to demonstrate the individual accountability for any abuse or misuse of police powers if public confidence in the police service is to be maintained. They must



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

also be imposed fairly and proportionately. When determining the appropriate outcome to impose consider the purpose of police misconduct proceedings. The purpose of the police misconduct regime is threefold.

- 1. Maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service.*
- 2. Uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.*
- 3. Protect the public".*

5. The Guidance draws specific attention to the decision of the House of Lords in *R (Green) v Police Complaints Authority* [2004] UKHL 6 at paragraph 78 where Lord Carswell stated in relation to the police service:

"Public confidence in the police is a factor of great importance in the maintenance of law and order in the manner of which we regard as appropriate in our polity. If citizens feel that improper behaviour on the part of police officers is left unchecked and they are not held accountable for it in a suitable manner that confidence will be eroded".

6. In Chapter 4 of the Guidance entitled 'Assessing Seriousness' the *Fugler* stages are summarised at paragraph 4.2 in these terms:

"As Popplewell J explained there are three stages in determining the appropriate sanction.

- 1. Assess the seriousness of the misconduct.*
- 2. Keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions.*
- 3. Choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question".*

7. The Guidance goes on to emphasise that assessing seriousness is the first stage and directs attention to four central reference points set out in paragraph 4.4 in these terms:

- "1. The officer's culpability for the misconduct.*
- 2. The harm caused by the misconduct.*
- 3. The existence of any aggravating factors.*
- 4. The existence of any mitigating factors".*

8. Under the heading 'Culpability' at paragraph 4.10 the Guidance contains the following: *'Culpability denotes the officer's blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions. The more culpable or blameworthy the behaviour in question the more serious the misconduct and the more severe the likely outcome'. At paragraph 4.13 the guidance adds:*

"Culpability will be increased if the officer was holding a position of trust or responsibility at the relevant time. All police officers



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

are in a position of trust but an officer's level of responsibility may be affected by specific circumstantial factors such as rank, their particular role and their relationship with any persons affected by the misconduct".

9. The Guidance adds at paragraph 4.15, '*The following types of misconduct however should be considered especially serious...*' There then follows a series of categories of conduct which fall within this category which includes sexual impropriety (see paragraph 4.39) where it is noted that, '*Misconduct involving...sexual impropriety undermines public trust in the profession and is therefore serious...*'

10. Under the heading '*Harm*' there is a section on the effect on public confidence in these terms:

"Harm will likely undermine public confidence in policing. Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual group to undermine public confidence. Where an officer commits an act which would harm public confidence if the circumstances were known to the public take this into account. Always take seriously misconduct which undermines discipline and good order within the police service even if it does not result in harm to individual victims".

At paragraph 4.60 the guidance adds, '*How such behaviour would be or has been perceived by the public will be relevant whether or not the behaviour was known about at the time*'.

11. At paragraph 4.65 the guidance states:

"Where gross misconduct has been found however and the behaviour caused or could have caused serious harm to individuals, community and/or public confidence in the police service dismissal is likely to follow. A factor of the greatest importance is the impact of the misconduct on the standing and reputation of the profession as a whole".

There then follows a list of aggravating factors at paragraph 4.67 and mitigating factors at paragraph 4.71.

12. Chapter 7 of the guidance is entitled '*Conclusion*'. It repeats that there are three stages to delivering outcome. It adds that when considering outcome less severe outcomes should be considered before more serious ones but adding at paragraph 7.6, '*The reasons for imposing a particular outcome should be recorded and usually read out in public...*'



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

13. In determining the appropriate sanction we have followed the 3-stage approach identified above and have had regard in particular to the importance of maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police profession as a whole. This dual objective takes precedence over the specific impact that the sanction has on the individual whose misconduct is being sanctioned: see Guidance at paragraph 4.5.
14. We consider that all of the allegations are of the utmost severity, but particularly Allegation No.2. Their seriousness is self-evident from our findings above and in one sense requires no further elaboration. As regards Allegation No.2, PS Adams was engaging in oral sex (on more than one occasion) whilst on duty and in uniform in a public place or a place accessible to the public and prioritising his sexual trysts over his duties and responsibilities. Allegations No.1, 3 and 4 are only marginally less serious. His culpability is high and obvious. He only has himself to blame. There was no suggestion of ill-health or anything that might begin to explain, still less justify his behaviour. In terms of harm, this type of behaviour risks undermining public confidence in the police service. We have given careful consideration to his solid record of service and the references he has supplied but we regard this as scant personal mitigation in the circumstances of this case. We have concluded that dismissal without notice is the only appropriate sanction for the breaches of the SPB which we have found proved or admitted. We would have imposed the sanction of dismissal for any one of the proven allegations. No other sanction would be sufficient to maintain public confidence in the police service and uphold the reputation of the police service and the high standards that are reasonably expected of police officers by the public.



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

REPRESENTATIONS BY LEGALLY QUALIFIED CHAIR AS TO PUBLICATION ON BARRED LIST

NONE

The above misconduct hearing was concluded on:

26 February 2020

The tribunal:

Mr W Hansen, Legally Qualified Chair

Superintendent Martin Buffoni

Mr Stephen Cowburn, Independent Panel Member

Under Rule 4(2) of the Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2012 an appeal may be made by:

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



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

- (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 a special case hearing

Under Rule 4(1) an officer may appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal against the finding or the disciplinary action imposed as a result of that finding or both.

Under Rule 4(4) the only grounds of appeal under the Police Appeals Tribunals Rules are:

- (a) the finding or disciplinary action imposed was unreasonable or
- (b) that there is evidence that could not reasonably be 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 Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012, Schedule 3 to the Police Reform Act 2002 or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.

A police officer may not appeal to a tribunal against the finding where that finding was made following acceptance by the officer that his conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct as the case may be.

Where the appeal is brought by a chief officer of police or an acting chief officer, the respondent shall be a person designated by the relevant local policing body. Where the appeal is brought by any other police officer the respondent shall be the Chief Constable.

A police officer who wishes to appeal to a tribunal shall give notice of the appeal within 10 working days beginning on the date on the first working day after he/she received written notice of the decision that he/she is appealing against. The notice of appeal shall be given in writing to the relevant local policing body. Upon receipt of such notice the relevant local policing body shall send a copy to the respondent and where the appeal is a specified appeal to the IPCC.

For any notice of appeal outside this period, see Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 7(1) to (5).

The tribunal may determine a case without a hearing if the appellant has so consented in writing.

The appellant has the right to be represented at a hearing by a relevant lawyer or police friend. Even if represented by a relevant lawyer, the officer may also be accompanied by a police friend. If he/she chooses not to be represented the hearing may take place and the appeal may be determined without representation.

Costs

It is drawn to your attention that paragraphs 15.1 and 15.2 of the Home Office Guidance regarding Police Officer Misconduct state that the fees and expenses of tribunal members will be borne by the local policing body. An appellant pays their own costs of the appeal unless the tribunal directs that the whole or part of his or her costs are to be paid by the local policing body. Where the tribunal decides



**SURREY
POLICE**
*With you, making
Surrey safer*
www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20

to award costs in favour of the appellant, it is suggested that the tribunal sets out the reasons for this and identifies any lessons to be learned by the force as a result of the case.

SUBMISSION OF NOTIFICATION OF APPEAL (AND ALL SUBSEQUENT DOCUMENTATION)

Please note that all correspondence regarding Police Appeals Tribunal matters are to be submitted to:

PCC@.pnn.police.uk

or

The Police and Crime Commissioner
Surrey Police Headquarters
Mount Browne, Sandy Lane
Guildford
Surrey GU3 1HG

Signature of Legally Qualified Chair: W.Hansen

Date: 26 February 2020

I acknowledge that I have been served with a copy of this document.

Signature of Officer's Federation

Friend: _____

Date: _____



SURREY
POLICE
*With you, making
Surrey safer*

www.surrey.police.uk

Professional Standards Department

REGULATION 36 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2012
AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2015.

Hearing - 20