

Misconduct Hearing outcome - 12 August 2026

Former officer, Billy Sanders

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing of former PC Billy Sanders. The outline of the panel decision on facts and outcome was provided to the former officer during the hearing.
2. The panel comprised of the Chair, ACC Pete Gardner, the independent panel members, Julie Cook and Katy Parker, the panel legal adviser, Claire Fraser, the Appropriate Authority ("AA") was represented by Richard Black, PSD investigating officer, Jim Dempsey. The former officer did not have legal representation but did have a federation representative, Stuart Green. The former officer Billy Saunders was in attendance at the Hearing.
3. The hearing took place on 12th August 2026.
4. At the outset of our determinations and throughout the hearing the panel reminded itself of the purpose of police misconduct proceedings, which are as follows:
 - i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service, including by holding officers to account and making clear that improper behaviour of police officers will not be left unchecked;
 - ii. To uphold high professional standards in policing and deter misconduct, including by demonstrating to other officers that misconduct of a certain kind will not be tolerated; and
 - iii. To protect the public and/or officers or staff, including, in appropriate cases, by preventing the officer from committing similar misconduct again by excluding them from the police service.
5. The first stage in the hearing process is for the panel to decide what facts we find proved, whether those facts found proved amount to a breach of the professional standards and then to consider if on those findings, there is misconduct or gross

misconduct. If we find misconduct or gross misconduct proved, then we go on to consider the second stage which is 'outcome'.

Regulation 30 Notice

The case against the former officer was as follows:

6. On 22nd February 2025 you attended a social event in [REDACTED], which mainly involved colleagues from [REDACTED]. You were present with them at "[REDACTED] Bar," "[REDACTED] Public House", "[REDACTED]" and "[REDACTED]" It has been reported by the majority of the witnesses that you were under the influence of alcohol and appear to have become increasingly intoxicated as the evening progressed.

7. It is alleged that you have breached the standards of professional behaviour in that at various times during the course of the evening:

- i. You used inappropriate and offensive language and behaviour towards others present.
- ii. You used homophobic, racist and misogynistic language towards others present.
- iii. You exhibited inappropriate behaviour in the sight and hearing of others present.

PARTICULARS

a) You repeatedly referred to [REDACTED] as 'GAY BOY'. You were challenged by [REDACTED] about this and responded, "It's fine. I am 'B Rota firearms' and gestured holding a firearm and waving it around.

b) You repeatedly referred to [REDACTED], the girlfriend of another colleague [REDACTED] as a WELSH PIKEY' and as a 'PIKEY'.

c) PC A had previously been the subject of an investigation which was unsubstantiated. You said to PC A "I know who you are" and asked if he was, "that sexual predator" that you had been told about. You referred to him as 'PC A THE BUM TOUCHER' and compared him to 'WAYNE COUSINS'. Both PC A and [REDACTED]

challenged you over these comments. When you left the [REDACTED] Public House, you were shouting in the street “PC A IS A RAPIST” when he was walking ahead of you.

d) You were overheard by colleagues to mention ‘NAZIS’ and you were heard to sing a World War II German Army marching song and gestured a NAZI salute when singing the song.

e) While PC B was standing at the bar inside [REDACTED] Bar waiting to be served, you came up behind him and placed both your hands on each side of his waist. You thrust your groin into the officer’s buttocks several times. This was unsolicited and without PC B’s consent.

f) As [REDACTED] was entering one of the bars, you made a gesture with an open hand towards him as if to grab him in the groin area although no contact was made.

g) [REDACTED] approached you and engaged in conversation to get you know you better as he knew you were the partner of one of his team colleagues. You became slightly hostile towards him and asked him in a threatening manner what he thought about your partner and kept on questioning him about this. When he attempted to leave the table, you grabbed him by the collar of his jumper and pulled him towards your face. Whilst staring at him, you told him how much you hated him and became verbally insulting and called him ‘GAY’ several times.

h) [REDACTED] handed you a cigarette and his lighter. You dropped the cigarette on the floor accidentally and then took out some vape liquid from your pocket and tried to pour it into the top of the lighter. When he stopped you and pointed out that it was a lighter and not a vape, you tried to take a puff from the lighter. You then put the lighter in your pocket and when he asked for it back you told him, "ITS IN MY POCKET SO JUST GET IT." When the officer got the lighter from your pocket you said, "DONT SEARCH ME AGAIN, IM A GYPSY".

i) Whilst colleagues were trying to facilitate an “Uber” taxi for you to go home, you said to [REDACTED] , “FUCKING GYPSY, YOU’VE GOT GYPO EYEBROWS’ and called [REDACTED] a ‘CUNT’.

The allegations set out above are in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to:

- I. Discreditable Conduct: Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.
- II. Authority Respect and Courtesy: Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.
- III. Equality & Diversity: Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.

8. The facts are set out in detail in the Regulation 30 Notice. There was no dispute to the underlying facts to this case. The former officer indicated at the misconduct hearing that the facts alleged were accepted and the former officer accepted they amounted to gross misconduct.

Burden and Standard

9. We reminded ourselves that the burden of proof is upon the AA and remains upon them to prove their case to the necessary standard of proof.

10. The standard of proof is the civil standard – the balance of probabilities. In simple terms, whether the tribunal considers on the evidence the occurrence of the event or act alleged was ‘more likely than not’.

FPC Sanders: FINDINGS

11. The Panel carefully considered all the written material submitted, along with the evidence heard at the Hearing itself. The Panel also reminded itself that the AA brings the case, and it is for the AA to prove the case on the balance of probabilities.

12. The Panel has followed the staged approach as set out in the guidance. Firstly, to consider findings as to the facts.

PANEL FINDINGS AS TO THE FACTS

13. Notwithstanding the former officer's admissions in their regulation 30 response and their admissions at the Hearing, the Panel have carefully considered the uncontested witness evidence regarding each of the alleged facts. The Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that all the alleged facts contained in the regulation 30 (a through to i) are proven.

STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOUR

14. Notwithstanding the former officer's admissions, we have considered each of the alleged breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

DISCREDITABLE CONDUCT

15. The Standard related 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."

16. Given the findings of the facts, the Panel found that the former officer engaged in a pattern of behaviour that brought significant discredit on the police service and has the potential to significantly undermine public confidence in the police, the Panel concluded that the Standard of Discreditable Conduct has been breached.

AUTHORITY, RESPECT and COURTESY

17. The Standard of Authority, Respect and Courtesy as set out in Schedule 2 of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 states that the expectation that: "Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.."

18. Given the findings of fact, it is clear that the officer has failed to exercise self-control, been intolerant and failed to treat his those present with respect and courtesy. Given these failures, the Panel found that the Standard with respect to Authority, Respect and Courtesy has been breached.

EQUALITY and DIVERSITY

19. The Standard of Equality and Diversity as set out in Schedule 2 of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 states that the expectation that: “Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.”

20. The findings with regards to the facts show that the former officer used discriminatory, racist, homophobic, sexist and antisemitic language and behaviour.

21. Given these failures, the Panel found that the Standard with respect to Equality and Diversity has been breached.

SEVERITY ASSESSMENT

22. Notwithstanding the former officer’s admissions and following the staged process the Panel then considered the severity of the breaches of the Standards and whether they were at a misconduct or gross misconduct level (that is, misconduct so serious as to justify disciplinary action or misconduct so serious as to justify dismissal).

23. Considering the College of Policing ‘Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023)’ for the purposes of assessing seriousness at this stage, the Panel found:

i. The officer has a high level of culpability having regard to the factors laid out in the COP guidance:

- The former officer’s actions were targeted and deliberate
- The former officer ought to have foreseen the risk of harm from their actions
- The actions involved sexual impropriety, misogyny and discrimination.

ii. The actions were at the high end of the harm scale:

- Whilst no persons were physically harmed, there was actual and the potential for psychological distress to the victim of the former officers’ actions.
- There is significant reputational risk for Surrey Police and policing nationally if they were aware of the behaviour of a police officer in this

manner. The actions have the ability to significantly undermine public confidence in policing

- iii. There were a number of aggravating factors present, including:
- Regular, repeated and sustained behaviour over the period
 - The behaviour continued after the former officer realised or ought to have realised it was wrong, particularly after being challenged.
 - There are multiple victims of the behaviour
 - The behaviour included discrimination, antisemitism, sexual impropriety and misogyny which are all areas of national concern.
 - There are multiple proven allegations and standards breached.
- iv. The panel found there was limited mitigation for the behaviour. The Panel noted the officer's stress but note they had not been presented with any evidence of causality with regards to the behaviour in question. The Panel also noted that being drunk is not a defence to subsequent behaviour, regardless of whether the consequences were intended or not.

24. Taking all of the above into consideration, the Panel found that the Officer's conduct was so serious and fell short of the Standards expected to such an extent, that their dismissal from the Police would be justified. Accordingly, the Panel made a finding of Gross Misconduct in this matter for the breach of the standards individually and collectively.

Former PC Sanders: OUTCOME

25. Following the findings, the Panel went on to consider the most appropriate outcome for the findings of gross misconduct.

26. The disciplinary action available is limited per Regulation 42 as modified by paragraph 32 of Schedule 1.

27. Upon a finding of gross misconduct, the only disciplinary action available is to find that the former officer would have been dismissed had he still been a member of the police service and that his name be entered on the barred list.

28. Upon a finding of gross misconduct but the Chair determining that disciplinary action falling short of dismissal would have been imposed had the former officer still been a serving officer, no disciplinary action may be imposed but the finding recorded.

29. In this matter, the Panel followed the structured approach as set out in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes namely:

- a. Assess the seriousness of the misconduct.
- b. Keep in mind the threefold purpose of imposing sanctions.
- c. Choose the sanction which must appropriately fulfil that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

30. We first considered once more the severity assessment and the seriousness of the breaches with respect to:

- Culpability
- Harm
- Aggravating factors; and
- Mitigating factors

31. We also considered personal mitigation, such as testimonials and references, after assessing the seriousness of the conduct by the four categories above.

32. We considered our assessment of severity at the previous stage and revisited this with regards to the considerations at this stage of proceedings. We noted the former officer's remorse, insight and admissions. We carefully considered this as we do believe the former officer has shown genuine remorse and has clearly taken a course of action to understand their behaviour to ensure this does not reoccur.

33. We considered the officers service record and character references though we note the limited weight they carry at this stage in proceedings as set out in *R v Slater* ([1995] Crim LR 244) 512 and reinforced by Lord Justice Holroyde in the case of *Williams v Police Appeal Tribunal* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).

34. We then reminded ourselves of the purpose of imposing sanctions as set out in the College of Policing Guidance:

- i. To uphold public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
- ii. To uphold high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and
- iii. To protect the Public.

35. We then considered 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.

36. We considered and deliberated as to whether a lower sanction than dismissal should the officer still be serving and being placed on the barred list would satisfy the purposes of the misconduct regime.

Conclusion

37. As a Panel we felt that given the seriousness of the gross misconduct the only sanction that appropriately and proportionately meets the purposes of the police misconduct regime would be dismissal without notice had the officer still be serving. The former officer will also be placed on the College of Policing barred list.

Appeal

38. If the former officer wishes to appeal the findings and sanctions of this Hearing, they must do so within 10 working days following receipt of this written decision. The notice of appeal must be in writing to the relevant local policing body.