

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 – Notification of Outcome

Former Officer:	Former PC 24607 Calum Brand
Date:	02 September 2026
Chair:	Debra Tedds

The Decisions of the Hearing

Allegation No.	Allegations (See Regulation 51 Notice)	Finding Proven / Not Proven	Outcome
1.	It is alleged that your conduct on the 15 July 2026 breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that: You appeared at Nottingham Magistrates Court and were convicted following trial of an offence of assault by beating contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. Your conduct was a breach of the Discreditable Conduct Standard of Professional Behaviour which requires officers to behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it. This conduct has brought discredit to the police force and the police service, generally. The breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour is considered so serious your dismissal would be justified and thus amounts to gross misconduct.		

The reasons for the decision as to Finding:

I was satisfied that Former Officer Brand had had proper notice of the hearing and had emailed in via his Federation representative stating that he was not intending to submit a response to the allegations and was not seeking to attend the hearing. I was therefore satisfied that it would be fair and in the interests of justice to proceed in his absence.

As Chair, under the regulations, I am asked to approach this case in stages, which I have done so.

Police Conduct Regulations sets out:

The person or persons conducting the misconduct proceedings must not find that the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct unless:-

- a. They are satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this is the case, or*
- b. The officer admits it is the case.*

I have read the papers and considered the verbal submissions by the Appropriate Authority during this hearing. There are no responses under regulation 54 from the former officer that I can consider albeit during his criminal interview he denied assaulting the victim and using excessive force.

The burden is on the Appropriate Authority to prove the allegations on the balance of probabilities and not on the former officer.

It was the Appropriate Authority's case that there is incontrovertible evidence through the certificate of conviction and court extract showing that Former Officer Brand was found guilty and convicted of assault by beating on the 15th July 2026 at Nottingham Magistrates Court.

Based on what I have read and heard, I find the factual allegations against Former Officer Brand to be proven and breached the standards of professional behaviour namely – Discreditable Conduct.

In determining the seriousness of the breach of the professional standards of behaviour and having regard to the College of Policing guidance on outcomes and the definition of gross misconduct in regulation 2 of the regulations, in my view, these breaches of the standards of professional behaviour amount to gross misconduct – that is to say that is so serious that the officers dismissal would be justified.

It is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves.

The reasons for the decision as to Outcome:

I have considered in detail everything that I have read within the bundle, what I have heard in submissions and the officers record of service.

As a former officer, on a finding of gross misconduct, the only outcome I can arrive at is either: -

RESTRICTED

- Disciplinary action – the former officer would have been dismissed had they still been a serving member of the Force
- No disciplinary action.

In arriving at my decision, I have recognised the purpose of the police misconduct regime being to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service, to uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct and to protect the public. I have utilised the College of Policing guidance on outcomes to assist in determining the most appropriate outcome. This has included the three stages to determining the appropriate action and assessing the seriousness of the proven conduct through culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating factors before considering any personal mitigation.

My considerations are as follows:

Culpability

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.

This case involves the former officer being convicted of a criminal offence at Nottingham Magistrates Court for assault by beating of a female victim. Violence against women and girls is a particular concern to the public. When perpetrated by a police officer the outcome is likely to be severe and will always have a high degree of culpability.

All police officers are in a position of trust or responsibility by the nature of their role. This is on duty conduct whereby the former officer has assaulted a member of the public during an incident and subsequently been convicted of doing so. As per the College of Policing guidance on outcomes, it is unacceptable for police officers who are responsible for enforcing the law to break the law themselves.

Harm

When assessing harm the impact by an officer's actions can be considered in various ways.

The victim in this case suffered physical injury to her face and was traumatised by the officer's actions. A member of public was present, and I have no doubt their trust and confidence within the police service would have been negatively impacted as would the wider public if they were aware of the circumstances. This would have a negative impact on the reputation of West Midlands Police and the wider service.

Aggravating Factors

Aggravating factors are those tending to worsen the circumstances of the case, in relation to either the officers' culpability or the harm caused.

When considering the aggravating factors, I have sought to avoid double counting either within the list or with the factors already considered as part of my assessment.

As already stated, this was a female victim, of assault, on duty whilst attending an incident whereby the female called for Police help.

The former officer had with him a student officer who he was supporting, as a role model, and who should have been receiving guidance.

This is, however, a single allegation and one breach of the standards.

RESTRICTED

Mitigating Factors

Due to the former officer not engaging within the process and not providing any response to the allegations there are no mitigating factors put forward by him. I can see no other mitigation within the evidence that I have read apart from the fact that the victim hit the former officer on the head prior to the assault which is not disputed by any party.

Personal Mitigation

There is no personal mitigation put forward by the former officer nor any character witness evidence or testimonials. I have however considered the officers record of service.

I have decided, in the circumstances, that the only appropriate outcome to reflect the seriousness of the proven gross misconduct is to impose disciplinary action and therefore if Former Officer Brant was still serving that he would have been dismissed.

The former officers' details will be placed on the College of Policing barred List.

As stated under regulation 63, I am required to submit a report to the Appropriate Authority setting out my findings, the reasons for my findings and any disciplinary action imposed.

The Appropriate Authority will send a copy of the report to the former officer in line with the timelines specified in the amended regulations. There will be a right of appeal of the decision if you so wish of which you will be provided guidance on the process for doing so.

Reg 63(2) Right of Appeal:

You have a right of appeal against the outcome under the following circumstances: -

- a) the finding or outcome was unreasonable;
- b) 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) there was a breach of the procedures or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on outcome.

Should you wish to appeal this must be done to the Police Appeals Tribunal by writing to the Police and Crime Commissioner, West Midlands Office for Policing and Crime **within ten working days** beginning with the day after receipt of this notice. Please note that the tribunal can increase any outcome imposed as well as reduce or overturn the decision of the chair. You have the right to be legally represented at the appeal hearing.

Decision on Publication:

Chair's Signature:

DJ Tedds

Date:

02/09/2026