

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 – Notification of Outcome

Officer:	Former Sgt 5266 Christopher Parry
Date:	02 Sept 2026
Chair:	Julia Debenham

The Decisions of the Hearing

Allegation No.	Allegations (See Regulation 51 Notice)	Finding Proven / Not Proven	Outcome
	1. It is alleged that you have used your Force issued mobile device to communicate with a sex worker and to arrange a meeting with her for the purposes of receiving sexual services. 2. On 30 September 2025 at 15.14.10, the sex worker sent you a message to your Force issued mobile device in which she described the sexual services she provided and the costs of these based on a full hour or half an hour. The sex worker made clear that she accepted cash payments only and provided the location where she would be working. 3. At 15.21.43, you replied with the message: "Thanks can be there in 15 mins. If convenient 30 mins" the latter being a reference to the amount of time you required with the sex worker. 4. At 15.22.07, the sex worker messaged you to say that she could see you at 16.40. 5. At 15.22.28, the sex worker sent you a further message stating: "It's the [REDACTED] Hotel. When you're a couple of minutes away let me know and I'll send over the room details." 6. At 15.34.11, you messaged the sex worker to advise that you were walking up to the hotel. At 15.34.33, the sex worker replied, "Floor 4 room 442". At 15.34.43, the sex worker messaged you to advise you where		

RESTRICTED

	the lifts could be located inside the hotel to which you replied. “Great”. 7. On 1 October 2025 which was the following day, the sex worker messaged you at 09.24.15 to ask “Hey sweetheart. How are you?” to which you replied at 10.52.02 with the message “Great thanks”. 8. The National Police Chief’s Council has published National Guidance on Sex Work which makes clear that the use of sex workers is incompatible with the role of a police officer and police officers should not procure the services of sex workers. 9. Your conduct as described above breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour Orders and Instructions and Discreditable Conduct: You breached the Orders and Instructions Standard by using your police issued mobile device to communicate with a sex worker and arrange to meet with her to receive sexual services. You also breached the Discreditable Conduct Standard which relates to both on and off duty conduct and how it would be perceived by the public. 10. Your conduct brought discredit on you as a serving police officer and the police service generally and has undermined public confidence in policing. Your conduct is considered so serious as to amount to gross misconduct		
--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

The reasons for the decision as to Finding:

I am asked to consider these matters in two stages – the first being whether the facts are proved and whether they amount to a breach of the standards of professional behaviour.

If so, I will move on to the outcome stage.

I note that Sergeant Parry has recently resigned from West Midlands Police and that he is now a former officer.

The former officer is not present at today's hearing.

He is not represented by any party at the hearing.

I am satisfied that the former officer has absented himself voluntarily and that I am able to proceed.

The former officer has not provided a Regulation 18 response to the matters that are alleged.

I have reminded myself that the standard of proof in this case is "balance of probabilities." The burden of proof rests on the AA.

I am satisfied that the evidence presented is incontrovertible and that the facts are proven. Contact was made from the former officer's work device to a number that is attributed to a sex worker. It is clear that the former officer was making an appointment to visit the sex worker for the purposes of receiving sexual services.

I am satisfied that the evidence is reinforced by the Open Source attribution of the sex worker's phone.

The sex worker followed the officer up the following day, asking how he felt, and this supports the fact that sexual activity had taken place.

There has been no explanation offered by the former officer for these messages.

In relation to breaches of the standards of professional behaviour, I find that the former officer has breached **Orders and Instructions**. He has used his force issue mobile device to arrange

RESTRICTED

to meet a sex worker to receive sexual services. This clearly was not in the course of his duties and he would have known that this use was inappropriate.

In relation to **Discreditable Conduct**, I find that the former officer's conduct has breached this standard. He has brought discredit on himself and the wider force. The use of sex workers, who are often vulnerable women, is incompatible with the role of a police officer. Not only is it a potential abuse of the sex worker, but it also compromises the officer's position and leaves him open to potential blackmail and corruption. The position of the National Police Chiefs Council in this matter is clear.

The public would not expect a police officer to be buying sexual services from sex workers, and would not expect them to be making arrangements to do so using their work devices.

Taken together, I find these breaches amount to Gross Misconduct.

The reasons for the decision as to Outcome:

Having found these breaches and that they amount to Gross Misconduct, I will consider outcome.

As the officer is now a former officer, I have two options available to me. I can determine that no disciplinary action is required, or that disciplinary action should be taken. The only disciplinary action that can be taken is that the officer would have been dismissed if he were still serving.

I have considered the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct proceedings, along with the Home Office Guidance.

I also bear in mind the purpose of police misconduct proceedings which are:

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

I have assessed the seriousness of the misconduct using the four stage approach.

In terms of **culpability**, I find this to be high. The contact with the sex worker was deliberate and planned and was initiated in order to obtain sexual services and sexual gratification. This was not a momentary lapse of judgement but a planned visit to a sex worker. Under the guidance, sex workers can be considered as vulnerable and this raises the former officer's culpability.

In terms of harm, I find this to be **high**. The impact on public confidence, should the actions of this officer become known, could be significant. The public would not consider it to be acceptable for a police officer to engage in such activities for their own sexual gratification, knowing that sex workers can be vulnerable women.

RESTRICTED

In terms of **aggravating** factors, I am careful not to double count. I find that the fact that the former officer was in a supervisory position and that he was an experienced officer to be an aggravating factor.

I find that the officer could have stopped the behaviour before he met the sex worker, but he continued when he would have known that he should not do so.

I find that the officer's behaviour was a significant deviation from instructions, in the use of the equipment and in using a sex worker which is against NPCC guidance.

I find the scale of national concern around police officers and women is an aggravating factor.

In terms of **mitigating** factors, no mitigation has been put forward by the officer or any representative. I do acknowledge that this behaviour took place on one occasion. That is not mitigation in itself, but I recognise that there is no suggestion that it was repeated behaviour.

In terms of **personal mitigation**, I have reviewed the officer's service history. There are a number of notes of good work and recognition contained within his record. I have taken these into account, but recognise that personal mitigation can have a limited impact on the outcome.

In coming to a conclusion, I find that the purposes of the Police Misconduct regime can not be served by taking no disciplinary action and so that disciplinary action is required.

As such, I find that the former officer would have been dismissed had he still been serving.

His name will be added to the barred list.

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:

RESTRICTED

Please publish details

Chair's Signature:



Date:

04/09/26