Accelerated Misconduct Hearing
Regulation 63 – Notification of Outcome

Officer:	Former PC [redacted]
Date:	4 November 2026
Chair:	Debra Tedds

The Decisions of the Hearing

Allegation No.	Allegations (See Regulation 51 Notice)	Finding Proven / Not Proven	Outcome
1.	**Alleged Conduct** [redacted] you were convicted [redacted] of the following offences upon your own guilty plea: 1. Engaging in sexual communications with a child contrary to section 15A (1) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. 2. Causing/inciting a girl 13 to 15 to engage in sexual activity – no penetration contrary to section 10(1)(a), (b), (c)(i) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. 3. Meeting a girl under 16 years of age following grooming contrary to section 15 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. 4. Engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity with a girl 13 to 15 contrary to section 9(1)(a), (b), c(i) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. 5. Causing/inciting a girl 13 to 15 to engage in sexual activity – no penetration contrary to section 10(1)(a), (b), (c)(i) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. Your conduct has brought discredit on West Midlands Police and the wider police service and seriously undermined public confidence and trust in policing. Your conduct is a breach of the **Discreditable Conduct** Standard of the Standards of Professional Behaviour and amounts to **Gross Misconduct.**		

The reasons for the decision as to Finding:

Former Officer [redacted] has chosen not to engage in this process and has not sought to attend. He was also not represented and has not provided any regulation responses.

I was satisfied that Former officer [redacted] had received a copy of the bundle and proper notice of the hearing had been served and therefore determined that it was right to continue in his absence in the interests of justice.

Prior to the commencement of the hearing the Former Officer made representations in respect of the hearing being held in Private and reporting restrictions being granted [redacted]

Having considered representation from all parties and balancing the rights of the former officer with the wider public interest in open and transparent police misconduct proceedings I have dismissed the request to hold in private. I see no reason to default from the presumption of police misconduct hearings being held in public.

Having considered the representations made in respect of reporting restrictions, I have deemed it necessary to impose reporting restrictions as follows. No representations were made via the media or members of the public.

- The victims identity in this case due to her age, the nature of the conduct alleged and vulnerabilities.
- The Former Officers [redacted]

I have read the papers received as part of the bundle and considered the oral and written representations made on behalf of both parties.

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

Police Conduct Regulations sets out that 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 am required to establish the facts, whether those facts breach the standards of professional behaviour as outlined and if they do breach – whether they amount to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

The burden is on the Appropriate Authority to prove the allegations on the balance of probabilities.

The Appropriate Authority relies upon a certificate of conviction, [redacted] after Former Officer [redacted] entered a guilty plea to 5 separate charges of sexual activity and grooming of a child.

The former officer has not provided a regulation response to the allegations set out and has not indicated whether he admits to breaching the standards of professional behaviour. I therefore, as reminded by the AA within the Opening Note, need to make a determination as to whether the AA has proven the case alleged on the balance of probabilities and the former officer has breached the standards of professional behaviour and to what level if he has done so.

Having given consideration to the evidence provided within the bundle, based on what I have heard and read, I find that the factual allegations against Former Officer [redacted] to be proven and breached the standards of professional behaviour – namely discreditable conduct - the former officers convictions for serious sexual offences against a child could seriously undermined public confidence and trust in West Midlands Police and the wider police service.

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.

The reasons for the decision as to Outcome:

In arriving at my decision I have carefully considered what the appropriate outcome is in this case and focused on the evidence within the bundle, the oral submissions made at the hearing and the officers record of service. The former officer has not provided any character evidence.

As a former officer the only outcome I can arrive at is either:

- 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 which is to:

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

I have utilised the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes to assist in deciding on the most appropriate outcome. This has included the three stages to determining the most appropriate action and assessing the seriousness of the proven conduct through culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating factors before applying any personal mitigation.

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. Conduct that is intentional, deliberate, targeted or planned will generally be more culpable than conduct that has unintended consequences although the consequences of an officer's actions will be relevant to the harm caused.

Former Officer [redacted] actions were deliberate, planned and intentional and targeted a vulnerable young person for his own sexual gratification for which he has been convicted of a number of sexually related criminal offences and is serving a custodial sentence.

Police officers are responsible for enforcing the law and protecting the public. Any criminal conviction will be and is serious. Sexual offending against a young person is of particular concern and a fundamental breach of the public's' trust in police officers and will inevitably bring the profession into disrepute and have a detrimental and adverse impact on the public confidence in Policing.

Violence against women and girls is known to have a disproportionate effect on women and girls of which policing has come under national scrutiny over where officers have failed to prevent or protect women and girls being abuse, particularly where those who have perpetrated the abuse are serving officers.

I assess the culpability in this case to be extremely high. Misconduct of this nature is wholly unacceptable, is extremely serious and the outcome severe.

Harm

Harm caused by an officer's actions can be considered in various ways.

Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual or group to undermine public confidence. Where an officer commits an act that would harm public confidence if the circumstances were known to the public, this can be taken into account.

The victim in this case was a young person who is described as vulnerable. She suffered [redacted] as well as the sexual abuse. She was brave enough to report what had happened to a family member [redacted]

The impact on her was and has been significant.

As stated above, sexual offending by serving police officers is a matter of national concern and fundamentally undermines public confidence, particularly against women and girls. The public would be appalled and distressed by the circumstances of this case.

I assess the level of harm to be very high.

Aggravating Factors

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

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

I have already made reference to the fact that I believe the conduct was deliberate and intentional with the victim in this case being targeted by Former Officer [redacted] after he had made contact with her via a social media site and groomed her to meet with him.

The former officers actions were premeditated in as much as he sought to meet up with the victim to have sexual contact with her after initially engaging in inappropriate messaging of a sexual. He also took steps to set up a further meeting with her intending to engage in further sexual activity demonstrating an intent to continue with his offending. His actions were of a grooming nature and had malign intent for his own sexual gratification.

In the former officers criminal interview he claimed the victim was older than she was. He has not demonstrated any regret or remorse for the distress or harm caused by his actions.

Mitigating Factors

Mitigating factors are those tending to reduce the seriousness of the misconduct.

Whilst the former officer has not forwarded any mitigation he did enter a guilty plea [redacted] which would have prevented the victim in giving evidence.

Personal Mitigation

The weight of personal mitigation will necessarily be limited, particularly where serious misconduct has been proven. Nonetheless, personal mitigation is always relevant and should be considered.

Due to the former officer not providing any response or advancing any character evidence I cannot identify any personal mitigation to be considered.

Conclusion

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

Former Officer [redacted] will be placed on the College of Policing 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:

This hearing was heard in public with reporting restrictions granted as below:

- The victims identity in this case due to her age, the nature of the conduct alleged and vulnerabilities must not be identified and will be subject to anonymity.
- The identity of the former officer should not be reported upon or be able to be identified via any reporting in this case.

Chair's Signature:	DJ Tedds	**Date:**	4th November 2026