From:	Chief Constable Richard Cooper
Ref:	Former Constable Jones…….
Our Ref No:	……..
Date:	14 September 2026

FINDINGS and OUTCOME FORM

ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING – Former PC Aled Jones

14 September 2026: Hindlip Hall, Hindlip Headquarters

In accordance with Regulation 63 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended), below listed are the findings and any disciplinary action imposed in the above case. This document must be supplied to former PC Jones before the end of 5 working days beginning with the first working day after the conclusion of the misconduct proceedings.

Hearing members:

Chair: Chief Constable Richard Cooper

Details of the conduct alleged to have breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour:

1. You have been a police officer with West Mercia Police since 27th July 2020. You continue to serve as a police officer with West Mercia Police.

2. You had been involved in a sexual relationship with a colleague, [Officer A] but on 14 September 2025 she told you that she just wanted to be friends with you.

3. On 26 September 2025, you were on a night out with work colleagues, including [Officer A]. The group proceeded to a bar called Gordon Bennetts in Hereford.

4. During the course of the evening, you behaved possessively, aggressively and inappropriately towards [Officer A]:

a. You repeatedly called her name and said “come here now” in an angry fashion;
b. When she tried to speak with others, you would block her path;
c. You put your finger in [Officer A]’s drink;
d. You told [Officer A] “I fucked you senseless”;
e. You shouted at [Officer A] and blocked her path to prevent her from leaving the bar.

5. When [Officer A] went to leave the bar, you pushed her forcefully to the back, thereby assaulting her.

6. Your conduct was witnessed by members of the public including [MR A] and [MR B], who intervened and challenged your behaviour. [MR A] told you "Mate, stop being weird with her", or words to that effect, and was aware that you were a police officer. [MR B] told you words to the effect that you should not speak to a female the way that you had and told you to leave her alone.

7. After you had pushed [Officer A], you attempted to contact her:
   a. You messaged her saying "you fucked me";
   b. You messaged her saying "I don't know what it takes for you to make me care about you";
   c. You messaged her saying "I'm trying to talk" and "I'd rather get stabbed than you";
   d. You messaged her three times in quick succession on WhatsApp before deleting the messages;
   e. You rang her several times;
   f. Later on 27 September 2025, you again messaged her repeatedly asking to speak, despite her stating she did not want to.

8. On 30 March 2026, you accepted a conditional caution for assault without injury (common assault and battery) contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. The offence you admitted was described thus: "Between 26/09/2025 and 27/09/2025 at Hereford in the County of Herefordshire inside Gordon Bennetts Club assaulted [Officer A]". The conditions imposed were that you must not contact [Officer A] directly or indirectly and you must not attend her home address.

9. Your behaviour as set out above breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour, in particular that relating to Discreditable Conduct: and Authority, Respect & Courtesy.

- 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.
  - Police officers report any action taken against them for a criminal offence, any conditions imposed on them by a court or the receipt of any penalty notice.
- Authority, Respect and Courtesy
  - Police Officers will act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.
  - Police Officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.

I have reached my findings purely on the evidence presented to me and on that elicited during the hearing.

Findings of Fact:

Regarding point 8, it is accepted by former PC Jones that he has received a conditional caution for common assault. In accepting the conditional caution former PC Jones has acknowledged guilt in respect of the assault. This is a matter of fact.

In respect of point 5, the evidence provided by [Officer A] sets out clearly that she was forcefully pushed from behind and that she believes Jones to be responsible. [Officer B] witnessed [Officer A] being pushed by Jones. [Officer A] makes disclosures of the push at the first opportunity to [Officer C] and then challenges Jones several times in messages later on the night about him having pushed her. He at no point disputes having done so but makes references to having been trying to keep her safe. This explanation is not expanded upon in interview and is made redundant by his admission of guilt and acceptance of the conditional caution.

In respect of point 7, the relevant messages have been retrieved, and their existence is therefore not in doubt. They are corroborative of the assault having taken place.

The other allegations regarding former PC Jones are those at point 4 (possessive, inappropriate, and aggressive behaviour) and point 6 (his conduct was witnessed by members of the public who intervened).

On the behaviours alleged at point 4, all are included in [Officer A]'s statement and there is evidence provided by [Officer C] of early disclosure of them during the evening by [Officer A]. There is no witness testimony from anybody who claims to have seen them first hand. There is no CCTV. Former PC Jones denies behaving in this way.

There are various third hand accounts within the investigator's reports that arise from telephone conversations. I therefore assign minimal weight to them. One such account claims [Officer A] was 'having a go' at Jones. I have considered whether [Officer A]'s evidence alone is sufficient for me to find these matters proven. Whilst I do not reject her account, I am not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the behaviours occurred as alleged in the absence of supporting evidence and having been unable to test the competing accounts. I find the allegations at point 4 unproven.

The allegations at point 6 suggest that the behaviour of Jones was witnessed by named members of the public who intervened as a result. The evidence indicates that [Officer A] relayed to them what Jones had done rather than them seeing it first-hand. I therefore find point 6 unproven.

Severity: I have considered the 2023 College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings and the Home Office Guidance concerning Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness. I have adopted the three-stage process to assist my decision making. The first of those three stages is assessing the seriousness of the proven conduct with reference to culpability, the harm caused, and any aggravating and mitigating factors. In terms of culpability, this conduct was undertaken by former PC Jones alone. Whilst I have not found the allegations at point 4 to be proven, the assault on [Officer A] took place in the context of an evening together rather than being a spur of the moment act towards an unknown third party. She was pushed from behind and there was no

immediate provocation. This was therefore a deliberate assault on someone who had formerly been an intimate partner. No one else was involved and former PC Jones has admitted responsibility through a conditional caution for common assault. As such his culpability is high.

Harm has been caused to [Officer A] as the victim of an assault. She suffered no injury. The absence of physical injury does not materially reduce the seriousness of an intentional assault against a colleague but does mitigate against further aggravation. Foreseeable harm will also be caused to public confidence in the police service. An officer, who was serving at the time, has committed an offence of assault within a setting that would amount to domestic abuse and violence against women and girls. He has received a conditional caution for that offence. That offence was committed within a public house that was full of customers. Harm is high.

Aggravating factors are present, primarily that this is an act of physical violence towards a woman who had been an intimate partner. As well as the aggravation of the violence itself, this is therefore Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG), a matter of pressing national concern and specified as an aggravating factor of particular severity in the College outcomes guidance. This exacerbates the harm caused to public confidence.

In terms of mitigation, I have taken account former PC Jones' admission of responsibility and expression of remorse. He took responsibility through the acceptance of a conditional caution. The earliest expression of remorse that I have available to me is in the Regulation 54 response of 4 September 2026, but in that he does express regret and remorse. There is no record of previous disciplinary sanctions. No personal mitigation has been submitted.

In light of all the above I conclude that the allegations of pushing [Officer A] and receiving a conditional caution for common assault amount to gross misconduct. I find the behaviour as set out in point 7 proven. It does not in isolation amount to gross misconduct but is corroborative of, and linked to, the behaviour at point 5.

Sanction:

I have reflected on the purpose of the misconduct regime. It exists not be punitive but to:

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

I have also considered the Regulation 62(a) implications that the starting point is dismissal where gross misconduct is found unless under Regulation 62(b) exceptional circumstances apply.

I do not believe that exceptional circumstances exist that would lead to deviation from dismissal, even when balancing the acceptance of guilt and the absence of previous disciplinary outcomes. I have considered whether those factors individually or cumulatively amount to exceptional circumstances and conclude they do not.

Former PC Jones has committed an assault against a female colleague and been cautioned for the offence. I consider that dismissal is actually necessary to fulfil the purposes of the misconduct regime. Former PC Jones would have been dismissed

without notice had he not resigned. As a consequence of this finding, he will be included on the barred list held by the College of Policing.

I confirm that the above is correctly recorded. I also confirm that the officer's personal record was considered before a decision was reached on any disciplinary action to be imposed.

Signed: … ……. Date: 15 Sept 2026

Chief Constable Richard Cooper

If you wish to receive a copy of the record of the proceedings, please contact the Professional Standards Department.

You have a right of appeal against the finding. Should you wish to exercise this right you must do so in writing to the Chairman of the Police Appeals Tribunal within ten days of this notice. Please note that the tribunal can increase any outcome imposed as well as reduce or overturn the decision of the panel. You have the right to be legally represented at the appeal hearing.

Form of receipt to be completed by officer subject of proceedings:

I acknowledge receipt of this written notice of the misconduct proceedings, dated ……2026 of which this is a true copy.

Signed……. Date……