



From: Chief Constable Richard Cooper

Ref: PC [REDACTED].....

Our Ref: .....

No:

Date: 12 May 2026

## **FINDINGS and OUTCOME FORM**

### **ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING – PC [REDACTED]**

#### **12 May 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 PC [REDACTED] 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. On or about the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2021 you communicated via text message with Person A in relation to the arrest of Person B. Person A is known to you personally and was not involved in the matters that resulted in Person B's arrest. You therefore disclosed confidential information that you did not have a policing purpose to disclose. This was in breach of the force Data Protection Policy.
2. In breach of the Social Media Policy you participated in setting up and uploading images of a sexual nature of yourself onto OnlyFans. The purpose of uploading images to OnlyFans was to generate an income. You did so without submitting a business interest form in breach of the force Business Interests and Additional Occupations Policy.

#### **The breaches of the Standards of Professional behaviour alleged were:**

Confidentiality  
Orders and instructions  
Discreditable conduct

## RESTRICTED

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.

### **Assessing Seriousness: Allegation 1**

#### **Culpability:**

The exchange of text messages was unilaterally instigated by PC [REDACTED] within two and a half hours of an arrest being made. It was PC [REDACTED] who sent the first message to Person A, and that message specifically related to her attendance at an incident near where Person A lived. She is immediately derogatory regarding the partner of Person B.

Person A responded by asking what the female partner was trying to do and it was in response to this that PC [REDACTED] stated that she had arrested Person B and that his partner had tried to prevent her from entering. She expressed that the partner was lucky not to have been arrested.

Person A then asked PC [REDACTED] what had happened to Person B, to which PC [REDACTED] responded that he would be going to court in the morning and has "got B&B at [REDACTED] custody for the night."

My conclusion is that PC [REDACTED] was responding to questions from Person A and, certainly in respect of the behaviour of the female and the remand for court of Person B, providing information that Person A did not already know. As well as saying what was happening in respect of Person B, PC [REDACTED] is also derogatory about the female involved and explains to Person A how that female tried to prevent her entering.

Whilst there is no indication that she was seeking personal benefit, no one else was involved and she is solely responsible for what she did.

I have considered the submissions regarding the status of Person A as a witness but do not consider there was any policing purpose for the disclosure of the information, nor that PC [REDACTED] believed there to be a policing purpose.

Culpability is high.

#### **Harm:**

This is not a case of providing sensitive information to a criminal group for gain. Just because it is not an extreme case of breaching confidentiality does not prevent it from being a serious one.

The disclosures included saying that a named person had been arrested and remanded for court. That person has suffered harm regardless of whether they were aware of it or not.

In respect of the resistance offered by the female at the address and the remand for court, I do not accept that PC [REDACTED] was telling Person A things that she was already aware of. Person A did already have some awareness that PC [REDACTED] had attended at

## **RESTRICTED**

Person B's address, which reduces the harm compared to a wholly unsolicited provision of information.

There is also the foreseeable harm caused to public confidence by an officer disclosing information inappropriately given the reasonable expectation that police officers treat the information they are privy to with proper respect.

I assess the overall harm to be medium.

### **Aggravation**

The contact with Person A was made by PC [REDACTED] on her personal mobile phone.

The information that PC [REDACTED] disclosed was only known to her because of her position as a police officer. It therefore follows that disclosing this information without a policing purpose is an abuse of that position.

This was also an obvious deviation from local and national guidance

### **Mitigation**

This was a single episode that was confined to a period of a few minutes. There is no previous or subsequent history of similar transgressions.

PC [REDACTED], whilst giving explanations of the context, has acknowledged her responsibility for the disclosure of information and has not sought to shift the blame.

The extent of the disclosure is also not at the most serious end of the scale, but I have primarily considered this under the officer's culpability.

### **Finding: Allegation 1**

There has been a disclosure of information regarding a person's arrest, the behaviour of that person's partner, and then that the person was being held for court. The contact with Person A was instigated by PC [REDACTED] and started with a derogatory description of a member of the public. There was no policing purpose for the extent of the disclosure. On balance I find that this combination of factors tips the conduct into the range of gross misconduct, but at the lower end of that scale.

### **Assessing Seriousness: Allegation 2**

#### **Finding: Allegation 2**

PC [REDACTED] has accepted that her conduct in respect of allegation 2 is gross misconduct. I agree with that position based on the following criteria.

#### **Culpability**

The conduct admitted by PC [REDACTED] was deliberate and intentional.

Her culpability is tempered by the role played by her ex-husband.

- There is evidence, which I accept on the balance of probabilities, that he was the driving force behind the enterprise.

## RESTRICTED

- In messages between the two PC [REDACTED] states “you know best” in respect of a suggestion as to the type of content they should create.
- It was PC [REDACTED] in February 2023 who questioned “is it worth it anymore”? This is indicative of PC [REDACTED] questioning if she wished to continue
- I also accept on the balance of probabilities that PC [REDACTED] never directly interacted with the OnlyFans account and that the uploading of material was undertaken by her ex-husband.

A high degree of culpability sits with PC [REDACTED]

- PC [REDACTED] was a knowing and cooperative participant throughout.
- There is evidence that she was fully aware the intention was to generate income.
- She expresses enthusiasm on repeated occasions in the exchange of messages between the pair.
  - She is enthusiastic about the number of subscribers they may be able to attract
  - She invites her ex-husband to attend to help with capturing images
  - She independently purchases clothing to be used in the filming.

The conduct was also sustained over a period of several weeks and was clearly not permitted without a business interest being in place.

### Harm

There was nothing that would obviously identify PC [REDACTED] as the person involved in the material that was created and uploaded to OnlyFans, therefore there was nothing to identify her as a police officer. I cannot say if this was done to avoid detection, but it had the added effect, at the time, of any viewers of the material not realising PC [REDACTED] was a serving police officer. The harm to public confidence would have been greater otherwise.

There is still an obvious and significant damaging impact on public confidence, however. The harm caused by misconduct must also be determined by its impact on public confidence were it to be known. In this case the conduct of PC [REDACTED] will be reported because of these proceedings. That is a necessary part of the transparency associated with gross misconduct in policing, and I am of no doubt that the conduct undermines public confidence in the profession.

Business interests require authorisation because it is vital that trust in policing is maintained and that officers neither undermine that trust or create situations where they might be beholden to certain people or interests. In undertaking this activity PC [REDACTED] left herself open to coercion by anyone who found out about the conduct because the nature of the activity, whilst lawful, is likely to undermine confidence in policing. I believe that a reasonable person would think less of policing with knowledge of PC [REDACTED] actions.

Whilst the nature of the harm is confined to public confidence, as opposed to any individual, I still assess it to be approaching high harm, because of the extent of the public confidence impact.

### Aggravation

As I have stated, this involved sustained planning and repeated behaviour over several weeks. I have considered this primarily as a matter of culpability rather than aggravation.

The conduct represents a clear and obvious deviation from the business interest policy.

## RESTRICTED

The conduct did not place whilst on duty, which would have been a significant aggravating factor. I do though consider it an aggravating factor that PC [REDACTED] was on paid sick leave whilst engaging in the unauthorised business interest. There are occasions when business interests can continue whilst unfit for policing duties, but PC [REDACTED] was off sick with a physical ailment whilst engaging in this unauthorised enterprise for financial gain. This exacerbates the public confidence harm caused.

### Mitigation

There was nothing implicitly dishonest, nor was PC [REDACTED] behaviour criminal. There is no abuse of position involved.

PC [REDACTED] had also encountered a series of personal setbacks and difficulties.

- She had suffered recent and substantial financial losses

- [REDACTED]

Since the conduct came to light, PC [REDACTED] has shown clear contrition and has taken responsibility.

### Personal mitigation

I have taken account of PC [REDACTED] previous good character and good performance, particularly evidenced by the testimonies of five supervisory officers.

### Outcome

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 42A implications that the starting point is dismissal where gross misconduct is found unless exceptional circumstances apply.

I am able to consider both findings of gross misconduct together for the purposes of arriving at the appropriate sanction. I consider the overall seriousness of the gross misconduct in allegation 2 to be greater than in allegation 1, but both amount to gross misconduct. I have examined the level of seriousness in the context of the first two purposes of the misconduct regime, namely, to maintain public confidence in the police service and to uphold high standards and deter misconduct. Having done so I am of the view that the purposes of the misconduct regime are only satisfactorily fulfilled by the sanction of dismissal without notice. As a consequence of this finding, PC [REDACTED] will be included on the barred list held by College of Policing.

On a human level, I am sincerely sorry that PC [REDACTED] career in policing has come to an end in these circumstances.

### Restrictions on Reporting

I have considered restrictions on the publication of matters relating to the hearing, as set out in Regulation 59 of the Police Regulations. I heard this case in public, in line with the

**RESTRICTED**

presumption of openness and transparency. It is important that the police are open about misconduct and the sanctions imposed.

I have considered the Home Office Guidance provisions, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

The officer has not been cautioned or convicted of any offences, which might have increased the case for their identity being shared. The principle of open justice has been substantially upheld by holding the hearing in public and due public scrutiny of policing can be applied by the facts of the conduct being reported. Taking account of the totality of the circumstances, I believe that the public interest is served by the facts being reported without enabling identification of the officer's name. This will minimise further risks to her health whilst not substantially damaging the public interest.

I therefore impose a restriction that the officer's name, any reference to anything that might identify them, and any references to their health history should not publicised.

**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 May 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 .....2025 of which this is a true copy.**

Signed.....

Date.....

**RESTRICTED**

**RESTRICTED**