



From: Chief Constable Richard Cooper

Ref: Former PC [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] .....

Our Ref: .....

No: .....

Date: 19 August 2025

## **FINDINGS and OUTCOME FORM**

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

#### **19 August 2025: 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 [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:**

[REDACTED] you were convicted at [REDACTED] Court after pleading guilty to one offence of theft [REDACTED] contrary to Section 1(1) and 7 of the Theft Act 1968 and were fined £600 with a surcharge of £240 and prosecution costs of £85.

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

Honesty and integrity – following conviction for an offence of dishonesty.  
Discreditable conduct – you have been convicted of a criminal offence involving dishonesty which inevitably undermines confidence in West Mercia Police.

**In accordance with Regulation 61, the person conducting the accelerated misconduct hearing shall review the facts of the case and decide on the balance of probabilities whether the conduct of the officer amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.**

#### **Findings:**

The conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

**The following is a summary of the finding:**

Former PC [REDACTED] has been convicted at court of theft following a guilty plea. I am satisfied that the conduct is indeed gross misconduct and therefore conclude that the allegations are proved to the required standard.

**Disciplinary action to be imposed:**

I have considered the 2023 College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings.

I have adopted the three-stage process to assist my decision making today. 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.

Former PC [REDACTED] has broken the law having been entrusted to uphold it. [REDACTED] has been convicted of a theft – an offence of dishonesty. [REDACTED] is entirely culpable for [REDACTED] actions. No one else was involved in the offending, and the former officer has taken responsibility for what [REDACTED] has done. This was not a momentary act but a deliberate criminal deceit over many minutes.

In respect of harm, [REDACTED] offending was non-violent and was not committed whilst on duty. The extent to which public confidence in the police is damaged by an officer committing an act of common theft cannot be underestimated. It is the very antithesis of what people want and expect of their police service.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] I have given full consideration to [REDACTED] Regulation 54 response. [REDACTED] has pleaded guilty at court.

At the time of the incident former PC [REDACTED] had been an officer for almost 20 years. There were no live disciplinary sanctions or improvement notices at the time, and [REDACTED] has no adverse history of misconduct.

I have reflected on the purpose of the misconduct regime. Police officers hold incredibly privileged powers over their fellow citizens and the public are rightly concerned that those powers are exercised by those with honesty and integrity. A conviction for theft fatally undermines the trust that both the public and the force can have in [REDACTED]. Every evidential account that [REDACTED] might ever provide would be questioned and [REDACTED] professional integrity has been permanently damaged. Taking all the circumstances of this case together I believe the public would lose confidence if someone convicted of such an offence in such circumstances retained their position as a constable.

It is also important that other officers, most of whom work tirelessly to the highest of standards, see that such serious deviation from those standards is dealt with appropriately and proportionately. This protects the integrity of the police service.

I have weighed all the factors described and the outcome today is that former PC [REDACTED] would have been dismissed without notice had [REDACTED] not resigned. As a consequence of this finding [REDACTED] will be included on the barred list held by College of Policing.

