



memorandum

From	Assistant Chief Constable Grant Wills
To	Sgt C SMITH
Our Ref	CM/30/25
Date	20 th November 2025

FINDINGS and OUTCOME FORM

ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING – PS Conrad SMITH

20th of November 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 you before the end of 5 working days beginning with the first working day after the conclusion of the misconduct proceedings.

Hearing members:

Chair: Assistant Chief Constable Grant Wills

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

It is alleged that between the 3rd February and 4th February 2025 (material time) you stayed at a Travelodge Hotel with Ms A and that:

- i. You met Ms A as a direct result of your duties as a police officer in 2024;
- ii. At the material time you had been charged and were due to attend Birmingham Magistrates' in relation to improperly exercising your powers as a constable in that you entered into a sexual or improper emotional relationship with Ms A;
- iii. At the material time you were suspended from duties as a direct result of the allegations referred to above.

The breaches of the Standards of Professional behaviour alleged are as follows:

i. Discreditable Conduct: your behaviour as alleged above has breached this standard in that an ordinary well-informed member of the public would regard your conduct as falling far below that expected of a Police Officer. This is especially so given your rank and years of service combined with the fact that you were undergoing criminal proceedings in relation to allegations that pertain to person A. Your behaviour therefore discredits the police service and reduces public confidence in the reputation of the profession

Findings:

In the circumstances, I find that the officer has breached the standards of professional behaviour in relation to Discreditable Conduct. Further, I am satisfied that the conduct amounts to Gross Misconduct.

The following is a summary of the finding:

I am satisfied that the officer has been engaged with as per the regulations and been given ample opportunity to engage in these proceedings but has chosen not to in relation to this hearing, but has submitted a Regulation 54 response

When considering the allegations against the officer I note there is incontrovertible evidence supporting all three points and I therefore find them proven. Further, I note that the officer admits the alleged conduct in so far that it amounts to Misconduct and denies Gross Misconduct

Having considered the submissions from the AA, I have reminded myself of the definition of misconduct and gross misconduct as per the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, namely that "gross misconduct" means a breach of the standards that is so serious that dismissal could be justified

I have also consulted the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes, in particular sections 4.40 to 4.45 relating to sexual impropriety and reminded myself of factors which influence an assessment of gross misconduct, sexual impropriety, establishing a sexual or improper relationship with a member of the public, predatory behaviour and abuse of a position of trust or authority. All of which, whilst not being exhaustive, are present and of relevance in this case. 4.43 of the guidance in particular guides that the treatment of a single individual can be sufficiently serious to amount to gross misconduct where any of these are present

Therefore, this is a matter of Gross Misconduct

Disciplinary action to be imposed:

In making a determination on outcome I have used the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings, and used the three stage approach set out in this guidance. The first stage is assessing the seriousness of the conduct, and is at the heart of determining an outcome. To do this I have considered the

culpability of the officer, the harm caused and then taken into account any aggravating or mitigating factors

I have considered the circumstances relating to the allegations collectively when considering culpability. When considering the culpability in relation to the entirety of the allegations I have noted the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes at 4.10 directs me that where conduct is intentional, deliberate, targeted or planned, this will generally be more culpable. Having assessed all of the evidence available to me, it is clear that then Officer's conduct was deliberate pursuing a relationship with Ms A. Further, on the balance of probabilities, it is my assessment that he carried out a significant amount of planning, and subsequent execution of these plans. The repeated nature of similar conduct has also influenced my assessment of culpability, it being clear to me that the officer's conduct is not a result of unintended consequences, a one off or accidental happening. Sgt Smith is an experienced officer and he was at the material time. He knew that he was subject to a criminal investigation for the very same conduct. I can draw no other conclusion as a result, that he knew, or ought to have known, the risk of harm and continued regardless of this. Therefore, I assess the officer as having a high level of culpability, when taking the allegations in their totality.

When considering the harm of the officer's actions I turn to the effect on the policing profession and on public confidence. It is my assessment that his behaviour undermines good order in the Police Service and I also consider that his behaviour would be perceived by the public as unacceptable and, if known, would cast doubt on their assessment of his ability to discharge his duties in accordance with the standards of behaviour. I am further guided that a factor of the greatest importance for my consideration is the standing and reputation of the profession as a whole, and at a time when policing is rightly under scrutiny on matters of proper conduct of officers, the circumstances of this conduct will further impact our profession which needs to build public trust and confidence. When taking to the allegations as a whole, I judge the harm caused by the officer's actions to be of a high level.

The combination of culpability and harm leads me to assess that this is of the utmost seriousness.

I have then considered the impact of any aggravating factors, while taking care not to double count. I consider the abuse of trust, continuing the behaviour long after he should have realised that it was improper and the scale of national concern in relation to officers pursuing relationships with vulnerable victims of crime, to be aggravating factors, which impact further the seriousness of these allegations.

I have considered the mitigation provided by the officer within his Regulation 54 response. As presented within the written submission, this speaks to personal mitigation only and I have considered it in that way, noting the officer describes being in a poor mental health at the time of the allegations.

When assessing the sanction most appropriate, I have reminded myself of the purpose of the misconduct regime and imposing sanctions, namely to maintain public confidence, uphold high standards deterring future misconduct and protecting the public. All of which are very relevant in this case. I have considered the lesser

sanctions first, as well as also noting the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes, which sets out that where Gross Misconduct has been found and the behaviour would cause serious harm to public confidence in the police service, dismissal is likely to follow. I consider public confidence to be a factor of great importance in maintaining law and order

I have weighed all the factors described and the outcome is that Sgt Smith is to be dismissed without notice. As a consequence of this finding, Sgt Smith will be included on the barred list held by 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  **Assistant Chief Constable Grant Wills**

Date: 20th of November 2025