



memorandum

From ACC Grant Wills

:

To: Former PC BOYLE

Our CM.59/23

Ref:

Date: 18th of September 2025

FINDINGS AND OUTCOME FORM

ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING – FORMER PC ROWAN BOYLE

18th of September 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:

1. On or about the 12/08/2020, you conducted multiple checks, on Police IT systems without a proper policing purpose on male A.
2. You shared a 9 year familial association, and you knew person A to be involved in criminality (drink / drug drive and domestic violence). You failed to submit a notifiable associate declaration until the 01/10/20. When submitting the declaration, you failed to declare that you had previously checked Male A on Police IT systems.
3. On or about the 19/10/2022, you conducted a check on Child B, on Police IT systems without a proper policing purpose. You share a familial connection with Child B. The check was carried out immediately prior to submitting a notifiable association form. You made no record of conducting the check and failed to notify a supervisor that you had done so.
4. On the 22/05/23, your personal mobile phone was seized and forensically examined. That forensic examination revealed that between the 01/04/20 and the 30/06/22 you:

- [REDACTED]
- b) Disclosed confidential information that you had obtained in the course of your duties, to [REDACTED], using your personal mobile phone.
 - c) Also, that images of a sensitive, personal and confidential nature obtained during the course of your duties, was stored on your personal mobile phone.

The breaches of the standards of professional behaviour alleged are as follows:

Confidentiality – Police officers will treat information with respect, and access or disclose it only in the proper course of their duties.

Orders and Instructions – Police Officers will give and carry out lawful orders only and will abide by Police regulations.

Discreditable Conduct – Police Officers will behave in a manner, whether on or off duty, which does not bring discredit on the police service or undermine public confidence in policing.

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:

In the circumstances, I find that the former officer has breached the standards of professional behaviour in relation to orders and instructions, confidentiality and discreditable conduct. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the conduct amounts to Gross Misconduct.

The following is a summary of the finding:

I am satisfied that the former officer has been engaged with as per the regulations and been given ample opportunity to engage in these proceedings but has chosen not to and has not submitted a Regulation 54 response. Therefore, I am not in receipt of any admission or otherwise from the former officer.

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 Outcomes guidance, in particular sections 4.34 to 4.39 on Data Protection and Misuse, and reminded myself of factors which support a more serious outcome, onward disclosure of information, personal gain and potential compromise to a police investigation. All of which, whilst not being exhaustive, are all of relevance in this case.

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 taking into account any aggravating or mitigating factors.

I have considered the circumstances relating to the 4 allegations, noting that allegations 1, 2 and 3 share a connection in relation to searching police systems and also not declaring a notifiable association. Allegation 4 is based on forensically recovered evidence from a mobile phone showing the sharing of confidential data and direction of a member of the public, [REDACTED] to carry out activity which potentially put them in harms way. When considering the culpability in relation to all 4 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 Former PC Boyle's conduct was deliberate when accessing the data relating to Male A and Child B. Further, on the balance of probabilities, it is my assessment that he intentionally failed to submit the notifiable association required and clearly carried out planning (allegation 4) [REDACTED]. The repeated nature of similar conduct has also influenced my assessment of culpability, it being clear to me that the former officer's conduct is not a result of unintended consequences, a one off or accidental happening. Therefore, I assess the former officer of having a high level of culpability, when taking the allegations in their totality.

When considering the harm of the former 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 former 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 considered the impact of any aggravating factors, while taking care not to double count. I consider the repeated nature of the behaviour and the multiple proven allegations to be aggravating factors, which impact further the seriousness of these allegations.

I have not been provided with any mitigation from the former officer.

When assessing the sanction most appropriate, 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 today is that former PC Boyle would have been dismissed without notice if he had not ceased to be a member of West Mercia Police. As a consequence of this finding, former PC Boyle 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Grant Wills' with a stylized flourish at the end. Below the signature, the number '21961' is written in a smaller font.

Signed: ...
Assistant Chief Constable Grant Wills

Date: 18th of September 2025