



From:	Chief Constable Richard Cooper
Ref:	Former Officer McNamara.....
Our Ref	
No:	
Date:	25 June 2026

FINDINGS and OUTCOME FORM

ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING – Former PC Ellie McNamara

25 June 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 officer McNamara 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 the 2nd June 2025 you signed a witness statement which you submitted to the Professional Standards Department as part of a criminal investigation- [REDACTED] in which you stated that you were not in a relationship with [REDACTED] when you knew this to be untrue and were in an ongoing sexual relationship with him.
2. Between the 10th April and 8th December 2025 while [REDACTED] was subject to police bail conditions not to contact witnesses including yourself you initiated and received regular contact from [REDACTED] as part of your relationship with him which you failed to challenge or report knowing this was a breach of [REDACTED] bail conditions.
3. You failed to submit a notifiable association contrary to Paragraph 5.2 of West Mercia Police Notifiable and Vulnerable Association Policy which states that notification is required where a known association exists with a person who is known to be under investigation for but not yet charged with a criminal offence. You knew or ought to have known that you should have submitted a notifiable association.

RESTRICTED

4. On the 6th August 2025 you completed an Annual Integrity Health check in which you failed to disclose your relationship with [REDACTED] when you knew or ought to have known that such a relationship should be disclosed.

It is alleged that the Standards of Professional behaviour breached are:

- Honesty & Integrity
- Discreditable Conduct
- Duties & Responsibilities

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 former officer completed a formal MG11 statement regarding a criminal investigation in which her status was as a witness. There is incontrovertible evidence in the form of messages and admissions to a colleague that she was in a sexual relationship with [REDACTED] and this is in direct contradiction to what she says in her statement. The messages indicate that they met up with each other on the very day she made the statement.

Culpability is high.

Harm:

Lying in formal statements undermines justice. Police officers lying in statements undermines it even further and diminishes the trust that society can place in those who are themselves entrusted with gathering evidence.

Harm is very high.

Aggravation

This is operational dishonesty and is at the most serious end of the scale because of the formal witness statement setting. She was not put on the spot regarding the completion of the statement but had time to consider the content.

Mitigation

The former officer has not advanced any substantive mitigation, and I don't consider there to be any.

Finding: Allegation 1

Former PC McNamara has lied as a witness on a question of fact within a signed witness statement. This is gross misconduct.

Assessing Seriousness: Allegations 2, 3 and 4

Culpability

I have considered allegations 2, 3, and 4 individually but also judge them to be a series of connected opportunities for former officer McNamara to have told the truth.

The bail conditions were issued to [REDACTED] not to contact named witnesses, of which former officer McNamara was one. The responsibility to abide by them lies with him. At the time he and McNamara were in a relationship, but one that she had not disclosed. Former PC McNamara is culpable for the failure to disclose that [REDACTED] was breaching his bail conditions and there is evidence that she was aware of their existence.

Her culpability is reduced by the nature of their relationship and his behaviour within it. There is an indication, both from the messages he sent and from the evidence of [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] may have [REDACTED]. This does not excuse McNamara of her responsibilities as a police officer and, given her refusal to answer all questions, she has not advanced this as a defence. It is however something that is relevant to the question of culpability.

Regarding the failure to a notifiable association notification and the denial of any disclosable relationship within the Annual Integrity Health Check, the responsibility for being honest ultimately sits with the former officer. She created the situation for herself, because of the lies in the MG11, that further lies were required to conceal her operational dishonesty.

Harm

The harm is not as great as that caused when an officer lies as part of criminal investigation but remains high, primarily because her failing to disclose breaches of bail risks undermining an investigation.

Aggravation

The [REDACTED] was on bail for four months, so this was a sustained failure to do the right thing.

Mitigation

I accept that this is a case where one lie begat other lies and may have been motivated by a desire to protect someone the former officer cared about.

Personal mitigation

I have taken account of the absence of any previous disciplinary sanctions for the former officer in her relatively short service.

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

RESTRICTED

- 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 consider the overall seriousness of the gross misconduct in allegation 1 to be greater than in allegations 2, 3, and 4. Allegation 1 is a serious example of operational dishonesty where culpability sits squarely with the former officer.

However, given the sustained and repeated nature of the dishonesty involved I find gross misconduct in respect of allegations 2, 3, and 4 also.

I can consider the findings of gross misconduct together for the purposes of arriving at the appropriate sanction. 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, of note in this case, to uphold high standards and deter misconduct. The conduct in allegation 1 in particular is an egregious breach of those high standards. Police officers cannot lie in statements. Therefore, 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, former PC McNamara will be included on the barred list held by College of Policing.

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 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, including considerations regarding the [REDACTED] of the officer subject to the hearing. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] the level of misconduct is such that there is benefit in openness in reporting the case. I therefore believe that the public interest is best served by no anonymity restrictions being in place.

[REDACTED]

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: 25 June 2026

Chief Constable Richard Cooper

RESTRICTED

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, dated2025 of which this is a true copy.

Signed.....

Date.....