
REGULATION 43 REPORT OF OUTCOME

PC [REDACTED]

1. DETAILS AND OUTCOME OF MISCONDUCT HEARING

1.1 On 12 August 2024, in accordance with The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (hereafter “the PCR 2020”), a misconduct hearing was convened to deal with allegations against PC [REDACTED] which the Appropriate Authority (AA) assessed as amounting to gross misconduct.

1.2 The hearing Panel consisted of a Legally Qualified Chair (LQC), Mr Callum Cowx, a Police Panel Member (PPM) Detective Superintendent (D/Supt) Leanne Lowe of West Mercia Police, and an Independent Panel Member (IPM), Mrs Jenni Ord.

1.3 The AA was represented by Miss Amy Clarke of counsel.

1.4 PC [REDACTED] was represented by Miss Susannah Stevens of counsel.

2. THE ALLEGATIONS

2.1 The breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPB) alleged are set out in a Regulation 30 Notice of Allegations.

2.2 The allegations, as they appear in the Regulation 30 Notice, are as follows:

Factual Allegations

It is alleged that:

1. You joined West Mercia Police on 26 July 2021 having previously worked as a [REDACTED]. PC [REDACTED] joined West Mercia Police on the same day as you and at the time of joining, you were in an intimate relationship with each other.
2. When you and PC [REDACTED] joined West Mercia Police you were both posted to [REDACTED]. PC [REDACTED] was attached to [REDACTED] police station and you were attached to [REDACTED] police station.
3. On or about 7 January 2022, PC [REDACTED] ended your intimate relationship. After PC [REDACTED] ended your intimate relationship you pursued an inappropriate course of conduct towards PC [REDACTED] in that you;
 - (a) Sent more than one Snapchat message between the period 12 February 2022 – 19 February 2022 to PC [REDACTED] try and persuade her to continue an intimate relationship with you. Messages exhibited at CG05 which are summarised as:

- i. A message at 22:39 whereby you expressed that you wanted a future with PC [REDACTED] and to create memories together.
 - ii. A message at 22:41 whereby you expressed your desire to have children with PC [REDACTED] and how you wanted all your memories to revolve around PC [REDACTED].
- (b) Sent more than one Snapchat message between the period 9 March 2022 – 10 March 2022 to PC [REDACTED] telling her about your feelings towards her. The messages exhibited at CG07 which are summarised as:
- i. A message on the 9th March 22 at (time not visible) to PC [REDACTED] asking why she no longer says “*I love you*”.
 - ii. A lengthy message at 16:45 in which you expressed your love for PC [REDACTED], made a statement that you have changed the way you are as she had asked, how you had fallen deeper in love with PC [REDACTED]; how you had hoped that that love would be reciprocated and how you had won the “*I love you more game*”.
- (c) Sent a Snapchat message on 3 April 2022 to PC [REDACTED] asking why she had not been in touch with you that day.
- (d) Sent a message on Snapchat on 4 April 2022 to PC [REDACTED] at 06.49 saying ‘*we not even saying morning now?*’
- (e) Sent more than one Snapchat message on 4 April 2022 to PC [REDACTED] asking her to contact you. The messages are as follows:
- i. A message at 14:10 saying “*call me when you are finish work and we’ll talk it out*”
 - ii. A message at 14:50 saying “can we talk”
 - iii. A message at 16:41 saying “*can you tell me what is going on..... please just let me know what is happening*”

- (f) Sent Snapchat messages on 7 April 2022 to PC [REDACTED] saying [REDACTED] *I really want to make this work', [REDACTED] I'm crazy in love with you still am for some reason' and 'I accept the fact that we're not in a relationship I don't want to move on because I still firmly believe you're the one, so I'll be waiting:)'*
 - (g) Sent a Snapchat message on 16 June 2022 to PC [REDACTED] saying *'I'm gonna have to say this, I don't know why you ghosted me all of yesterday, not quite sure what I've done wrong, but doing that knowing we're working together today isn't exactly the way to go about "not being awkward at work" like you keep saying you want.'*
 - (h) You telephoned PC [REDACTED] personal mobile telephone 35 times during the period 11 April 2022 – 16 June 2022.
 - (i) Identified PC [REDACTED] whereabouts by using the West Mercia Police Service computer system SAAB SAFE on 27 March 2022.
 - (j) On 27 March 2022, having identified PC [REDACTED] whereabouts, when you saw that she was working in the [REDACTED] area you called PC [REDACTED] using the force's point to point radio system to ask why she had been in [REDACTED].
 - (k) On a date between 7 January 2022 – 15 July 2022 whilst on duty, you made your way to the [REDACTED] Police Station in the hope of meeting up with PC [REDACTED] whom you believed had transported a prisoner to [REDACTED] Custody Suite.
4. You were spoken to by PS [REDACTED] on 7 April 2022 about having maintained an inappropriate level of contact with PC [REDACTED] particularly during her working hours and advised about conducting yourself appropriately moving forward. Following this conversation with PS [REDACTED], on a date in April 2022 whilst you and PC [REDACTED] were on duty, you walked up to a police vehicle in which PC [REDACTED] was sat in the car park at [REDACTED] police station, crouched down and had a conversation with her. At the end of the conversation you put your head through the window, leaned into the vehicle, asked PC [REDACTED] for a kiss and tried to kiss her. PC [REDACTED] put her hand over your face, pushed your head out of the vehicle and drove away.
5. On a date in June 2022, PC [REDACTED] was driving her own vehicle home following a tour of duty when you, whilst on duty and driving a police vehicle followed her vehicle, put your blue vehicle lights on causing PC [REDACTED] to pull over. When PC [REDACTED] pulled over

you had a personal conversation with her and there was no mention of any traffic offences or concerns about the vehicle that she was driving.

Particulars of Misconduct:

It is alleged that you have breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour and in particular the standards relating to:

- (1) Authority, Respect and Courtesy: Your behaviour as set out in the factual allegations at paragraphs 3 – 5 above has breached this standard in that you failed to act with self-control, failed to show respect to PC [REDACTED], failed to respect the rights of PC [REDACTED] and abused your power when you pursued the unwanted course of conduct, despite PC [REDACTED] having told you to stop and despite you having received advice from a Supervising Officer. You abused your power as a Police officer by using work equipment to contact PC [REDACTED] during working hours for a non-policing purpose and when you pulled her vehicle over also for a non-policing purpose and contrary to the West Mercia Police Driving Standards Policy.
- (2) Orders and Instructions: Your behaviour as set out in the factual allegations at paragraphs 3 – 5 above has breached this standard in that you acted in breach of force policies with your conduct towards PC [REDACTED] (Harassment and Bullying policy), caused PC [REDACTED] to pull over in her vehicle for a non-policing purpose (Driving Standards policy), and entered PC [REDACTED] details into the force computer system to identify her whereabouts for a non-policing purpose (Data Protection policy).
- (3) Confidentiality: Your behaviour as set out in the factual allegations at paragraphs 3(i) and 3(j) above has breached this standard in that you acted in breach of the force's Data Protection policy when you accessed the SAAB SAFE computer system on 27 March 2022 and inputted PC [REDACTED] personal information to establish her whereabouts. This was a failure by you to respect the confidential nature of PC [REDACTED] personal information and/or to use the information lawfully and only in the proper course of your police duties.
- (4) Discreditable Conduct: Your behaviour as set out in the factual allegations at paragraphs 3 – 5 above has breached this standard in that;
 - (a) Colleagues of PC [REDACTED] considered it appropriate to raise their concerns about your conduct towards PC [REDACTED] with supervising Officers;

- (b) An ordinary well-informed member of the public would regard your conduct as falling far below that expected of a Police Officer, particularly in view of you having been spoken to about your behaviour during the course of conduct by a supervising Officer. Your behaviour therefore discredits the police service and reduces public confidence in the reputation of the profession.

It is alleged that these matters individually and/or collectively amount to gross misconduct.

2.3 The officer submitted a written response to the allegations in accordance with Regulation 31 of the PCR 2020. He accepted sending the messages to PC [REDACTED] but denied that they were part of an inappropriate course of conduct.

2.4 He accepted there was telephone contact with PC [REDACTED] but denied that they were part of an inappropriate course of conduct.

2.5 He denied identifying PC [REDACTED] whereabouts by using the SAAB SAFE system. He accepted using his radio to make a point-to-point call to PC [REDACTED] but denied doing so having identified her whereabouts or for the purpose of asking her why she had been in [REDACTED].

2.6 He accepted that he made his way to the [REDACTED] Police Station in the hope of meeting up with PC [REDACTED] but denied this was part of a wider inappropriate course of conduct.

2.7 He accepted that he attempted to kiss PC [REDACTED] when she was sitting in her police vehicle but only after PC [REDACTED] initiated a conversation with him. He accepted this was a breach of the SPB relating to Orders and Instructions and Authority, Respect and Courtesy, but not to a level that mounted to misconduct or gross misconduct.

2.8 He accepted causing PC [REDACTED] to stop her private vehicle by following her and illuminating the blue lights on his police vehicle. He accepted this was a breach of the SPB relating to Orders and Instructions and Discreditable conduct and that this amounted to misconduct but not gross misconduct,

3. PANEL DETERMINATION OF THE FACTS, BREACHES OF THE SPB AND LEVEL OF MISCONDUCT

Burden and Standard of Proof

3.1 The Panel was reminded that the burden of proof rests with the AA and the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is to say, on the balance of probabilities. The Panel applied this standard when considering the facts of the case.

The Evidence

3.2 The Panel took into account the evidence contained in the AA's bundle and a bundle of documents provided by the defence.

3.3 Before considering the evidence, Miss Clarke provided the Panel with written and oral opening submissions on how the AA put its case.

3.4 On 15 July 2022 PC [REDACTED] was interviewed by officers from West Mercia Police. During that interview she gave a detailed account of the events which later founded the allegations brought against PC [REDACTED]. The interview was audio recorded and a written record of that interview was provided to the panel, albeit heavily redacted.

3.5 On 12 and 13 August 2024 PC [REDACTED] gave oral evidence to the Panel. Her evidence can be briefly summarised. She and PC [REDACTED] met at school and were in a relationship for 5 years up to the point when she ended it on 7 January 2022 when she told him it was over, and she needed some space away from him.

3.6 She said they tried to maintain a friendship as she did not want to cut him out of her life. She said they still had feelings for each other. On occasion they saw one another but were not in a relationship. However, there came a point where she became concerned about his behaviour which she believed was professionally unacceptable and which she reported to her supervisor. What prompted her to report him was an occasion when she and a colleague were on duty in [REDACTED] and when PC [REDACTED] contacted her. He first tried to call her on her mobile phone, which she ignored, then he called her by police radio. During their conversation he said he could not see her on the police SAAB SAFE mapping system, a system which shows the location of on duty police officers. She was also generally unhappy about the way PC [REDACTED] "lingered" around her at work which she said she found unnerving.

3.7 PC [REDACTED] said that she felt PC [REDACTED] needed to be spoken to by police supervision so that he would respect her wishes that he "keep separate" from her at work and that any contact they had outside work would be managed by her.

3.8 She was aware that PC [REDACTED] was spoken to by his supervisor on 7 April 2022 about her concerns. On that same day she messaged him to say that she would be going to [REDACTED] Police Station and when she got there, she saw him in the vehicle yard. She stopped her vehicle, and he came over to speak to her. They chatted and at the end of the conversation PC [REDACTED] leaned in through her car window and tried to kiss her, however she prevented this by putting her hand over her face and pushing his head away. Shortly after, he messaged her to say he was sorry and that he had misread the signals.

3.9 She was asked in interview if there was anything else which caused her concern, and she relayed the occasion when she was driving home after work and she was stopped by PC [REDACTED] who was driving a marked police car. She said he told her that he did it because he thought it would be funny and that other members of his shift commonly stopped police colleagues in their private vehicles after going off duty and it was done as a joke. This incident occurred in June 2022. The AA did not specify the day it happened, and PC [REDACTED] could not recall it, but by a process of elimination, after comparing shift rotas, the Investigating Officer identified the most likely date as 6 June 2022.

3.10 In oral evidence PC [REDACTED] provided additional detail to her account given in interview. In short, after telling PC [REDACTED] she did not want to continue their relationship, she in fact maintained regular contact with him outside work, through phone calls, video calls, messaging and face to face meetings. She also said that on a number of occasions they had sex together. She said she still had feelings for him but a main reason for maintaining contact with him was that she was concerned for his welfare.

3.11 She said that she had been advised by her own supervisors not to have contact with PC [REDACTED]. She said that PC [REDACTED] supervisors had advised him not to contact her when she was at work.

3.12 Analysis of PC [REDACTED] phone revealed messages between PC [REDACTED] and PC [REDACTED] from 10 January 2022 to 16 June 2022. These were supplemented by additional call data produced by PC [REDACTED] for roughly the same period. PC [REDACTED] also produced a timeline of events from 7 January 2022 to 16 June 2022, the latter being the final occasion when there was contact between the two.

3.13 The timeline included numerous instances of PC [REDACTED] and PC [REDACTED] meeting and spending time with each other for walks, meals and intimate contact. This timeline was later put to PC [REDACTED] who did not deny its accuracy.

3.14 A number of police officers provided witness statements about their understanding of the situation between PC [REDACTED] and PC [REDACTED] and how they perceived the impact of this on PC [REDACTED]. PC [REDACTED] wrote that PC [REDACTED] seemed to be concerned about the number of texts she was receiving from PC [REDACTED] and advised her to make supervision aware if the texts were unwanted. On a later occasion, on 27 March 2022, when PC [REDACTED] and PC [REDACTED] were working in [REDACTED], PC [REDACTED] became concerned when PC [REDACTED] contacted PC [REDACTED], and he believed he had used the SAAB SAFE system to locate her. He told PC [REDACTED] that if she did not report her concerns to supervision then he would do so.

3.15 PC [REDACTED] did not give live evidence, but his witness statement did not suggest that he was aware of the true nature of the ongoing contact between PC [REDACTED] and PC [REDACTED]. PC [REDACTED] statement is silent about the fact that the day before was PC [REDACTED] birthday, and that PC [REDACTED] was invited to join in her birthday celebration, at her home, with her mother and grandparents.

3.16 PC [REDACTED] provided a witness statement but was not called to give live evidence. He first met PC [REDACTED] in June 2022. In his statement he articulated the concerns he had for PC [REDACTED] who spoke to him on a number of occasions about her separation from PC [REDACTED] and how she reported receiving unwanted messages from him on rest days. PC [REDACTED] statement was also silent about the fact that PC [REDACTED] had voluntarily maintained regular contact with PC [REDACTED].

3.17 Police Sergeant (PS) [REDACTED] was PC [REDACTED] supervisor. He provided a witness statement but was not required to give oral evidence on it. He wrote that in April 2022 PC [REDACTED] approached him and informed him about her previous relationship with PC [REDACTED], that she had ended the relationship, and that PC [REDACTED] was continually making contact with her, especially when she was at work. He said she was nervous and upset when she made this disclosure. In July 2022 she made further disclosure to PS [REDACTED] which included the vehicle stop in June 2022. He said that she told him the stop had worried her and when she made this disclosure, she was very upset and scared.

3.18 PS [REDACTED] witness statement was also silent about the regular consensual contact that had taken place between PC [REDACTED] and PC [REDACTED]. In his timeline of events, PC [REDACTED] asserted that on 11 June 2022 he and PC [REDACTED] went out for a meal. Afterwards she went to his house where they had consensual sex. In cross examination PC [REDACTED] could not recall this occasion but she did not deny it happened, admitted that she had sex with PC [REDACTED] on several occasions after she ended their boyfriend/girlfriend relationship. The Investigating Officer concluded that 6 June 2022 was the most probable date of the vehicle stop, and only six days after that PC [REDACTED] was enjoying a meal and intimacy with PC [REDACTED].

3.19 In cross examination PC [REDACTED] confirmed that her relationship with PC [REDACTED] had been a serious one and they had discussed marriage.

3.20 It was put to PC [REDACTED] that she did not clearly tell PC [REDACTED] that the relationship was over and that she gave him a ray of hope that with time it might revert to the way it was. She denied this suggestion. It was suggested she liked receiving attention from PC [REDACTED] which she denied.

3.21 PC [REDACTED] admitted that she thought PC [REDACTED] was in a vulnerable state after telling him the relationship was over, and this was a reason why she maintained contact with him.

3.22 It was put to PC [REDACTED] that she did not say anything to her colleagues about initiating contact with PC [REDACTED] or that she had consensual sex with him after their breakup. PC [REDACTED] maintained that her colleagues knew she was still having contact with PC [REDACTED], and she believed they knew about them having a sexual relationship.

3.23 PC [REDACTED] was asked about her conversation with PC [REDACTED] on 27 March 2022 and her failure to mention inviting PC [REDACTED] to her birthday celebration the day before. PC [REDACTED] thought that fact was irrelevant.

3.24 PC [REDACTED] agreed that if the roles were reversed and it was PC [REDACTED] who ended their exclusive relationship but used her for sex, that would have been an unpleasant thing to do.

3.25 It was put to PC [REDACTED] that she had been playing mind games with PC [REDACTED] which she denied. However, she conceded that by having sex with him then "ghosting" him (ie. abruptly ending communication without explanation) could, in hindsight, be seen as playing mind games with someone.

3.26 PC [REDACTED] admitted that she had been advised to stop having contact with PC [REDACTED], but she did not follow that advice.

3.27 PC [REDACTED] was referred to PC [REDACTED] timeline and accepted that going out for dinner with him only three days after telling him she wanted space from him and then going out with him for a Valentine's Day breakfast with him were unhelpful and gave out mixed messages.

3.28 PC [REDACTED] was questioned about events on 11 March 2022. She went out with friends in [REDACTED] and had booked herself a room at a hotel in the [REDACTED]. She was asked about PC [REDACTED] spending the night with her in the hotel. In response she said she could not recall consenting to PC [REDACTED] spending the night with her. She said she was drunk on that occasion, yet she was able to clearly recall certain details of that night but not others. She recalled talking to him on "facetime" and when she told him she was intending to get food from McDonald's he told her he was worried for her safety and that he would travel to [REDACTED] to make sure she was safe. Having driven to [REDACTED] and after escorting her to McDonald's PC [REDACTED] asserted that PC [REDACTED] then followed her to her hotel. She did not recall inviting him into her room and into her bed. She said she was questioned by a security guard in the hotel about whether she had booked a room for one person or two. She told the security guard she had booked for two people but did not tell the guard or PC [REDACTED] that she did not want PC [REDACTED] to go with her to her room. The Panel was not persuaded that PC [REDACTED] version of events about how PC [REDACTED] ended up spending the night with her was the truth.

3.29 PC [REDACTED] was asked about events on 19 March 2022. On that day she messaged PC [REDACTED] and asked if he wanted to come with her to buy some doughnuts. She was asked why she did that if she wanted space from PC [REDACTED]. She replied that on that particular day, that is what she wanted to do and there was no one else available, so she

invited PC [REDACTED]. She accepted that if her friends were not away at university, she would have invited them and not PC [REDACTED].

3.30 With regard to the SAAB SAFE allegation PC [REDACTED] accepted that if PC [REDACTED] wanted to locate her he could have done so using the Find My iPhone app which they had on their respective phones or by using Snapchat.

3.31 PS [REDACTED] gave evidence for the sole purpose of explaining how the SAAB SAFE system works. He explained that officers are encouraged to use the system regularly as it shows the location of ongoing incidents across the force area. He explained that officers can be located on the mapping system from an icon which shows their police callsign, although if double crewed it will show only a single callsign. To locate an officer whose callsign is not displayed on the map all that is required is a simple search of the officer's police collar number.

3.32 PC [REDACTED] accepted that she had a lot of contact with PC [REDACTED] in May 2022 and also accepted that she may not have done so if her friends were home from university.

3.33 PC [REDACTED] was referred to a Domestic Abuse Stalking Harassment & Honour based violence (DASH) form which she completed with PS [REDACTED] on 14 July 2022. The purpose of the DASH form is to assess the degree of risk posed to an individual from a partner or ex-partner. The greater the number of affirmative responses to the questions on the form the higher the degree of risk. PC [REDACTED] answered a number of questions in the affirmative, particularly in regard to contact from PC [REDACTED]. However, when she completed the form, she failed to describe the true nature of that contact and the true nature of their relationship.

Withdrawal of Allegations at Paragraphs 3 and 4

3.34 On Day 2 of the hearing the LQC invited the AA to reconsider its case against PC [REDACTED] in light of the evidence seen and heard by the Panel which revealed that PC [REDACTED] and PC [REDACTED] did continue in some form of relationship during the entire period in which it was alleged that PC [REDACTED] had acted inappropriately towards PC [REDACTED].

3.35 On the evening of Day 2 the AA informed the Panel, by email, that the AA was withdrawing those allegations set out at paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Regulation 30 Notice. This was confirmed by Miss Clarke on the morning of Day 3 and the Panel formally entered into the record a finding of not proven for those allegations.

3.36 The AA confirmed that it was proceeding with the vehicle stop allegation at paragraph 5 of the Regulation 30 Notice and maintained that this was still considered to amount to gross misconduct.

The Goodyear Indication

3.37 Miss Stevens asked the Panel to consider giving a Goodyear indication on this remaining allegation. The LQC discussed the permissibility of such a procedure in police misconduct hearings. Counsel were in agreement that it was permissible.

3.38 The Panel agreed to give such an indication but limited to whether the conduct admitted amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

3.39 A basis of plea was then produced and delivered orally to the Panel.

3.40 The Panel considered the basis of plea which maintained PC [REDACTED] full and frank admission to stopping PC [REDACTED] car, which he had admitted to at the first opportunity.

3.41 The Panel recognised that PC [REDACTED] had no legitimate policing purpose when carrying out the vehicle stop using his police vehicle's blue lights. The Panel did accept that this young and young in-service student officer had been influenced by more experienced officers who had done the same thing previously as something of a shift joke. This in no way excused or mitigated his actions but the fact that the AA took no action to investigate others for the same behaviour was a helpful indicator of the true level of seriousness of this matter.

3.42 The Panel recognised that the public would disapprove of the misuse of police time and equipment in this way but would recognise that there was no harm done or ill intent.

3.43 The Panel considered the impact the incident had on PC [REDACTED]. The Panel did not find PC [REDACTED] to be a credible witness. Her account of when PC [REDACTED] spent the night with her in [REDACTED] was a clear example of her willingness to manufacture evidence when the truth was inconsistent with her narrative. The Panel was satisfied that those police colleagues who expressed concern for her in their witness statements were most probably unaware that she was actively maintaining a relationship with PC [REDACTED], albeit a quite different one to what he wanted. On 7 January 2022 that relationship was transformed by PC [REDACTED] from an equal and committed partnership into a one sided selfish relationship in which she set the rules.

3.44 The Panel was deeply troubled by the false impression PC [REDACTED] gave to her colleagues about PC [REDACTED] and his colleagues. The Panel did not have the benefit of an unredacted interview record from PC [REDACTED], but her DASH form was clearly not an accurate reflection of the truth. The false impression given was one of worrying unwanted contact from an ex-partner.

3.45 Taking all of the above into account the Panel was not satisfied PC [REDACTED] was in anyway troubled, upset or concerned when PC [REDACTED] stopped her vehicle.

3.46 On the facts established by the Panel it was satisfied that PC [REDACTED] breached the SPB relating to Orders and Instructions because it must be contrary to such orders or instructions to cause a motorist to stop as a practical joke, even if that motorist is a colleague or friend. Such a departure from orders and instructions must also amount to a breach of the SPB relating to Discreditable Conduct.

3.47 The Panel reminded itself that under the PCR 2020 a breach of the SPB does not automatically amount to misconduct. The Panel also reminded itself that it alone has the duty to determine the question of misconduct regardless of any admission by a defendant officer. The Panel was satisfied that PC [REDACTED] conduct was not so serious as to amount to misconduct. If the vehicle stop incident had been presented to his supervisors to deal with in isolation it would not have been considered so serious that disciplinary action was merited. In the Panel's judgement the appropriate and proportionate response would have been some form of immediate informal rebuke or the formal Reflective Practice Review Process (RPRP).

3.48 The Panel therefore gave its indication that the outcome in this case would be a finding that the conduct admitted breached the SPB relating to Orders and Instructions and Discreditable Conduct, and that such conduct was neither misconduct nor gross misconduct.

Finding

3.49 Miss Clarke made the pragmatic suggestion that the Panel need not retire to waste time on what would have been an artificial exercise of further deliberation. The Panel agreed that this would have been a pointless exercise and formally announced its finding in the same terms as its Goodyear indication and directed that PC [REDACTED] be referred for RPRP.

Mr Callum Cowx – LQC
D/Supt Leanne Lowe – PPM
Mrs Jenni Ord – IPM

22 August 2024