



memorandum

From: Chief Constable Richard Cooper

To: Former PC Macauley Sergeant

Our Ref:

Date: 14 April 2026

FINDINGS and OUTCOME FORM

ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING – former PC Macauley Sergeant

14 April 2026: Hindlip Hall, Hindlip Headquarters

In accordance with Regulation 63 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended), below listed are the findings 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: Chief Constable Richard Cooper

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

On 7th May 2024 during the course of your duties as a police officer, you were dispatched to a Grade 1 incident, where you met a female member of the public [REDACTED] who had reported she was a victim of harassment / stalking. Following this, you have then made inappropriate contact with the victim outside of your professional policing duties, which has led to a sexual relationship.

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

Discreditable conduct.

RESTRICTED

In accordance with Regulation 61, in conducting the accelerated misconduct hearing I have reviewed the facts of the case and decided on the balance of probabilities whether the conduct of the former officer amounts to gross misconduct.

Findings:

The conduct, on the balance of probabilities, does amount to gross misconduct.

The following is a summary of the finding:

The evidence indicates that the former officer instigated contact with a person who he had met only through his position as a police officer and the conduct of his duties. The nature of that contact was personal and flirtatious and ultimately resulted in the two having consensual sexual intercourse. This amounts to the abuse of his position for a sexual purpose and is serious enough to justify dismissal, therefore amounts to gross misconduct.

Disciplinary action to be imposed:

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.

Former PC Sergeant is culpable for his actions. He intentionally and deliberately instigated contact with a member of the public that he had briefly met in the conduct of his duties and the nature of that contact was immediately flirtatious.

The College guidance states that an officer's misconduct will be more culpable where it involves an abuse of their position. The abuse of position for a sexual purpose (APSP) is a form of serious corruption, defined as any behaviour by a police officer, whether on-duty or off-duty, that takes advantage of their position as a member of the police service to misuse their position, authority or powers in order to pursue a sexual or improper emotional relationship with any member of the public. The former officer has misused the privileged position of having attended someone's home when they were seeking urgent help from the police. He has done so by using his knowledge of who that person is, learned solely through the conduct of his duties, to contact her. Having reviewed the telephony material I am satisfied to the necessary standard that this was for the aim of initiating sexual activity. It was certainly nothing to do with a policing purpose.

The status of the member of the public is also relevant to the question of culpability. She was not a vulnerable adult per se, but the former officer knew that she was a recent victim of crime, and the telephony download confirms that she acknowledged to him that she had previously been in a violent and controlling relationship. It is evident that she was a willing participant in what took place, but this does not reduce the culpability of the former officer or negate the fact that he has abused his position.

RESTRICTED

In respect of harm, there is no evidence before me that indicates any substantial harm has been suffered by the member of the public. I have taken account of the fact that the former officer was not the officer in the case and had not been providing ongoing support to the member of the public in such a way that may have accentuated any power imbalance.

The extent to which public confidence in the police is damaged by an officer behaving in this way is still very significant, however. The public should expect that when they need the police's help that is provided compassionately, professionally, and without agenda or ulterior motive. In this case the former officer has used the knowledge of a person that he has obtained in responding to an emergency to instigate contact with her for a sexual purpose.

There is a deficit in the overall trust in the police that is particularly linked to the safety of women at the hands of male police officers. The consequences of this are potentially awful if a member of the public suffers harm because they did not trust the police to help them. The fact that the former officer pursued such conduct as he did in the context of this concern further increases the harm caused.

I consider the premeditated contact to be an aggravating factor as is the former officer's knowledge of the potential vulnerability of the member of the public, beyond her status as a victim of crime.

No mitigation has been submitted by the former officer.

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
- to protect the public

In determining the outcome, it should be no more than is necessary to satisfy those purposes. The most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanction is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole. This dual objective must take precedence over the specific impact that the sanction has on the individual whose misconduct is being sanctioned.

It is also important that other officers, most of whom work 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.

This was off duty conduct but enabled by the abuse of position whilst performing the duties of a constable. The former officer's culpability is high and the harm to public confidence is high.

Taking all the circumstances of this case together and applying my judgment to the guidance, I believe that dismissal is the necessary outcome to fulfil the purposes of the misconduct regime. I do not believe that a final written warning is sufficient because of the level of culpability and the level of harm arising from this isolated act of gross misconduct. The outcome I have reached is that former PC Sergeant would have been dismissed without notice had he not previously resigned.

RESTRICTED

As a consequence of this finding, former PC Sergeant will be included on the barred list held by College of Policing.

The member of the public's name should be redacted from the published record of this hearing.

Signed: 

Date: 14 April 2026

Chief Constable Richard Cooper

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,
dated2026 of which this is a true copy.**

Signed.....

Date.....