



**Cheshire
Constabulary**

**Outcome of Accelerated Misconduct Hearing and Right to Appeal
Regulation 63 Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020**

Officer's Name: PC Andrew Hein

Collar Number: 5170

Rank: Constable

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and have read them carefully. I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and heard from his Legal representative at today's hearing.

There is one Allegation under consideration at today's hearing, that is that on 13th December 2025 PC Hein visited a Registered Sex Offender with a colleague. During the visit PC Hein identified that he was in possession of an unregistered tablet in breach of his Sexual Risk Order. It has been alleged that he failed to take appropriate action in relation to this and made false statements in relation to the visit on policing systems.

At the commencement of the hearing, I heard submissions concerning the nature of the allegations, and in particular that this case was not suitable to be heard under the Fast Track regime, and I was referred to the case of Gannon v Chief Constable of Merseyside [2009]. In my view, whilst I appreciate the points raised it is not transferrable to this case, as the facts of that matter entirely relied upon witness statements capable of dispute. In this case, PC Hein made admissions that he had indeed identified and examined the device in question.

PC Hein worked in a unit charged with managing the risk of offenders who present a significant threat to the public. In this case the offender was charged (and subsequently convicted) of extremely serious sexual offences relating to young children. PC Hein was aware of the nature of the then alleged offences, which consisted of the possession of indecent images, and also incitement of children to engage in sexual acts, sexual communication, and grooming. As such, it must have been apparent to PC Hein that robust management and enforcement of his devices under the (Interim) Sexual Risk Order was essential to mitigate the risk that the offender posed to children. Taking the most benevolent interpretation of events as outlined today a

predatory paedophile had been in possession of an electronic device capable of facilitating like offences, whilst in hospital, and upon his return to his home whereupon the device was located in his bedroom.

When the device was ultimately properly seized over a month later the internet history had been deleted, and the absence of a comprehensive Visor report detailing the discovery of the device on 13th December 2025 means I cannot be certain that this was the same device that had been left in the offender's possession by PC Hein.

Given the potential serious consequences of his conscious decision not to act in accordance with the clear responsibilities required of you, your actions created the potential for the offender to commit further offences. The failure to properly document the visit compounded this as it circumvented initial management review to identify the risk, and limited future investigation of the device. As such I consider these clear breaches of his Duties and Responsibilities, which amount to Gross Misconduct. Further to this, this risk should have been apparent to him, which leads me to believe that PC Hein's failure to properly document his decision making was borne out of Dishonesty, rather than forgetfulness. Such conduct does bring discredit upon the Constabulary, and policing generally as it undermines public confidence in us to properly manage sex offenders in the community. I also find Gross Misconduct in relation to those standards of Professional Behaviour.

He is an experienced officer whose role in sex offender management is critical to maintaining public safety, and identifying further offending in relation to high risk offenders in the community. I understand that he accepts that he knew of the existence of the device, but determined that no action was required, as per his account of the visit. The device should have been seized and examined, and arguably the individual ought to have been arrested. If he was unclear as to his responsibilities in this regard he ought to have sought advice from his supervisor, but he made no effort to do so. In any event, if so satisfied that no offences were identified he ought to have recorded this on policing systems for future reference.

Such behaviour is unacceptable and not in accordance with fulfilling his policing duties in an efficient, diligent and professional manner.

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified. Applying that definition, I find the matter proven as gross misconduct.

I have read the character references, such as they are, in the papers. I note the submissions in relation to sanction however having considered the matter fully and having had regards to the nature and severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, my decision is that PC Hein should be Dismissed without notice and be placed on the barred list preventing re- entry to the profession.

I would like to outline my rationale for that decision in detail now.

The College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings is a clear document that sets out the stages of the decision-making process. I have applied those Guidelines and that process to my decision-making today.

The first stage of deciding on the outcome is to assess the seriousness of the conduct. This covers the areas of the officer's culpability – that is, their blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions - the harm caused and any aggravating or mitigating factors.

The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime. This has three elements:

To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service,
To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and
To protect the public.

The police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils the purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.

Every case is different and I have made my decision on the specific facts of this individual case.

I have started by assessing the seriousness of the conduct

I now move to the second stage, which is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime, that has three elements:

To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service,
To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and
To protect the public.

In my opinion, this was gross misconduct which does undermines public confidence in policing as well as the particular reputation of Cheshire Constabulary. A lesser sanction than dismissal would not serve to uphold high standards and deter misconduct that is so completely out of keeping with colleagues' and the Constabulary's ethics and values. Furthermore, importantly a dismissal is necessary in order to protect the public from a police officer who could potentially cause this kind of harm in future by barring his re-entry from the profession.

In terms of the outcome that most appropriately fulfils the purpose given the particular gravity of the conduct in question, it is clear to me and it is my decision that the imposition of a final written warning would be a wholly inadequate outcome for behaviour of this kind and therefore that nothing less than dismissal would fulfil the purpose of the police misconduct regime. I make clear that such conduct shall not be tolerated by myself and the Constabulary.

Outcome	Indicate Below
Dismissal without notice	X
Final Written Warning	
Reduction in Rank	
Case returned to Appropriate Authority to deal with as Part 4	
Gross Misconduct Not Proven – Case dismissed	



Chief Constable:

Date:

23/10/2026

Right of Appeal

You have a right of appeal to a Police Appeals Tribunal against the finding and / or disciplinary outcome imposed at the hearing. A Police Appeals Tribunal is not a re hearing of the original matter; rather its role is to consider an appeal based on specific grounds. Those grounds are:

- That the finding or disciplinary action imposed was unreasonable; or
- That there is evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the misconduct hearing which could have materially affected the finding or decision; or
- That there was a breach of the procedures set out in the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.

Should you wish to appeal he will need to give notice of his appeal in writing to the local policing body. The notice of appeal must be given within 10 working days, beginning with the first working day after receipt of this notice.

Any request for an appeal must be forwarded to:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

If you fail to submit a notice of appeal within the 10 working days period, he may, within a reasonable time after the end of that period, submit a notice of appeal which shall be accompanied by the reasons why it was not submitted within that period, and the reasons for his view that it was served within a reasonable time after that period.