



Cheshire Constabulary

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

Officer's Name: Philip Reeves

Collar Number: 3848

Rank: Police Constable

At an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing held on 10th June 2026, the following allegations contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour were considered:

Allegation One

It is alleged that you have maintained an ongoing friendship with a convicted sex offender knowing the nature of his convictions due to them being publicised widely in the local and national press and on the force intranet. You have failed to disclose your ongoing association with him to the Counter Corruption Unit in line with the Notifiable Association Policy.

In doing so you have acted with a lack of integrity, compromised your position and behaved in a manner which discredits the police service and undermines public confidence in it. It is alleged you have breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Honesty & Integrity, Orders & Instructions and Discreditable Conduct.

Contrary to Paragraphs 1, 5 & 9 of Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct)

Regulations 2020.

Allegation Two

It is alleged that you have provided misleading and dishonest accounts to Professional Standards regarding the nature and extent of your relationship with convicted a child sex offender.

In doing so it is alleged you have breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct.

Contrary to Paragraphs 1 and 9 of Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct)

Regulations 2020.

Outcome

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and have read them carefully, and in particular have considered the bundle of evidence that relates to 2 Allegations concerning PC Reeves & have reviewed the Investigating Officer's report in detail. I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority.

PC Reeves resigned on 8th June 2026 in advance of the hearing & was not in attendance. This is understandable as in my view there can be no reasonable explanation for his actions.

However, I should add that the facts of this case speak for themselves, and the evidence is entirely incontrovertible, that is, there is communication between PC Reeves and a serving prisoner, a convicted sex offender, who had received a 30 year sentence.

Allegation 1 relates to the fact that PC Reeves maintained an ongoing friendship with a prisoner, who had recently been convicted of serious sexual

offences against children, and that he failed to report this to the organisation in line with the Notifiable Association Policy.

Given his status as a police officer, it is outrageous that he aligned himself with a convicted sex offender, and clearly sympathised with his position in custody. He also made derogatory comments about the victims of this offending, and I find this inexcusable and abhorrent. Of course, these views were shared in a private context, but such comments were wholly unguarded, and I believe reflect his true feelings, that are in complete contrast to the values expected of Officers.

Such conduct is naturally capable of undermining public confidence in policing as reasonable members of the public would be horrified by such offending and cut ties with such individuals. Whilst he sought to downplay the depth of the friendship, the evidence I have seen belies this, including numerous lengthy telephone calls, and mutual terms of endearment.

PC Reeves accepted that his conduct was in breach of the Notifiable Association Policy, but he suggested that he was aware everyone knew of the friendship, and inferred that there was therefore no requirement to confirm this to the organisation. Whilst he accepted this was 'foolish' he argued that it did not constitute Gross Misconduct. I wholeheartedly disagree.

Allegation 2 relates to the fact that PC Reeves was purportedly dishonest in his interview with PSD, and PC Reeves denied this. However, he clearly sought to underplay the frequency of contact, and depth of that friendship. He did ultimately disclose the fact of the prison visit, but I do not think he deserves particular credit for this.

I do consider that PC Reeves has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Orders and Instructions, and Discreditable Conduct in relation to the above Allegations, and I am extremely disappointed in his conduct to say the least, and it is very shocking indeed. 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, and that given the gravity of the conduct dismissal without notice is inevitable.

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 – this speaks for itself as a serving police ought not to align himself (and to assist) a serving sex offender, without at the very least informing the organisation. This is aggravated by the nature of the offender's crimes, as reflected by an extremely lengthy custodial sentence.

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.

Determination

Further to the above, had PC Reeves not previously resigned he would have been dismissed without notice

Chief Constable:



Date:

10/06/2026

NB1: In the circumstances that PC Reeves resigned in advance of the hearing, there is no Right of Appeal.

NB2: FURTHER TO THE DETERMINATION THAT PC REEVES WOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED WITHOUT NOTICE HAD HE NOT PREVIOUSLY RESIGNED, HIS NAME WILL BE ADDED TO THE BARRED LIST (MAINTAINED BY THE COLLEGE OF POLICING) TO PREVENT HIS RE-ENTRY INTO THE PROFESSION.

Right of Appeal

You have no right of appeal to a Police Appeals Tribunal given your resignation