



**Cheshire
Constabulary**

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

Officer's Name: Shannon Burt

Collar Number: 37298

Rank: Police Constable

At an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing held on **18th August 2026**, the following allegation contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour was considered:

Allegation One

Whilst a serving police officer for Cheshire Police you have been concerned in the supply of anabolic steroids, a controlled drug of Class C.

In doing so, you have compromised your position as a police officer and behaved in a manner which discredits the police service with the potential to undermine public confidence. It is alleged that you have breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Honesty & Integrity and Discreditable Conduct

Contrary to paragraph 1 and 9 of Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Allegation Two

It is alleged that on three separate occasions whilst serving with Greater Manchester Police, you shared body worn video clips with [REDACTED]

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

Contrary to paragraph 9 and 7 of Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Outcome:

I have considered the potential outcomes available to me under Regulation 62. I consider that dismissal without notice is the most appropriate sanction in this case had (former) Police Constable Shannon Burt not previously resigned. As a result (former) Police Constable Shannon Burt shall be placed on the Barred List, that will prevent her re-entry into the profession.

Determination:

I am Chief Constable Mark Roberts, and I act as the decision maker for this Hearing. My first function is to review the facts of the case and determine whether or not (former) Police Constable Shannon Burt's conduct amounts to Gross Misconduct as defined in Regulation 2.

I have read all the information presented to me in the bundle as well as Former Constable Burt's email of resignation dated 10th August 2026. I note that she had failed to serve a Regulation 54 Response, but I refer to her written statement response at page 23 of the Bundle and her responses when interviewed.

I note that Former Constable Burt accepts that she sent body worn video footage to [REDACTED] on various dates in 2022. She also accepts that this conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of both confidentiality and discreditable conduct, and she offered an unreserved apology. This breach alone would be deemed as gross misconduct. Police officers are expected to adhere to the duty of confidentiality as well as the requirements of the Data Protection Act. A complete disregard for these duties is unacceptable.

Former Constable Burt denies that she purchased or supplied steroids to a man known [REDACTED] or to any other person. She states that the references within the Whatsapp messages dated 7th March 2023 have been misinterpreted, asserting that the phrase "I bought his steroids lol" was rhetorical or expressing surprise rather than an admission. I am struggling to believe this explanation when reading the messages as contained at pages 125 to 127 of the Bundle. I am also of the view that if the messages were read by a member of the public they would come to the same conclusion as I have; she has previously supplied steroids to a male known [REDACTED]

Former Constable Burt's conduct is undoubtedly Gross Misconduct. In 2022 she shared body worn video footage without a policing purpose, which is clearly against the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of both

confidentiality and discreditable conduct. This alone would have led to her dismissal from the police service, but I also find based on the evidence presented to me in the Bundle that she had supplied steroids to a male known [REDACTED] and at the very least that is what a member of the public or colleague would perceive.

I have no doubt that if the public became aware of this conduct by a serving police officer it would seriously undermine trust and confidence in policing.

The only appropriate disciplinary outcome in this case is Dismissal without Notice, had the former Officer not previously resigned. A lesser sanction than dismissal would not serve to uphold the high standards and deter such conduct in the future. Of course, she shall now be placed on the Barred List, that serves to prevent her re-entry into the profession.



Chief Constable:

Date: 21/08/2026

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 you will need to give notice of your 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, you 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 your view that it was served within a reasonable time after that period.