



**Cheshire
Constabulary**

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

Officer's Name: [REDACTED]

Collar Number: [REDACTED]

Rank: **Detective Inspector**

At an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing held on 26th August 2026, the following allegation contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour was considered:

Allegation 1

It is alleged on 19th February 2026, you have become involved in an investigation being undertaken by [REDACTED] where there was a personal conflict of interest. It is alleged you have abused your position, accessing Police systems relating to this investigation and attempted to influence the investigation and outcome. You withheld your personal connection to the family of the suspect and how you came to be involved in the investigation from police colleagues.

Outcome:

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance and have read them carefully. I have reviewed the Investigating Officer's report in detail. I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and to the thoughtful submissions of Mr Gillespie.

As we have discussed DI [REDACTED] is not in attendance today.

However, I should add that I have formed the view that the facts of this case speak for themselves, and the evidence is incontrovertible, that is that DI [REDACTED] accessed policing systems without a legitimate policing purpose. I have also had sight of an email where [REDACTED] disclosed details of an investigation to a third party (the mother of a suspect). I have considered Mr Gillespie's propositions that DI [REDACTED] appropriately somehow – not stipulated- became aware of the investigation and that [REDACTED] interventions represent an acceptable demonstration of supervisory oversight. Equally that [REDACTED] association with the [REDACTED] was not such to create a conflict of interest

that should have been declared. To be clear I find these suggestions wholly unsustainable. In terms of the association of DI [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] the Facebook entries, [REDACTED] direct engagement with the DI, the stark contrast in tone between them and [REDACTED] contact with the complainant's mother and the broader context make it entirely implausible that the relationship was such that it did not merit being declared and that to an experienced officer it should have been entirely obvious that [REDACTED] should not have involved [REDACTED]. From that point onwards, whether [REDACTED] interventions were reasonable or not is irrelevant as [REDACTED] simply should not have been involved.

As outlined above, it is alleged on 19th February 2026, Inspector [REDACTED] became involved in an investigation when there was a personal conflict of interest, due to the fact that the brother of the suspect was [REDACTED]. It is alleged [REDACTED] abused [REDACTED] position, accessing Police systems relating to this investigation and attempted to influence the investigation and outcome by directing the OIC to finalise the matter as No Further Action. There are no records of telephone calls she alleges to have received from the Force Control Room, and I believe that the mother of the suspect contacted [REDACTED] directly, although Inspector [REDACTED] has not admitted to this, given it would reveal their association.

Inspector [REDACTED] has provided an initial response to the Allegation, but has not addressed the fact of the ongoing association with the family of the suspect, seeking to distance [REDACTED] from it, and providing an implausible reason for interfering with the investigation. I find this disingenuous and self serving. [REDACTED] account about how [REDACTED] embroiled [REDACTED] in this investigation is wholly incredible. PC [REDACTED] was being appropriately supervised by her Sergeant and Inspector and there is no reason whatsoever as to why DI [REDACTED] should have inserted herself into this matter. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I note that despite advising PSD [REDACTED] would provide [REDACTED] phone records, [REDACTED] has not done so.

In providing [REDACTED] response to this Allegation, DI [REDACTED] sought to undermine the Constable & [REDACTED] Sergeant, the FCC Operator and the Inspector who raised the issue with [REDACTED] and received a very robust and inappropriate reply. I have read the transcripts of the call from the suspect's mother, and I do not believe that she was distressed, or subsequently concerned about the possibility of a death message, as DI [REDACTED] asserted. DI [REDACTED] also reiterated that [REDACTED] had no ongoing relationship with the suspect's mother, and that is demonstrably untrue.

Naturally, I find that [REDACTED] actions were improper and dishonest, and also in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour concerning Orders and Instructions and Confidentiality, and also breached Force Policy concerning accessing information. As such, [REDACTED] actions capable of undermining public confidence in policing, therefore I find it does constitute Gross Misconduct.

I note DI [REDACTED] service record, but in no way does this reduce the gravity of the conduct, or [REDACTED] culpability for [REDACTED] actions. In fact, given [REDACTED] length of service and rank I find this behaviour more shocking, [REDACTED]. To go to such lengths to influence an outcome – at worse likely to send in a community resolution if admitted – is beyond belief and speaks to appalling judgement, and it is ironic that it was completely unnecessary, as ultimately it was properly determined that NFA would be taken.

I do consider that Inspector [REDACTED] has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Honesty and Integrity, Orders and Instructions, Confidentiality and Discreditable Conduct, on numerous occasions in relation to the Allegation, and I am extremely disappointed in [REDACTED] conduct to say the least, particularly given that I have strived to create a supportive culture within the organisation, and [REDACTED] actions clearly undermined this. I should note that I commend the actions of the PC in discussing this matter with [REDACTED] colleagues, escalating matters to [REDACTED] Sergeant, and for that Sergeant to bring it to the attention of his Inspector and onward to PSD to investigate. In [REDACTED] e mail DI [REDACTED] clearly took issue with a PC and fellow Inspector questioning [REDACTED] inappropriate behaviour seeing this as some kind of affront to [REDACTED] status.

Outcome decision

Having considered the matter fully and having had regards to the nature and severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, notwithstanding submissions in mitigation on [REDACTED] behalf my decision is that Inspector [REDACTED] should be Dismissed without notice.

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.

I have also considered Inspector [REDACTED] record of service during this decision-making process.

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 do consider this to be grave as ■■■ sought to influence the outcome of a criminal investigations for ■■■ own personal purposes.

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 ■■■ 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 (particularly in light of the Officer's rank) 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:

01/09/2026

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 [REDACTED] will need to give notice of [REDACTED] 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, [REDACTED] 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.