

**IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020**  
**CONCERNING**

**Police Sergeant 2556 Dawn Boyd**

---

**CHAIR DECISION – AMH OUTCOME NOTICE**

---

**Preliminary Matters**

1. On Monday 21<sup>st</sup> September 2026 I conducted an accelerated misconduct hearing (AMH) at Cumbria Police Federation Headquarters. This full written decision follows an outline of my conclusion and reasons delivered orally on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2026.
2. The hearing was convened to hear allegations relating to Police Sergeant (PS) Dawn Boyd.
3. PS Boyd was represented by Counsel, Mr Steven Reed.
4. The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by DCI Simon Gray. An opening note from Counsel, Barney Branston was circulated ahead of the hearing.
5. PS Boyd attended the hearing and was supported by a Police Federation representative, Paul McMillan.
6. As a preliminary matter, Mr Reed highlighted that there had been an amendment to the particulars of the allegations contained within Regulation 51 notice. The Officer accepted the latest version contained within the hearing bundle. Whilst he submitted there may have been a procedural irregularity regarding the manner of the alterations, Mr Reed confirmed that there would be no submissions advanced regarding an abuse of process.

**Alleged conduct:**

7. The AA alleged that:
  - a. *On the morning of 23 December 2025 you drove your personal motor car (details redacted) to your place of work at Ulverston Hub despite having consumed a bottle of wine the previous evening;*
  - i. *you arrived for duty at Ulverston Hub at approximately 08.45;*
  - ii. *you were found to have 40 micrograms of alcohol in 100 ml of breath at 09.16;*

*and /or*

*iii. you were found to have 31 micrograms of alcohol in 100 ml of breath at 10.34 and at 10.39.*

*b. On 23 December 2025 you paraded for duty at Ulverston Hub when unfit through intoxication in that you:*

*i. had consumed a bottle of wine the night before;*

*ii. arrived for duty at approximately 08.45;*

*iii. knew or ought to have known that you were in breach of Cumbria Police's acceptable alcohol limit at work, namely zero, as set out in the Substance Misuse Policy and Procedure dated January 2024;*

*iv. were found to have 40 micrograms of alcohol in 100 ml of breath at 09.16 that morning;*

*v. were found to have 31 micrograms of alcohol in 100 ml of breath at 10.34 and at 10.39.*

*c. Aggravating factors of such conduct include the fact that you were a supervisor at the time and that Cumbria Police were being especially vigilant regarding drink driving at that time of year.*

*d. Such conduct is in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to Fitness for Duty and Discreditable Conduct in that it would discredit the police service and damage public confidence in it; it amounts to gross misconduct in that it is so serious as to justify your dismissal.*

## **The AMH**

8. The hearing was conducted in line with Part 5 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as the AA had certified that the special conditions had been met, namely that there was sufficient evidence in the form of written statements or other documents, to establish on the balance of probabilities, that the conduct of Officer constituted gross misconduct and that it was in the public interest for the Officer to cease to be a police Officer without delay.

9. Regulation 61 (15) (16) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 provides that:
- (15) The person conducting or chairing the accelerated misconduct hearing must review the facts of the case and decide whether or not the conduct of the Officer concerned amounts to gross misconduct.
- (16) A finding of misconduct or gross misconduct must not be made unless
- (a) the Chair is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this is the case, or
  - (b) the Officer concerned admits it.

#### **Home Office Guidance- Standards of Professional Behaviour**

10. I have had regard to the following;

**Discreditable Conduct;** Police Officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

**Fitness for Duty;** Police Officers when on duty or presenting themselves for duty are fit to carry out their responsibilities

#### **The Home Office Guidance**

11. The Home Office Guidance: Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness provides discredit can be brought on the police by an act itself or because public confidence in the police is undermined, or is perceived to be undermined. In general, it should be the actual underlying conduct of the police officer that is considered under the misconduct procedures, whether the conduct occurred on or off-duty. As a result of the nature of the office of constable, a police officer is always subject to the Standards of Professional Behaviour even when off-duty. As such police officers should not behave in a manner that discredits the police service or undermines public confidence at any time. In determining whether a police officer's off-duty conduct discredits the police, the test is not whether the police officer discredits themselves but the police as a whole.

#### **Guidance for ethical and professional behaviour in policing**

12. I have had regard to the College of Policing guidance for ethical and professional behaviour in policing, in particular those passages relating to wellness & wellbeing, public interest & trust and line manager considerations.

### **Agreed and Disputed Facts**

13. The Officer accepted the particulars of the allegations in the current regulation 51 notice.
14. The Officer also accepted that her conduct breached the standards of professional behaviour relating to fitness for duty and discreditable conduct.
15. The Officer submitted this amounted to misconduct only, not gross misconduct.
16. In her Regulation 54 response, the Officer denied being unfit through intoxication to drive to her place of work as the only evidential sample of breath was 31ug/100ml<sup>1</sup>. The Officer stated that as a matter of law she was not unfit to drive to her work through intoxication because she was below the drink drive limit. If she had been unfit to drive to her place of work by intoxication, then she would have been charged with a criminal offence, which she was not.
17. Furthermore, the Officer submits that she was not on duty at that time she was driving, and it is not discreditable conduct for a police officer to drive a motor vehicle whilst under the drink drive limit.

### **Witness Evidence**

#### **PS Boyd**

18. PS Boyd gave evidence at the hearing. The Officer stated that she was, at the time of the incident, experiencing stress due to the ill health of her father, and because her operational duties had been restricted at the time (linked to an unrelated matter).
19. The Officer accepted that she was unfit for work when she paraded for duty.
20. The Officer said she remorseful for her actions and explained that she was struggling in her personal life, and in hindsight, she should have reported sick.
21. At the time of this incident, her restrictions were such that she would not have been expected to drive a police car or attend any public facing incidents. At the time of this incident the Officer was performing a support / administrative role.
22. No other witnesses gave evidence at the hearing, but the witness statements in the bundle are summarised as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> 31 ug/100ml = microgrammes of alcohol in 100ml of breath

**a. PC D**

On Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2025, PC D saw PS Boyds private motor vehicle parked outside her house in Barrow at 07:00 hours and again at 08:00 hours.

PC D was undertaking these checks because he was informed on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2025 that PSD had received intelligence that *“SGT Dawn BOYD had been in work whilst under the influence of alcohol and she was potentially driving OPL<sup>2</sup> to work’.*

At 08:45 hours on 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2025, PC D saw that PS Boyd was shown as logged online on her work computer.

PC D then drove to the Ulverston Blue Light Hub and saw PC Boyds vehicle parked on the Hub car park.

At 09:15 hours PC D spoke to PS Boyd in person in the car park. He could smell alcohol emitting from her. When asked, PS Boyd told PC D that she had consumed a bottle of wine the previous evening.

The Officer obtained a specimen of breath from PS Boyd which read 40 ug/100ml.

PC D arrested PC Boyd.

PC D later obtained evidential breath samples from PS Boyd on the intoxylizer machine in the custody suite.

Due to an error message being displayed on the machine, PC D performed two evidential tests, one at 10:34 hours, and another at 10:39 hours. On both occasions the breath samples were measured at 31 ug/100ml.

**b. DC M**

On Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> December 2026, DC M served police regulation 17 papers on PS Boyd. PC Boyd commented to DC M that *“‘I’M NOT ALCOHOLIC, I JUST HAVE A LOT OF STRESS WITH WORK AND HOME”*

DC M also accessed the CCTV at the Blue Light Hub the same day. The CCTV showed PS Boyd driving her vehicle into the car park on the day in question, at 08:41 hours. She was the only person in the vehicle at that time. PS Boyd was seen to get out of her car and then stood by her car and had a cigarette whilst chatting to a PCSO.

---

<sup>2</sup> Over the Prescribed Limit

### **c. Charles Squire**

Mr Squire is an expert witness employed by Lion Laboratories Ltd in the field of Breath Alcohol measurement. He analysed the error messages displayed on the intoxilyzer at the time PS Boyd gave her samples. He concluded that the two separate readings of 31 ug/100ml produced from PS Boyd's first breath samples in each of the two procedures were correct, and therefore, could be relied upon.

### **Cumbria Constabulary Substance Misuse Policy & Procedure**

23. The policy opens with the statement that 'Cumbria Police expect all Officers and staff to be fit for duty and not do anything which could affect their safety or the safety of others. The use of drugs or misuse of alcohol can make you unfit for duty'.
24. The policy states that the acceptable alcohol limit at work is zero.
25. The consequences outlined in the event of a positive alcohol test whilst on duty are as follows:
  - Results whereby the breath sample is over 13mg% (Home Office Limit) but under 35mg% Officers will be removed from safety critical roles, a risk assessment conducted by their line manager and the person found alternative work for the duration of the shift.
  - Results whereby the breath sample is 35mg% or above will be subject to the same removal from safety critical roles and risk assessments. Consideration will be given to the fitness of the individual and if it is suitable for them to remain at work. These should be referred to the Professional Standards Department for consideration of potential criminal matters. Nothing in this procedure prevents any action from being taken under the Road Traffic Act 1988 and this should be considered under these circumstances.

### **Submissions on Severity and Outcome**

26. Mr Reed submitted that given PS Boyd accepted the allegations and misconduct, as Chair, my main consideration would need to be the assessment of severity and outcome. i.e., whether this was gross misconduct, and thereafter, if found, determine the most appropriate sanction.

27. Mr Reed suggested that given his submissions for these matters would be identical at stage one and stage two, he intended to make one overall submission to avoid duplication.
28. The AA agreed with this approach and referred to the submissions already outlined in the opening note from Counsel, Mr Branston.
29. Notwithstanding parties only making one overall submission on findings/severity and outcome, I undertook a staged approach, and considered distinct steps as follows:

#### *Stage 1*

- (a) firstly, I analysed the evidence and determined the facts, based upon what is admitted by the Officer or proven on the balance of probabilities;
- (b) secondly, I determined whether on the basis of those facts the Officer has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour alleged;
- (c) thirdly, I determined whether the breaches found amounted to gross misconduct

#### *Stage 2*

- (d) I determined what the outcome should be.

30. When I retired to consider the evidence, I took time to make sure the four steps were not conflated. I ensured each had discrete findings and linked rationale.

#### **Analysis of evidence**

31. I have read and carefully considered every item contained within the bundle of evidential material supplied ahead of the hearing. This consisted of an electronic bundle of evidence consisting of 94 pages and a 4-page opening note from the AA. I was supplied with PS Boyds record of service and two character references during proceedings (considered at stage one and reviewed at stage two).
32. The Officer accepted the facts as outlined in the latest version of the Regulation 51 notice.
33. I have considered the submission from PS Boyd that as a matter of law she was not unfit to drive to her work through intoxication because she was below the drink drive limit of 35 ug/100ml.
34. The AA's allegations have been particularised in such a way that I have not been asked to find that the Officer was in fact over the evidential limit to be unfit to drive. I have made no such finding.
35. PS Boyd had been rostered to commence her shift at 08:00hrs.

36. PS Boyd stated she was unwell and this caused her to be late for work that day.
37. Considering the evidence of PC D, PS Boyd would have driven her car from her home address in Barrow to her place of work in Ulverston sometime after 08:00 hours.
38. CCTV showed PS Boyd driving her car into her workplace car park at 08:41 hours. She was seen to get out of her car smoke a cigarette, whilst chatting to a PSCO, before heading into the office.
39. At 09:16 hours PS Boyd provided a breath sample of 40ug/100ml during the “roadside test”; a preliminary breath test.
40. Whilst not an evidential sample, *‘a preliminary breath test is a procedure whereby the person to whom the test is administered provides a specimen of breath to be used for the purpose of obtaining, by means of a device of a type approved by the Secretary of State, an indication whether the proportion of alcohol in the person’s breath or blood is likely to exceed the prescribed limit’<sup>3</sup>.*
41. Given this test is used as the legally accepted preliminary test to justify a subsequent arrest, this reading cannot be dismissed as entirely irrelevant in these proceedings.
42. In any case, the Officer has accepted the facts laid out in allegation a that she did drive her personal motor car to work that day, that she arrived at work at approximately 08:45 hours and subsequently provided a breath sample of 40 ug/100ml at 09:16 hours.
43. PS Boyds evidential samples of 31 ug/100ml<sup>4</sup> were later provided at 10:34 and 10:39 hours.
44. Therefore, it is a matter of fact that the Officer drove to work (off-duty) and was then later found to have the particularised (indicative & evidential) levels of alcohol in her body at the relevant times whilst on-duty and in the workplace.
45. The facts are incontrovertible and the breath test results are not disputed.
46. Given that PS Boyd is employed as a police Officer, and someone in a leadership position, it would significantly undermine public confidence that an Officer was at work, and that they may be cognitively or physically impaired through alcohol at this elevated level.
47. We know from the statement from PC D that PS Boyd smelled of alcohol. This is likely to have been apparent to any other police or partner employee present in work that day. We know she was stood next to and was talking to a PSCO around 08:45 hours.

---

<sup>3</sup> Section 6A Road Traffic Act 1988.

<sup>4</sup>The England and Wales prescribed limit (breath) for driving is 35 ug/100ml (35 micrograms of alcohol per 100 millilitres of breath)

48. Her place of work, the Ulverston Hub, is a multiagency setting, where Officers work alongside other blue light services, and council employed personal. Unprofessional conduct is likely to be noticed by people employed in these services. Positive conduct of Officers in those settings is key to maintaining confidence in policing.
49. A Sergeant is a role model and should arrive punctually and fit for duty. It was her own responsibility to have ensured she was fully fit to drive to work before her rostered time and have been ready and capable to perform her role once on duty.
50. This is even more crucial given her role was in a community setting, where there is a greater degree of trust for people to act with less supervision.
51. Cumbria Police have a policy that says Officers should have zero alcohol in their system whilst at work.
52. In this case we know that at 10.34 hours, PS Boyd evidential breath sample was 31 ug/100ml.
53. That's 31 ug/100ml higher than the acceptable work limit for Cumbria police.
54. This is not a minor deviation.
55. This should be considered in the context that the evidential samples were taken two hours and thirty-four minutes after the Officers rostered start time, and approximately two hours after the Officer arrived for work at 08:41 hours. It is, therefore, a reasonable conclusion that the level of alcohol in her body upon arrival to her workplace would have been, more likely than not, higher than the evidential samples provided.
56. This is supported by the fact that the relevant indicative test was 40 ug/100ml at 9:16 hours, 34 minutes after she was seen on CCTV to drive into the works car park.
57. All Officers, including PS Boyd have a responsibility to keep the public safe. Whilst the Officer states she was in a restricted and non-public facing role at the time of the event, she was still on-duty, and involved in the administration of police matters, which ultimately affect public service.
58. Officers should not be on duty, whilst intoxicated and cognitively impaired in any capacity.
59. I have also noted that in the unchallenged statement of PC D, he states he deployed to PS Boyd's house that that day because the Professional Standards Unit (PSD) told him that they had received intelligence that PS Boyd been in work whilst under the influence of alcohol and she was potentially driving over the prescribed limit to work.

60. I am mindful that this was referred to in the statement as 'intelligence', and without any accompanying evaluation code, the suggested veracity or reliability of this intelligence is unknown to me.
61. However, it is a fact that when PC D deployed to investigate this intelligence, PS Boyd was subsequently found to blow over the legal limit at the roadside test and was also later found to be in work under the influence of alcohol. One can reasonably infer from this that the intelligence was found to be relatively accurate (notwithstanding there were no drink driving criminal matters pursued).
62. I have borne in mind that findings of fact must be based on evidence and not on speculation. The decision on whether the facts in issue have been proved to the requisite standard must be based on all the available evidence; the 'broad canvas' of the evidence. Essentially, I should consider each piece of evidence in the context of all the other evidence.
63. Given the facts of this case are accepted, and the indicative and evidential readings are not disputed, I have not had to attach any weight to this intelligence when determining whether the AA has proven their case or not.
64. Nevertheless, submissions from PS Boyd during the hearing suggested this was an isolated lapse by her, and that the Officer did not know she was over the on-duty limit for work.
65. The intelligence referred to in the statement from PC D did provide a degree of doubt in my mind that this was an isolated matter, because the chronological way in which the intelligence was disseminated and acted upon means there must have been sufficient previous concern about the conduct of PS Boyd to prompt the PSD being alerted.

#### **Determination of Facts - conclusion.**

66. The officer has already accepted the facts, but in considering all the above evidence I also **find all the allegations (a, b, c and d) proven on the balance of probabilities.**

#### **Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.**

67. The AA alleged that PS Boyd's conduct breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

Discreditable Conduct – Police Officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence.

Fitness for Duty - Police Officers when on duty or presenting themselves for duty are fit to carry out their responsibilities

The Officer has accepted the key facts that:

- She drove to work, arriving at approximately 08:45 hours
- Provided an indicative breath sample of 40ug/100ml at 9:16 hours whilst on duty
- Provided an evidential breath sample of 31 ug/100ml at 10:34 & 10:39 hours whilst on duty
- Was in breach of Cumbria Police's acceptable alcohol limit at work, namely zero

**I find that she has breached both relevant standards of professional behaviour.**

### **Seriousness / Level of Misconduct**

68. I have considered the seriousness of PS Boyd conduct and in doing so I have referred myself to the four-stage approach as laid down in the College of Policing guidelines on outcomes in misconduct proceedings.

### **Culpability**

69. Culpability denotes the Officer's blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions. The more culpable or blameworthy the behaviour in question, the more serious the misconduct and the more severe the likely outcome.
70. PS Boyd held the rank of Sergeant and had been entrusted to work out of community based multiagency hub. Even though the Officer was restricted, as a Sergeant you are seen as a role model. A Sergeant's behaviour is pivotal in setting the culture and performance in a locality. PS Boyd would have been viewed as a leader by those around her, both in the police and partner agencies.
71. The College of Policing guidance for ethical and professional behaviour in policing states that supervisors should act as role models of professional behaviour ensuring that decisions are consistent with the ethical policing principles, with a clear alignment between what they say and what they do.
72. PS Boyds conduct was the antithesis of positive role modelling.
73. Furthermore, the guidance for ethical and professional behaviour in policing it states that if an Officer believes they are unfit to undertake their role or are impaired for duty, it should

be declared to the appropriate person as soon as practicable. It also states that Officers should not make themselves unfit or impaired for work because of the misuse of substances.

74. Whilst the Officer has said that she did not realise she was unfit for work, she is an experienced Officer. She would have known how much alcohol she had consumed, and at what time she stopped. She should have been able to reasonably foresee the risk that that she would have been unfit to work at her scheduled shift time (and arrival time), and that there was a heightened risk that she may provide a breath sample that would exceed the acceptable limit in a roadside test.
75. Had she not felt well enough for work or even suspected that she was not fit to work or drive through alcohol, then she should have absented herself properly and reported sick.
76. PS Boyd is fully responsible for her actions.
77. I found the level of culpability in this case to be **high**.

## **Harm**

78. Professional standards within policing is a matter of national concern and whilst no-one has been actually harmed, public confidence would have been significantly harmed had the circumstances been known.
79. The purpose of the misconduct regime is to ensure that high standards are maintained in policing. By presenting for work in an unfit state PS Boyd displayed behaviour that undermined discipline and good order within the police service, even though it hasn't resulted in direct harm to individuals.
80. The Officer was not in a public facing role at the time but was still present in work in a multiagency setting and was involved in police related administration. This would be a role that ultimately supports the delivery of service to the public, and the public would expect that someone entrusted to do so would have been fully fit to perform their role effectively and safely. The risk of harm or consequence resulting from impaired decision making should not be undermined.
81. I found the level of harm in this case to be **high**.

### **Aggravating Factors**

82. The Officer has not been found to be evidentially over the drink drive limit. However, the Officer accepts that she provided a breath sample of 40ug/100ml during a preliminary breath test conducted approximately half an hour after she was seen to drive into work. This was essentially classed a “fail at the roadside”, resulting in her arrest. Even though the later evidential samples were lower, such that no criminal charges followed, at the time of this incident Cumbria Constabulary was operating a drink drive awareness / reduction campaign over the festive period. The Officers' actions would have significantly undermined this campaign. It sends a conflicting message to those members of the public who the police try to positively influence.
83. I have been careful not to either double count or exaggerate matters when considering the aggravating factors. I accept that by admitting the facts PS Boyd also accepts she breached force policy, and therefore I considered whether this should be additionally classed as an aggravating feature in the case. However, being on duty whilst experiencing the highly elevated levels of alcohol in her body was a *significant* deviation from force policy. The acceptable workplace setting is zero. The Officer blew 40 and 31 in the respective tests which is significantly over the limit. This should also be considered in the context that the evidential test was obtained two hours after she paraded on duty.

### **Mitigating Factors**

84. The Officer admitted the facts and showed remorse for her actions.
85. The Officer was cooperative with PC D and those attending to her.
86. Submissions were made that this was an isolated occurrence. However, the intelligence report cast some doubt on this, and as a result I attached reduced weight to mitigation on this specific point.
87. I have considered that the Officer was experiencing difficulties in her personal life at the time and was experiencing stress. I do have sympathy in that regard. However, I have not been provided with any specific medical evidence to assist me in firmly establishing that the Officer's mental ill health or stress materially affected her actions. Therefore, whilst I do sympathise with the Officer's personal situation, it cannot outweigh the culpability, harm or

aggravating features. The interests of the profession, and the primary need to maintain public confidence carries greater weight than mitigation in favour of an individual Officer<sup>5</sup>.

### **Seriousness – Conclusion**

**88.** In the light of my findings above, I have concluded that seriousness was at a high level and that this **is a case that amounts to gross misconduct.**

### **Stage two – Outcome**

**89.** I referred myself to overriding purpose of the misconduct regime which is:

- to maintain public confidence and the reputation of the police service
- to uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct
- to protect the public

**90.** In relation to the seriousness of the misconduct, I had already considered this and made no significant changes when revisiting it at stage two. I did however re-consider the personal mitigation offered by the Officer.

**91.** I had sight of and considered PS Boyd's service record and saw that there were no other live disciplinary findings.

**92.** I read and considered the two separate character statements provided, which outlined some evidence of positive police service prior to this matter.

**93.** Personal mitigation was considered, although its impact was limited.<sup>6</sup>

**94.** I was alert to the fact that the purpose of misconduct proceedings is not to punish an Officer<sup>7</sup>. I reminded myself that any outcome may have a punitive effect upon the Officer and that the outcome should be no more than necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings.

**95.** I also recognised that where an outcome is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings, I must impose that outcome even if, in doing so it may lead to significant consequences for the individual Officer.

**96.** The AA submitted that pursuant to regulation 17 of the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025, the Officer should be

---

<sup>5</sup> *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512

<sup>6</sup> *Williams v Police Appeals Tribunal* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin). See also the 'Personal mitigation' section of the College of Policing guidance on outcomes on police disciplinary proceedings.

<sup>7</sup> *Chaudhury v General Medical Council* [2002] UKPC 41.

dismissed without notice unless the Chair is satisfied that there are “exceptional circumstances” justifying a final written warning. The AA submitted that there was nothing that can truly be said to be “exceptional” about the “circumstances” of this case, and accordingly the appropriate outcome would be dismissal without notice.

97. Counsel for the Officer, Mr Reed, made submissions that there were exceptional circumstances linked to the Officers’ difficulties, and that this was an isolated lapse. This would permit the consideration of alternative outcomes of a final written warning or a reduction in rank. Given the culpability of the conduct was linked to the Officer being a Sergeant, then Mr Reed submitted that the removal of that rank would be a sufficient and just outcome.
98. However, there was nothing that I considered to fulfil the definition of exceptional circumstances. Whilst I make no attempt to undermine the level of upset the Officer was experiencing at the time of the incident, I was not presented with any additional information as to how this matter could be classed as exceptional beyond the stresses that many other Officers could experience at some point in their career.

#### **Stage two – Conclusion on Outcome**

99. I therefore concluded that **the most appropriate outcome is a finding that Officer is dismissed without notice** and that this sanction does fulfil the purpose of the misconduct regime.
100. I acknowledge the Officer's previous service and personal issues, however, this would not allow me to impose a lesser outcome, given the serious nature of my findings.

#### **Barred List**

101. The Officer should be placed on the barred list.

#### **Right of Appeal**

102. In accordance with Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 the Officer has a right to appeal to a Police Appeals Tribunal against the findings and outcome of a misconduct hearing.

ACO Sarah Jackson. Chair.

22<sup>nd</sup> September 2026