Written Decision of Accelerated Misconduct Hearing
Regulation 62 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020
30th October 2026

Reasons for determination:

1.Introduction

1.1 This is my determination in the accelerated misconduct proceedings relating to Former Special Constable [Redacted], a former Serving Special Constable from Humberside Police.

1.2 They resigned from the organisation on 9th June 2026 after less than one year's service as a Special Police Constable and as such I will refer to them as 'the Former Officer'.

1.3 An application was made by the Former Officer for anonymity. Pursuant to Regulation 59 of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing must be held in Public, however the chair may give such directions as they think appropriate prohibiting the publication of any matter relating to the hearing.

1.4 All parties should have an opportunity to make submissions on this issue, and the appropriate authority has acknowledged the application and raised no objection. The email from the former officer raised this issue themselves on the 10th October 2026.

1.5 The Home Office Guidance (HOG), at para 11.84, provides a list of factors for a Chair to consider when determining whether a hearing/part of a hearing should be conducted in private. These include, at (d), the involvement or naming of any children. I have also considered the case of Newsquest and the factors contained within.

1.6 I have considered that the Former Officer's daughter has article 8 rights just as the Former Officer does, and that they are a third party who has done no wrongdoing.

1.7 One of the allegations the Former Officer faces relates to child neglect of her daughter. I am concerned that there could be a jigsaw identification of the daughter. For example, if the Officer's name is unredacted, and the child is named as the daughter, but the daughter's name is redacted, she might nevertheless be identified in those circumstances.

1.8 Therefore, pursuant to Regulation 59 Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 I imposed a reporting restriction. There must be no reporting of any matter that may identify the daughter of the Former Officer. This includes reference to the Former Officer's name or her daughter's name."

2.Representation

2.1 The appropriate authority was represented at the hearing by Detective Chief Inspector Craig Atkin.

2.2 The Former Officer chose not to attend the accelerated misconduct hearing, despite being given notice of it. The Former Officer was informed of her right to be legally represented at the hearing even in their absence and has agreed that the hearing may proceed in their absence and without representation. The Former Officer submitted a written response pursuant to Regulation 54, which I have read.

2.3 I have considered Regulation 57(3)(b) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, and I was content to proceed in the Former Officer's absence.

3.Allegations

3.1 I am satisfied that the Former Officer was served with notice of accelerated misconduct proceedings outlining the following conduct, which, if proven, was assessed as amounting to gross misconduct:

3.2 Background / Facts

a. On Wednesday 22nd April 2026 Special Superintendent Joe Broderick in formed the Professional Standards Department of concerns regarding the Former Officer.

b. S/Supt Broderick had been contacted by the Former Officer's Social Worker, querying the Former Officer's shifts, as her daughter had disclosed to her school that her mother had been picked up one night by a male and she had then been left at home alone.

c. S/Supt Broderick confirmed that the Former Officer had conducted a shift on Friday 17thApril 2026 with another Special Constable, this being the day in question.

d. On Thursday 23rd April 2026 a Strategy Meeting took place involving Humberside Police, Children's Services and the child's school. On Friday 24th April 2026 the child was visited at school and confirmed the original disclosure.

e. The Former Officer was then arrested for the offence of Child Neglect.

f. When served with notices under Regulation 17 and 11 at her home address, the Former Officer was also asked to return her Police Equipment. It was then disclosed that her Pava Spray had been kept in her personal vehicle, parked on a public road together with other Police equipment.

g. On the 3rd June 2026 the Former Officer accepted a conditional caution for the offence of child neglect.

4.Interview

4.1 The Former Officer was initially interviewed on 24 April 2026. During the interview the officer admits to leaving her daughter at home alone on the 17th April 2026 whilst undertaking duties as a Special Constable with Humberside Police.

4.2 She states that she has been struggling to look after herself and her child and had become fixated on becoming a regular Police Officer in order to provide better for her daughter. On the evening of the 17th she had mixed up whether her childcare would be available or not.

4.3 She had previously synchronised her daughter's iPad to her own phone, so when her daughter started messaging other family members saying she was alone and scared, the Former Officer was able to see these messages on her own phone.

4.4 She then panicked and asked her work partner to take her home. As she had done so in a rush, having seen her daughter's messages, she did not have time to store her uniform and equipment properly, hence it was left with the PAVA spray in her own vehicle, parked on the public road outside her house.

5.Burden and standard of proof

5.1 The burden of proof is on the Appropriate Authority to prove that the Former Officer behaved in the manner alleged and that, in doing so, she breached the standards of professional behaviour.

5.2 The standard of proof is on the balance of probabilities. The Appropriate Authority must further satisfy me that the manner of the breaches is of such a nature or degree that it amounts to gross misconduct.

6.Former Officer's Response

6.1 The Former Officer submitted a written response under Regulation 54 on the 19th October 2026. In this response she confirms that her conduct amounted to gross misconduct and that she does not dispute either allegation. She recognises the seriousness of the matters and does not seek to minimise this or avoid responsibility for her own actions. She acknowledges that she was arrested in connection with the neglect of her child and that she accepted a conditional caution.

6.2 The Former Officer has now completed the conditions of her caution and is focused on learning from her mistakes and rebuilding her relationship with her family. She is now pregnant with her third daughter. At the time she was a single parent and suffering with complex trauma from many years of domestic and sexual abuse. She apologises for her actions and conduct.

7.Determination of conduct

7.1 In making my determination in relation to the alleged misconduct, I have assessed all evidence put before me and have had regard to the College of Policing Guidance and Home Office Statutory Guidance.

7.2 I remind myself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime, namely:

(i)To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
(ii)To uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct; and
(iii)To protect the public.

7.3 I have considered the representations made on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and the Officer within her response and interview, where the seriousness of the alleged conduct is agreed.

7.4 Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 defines 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.*

7.5 Whilst recognising that the officer has themselves admitted to the allegations being made and acknowledged the seriousness of the misconduct, I have nevertheless considered all the available evidence myself. In doing so I have considered whether, in the absence of any such admission, the allegations would, on the balance of probabilities, still be proven.

7.6 I have determined that the following facts are proven: 7.6.1 On 17 April 2026, the former officer was on shift as a Special Constable for Humberside Police, their duty was between

19:45hrs to 02:02hrs on 18 April 2026. While undertaking this duty, they left their seven-year-old daughter at home by herself.

7.6.2 On 3 June 2026, the former officer accepted an Adult Conditional Caution for child neglect in respect of leaving their daughter home alone on the night of 17 April 2026 into the morning of 18 April 2026.

7.6.3 On 25 April 2026, following a Special Constable shift, the former officer had taken home their police issue PAVA spray and left this in their personal vehicle overnight, parked on a public road.

7.7 As a result, I am satisfied that the following breaches of the standards of professional behaviour are proven:

•Discreditable Conduct

8.Determination whether the behaviour amounted to Misconduct or Gross Misconduct

8.1 Misconduct means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross Misconduct means, as amended by Schedule 1 of the Regulations, "*a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious that the officer concerned would have been dismissed if the officer had not ceased to be a member of a police force or a special constable".*

8.2 In determining whether these breaches amounted to gross misconduct or simple misconduct, I assessed the seriousness by reference to the Former Officer's culpability, the harm caused, the existence of aggravating factors and the existence of mitigating factors. In doing so, I considered all the representations made by and on behalf of both the AA and the Former Officer.

8.3 For ease of reference I will refer to the allegation in two parts; part one being that relating to the alleged child neglect and receipt of a conditional caution; part two being that relating to the use of PAVA spray.

8.4 I found that the Former Officer was culpable to a high degree in relation to part one of the allegation, having made a conscious decision to leave their child at home alone and undertake special constabulary duties. The circumstances of part two arose unexpectedly, but only as a direct result of the Former Officer's own actions; in that she had to rush home once she realised her daughter was scared, without time to properly store the equipment. Had she not left her daughter though, these circumstances would not have arisen. She is therefore also culpable in part two.

8.5 The Former Officer has accepted a conditional caution for a criminal offence of child neglect. This is now formally recorded and is disclosable in any future criminal proceedings involving this officer.

8.6 The conduct involves a vulnerable person; namely the Former Officer's own child, who was by her actions neglected.

8.7 In respect of part one, the harm in this case was both reputational and personal. I found that it would undermine public confidence in policing if the circumstances were known. The public expect discipline and good order from police officers at all times. The public expect the vulnerable to be supported and treated with compassion and professionalism. A reasonable and informed member of the public would consider the Former Officer's behaviour to have been negligent and to have put her child at risk of harm. They would not have trust and confidence in this Former Officer to care for others who are vulnerable. I believe that if the circumstances were known, they would seriously undermine public confidence in the police service. The conditional caution is now recorded and will need to be disclosed and therefore become known, should the Former Officer be involved in any future criminal proceedings or similar.

8.8 In respect of part two of the allegation, the harm is much less significant. This is a matter from which learning could well be drawn.

8.9 Being careful not to double count, the factors already highlighted in relation to the culpability and harm of part one, are nevertheless aggravating factors. However, as they have already been taken into account when assessing culpability and harm, I do not consider them as separate aggravating factors.

8.10 In mitigation, the Former Officer has highlighted that they themselves were vulnerable at the time. They have made frank admissions and accepted responsibility for their actions. They have not sought to diminish the seriousness of the matters. They have demonstrated genuine remorse and an intent to improve their behaviour, conduct and personal situation that was contributing to their vulnerability.

8.11 Taking all of these factors into consideration, I found that the behaviour, in relation to part one of the allegation, was so serious as would justify dismissal if the officer was still serving. These breaches do, therefore, constitute Gross Misconduct.

……

9.Determination of sanction

9.1 Having already concluded that the conduct was very serious I turned to consideration of the appropriate outcome at stage 2.

9.2 In reaching my decision regarding the disciplinary outcome of this case, I have given due consideration to all of the evidence and information put before me. I have also considered the following:

- The former officers' police records;
- The evidence provided by, and the submissions made by, the Appropriate Authority;
- The nature of the allegations;
- The interests of the public;
- The interests of Humberside Police.

9.3 I had regard to the following authorities:

a. *Bolton v. Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512 at 519A*: "A profession's most valuable asset is its collective reputation and the confidence which that inspires".

b. *Redgrave v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis [2003] 1 WLR 1136 at [33]*, citing Ziderman's case with approval: "The purpose of disciplinary proceedings … is … to protect the public … and to maintain the high standards and good reputation of the honourable profession".

c. *R (Green) v Police Complaints Authority [2004] UKHL 6 at [78]:* "Public confidence in the police is a factor of great importance in the maintenance of law and order in the manner which we regard 7s appropriate in our polity. If citizens feel that improper behaviour on the part of police officers is left unchecked and they are not held accountable for it in a suitable manner, that confidence will be eroded". Recently cited with approval in The Chief Constable of Sussex Police v Police Appeals Tribunal and another [2017] EWHC 2333 (Admin).

d. *In R (Coke-Wallis) v Institute of Chartered Accountants, [2011] UKSC at [60]* Lord Collins reaffirmed the purpose of professional disciplinary proceedings to be (emphasis added):

e. "*…to protect the public, to maintain public confidence in the integrity of the profession, and to uphold proper standards of behaviour":* see eg Bolton v Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512, 518, per Sir Thomas Bingham MR; Gupta v General Medical Council [2002] 1 WLR 1691, para 21, per Lord Rodger of Earlsferry. E. *Chief Constable of Wiltshire Police v The Police Appeals Tribunal (Paul Woollard interested party)[2012] EWHC 3288 (Admin) at [53]* , the panel will keep the high standards of

honesty and integrity expected of professional men and women, including police officers, well in mind in determining both the substantive issue and the issue of sanction in the case.

9.4 I have followed the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes and reminded myself of the three stages in determining the appropriate outcome:

i. The seriousness of the misconduct, taking into account the officer's culpability, the harm caused, aggravating and mitigating factors,
ii. The threefold purpose of misconduct proceedings (which are maintaining public confidence and the reputation of policing; upholding high standards and deterring misconduct; and protecting the public).
iii. And that I must choose the most appropriate outcome that fulfils that purpose, considering the least severe outcomes available first.

9.5 Personal mitigation had been provided which included the Officer's service record and the accounts given in interview and their own written submission as previously identified. However, the weight of personal mitigation will necessarily be limited.

9.6 In these circumstances, an Accelerated Case Hearing concerning a former officer, I am reminded by paragraph 3.32 of the Guidance that where the special conditions apply, disciplinary action can only be to find that the former officer would have been dismissed if still serving.

9.7 I am also reminded that this is a "presumption case" in line with the new Regulations, as gross misconduct is found. That is because the allegations came to the appropriate authority's attention post the commencement date, i.e. 28th May 2025 (that being the 25th April 2026). I must therefore presume dismissal in these circumstances unless "exceptional circumstances" are present.

9.8 Having considered all the available evidence and the submissions made, I do not consider that any exceptional circumstances have been substantiated and in any event this conduct was so serious that the only appropriate sanction would be dismissal. **The Former Officer would therefore have been dismissed without notice, if still serving.**

9.9 As a result **the Former Officer will also be added to the Barred List**.

9.10 Restrictions to publication apply as previously notified.

9.11 The Former Officer has a right to appeal.