CM/67/25

In the matter of a Police Misconduct Hearing pursuant to

The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended)

Northamptonshire Police

("Appropriate Authority")

and

Former Special Constable 3955 Adam Jeskins

("FSC Jeskins")

REPORT UNDER REGULATION 43

OUTCOME OF A POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING

Hearing

The hearing took place virtually on 7-8 October 2026.

Panel

Chair: Assistant Chief Constable Emma James

Independent Panel Members: Elizabeth Nicholls and Bo Kay Fung

Legal Advisor

Simon Barnes (Barrister)

Counsel for the AA

Oliver Thorne

Police Federation Representative for Former Special Constable Jeskins

Stuart Rands

Former Special Constable Adam Jeskins ("FSC Jeskins") did not attend the hearing.

Allegations as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice

1. You joined Northamptonshire Police on 13/07/2015. At all material times, you were subject to the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

2. On 5th October 2024, you were on duty and driving a marked police vehicle registration number KX73 CSL, which you drove:

a. In excess of the speed limit for the road that you were travelling on, without a proper policing purpose.

b. At excessive speed, reaching 106mph.

c. At speed past road works, in a section of the motorway where the speed limit had been reduced to protect workers.

d. Using the vehicle's lights and siren without a proper policing purpose.

3. You failed to make any record of an operational rationale for using the exemptions afforded to police officers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

4. On 9th October 2024, Warwickshire Police issued a Notice of Intended Prosecution in respect of an alleged offence of speeding at 10:00 on 5th October 2024.

5. You completed that notice on the 17th October 2024 and applied for an exemption. On that form, you declared that you had been "travelling back on the M6 motorway at 80mph as an enforcement speed in a fully marked Police Traffic Car." That was untrue, and you knew it to be untrue and you relied upon it to avoid action being taken against you for a criminal offence.

6. Your conduct in paragraph 2, above, breached the standards of Orders and Instructions and Discreditable Conduct.

7. Your conduct at paragraph 3, above, represents a breach of the standard of Duties and Responsibilities.

8. Your conduct at paragraph 5, above, breached the standards of Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct.

9. Your conduct represents Gross Misconduct in that it involves breaches of the criminal law and a dishonest attempt to rely on your position as a constable to avoid responsibility. Your conduct risks undermining public trust and confidence in Northamptonshire Police.

If proven, this is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour for:

- Orders and Instructions
- Discreditable conduct
- Duties and Responsibilities

Based on the information available at this time the conduct described above if proven or admitted has been assessed as amounting to: Gross Misconduct

[References to "Regulations" are to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended)]

Background

1. FSC Jeskins was a volunteer Special Constable, attached to a roads policing team. He resigned with immediate effect on 20 August 2026.

2. The case concerns allegations that FSC Jeskins was caught speeding whilst out of the county of Northamptonshire and on duty in a police vehicle. He received a Notice of Intended Prosecution ("NIP") from Warwickshire Police. It is alleged that he then applied for an exemption from prosecution on the basis that he was speeding for police purposes and that, in doing so, he dishonestly made statements which he knew to be untrue in order to avoid prosecution.

3. On 24 December 2024, an integrity report was submitted to the AA by an anonymous source. The report stated that there was dishonesty relating to the circumstances provided by FSC Jeskins in relation to the exemption application.

4. The AA undertook a local investigation led by DC Ryan Smedley. Initially the matter was treated as both a criminal (perverting the course of justice) and a misconduct investigation. It was subsequently decided that there would be no further action in respect of the criminal investigation.

5. In summary, the AA's case is that the FSC Jeskins did not have a proper policing purpose when he broke the speed limit and that he then dishonestly sought to rely on a police exemption in order to avoid responsibility for his actions.

6. FSC Jeskins' position is that he accepted that he was speeding but was doing so for a proper policing purpose which he could not remember due to the passage of time. He accepted that he did not make any records of what the policing purpose had been but maintained that he had acted with honesty and integrity at all times. He denied Gross Misconduct.

Proceeding in absence

7. FSC Jeskins did not attend the hearing. Mr Rands confirmed that FSC Jeskins was aware of his right to legal representation under Regulation 8. The AA confirmed, and the Panel accepted, that FSC Jeskins had been properly served with the case papers. The Panel therefore considered whether to proceed in his absence. The Panel accepted the advice of the Legal Advisor that it should apply the principles in the cases of R. v Jones (No.2) [2002] UKHL 5 and more recently GMC v Adeogba; and GMC v Visvardis [2016] EWCA Civ 162.

8. The Panel noted that in his written statement to the Panel FSC Jeskins stated:

> *"Please don't take my absence from the hearing as a lack of engagement or interest in this process, nor that of either shying away from the allegation or as a sign of guilt, this process has been going on for a significant period of time, the impact it has had on me has been substantial and I am keen to try and move on the remainder of my life."*

9. The Panel was satisfied that FSC Jeskins was aware of the hearing and of his right to attend and he had voluntarily absented himself. Whilst there would inevitably be a degree of disadvantage to him by not attending the hearing, the Panel was satisfied that it was in the public interest to proceed and that an adjournment would be unlikely to secure his attendance at a future date. Accordingly, the Panel decided to proceed in his absence.

The AA's case

10. All of the evidence before the Panel was documentary evidence, consisting of a bundle of 171 pages which the Panel had considered in advance of the hearing.

11. The documents included a copy of the Notice of Intended Prosecution ("NIP") issued by Warwickshire Police dated 9 October 2024 confirming that the police

vehicle which FSC Jeskins had been driving had been recorded by an automatic camera as travelling at 81mph at 10.00 on 5 October 2024 at J3-J2 on the southbound part of the M6 motorway where the speed limit was 70mph.

12. In his witness statement, PC 1445 stated that on 14 October 2024 he was in the Safer Roads Team office along with other staff and FSC Jeskins. He recalled FSC Jeskins asking the supervisor, a member of the Safer Roads Team, for his assistance in completing an exemption for a Notice of Intended Prosecution ("NIP"). The supervisor agreed. PC 1445's recollection is that FSC Jeskins then stated words to effect that he was travelling at an enforcement speed but was also late to a cadet meeting. This sounded odd to PC 1445 because, in his view, you were either carrying out enforcement or speeding because you were late. He recalled that the supervisor replied that FSC Jeskins should come and see him to discuss. PC 1445 was not present during any subsequent conversation between them. However, he remembered their conversation in the office.

13. In an email exchange on 14 October 2024, the supervisor sent FSC Jeskins an email titled 'out for force exemption' in which he stated "[c]omplete this based on the patrol speed element we discussed". FSC Jeskins replied stating "[t]hank you. Can you have a read of the attached before I send it for approval please? Does this sound like a justified policing purpose to you?" In his draft response to the NIP, FSC Jeskins had stated:

> *"Returning into Northamptonshire from completing a convoy escort for the Ride to the Wall event. Travelling back on the M6 motorway at 80mph as an enforcement speed to*
>
> *a) avoid effectively creating a rolling roadblock behind a fully marked police traffic car,*
>
> *b) prevent the creation of a 'bubble' of traffic around the vehicle,*
>
> *c) to reduce the risk of distraction from members of the public by my presence and*

d) to ensure traffic flowed freely around me"

14. The supervisor replied stating "I would suggest taking out the examples and just leave it as travelling at a patrol / enforcement speed." FSC Jeskins appeared to accept this advice. In his submitted response to the NIP, he admitted that he was the driver and stated that he was:

> *"Returning into Northamptonshire from completing a convoy escort for the Ride to the Wall event. Travelling back on the M6 motorway at 80mph as an enforcement speed in a fully marked Police Traffic Car".*

15. FSC Jeskins' response to the NIP was signed off by his line manager on 16 October 2024, and by his Authorising Manager, the supervisor, on 17 October 2024. A senior caseworker in Warwickshire Police subsequently confirmed that the force's process in October 2024 meant that these two authorisations were sufficient for them to approve the exemption.

16. An important issue in this case is what is meant by 'enforcement speed'. There were differing understandings between the witnesses. PC 1445's understanding (which accorded with that of FSC Jeskins) is that on a multi lane highway it involved driving faster than the traffic in order to get a view into vehicles that the police officer is passing on the near side to see if the drivers are committing offences. This would usually be 10 miles an hour faster than the traffic was moving and would not involve the use of emergency warning equipment because that would alert other drivers to the police presence.

17. However, in an email to the Investigating Officer on 4 August 2025, Chief Inspector Ian Wills of the AA's Roads Policing Team provided a different view. He stated that:

> *"I would described [sic] patrol speed as that being below that of the posted speed limit. For example, on a motorway this would be below 70mph, usually between 55 – 60 mph, to allow vehicles travelling at normal road speed to be able to overtake a police vehicle without*

contravening the speed limit. Enforcement speed would be where you are responding to a definitive set of circumstances such as following a vehicle to capture evidence of its manner of driving / speed. Therefore, the speed of the Police vehicle would be to match that of the subject vehicle and as such might require the use of our exemptions to the Road Traffic Act.

In the circumstances you described I would not consider the actions of the officer to be using their exemptions for a policing purpose or to lawfully undertaking their duty in regards these exemptions. A Policing purpose would be a deployment from the FCR [Force Control Room], being attached to an incident or the driver being able to demonstrate a policing outcome such as a traffic process or traffic offence report."

18. As part of his investigation, the Investigating Officer, DC Smedley, produced a Driving Standards Audit report dated 13 October 2025. This was compiled using:

- the mapping system for police officer radios;
- UK telematics which shows a police vehicle's location, along with the actions of the vehicle;
- Pronto Manager – the Northamptonshire Police system which logs all activities including the use of an officer's pocket notebook; and
- PNC – the Police National Computer, which officers use to conduct vehicle or person checks, when either behind a moving vehicle, or having stopped a vehicle.

19. The data in that report showed that on 5 October 2024 FSC Jeskins had initially travelled along the M1 (Northamptonshire) and M6 (Warwickshire) consistent with his role in accompanying the 'Ride to the Wall' event. He then turned back to travel south along the M6 whereas the other officers in the convoy continued further into Warwickshire. At10:00 hours his car was captured driving at 81mph by a speed enforcement camera. Telematics data then showed that at 10:06:57 hours FSC Jeskins' car speeds up to 90mph with emergency blue lights activated. After that the data shows FSC Jeskins travelling at speed, reaching

101mph at 10:08:36 hours, before reducing the speed by almost half, travelling at 55 mph at 10:09:28. The front and rear blue lights and flashing headlights are deactivated. At 10:09:57 hours, the vehicle's emergency lights are reactivated, and are only deactivated at 10:25:34 hours. During that time, the sirens are activated and deactivated intermittently, with speeds of the vehicle showing between 52 mph and 106mph.

20. Based on the locations, the data showed that FSC Jeskins' police vehicle travelled 20 miles whilst displaying its blue lights and sirens. During this time, there was nothing within the telematics to show that the vehicle had stopped. The data then shows that after leaving the M1 Motorway, his vehicle travelled to Salt House Road, Brackmills where it came to a stop and the engine was turned off. PNC data showed that no PNC vehicles checks were conducted on this date by FSC Jeskins. An audit on Pronto Manager, showed no input into his electronic pocket notebook.

21. Evidence from the Northamptonshire Emergency Services Cadets Unit Commander was that an in-person cadet training session had been arranged for 5 October 2024 between 9am to 2pm at Giffard House, with FSC Jeskins as the trainer. They confirmed that FSC Jeskins had been expected to arrive at 10am, but they could not remember if FSC Jeskins had arrived late.

22. Entry data from the Salt House Road site shows FSC Jeskins leaving at 10:32 hours on 5 October 2024 and arriving at the Giffard House site at 10:43 hours the same day.

23. On 27 October 2025, FSC Jeskins was interviewed on suspicion of perverting the course of public justice; and suspected professional misconduct. He explained that it had been agreed that he would turn around when the convoy had got past the key motorway junctions because he had a series of other engagements that day. He said that on his return journey he was policing in his normal style in full uniform in a fully marked police traffic vehicle on the motorway travelling at

fluctuating speed but up to plus 10 which they (roads policing officers) patrol by on a motorway. At some point he was caught by a speed camera. He continued back to Salthouse, booked off, de-kitted and got back in his own car and then carried on to his other events that day. He subsequently received the NIP and recalled that he had been patrolling on the motorway.

24. He explained that when he was back in the office on 14 October, he asked to speak with the supervisor about the NIP and whether he could apply for an exemption as a patrol speed of plus 10 or whether he would have to take a speed awareness course. The supervisor said he can sort it out and to come and see him later. FSC Jeskins did that – he had only ever had one NIP before and this was the only one he had to fill in himself, so he wanted some advice. The supervisor advised that plus 10mph is nationally accepted and he approves them frequently. FSC Jeskins stated that he therefore completed the NIP confirming he was the driver and had just come back into the county at patrol speed. He did not believe he had done anything incorrect in the process. He went on to state that when he had finished the escort, he went to Gifford House to do some leader training relating to the county TRI-service cadet program which was in his diary between 11am and 1pm.

25. FSC Jeskins explained that he was driving at 10mph over the speed limit because the presence of a marked police vehicle has a ripple effect and creates a bubble round a vehicle, meaning that people start to focus on their speed rather than their driving and it effectively creates a rolling road block. Therefore, roads policing officers never travel at the speed limit on a motorway because effectively they get a 'wall of vehicles' behind them and it takes people's attention away from driving. Therefore, they either sit at 60mph to allow traffic to pass, or they travel at plus 10mph which means that they don't get that 'ripple effect' because public drivers are not catching them up. This also allows them to look into vehicles at the same time to detect offences on the motorway. He said that plus 10mph or minus 10mph is 'patrol speed'.

26. PC 1445's statement was put to him. FSC Jeskins denied that he had claimed an exemption because he had been running late which would be dishonest. He was asked for his understanding of the term 'enforcement speed' and stated that patrol speed and enforcement speed is one of the same thing – i.e. travelling at plus 10 or minus 10 to detect traffic offences. He could not recall carrying out any specific enforcement that day such as issuing tickets, nor had he documented any in his pocket notebook, or requested any PNC checks of vehicles. He was asked about whether he was he told or trained that there was the plus 10 minus 10 'rule'. He replied that:

> *"…plus 10 minus 10 is national practice um so we reduce the risk of having that bubble effect and impacting on road safety for people slowing down, so that's where I've had it from. I don't specifically recall whether I've heard it on any courses.*
>
> *[…]*
>
> *I know other forces do it because I've done some training with them and they talk about it as well. Again, nothing on, nothing formal. I I wouldn't be able to tell you."*

27. He was asked why he had reached speeds of over 100mph and stated he could not give a rationale as it was a year ago. He accepted that he was not attached to a police incident at the time but insisted that he would have had a policing reason which he could not now recall. He denied he was driving in that way because he was late. His only logical answer was that he must have used the matrix board in the rear of his vehicle to flash up a message to the driver of a vehicle that he'd caught up with, the driver had then slowed down and he did not then have the evidence to prosecute him. He could not remember, but he had never activated his blue lights for a non-policing reason. The conversation overheard by PC 1445 had been misinterpreted.

28. He was asked why he had changed his response to the NIP. He stated that he was advised by the supervisor that he did not need to explain the reasons for

doing plus 10 because it was deemed nationally accepted. It was put to him that the reasons contained in his first draft response to the NIP were nothing to do with enforcement and were more about traffic management. It was also put to him that the supervisor and him had both decided on a term to use in order to create an exemption to which he was not entitled in order to get out of a speeding ticket. FSC Jeskins denied this and stated that if he'd been caught speeding then he would have accepted it.

29. With regard to the alleged conversation with FSC Jeskins in the office, the supervisor stated that he recalled FSC Jeskins making mention that he was travelling for a meeting but was actually conducting enforcement whilst he was doing so. For the supervisor the two things were very different. He took FSC Jeskins' account at face value. He could not recall FSC Jeskins saying that he was late for the meeting. He went on to say that in his view 100mph was not an enforcement speed because it was not possible to see into other vehicles. In his view, enforcement speed would not necessitate activation of blue lights and sirens because officers should only use blue lights and sirens to warn others of their presence, typically when they are responding to something. He stated that 'enforcement speed' and 'patrol speed' were "pretty much the same thing… I think its just a play on words".

30. The supervisor did not ask FSC Jeskins for any evidence of him carrying out enforcement. FSC Jeskins' exemption, as submitted, was put to him and the supervisor stated that there wasn't anything in there which led him to think there was an issue. He stated that, with regard to his conversation with FSC Jeskins which PC 1445 had overheard, PC 1445 had "found 2 and 2 and made 12".

31. With regard to the telematic data showing that FSC Jeskins' blue lights and sirens had been activated on and off periodically and that he had reached speeds of over 100mph, the supervisor agreed that this was not 'enforcement speed' and indicated that FSC Jeskins was driving in that manner because he was late for something. The supervisor stated that if he had looked at the data showing FSC

Jeskin's timed access at Gifford House where he was doing Cadet training, then he would never have approved the exemption. He agreed that he had made a mistake in approving the exemption.

32. In his Regulation 31 response, FSC Jeskins accepted being the driver of the vehicle, but denied dishonesty and any intention to mislead. He stated that any errors made were honest, misguided, and based on a genuine (albeit possibly mistaken) belief as to lawful exemptions and locally accepted practice. He stated that:

> *"...the speed was not reckless or cavalier as he was trained in advanced driving and did not believe the manner of driving fell below expected standards. The officer accepts lights/sirens were used intermittently. Whilst the full reasons for their use cannot be recalled due to the time elapsed since the date of the allegation and lack of a record, their use was intended in good faith, under an honest belief it was permitted for a policing purpose at that time. The officer accepts no contemporaneous written record was made and acknowledges on reflection that he should - as a full and accurate account and explanation around his patrolling and the use of lights could have been provided."*

33. Shortly before the hearing, FSC Jeskins submitted a written statement to the Panel. The AA did not object to its admission although did observe that it should have been submitted much earlier. The Panel allowed the statement to be admitted into evidence. In the statement, FSC Jeskins maintained the position in his Regulation 31 response. He stated that he:

> *"...accepted I was clearly driving under emergency conditions, and advised that I cannot recall or produce records to fully justify my rationale"*

34. At the beginning of the misconduct hearing, Mr Rands confirmed that FSC Jeskins denied Gross Misconduct, but admitted the following elements of the Allegations as set out in the Regulation 30 notice: paragraphs: 2 a-d (but on the basis that had acted with a proper policing purpose); 3; 4; 5 (on the basis that he

completed the notice but denied he had said anything untrue in order to avoid action being taken against him for a criminal offence); 6; and 7. Essentially FSC Jeskins' position was that he did not appear to be disputing that he drove the vehicle at the speeds alleged, but that he did so for a proper policing purpose and had not acted dishonestly.

35. The Panel received and considered oral submissions from Mr Thorne and Mr Rands.

36. On behalf of the AA, Mr Thorne confirmed that FSC Jeskins was of previous good character. He took the Panel through the evidence in the bundle.

37. On behalf of FSC Jeskins, Mr Rands emphasised his good character and the awards which he had received for his work in the past. He submitted that FSC Jeskins had always identified himself as the driver and had not sought to conceal or deny speeding, nor mislead investigators in his interview. When he received the NIP he sought advice on his draft exemption and whether it constituted a proper policing purpose. He had left an email trail which was evidence that he was not acting dishonestly. He had amended his exemption application on the basis of the advice he received and honestly believed that travelling at enforcement speed was a legitimate exemption.

38. With regard to the overheard conversation in the office, Mr Rands submitted that this was evidence from a single witness and there was no corroborating evidence of the conversation. None of the witnesses at the cadet training meeting could confirm that FSC Jeskins was late. The start times of the meeting were inconsistent. With regard to the telematic data, this was an unreliable system. However, FSC Jeskins did not deny the alleged speeds or use of the sirens and emergency lights and he admitted that he did not record a rationale for this. Mr Rands submitted that this was not proof of dishonesty, just poor record keeping. It did not mean the enforcement activity had not occurred or that FSC Jeskins

had lied on the form.

39. Mr Rands submitted that this was a case of poor judgment, inadequate record keeping and reliance on poorly defined policing practice. FSC Jeskins accepted responsibility for the driving and mistakes had been made. However, he denied any dishonesty.

Facts, Standards of Professional Behaviour and Gross Misconduct

40. The Panel accepted the advice of the Legal Advisor and adopted the following approach:
    a. The burden of proof was on the AA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.
    b. There is no provision in the Regulations for adverse inferences to be drawn as a result of a failure to attend a misconduct hearing and give oral evidence, but ordinarily the public would expect a professional person to give an account of their actions (Iqbal v Solicitors Regulation Authority [2012] EWHC 3251 (Admin)).
    c. Evidence of FSC Jeskins' good character (a lack of disciplinary history) should be taken into account when assessing his credibility and propensity to behave as alleged.
    d. The legal test for dishonesty was as set out in Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd [2017] UKSC 67.
    e. The concept of 'Integrity' was as per the Court of Appeal's decision in Wingate and another v Solicitors Regulation Authority; Solicitors Regulation Authority v Malins [2018] EWCA Civ 366.
    f. Section 87 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 states that no statutory provision imposing a speed limit on motor vehicles shall apply to any vehicle on an occasion when it is being used for [...] police purposes, if the observance of that provision would be likely to hinder the use of the vehicle for the purpose for which it is being used on that occasion.

41. The Panel handed down the following decision orally:

There is no dispute that FSC Jeskins exceeded the legal speed limits and that at one point reached the speed of 106mph and in excess of 100mph several times throughout the journey. It is the Panel's view, that the key issue in this case is whether or not he did so for a proper policing purpose. The Officer's account is that at the time he was caught by the speed camera, he was travelling at what he termed an 'enforcement speed' which was 10 miles an hour above the legal speed limit of 70 miles an hour which would enable him to safely pass other traffic and look into other vehicles to detect offences. He accepts that at other times he drove much faster than that and he does not dispute that he reached 106 miles an hour or that at one point he drove at speed through road works, in a section of the motorway where the speed limit had been reduced to 50 mph to protect workers. He states that he was doing this for a policing purpose which the details of which he cannot recall, he says, due to the passage of time. He accepts that he did not make any records of what that policing purpose was and he admits that he was in error for not doing so.

There is no dispute that the Officer reached the speeds alleged and that at times he also used the police vehicle's lights and sirens. The telematic data gives a detailed breakdown of how the officer drove that day. The Panel rejects the Officer's suggestion, which was made for the first time today, that the telematic data is unreliable. That is the first time that point has been raised, it is unsupported by evidence, and in any event, the Officer does not dispute using the lights and sirens or driving at the speeds alleged.

It is also not in dispute that the Officer was due at a cadet training event after he had finished his police duties.

The Panel accepts the evidence of PC 1445 that, when they were in the Roads Policing office, he overheard the Officer state that the Officer was travelling at an 'enforcement speed', but was also late for a cadet meeting. The Panel has borne in mind that PC 1445 statement is hearsay and that the Panel has not received oral evidence from him. However, the Panel finds PC 1445 written statement to be fair and balanced because he accepts that there were elements of the conversation which he did not hear. The Panel has also given weight to the fact that PC 1445 is a serving police officer who is subject to the Standards of Professional Behaviour and he has given his evidence in the form of a formal witness statement.

The Panel has placed weight upon the fact that FSC Jeskins is a highly experienced Roads Policing Officer. The telematic data indicates that on five occasions he drove at speeds of over 100 miles an hour. In the Panel's view that is too fast for the Officer to have been able, safely, to look into other vehicles and detect offences. Furthermore, the use of the vehicle's lights and sirens makes it less likely that the Officer was seeking to detect offences because using them would have alerted other road users to his presence. In the Panel's view, the most likely policing purpose for driving at speeds of over 100 miles an hour on five occasions would have been because the officer was responding to an incident.

However, the Panel does not find it credible that he would not have remembered any details at all of such incidents – they would have been significant and would have stuck in his memory. That is particularly so because the telematic data shows that he was exceeding the legal speed limits at points when he was not within his own jurisdiction of Northamptonshire, so dealing with any police incidents would necessarily have involved dealing with another police force.

In his statement to the Panel, the Officer talks about driving under 'emergency conditions', but the Panel noted that this is contradicted by

what he wrote in his application for the exemption in which he stated that he had been driving at an 'enforcement speed' which he later explained was to enable him to detect offences in other vehicles. His position is therefore inconsistent. The Panel notes that the supervisor was shown the telematic data showing that the Officer drove with blue lights and sirens are activated on and off having reached speeds of 105- 106mph. The supervisor agreed that this was not 'enforcement speed' and stated that

"[…] he should never have been granted that exemption."

The Panel therefore finds on the balance of probabilities, that FSC Jeskins did not have a proper policing purpose for breaking the speed limit.

With regard to the allegation of dishonesty, the Panel considered the first limb of the Ivey test: what did FSC Jeskins know or believe as to the facts and circumstances in which the alleged dishonesty arose?

The Panel noted that this was not the first NIP which FSC Jeskins had to deal with, so he would have had at least some familiarity with the process. The Panel found it strange that, as a highly experienced Roads Policing Officer, FSC Jeskins had felt the need to seek advice from a supervisor before submitting his exemption form. The Panel noted that FSC Jeskins resiled considerably from the first draft of his exemption application after he had taken advice.

The Panel has concluded that FSC Jeskins was exceeding the speed limit without a proper policing purpose. The Panel therefore find that FSC Jeskins must have known at the time that he did not have a proper policing purpose, meaning that he knew that the information he put in the exemption form was false. Indeed, if FSC Jeskins knew that he was not acting with a proper policing purpose then he would have known that he should not have submitted an application for an exemption at all. In the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the only reason for submitting a

false application for an exemption was because FSC Jeskins sought to avoid action being taken against him for a criminal offence.

With regard to the second limb of the Ivey test, the Panel has found that FSC Jeskins knew that the information he submitted in his exemption application was false. He was an experienced Special Constable who was tasked with enforcing the criminal law. Accordingly, the Panel finds that his conduct was dishonest by the standards of an ordinary decent person.

With regard to the allegation of lack of integrity, the Panel finds that by deliberately making a false declaration in his exemption form, FSC Jeskins also acted without integrity.

For those reasons, and having had regard to FSC Jeskins' admissions, the Panel therefore finds that the facts alleged are proved.

The Panel finds that, by driving at such excessive speeds which broke the criminal law, endangered the public and had no proper policing purpose, FSC Jeskins breached the standards of Orders and Instructions, Discreditable Conduct, and Duties and Responsibilities. The Panel further finds that by then submitting false information in his application for an exemption, he also breached the standard of Honesty and Integrity.

In view of the fact that the Panel has found that FSC Jeskins acted dishonestly and without integrity, and also in view of the fact that he breached the standard of Orders and Instructions by driving at excessive speeds which put the public at risk, the Panel finds that the Officer's conduct risks undermining public trust and confidence in Northamptonshire Police. The Panel can only conclude that his conduct is so serious as to amount to gross *misconduct***.**

Outcome

42. The Panel received oral submissions from Mr Thorne and Mr Rands.

43. Mr Rands emphasised FSC Jeskins' extensive record of public service as a Special Constable and his work with the cadets. He submitted that FSC Jeskins had nothing to gain by lying about the NIP. He drew the Panel's attention to the Home Office Guidance paragraph 1.5 which stated that misconduct and performance procedures should be dealt with at the lowest appropriate managerial level. He confirmed that FSC Jeskins had not submitted any character evidence.

44. The Panel considered FSC Jeskins' record of service.

45. The Panel handed down the following decision orally:

The Panel has had regard to the Home Office Guidance and has followed the approach in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes ("Outcomes Guidance").

The Panel has also had regard to FSC Jeskins' record of service.

Culpability

The Panel finds that the conduct was deliberate, but there is no evidence that it was planned. With regard to the speeding which reached in excess of 100 mph on 5 separate occasions in the journey, coupled with inappropriate use of sirens and blue-lights, the Panel finds that this was intentional and deliberate. FSC Jeskins was a member of a road safety team and yet he chose to drive at excess speed through road works, in a section of the motorway where the speed limit had been reduced to 50 mph to protect workers. He would have been aware of the potentially devastating consequences of driving at those speeds were anything to have gone wrong. Furthermore, he was responsible for training

cadets and to that extent was in a position of trust.

The Panel places weight on paragraph 4.17 of the Outcomes Guidance which states that it is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves. Although the misconduct in this case did not result in the officer being prosecuted, the Panel accepts Mr Thorne's submission that his conduct, in making a false declaration on his exemption application, was conduct which was analogous to perverting the course of justice. Whilst this was not a case of operational dishonesty, the Panel places weight on paragraph 4.28 of the Outcomes Guidance in that this was a case which involved impropriety in connection with an investigation for a criminal offence. The Panel also finds that paragraph 4.29 of the Guidance is engaged in that FSC Jeskins exercised his police powers (to break the speed limit) in bad faith because he knew he did not have a proper policing purpose to drive in that manner and then made a false declaration about it in the exemption form in an attempt to avoid criminal consequences.

The Panel has concluded that his level of culpability is high due to the speeds at which he travelled, and the risks which this caused to the public. The Panel notes that although this was a single journey, he exceeded the speed limit and used the vehicle's lights and sirens on multiple occasions without a proper policing purpose. The Panel has also found that his conduct was dishonest.

Harm

The Panel finds that there is reputational harm to the police which risks undermining public confidence in policing. The Panel places weight on paragraph 4.74 of the Outcomes Guidance which states that where Gross Misconduct has been found and the behaviour has caused – or could have caused – serious harm to individuals, the community and/or public confidence in the police service, dismissal is likely to follow. A factor of the greatest importance is the impact of the misconduct on the standing and reputation of the profession as a whole. Had FSC Jeskins been caught speeding when he was travelling at

over 100 mph, the Panel finds that it is likely that he would have been dealt with severely by the criminal courts.

Aggravating circumstances

The Panel finds the following aggravating factors:

- *The misconduct was sustained in that FSC Jeskins broke the speed limit without a proper policing purpose on a number of occasions (albeit within a single journey) and then went on to make a false declaration in his application for exemption and subsequent interviews. He therefore had a number of opportunities to do the right thing but chose not to do so. To that extent, the Panel finds that the misconduct was a sustained course of behaviour.*

- *The Panel also finds to be a further aggravating factor FSC Jeskins' unevidenced suggestion that PC 1445 might not have been credible because FSC Jeskins was (on his account) the first special constable in Northamptonshire to gain an advanced driver qualification which might have annoyed his colleagues.*

Mitigating circumstances

The Panel finds the following mitigating circumstances:

- *There was no physical harm to any person.*

- *The speeding all took place in the course of one journey*

- *FSC Jeskins has made admissions. However, many of them were related to issues which he was unable to dispute such as telematic data and lack of records.*

Overall conclusion on the spectrum of seriousness

For the reasons given above, the Panel finds the combination of driving at high speeds without a proper policing purpose and then dishonestly making false statements to be very serious.

The Panel has kept in mind the threefold purpose for imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings, namely:

- *Maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;*
- *Upholding the high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and*
- *Protecting the public.*

The Panel notes that paragraph 4.4 of the Outcomes Guidance states that:

"The most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole. This dual objective must take precedence over the specific impact that the sanction has on the individual whose misconduct is being sanctioned."

Outcome

The Panel has taken into account the fact that FSC Jeskins has no previous disciplinary history. The Panel has also considered carefully the information given by him in his written statement. The Panel has not been provided with any character evidence or testimonials. In particular, the Panel has not been provided with any copies of the awards referred to in FSC Jeskins' statement, and therefore limited weight could be applied to this.

The Panel has considered the least serious outcome that no disciplinary action should be imposed. However the Panel has found that this is a very serious case of Gross Misconduct and disciplinary action should be imposed. The Panel therefore concludes that FSC Jeskins would have been dismissed if he had not ceased to be a Special Constable.

Barred List

46. There were no submissions from either party in relation to FSC Jeskins' inclusion on the public Barred List, so the Panel decided not to make any representations to the College of Policing.