

Former PC

DECISION

1. This is the stage 1 decision in an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing involving the Former Officer. She resigned from the Force on 4th January 2026 and is therefore subject to the Former Officer Regulations.
2. The allegations against the former officer are:
 1. *You joined Northamptonshire Police on 2nd August 2021. Your last day of service was 4th January 2026. At all material times, including on a career break between August 2023 and January 2024, you were subject to the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.*
 2. *You breached the standard of professional behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct in that you:*
 - a. *Discussed taking illegal drugs, including the Class A controlled drug cocaine in a positive way in May, September, October and December 2023.*
 - b. *Took controlled drugs, including cocaine, in May, September and December 2023.*
 3. *On 6th August 2023 you failed to attend for duty as required for a shift starting at 07:00hrs. At 13:49, you sent a message to PS [REDACTED] saying that you had not attended*

because you had had to travel to [REDACTED] for a family emergency, when in fact you had been drinking heavily on a night out. That was untrue and was intended to mislead PS [REDACTED] and Northamptonshire Police. You were granted compassionate leave to which you knew you were not entitled. Your conduct breached the standards of Orders and Instructions, Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct.

- 4. On 24th February 2024 you were asked by a friend or acquaintance to conduct a PNC check into a vehicle. You conducted the check without a proper policing purpose and relayed information to the friend or acquaintance. In doing so, you breached the standards of Orders and Instructions, Confidentiality and Honesty and Integrity (Integrity).*
- 5. Further, your conduct on 24th February was a criminal offence, and you were given a police caution on 21st April 2026 for an offence contrary to section 1 (1) and (3) of the Computer Misuse Act 1990. Your conduct breached the standard of Discreditable Conduct.*
- 6. Your conduct represented gross misconduct in that, separately and cumulatively, it would significantly undermine the trust and confidence of the public in Northamptonshire Police and the profession. Your conduct involves dishonesty, want of integrity and the commission of criminal offences. Further, even if your conduct was assessed as misconduct, Regulation 41 (6) of the PCR apply.*

3. There are three distinct allegations: talking positively about drugs and using drugs; giving deliberately false information as to why the former officer could not attend work on 6th August 2023 and obtaining compassionate leave on this basis; and misusing the force computer systems by carrying out a check on 24th February 2024 without a policing purpose.
4. In her Regulation 54 response, the former officer has accepted that her conduct was misconduct but denies that it was gross misconduct. She has made some admissions in her response. At the start of the hearing, the former officer clarified her position. She accepted allegation 2 (a) but denied part (b). She generally admitted misconduct but denied gross misconduct.
5. The underlying factual basis of the allegations are admitted. They are also substantiated by evidence in the bundle. There is incontrovertible evidence to prove the facts. The former officer also admits that there has been a breach of the standards of Professional Behaviour. She admits that the conduct is misconduct but denies that it is gross misconduct.
6. There are some disputes between the parties which I need to resolve:

7. Firstly, the former officer denies using drugs at any time. The AA contends that she did
8. Secondly, there is an issue about the extent of the information the former officer passed on to the third party and whether it was just limited to the fact that the driver had insurance. The AA contended that the information would have included detail of the keeper.
9. Thirdly, there is an issue whether the conduct individually or cumulatively constitutes gross misconduct or just misconduct as admitted by the officer.
10. I have read all the evidence in the bundle and listened to the voice messages. The officer read out a statement which provided some evidence about the disputed matters and also referred to her experience in the force. She is very upset and critical of the force and her treatment at various times by members of the force and PSD and how she considers this has impacted on her life and mental health.
11. I have heard and noted her concerns, they are only relevant for this stage 1 decision in so far as they may have impacted on her actions in respect of these events. The former officer has not provided any evidence that they did so.
12. The former officer was cross-examined about some of the allegations. In the course of her cross-examination about her use of drugs, the former officer indicated that she was

not willing to answer any further questions. She was specifically warned that adverse inferences could be made if she did not answer any questions. She again made clear that she would not answer any questions. She was not therefore asked any further questions about the drug issue or about any further issues.

13. The burden is on the AA to prove the allegations on a balance of probabilities.
14. The former officer denies taking any drugs. She contends that she associated with people who did take drugs and would talk about drugs with her friends to show off in front of her friends. She also pointed out that she had passed three random drug tests during the course of her work and had been tested before she joined the force. When she was pressed about the content of certain messages in cross-examination, she declined to answer any further questions.
15. There are a number of voice messages which mention the use of drugs and where the former officer has specifically referred to her use of drugs. There are eight drug related voice notes. These include her saying that she had been “tanked up on the gear all weekend”. In one message she called her friend “*Pablo Escobar*” and said, that sounded like a “*fucking good night*” and she wished she had sniffed a “*load of coke*” and “*that’s what we’ll be doing in Ibiza babe. Crushing up a pill and sniffing it for breakfast!*”. She described getting “*coke*” and stated that this is “*standard*”. She referred to “*a lovely couple giving her MD*”, that she planned “*buying shrooms*” and she had run out of a spliff and had “*smoked loads of weeds*”.

16. The former officer exchanged these messages with friends. She did not expect them to come to the attention of the force. These messages clearly show that the former officer had used drugs as well as talked about them in a positive manner. The former officer has not provided any credible evidence to explain why she would specifically and repeatedly refer to the use of drugs if she had not been doing so. I would have been entitled to draw adverse inferences about her failure to answer specific questions but consider, in any event, that the evidence on the voice messages clearly establishes that the officer did use drugs.

17. I therefore find allegation 2 (b) proved. The officer has admitted allegation 2 (a). This conduct is a breach of the standards of professional behaviour of Discreditable Conduct.

18. In respect of the allegation that the former officer deliberately gave false information as to why she could not attend work on 6th August 2023 and obtained compassionate leave on this basis. The former officer has admitted this conduct and that it is a breach of the professional standards which have been alleged. These are the standards of Orders and Instructions, Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct.

19. Even if the former officer had not admitted this allegation, I would have found it proved on the basis of the evidence in the bundle.

20. The former officer accepts that she contacted her Sergeant, PS [REDACTED] via Instagram on 6th August 2023, claiming to have just woken up and that she had travelled to [REDACTED]

overnight due to complications with her sister's childbirth and did not get to sleep until 4am. PS [REDACTED] responded and told her not to worry and that he would arrange this as compassionate leave. As a result, PS [REDACTED] spoke to the Inspector and the Former Officer was granted compassionate leave.

21. The officer did not attend work on 6th August 2023. There is evidence of the officer being in the Saxon Crown pub in Corby at 21.30pm on 5th August 2024.
22. There are three voice note messages by the Former Officer to a friend between 5:16am and 6am on 6th August 2023 in which she appears intoxicated, and on her way home from a night out. The messages also retell the events of the night out and described the Corby public houses which she had frequented that night.
23. There is a voice message at 1:54pm on 6th August 2023. The Former Officer left a further voice note for her friend, stating that she had just woken up, that she had not gone into work or called in sick and asked her friend if she could go to her address and get into her bed for a few hours as her parents were on their way home and would kill her.
24. In a further voice message at 2:47pm the former officer said to her friend "I just lied and said I was in [REDACTED] with my sister when she was giving birth". She then signs off the voice note with a laugh.

25. At 8:55pm, a colleague left a voice note for the Former Officer offering congratulations and stating that her colleagues were concerned when the Former Officer had not attended for her shift. The Former Officer replied at 9pm to say she had been out at the pub with a friend when she received a call from her parents to tell her things were not going well with her sister's labour and that there was an infection, she tells her colleague that she got a taxi home from the pub and drove to [REDACTED]. The colleague specifically mentioned that they had seen the Former Officer's Instagram story from the night before and thought the Former Officer had simply been out, was drunk and missed her shift due to being hungover. The former officer clearly lied to her colleague about her actions despite the evidence being provided to her.

26. The former officer has not provided any evidence at this hearing to justify her actions. The evidence contained in the voice messages are compelling. The AA has proved this allegation on a balance of probabilities and that it has breached the standards of Orders and Instructions, Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct.

27. The third allegation relates to the former officer misusing the force computer systems by carrying out a check on 24th February 2024 without a policing purpose.

28. At 09.51 the officer was contacted by a friend saying someone had driven into the side of him and could she find out the person's details if she sent her the number plate. He

suggested that doing the check would have been breaking some sort of code. She responded that she would. He sent her the registration number.

29. The officer accepted that she conducted a PNC check on 24th February 2024 without a policing purpose. She admitted that she had committed an offence contrary to section 1 (1) and (3) of the Computer Misuse Act 1990 and was given a police caution on 21st April 2026 for an offence. She said this was a mistake

30. In her interview on 7th August 2025, the officer accepted that she had been contacted and that she had checked the PNC computer and told him that the car was insured. She suggested that she did not pass on any other information. She put in a code suggesting she had seen a vehicle moving.

31. The former officer acknowledged that she had made a search as she felt a crime had been committed so she was ok to conduct a search. She had reservations about whether she had a proper policing purpose but ultimately decided to do it in any case. She made an unauthorised search for a friend. She suggested it was a real misjudgement and she had taken her eye off the ball.

32. The only dispute between the AA and the former officer concerns the extent of the information which the former officer provided to Mr [REDACTED]. The AA contends that this

included information about the detail of the driver. The former officer has always admitted her conduct and accepted a caution for it. There is no direct evidence as to what information was passed over by the former officer. The AA has not proved this aspect of the allegation.

33. The former officer has admitted allegation 4 and I would have found it proved on the evidence in the bundle. This conduct is a breach of the standards of professional behaviour of Orders and Instructions, Confidentiality and Honesty and Integrity on the basis of a lack of integrity.
34. I have to decide if these breaches amount to Misconduct or Gross Misconduct. Gross misconduct in a case involving a Former Officer is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour which 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.
35. I firstly have to assess the severity of the conduct by considering the former officer's culpability, the harm caused and any aggravating and mitigating factors. I have considered relevant sections of the Guidance on Outcomes in police misconduct proceedings and have made an assessment of the severity of the conduct.
36. I find that these allegations cumulatively amount to Gross Misconduct. The officer had engaged in numerous acts of serious misconduct over a significant period of time.
37. I also find that each of these allegations are individually so serious that they constitute gross misconduct.