

**In the matter of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2025
and in the matter of**

Police Constable Jack Sanderson

Decision of Sir Stephen Watson, Chief Constable

Monday 10th August 2026

Preliminary matters

1. I have today conducted an accelerated misconduct hearing at Unit A, GMP Force Headquarters, and have given consideration to various breaches of the standards of professional behaviour as pertain to PC Jack Sanderson.
2. PC Sanderson was not in attendance nor otherwise represented. PC Sanderson, failed to provide a Reg 54 response, and has therefore not indicated whether he accepts that his conduct amounts to gross misconduct. I, having considered the evidence, have determined that the breaches alleged; namely Honesty and Integrity; Discreditable Conduct; Fitness for Duty; and Orders and Instructions; are proven, and that the circumstances amount to gross misconduct. In coming to a determination as to the most appropriate outcome, I have taken cognisance of the submissions of the appropriate authority as contained within the bundle of evidence submitted to me prior to this hearing, with elements of the same being amplified in invited verbal submissions by the representative of the appropriate authority, Ms Sharpe.
3. In determining the appropriate outcome, I have had regard to the relevant provisions of the College of Policing's guidance on outcomes in misconduct hearings. I do recognise that it does not automatically follow that where breaches of the code of conduct are found to be so serious as to justify dismissal, that dismissal can be the only sanction implied. Nevertheless, it remains very powerfully the case that the principal objective in the conduct of these hearings must be to preserve public confidence in the police service.

4. In assessing the seriousness of the misconduct found, it is a matter of fact that PC Sanderson, was, on 31st March 2026, subjected to a drugs test having on that day provided a sample of urine. Following laboratory analysis, a positive result was identified in that evidence was found to exist which indicated the use of cannabis and cocaine. Cocaine is a controlled Class A drug, and cannabis is a controlled Class B drug under the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 and the associated Regulations.

Outcome

5. In considering the appropriate disciplinary action to be imposed, I received written and verbal submissions from the AA that the appropriate disciplinary outcome in this case, is dismissal without notice and the placing of his details onto the College of Policing's Barred List.
6. In determining the appropriate disciplinary action, I have had regard to the relevant provisions of the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Misconduct Proceedings.
7. At the forefront of my mind has been the purpose of misconduct proceedings – these are expressly set out in the College of Policing's Guidance.
8. My approach has been to "adopt" the "3 stage approach" also referred to in the College of Policing's Guidance.
9. I have assessed the seriousness of the conduct. I consider that PC Sanderson's culpability must be regarded as high. I am presented with incontrovertible evidence of the illicit use of cannabis and cocaine. His actions were deliberate and carried out in the full knowledge that his conduct was contrary to that explicitly set forth in the GMP Drug and Alcohol Misuse Policy.
10. With regard to the aggravating factors set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, I have already pointed to the fact that the misconduct was deliberate and unforced. The presence of distinct drug types in the officer's system indicates repeated misconduct. By definition, the breach clearly implies a significant deviation from instruction. The likely consequences

for officers found to be using illicit substances is widely understood within the Force. In accessing the unlawful supply of the controlled substances in question, he must have had recourse to interact with active criminals in order to procure the drugs consumed. A police officer is expected to target active criminals, not to consort with them.

11. In respect of harm, I refer principally to the harm to the reputation and standing of the service. PC Sanderson occupies a very particular strand of failure in that his conduct falls squarely into that which rightly causes a loss of trust amongst the public.
12. With regard to mitigating circumstances, of those set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, I have taken into account PC Sanderson's record of service. In consequence of the officer's failure to engage satisfactorily with these proceedings, I am not able to discern any mitigating factors in this case whatsoever.
13. I reiterate the point that the core purpose of these proceedings is to sustain public confidence in the police. As articulated above, there is no doubt that the facts of this case have the obvious potential to substantially diminish public confidence. In conclusion, I consider that the level of seriousness in this case is high.
14. PC Sanderson's offending behaviour was clearly extremely unwise, contrary to the clearest of instructions and must necessarily have involved a causal and corrupting association with a person or persons actively engaged in criminality. What is clear to me is that this episode reflects behaviours which are simply incompatible with the responsibilities inherent in the office of constable.
15. I am persuaded that nothing would outweigh the potential for the loss of confidence that would ensue if PC Sanderson were to be permitted to continue to perform in the office of Constable. I have therefore determined that PC Sanderson shall be dismissed from the service with immediate effect.
16. I order that PC Sanderson's name be added to the College of Policing's Barred List.

17. That an officer has had to pay such a heavy price for what amounts to a catastrophic lack of judgement and the putting aside of the values and standards of the service, should serve as a salutary lesson to all of those who are fortunate to hold the trusted office of constable. The use of illicit drugs will inevitably carry a similar consequence should any member of GMP be foolish enough to follow the example of the former PC Sanderson.
18. This concludes today's hearing.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'S. Watson', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Sir Stephen Watson QPM
Chief Constable