

IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (as amended)

RE: Former PC 14500 Michael Jones

The following represents the Panel's findings in respect of the Police Misconduct hearing held at Greater Manchester Police Headquarters on 10 and 11 June 2026.

Preliminary Matters

Amendment of Allegations

At the outset of the hearing Counsel for the AA confirmed that Allegation 3 (3) was to be withdrawn.

Reasonable Adjustments

Following representations made by PC Jones that he found the proceedings stressful, the Chair confirmed that frequent breaks would be taken during the hearing to enable PC Jones to de-stress and regain his composure.

Application to Adjourn the hearing

At the outset of the hearing PC Jones applied for an adjournment of the hearing on the basis that, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] he is unfit to attend the hearing.

In summary, the AA opposed the application for the following reasons:

- 1) The alleged conduct dates back to 2020.
- 2) PC Jones has had ample opportunity since service of the R13 Notice, dated 3 June 2025, and the Chair's previous decision not to adjourn the proceedings, to gain representation/support if he wished to do so.

- 3) The GP letter was produced the day before the start of the hearing and was, in any event, of limited value as the writer was not a mental health professional.
- 4) PC Jones's engagement with the process and his written communication with PSD and Legal services evidences a clear understanding of the relevant issues and his cognitive ability.

The first day of the hearing was adjourned to enable PC Jones to, amongst others things, prepare any further submissions that he wished to make in support of his application to adjourn the hearing.

The hearing was reconvened on 11 June 2026 and PC Jones made further submissions in support of his application.

In determining the application to adjourn the hearing the Panel had regard to the submissions made by PC Jones and Counsel, on behalf of the AA, and the available medical evidence.

Decision upon application to adjourn

The application to adjourn was dismissed for the following reasons:

- 1) The GP failed to state when PC Jones was likely to be fit to attend and therefore the likely length of an adjournment was unknown.
- 2) The date for the hearing was set in January 2026 and therefore PC Jones, having been made aware of the date, had ample opportunity to obtain advice and representation, if he wished to do so.
- 3) PC Jones's response/ defense to the allegations (including certain admissions) is clearly set out within the case papers.
- 4) The salient facts are undisputed and therefore, no witnesses have been required to attend the hearing to give evidence and subjected to cross-examination. Accordingly, the Panel will be required to determine the facts from the available evidence within the case papers.
- 5) The allegations dates back to 2020 and the public interest is served by concluding misconduct proceedings within a reasonable period and as efficiently as possible.

Resignation

Following the decision not to adjourn the hearing (as referenced above) PC Jones tendered his resignation on 11 June 2026 which was accepted by the AA. Accordingly, thereafter PC Jones was considered to be a Former officer: he decided not to take any further part in the proceedings.

Legal Advice

Integrity – Definition

The Court of Appeal in the case of **Solicitors Regulation Authority v Wingate [2018]** was required to consider the meaning of “acting with integrity” and observed that Integrity “*connotes moral soundness, rectitude and steady adherence to an ethical code. A person lacks integrity if unable to appreciate the distinction between what is honest or dishonest by ordinary standards*”.

Documentation

The Panel was provided with and read the case papers in advance of the hearing which included the following:

- 1) Regulation 30 Notice
- 2) Investigators Report (redacted) 26 March 2023.
- 3) Messages exchanged between PC Jones and: “S”, “Kay2”, “Workchat”, “Sarah Work” and “Sandy”.
- 4) DMS Record for PC Jones for relevant dates.
- 5) Written Responses from PC Jones dated 20 March 2023 and 16 September 2024.

Witnesses

The Panel did not hear any live evidence from PC Jones.

The AA’s Case

The AA maintains that the alleged conduct amounts to a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour of: Honesty and integrity (Integrity Only), Duties and Responsibilities, Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable conduct, and therefore amounts to Gross Misconduct.

PC Jones response to the Allegations

PC Jones did not serve a R31 Response to the Allegations. However, PC Jones provided written responses to the allegations dated 16 September 2024 and 11 August 2025.

ALLEGATION 1

Allegation 1(a): PC Jones maintains that his communication between 23 May 2020 and 14 April 2021 was personal and occurred within the context of a consensual relationship which in any event did not affect his role.

Allegation 1(b): PC Jones denies that between 23 May 2020 and 14 April 2021 he engaged in sexual activity outdoors whether on or off duty.

More specifically, PC Jones accepts that he met “FI” through a dating app for people interested in BDSM but denies that any sexual activity occurred when they met and further, any reference to sexual activity within their communication was to further role play/fantasy.

Allegation 1(c): PC Jones denies intending to meet the escorts and maintains that contact was for attention due to him feeling unsupported.

Allegation 1(d): PC Jones denies that his internet activity affected his work and assumes that his reason for such activity was due to him feeling stressed and overwhelmed, with a lack of support.

ALLEGATION 2

Allegation 2: PC Jones (as mentioned) denies engaging in any sexual activity outdoors whether on or off duty.

ALLEGATION 3

Allegation 3: PC Jones accepts that he engaged in communication of a sexual nature whilst on duty but denies that his duties or performance was impacted as a result.

ALLEGATION 4

Allegation 4: PC Jones does not dispute the evidence produced regarding his internet usage on 3 May 2021. However, he maintains that his usage did not

interfere with the performance of his duties. However, he acknowledges the optics of such usage and provided his assurance that he would not in future use the internet on his personal device whilst on duty.

Standard and Burden of Proof

The Panel is required to apply the Civil Standard of Proof namely, on the balance of probabilities. The alleged conduct is proven if the Panel is satisfied that it is more likely than not that the conduct occurred.

The Burden of Proof falls on the AA to prove the allegations on the requisite standard.

The Panel's Approach

During this hearing, the Panel took the following approach:

- (i) First, to consider the facts of the case and to make findings in relation to each of the facts alleged by the AA.
- (ii) Second, to determine whether those facts found proved constituted one or more breach(es) of the relevant standards.
- (iii) Third, to determine whether any conduct found proven against the Officer amounted to Misconduct or Gross Misconduct or Neither.
- (iv) Fourth, and if appropriate, to decide what the outcome should be.

The Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof is on the AA throughout the hearing and that the relevant standard of proof is the standard required in civil cases namely, the balance of probabilities.

The Allegations/ Facts

The Alleged misconduct is fully particularised within the R30 Notice.

In determining the facts (as detailed below) the Panel had regard to, amongst others, the unequivocal admission of facts made by PC Jones within his written responses, various message / communication exchanged, DMS Record and submissions made by Counsel on behalf of the AA.

Facts as found by the Panel

Allegation 1: on-duty sexual communications

On 23 May 2020 the Officer's tour of duty was 15:00-23:00: he clocked in at 14:42 and clocked out at 22:49. Between 17:47 hours and 22:37 hours PC Jones sent 16 messages to 'Workchat', with the prevailing theme being sexual fantasy.

30 May 2020

On 30 May 2020 PC Jones's tour of duty was 14:00-23:00 : he clocked in at 13:48 and clocked-out at 21:45. Within 11 minutes of clocking on PC Jones messaged "Workchat" in terms, '*Still thinking about a venue x*' (referring to a location for a consensual sexual liaison). In total PC Jones sent 35 messages whilst on duty, with the prevailing theme purveying a sexual fantasy.

07 June 2020

On 07 June 2020 PC Jones 's tour of duty was 14:00-22:00: he clocked on at 13:37 and clocked out at 21:46. Whilst on-duty PC Jones sent "Workchat" 31 messages concerning his sexual fantasy and arranging to meet for sexual activity in a public place. PC Jones and "Workchat" met the following morning at a pre-planned public location and engaged in sexual activity.

09 June 2020

On 9 June 2020 PC Jones's tour of duty was 07:00-15:00: he clocked in at 06:49 and clocked out at 15:21. During PC Jones's tour of duty he sent "Workchat" 28 messages which included an exchange of messages about his desired submissive sexual activity and pornography.

Separately, PC Jones messaged 'S' 42 times whilst on-duty, with the prevailing theme being sexual activity.

13 December 2020

On 13 December 2020 PC Jones's tour of duty was 07:00-15:00: he clocked in at 06:46 and clocked out at 15:00. PC Jones messaged "S" 20 times whilst on-duty to discuss kinks.

Furthermore, during this tour of duty PC Jones messaged 'F1' 45 times which included messages about BDSM and sexual fantasy.

13 April 2021

On 13 April 2021 PC Jones's tour of duty was 07:00-15:00: he clocked in at 06:46 and clocked out at 17:04. During this tour of duty PC Jones sent 'F1' (who was portraying a child) a total of 26 messages concerning arrangements to meet with her to carry out his sexual fantasy as 'daddy' spanking his 'princess'.

Between approximately 11:50 and 12:50 (having discussed his sexual fantasy and finding a quite public spot for spanking) PC Jones met with "F1" before attending a training course at 13:00.

14 April 2021

On 14 April 2021 PC Jones's tour of duty was 07:00-15:00: he clocked on at 06:44 and clocked -out at 15:4. During this tour of duty PC Jones sent 'F1' a total of 15 messages continuing the theme of the previous day's messages.

Allegation 2: sexual encounters in public

As mentioned above, the Panel found that on 7 January 2020, whilst off duty, PC Jones had a sexual encounter in a public place.

On 7 June 2020 PC Jones and "Work Chat" scheduled to meet in a car park where they had a sexual encounter. The following day, PC Jones and "Work chat" exchanged messages about their encounter the previous day.

On 13 April 2021 PC Jones's tour of duty was 07:00-15:00 (as mentioned). At about 08.10 PC Jones arranged to meet FI in a public place where they had a sexual encounter, prior to the start of a course that he was due to attend at 1pm. The following day, PC Jones and F1 continued to discuss their sexual encounter in an exchange of messages

Allegation 3: on-duty correspondence with escort services

On 16 July 2020 PC Jones's tour of duty was 14:00 -22:00: he clocked on at 13:43 and clocked out at 21:58

On 14 April 2021 Jones's tour of duty was 07:00-15:00: he clocked on at 06:44 and clocked out at 15:47. Whilst on-duty PC Jones sent 15 text messages to an escort, 'Kay', which included a suggestion that she could

get *'filming work'* and him describing BDSM activities he wished to engage in.

16 July 2020 and 14 April 2021

Allegation 4: on-duty personal internet browsing

On 3 May 2021 PC Jones's tour of duty was 07:00-15:00: he clocked in at 06:35 and clocked out at 15:02. During his tour of duty, PC Jones spent cumulatively in excess of 3 hours and 20 minutes browsing non-work-related websites which included dating and hookup websites namely, *'fabguys.com'* and *'spankthishookups.com'*.

Gross Misconduct / Misconduct or Neither/ Standards of Professional Behaviour

The Panel considered that PC Jones was solely responsible for the proven conduct which was very serious and a serious dereliction of duty.

Accordingly, the Panel considered that the proven conduct could justify the officer's dismissal and amounts to Gross Misconduct.

Having determined the facts the Panel considered which of the relevant Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPB) were engaged and breached, as stated in the College of Policing Code of Ethics.

Honesty and Integrity (integrity only)

By this standard, officers are required to act with integrity and not to compromise or abuse their position.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

By these standard officers are required to act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy. Further, officers are required to carry out their role in an efficient, diligent and professional manner

Duties and responsibilities

By these standard officers are required to be diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities and to this end they must demonstrate an efficient and effective use of policing resources

Discreditable conduct

By these standard officers are required to constantly keep in mind that the public expect them to maintain the highest standards of behavior. Therefore, they must consider how a member of the public may regard their behaviour whether on or off duty.

In all the circumstances, the Panel determined that the proven conduct fell far below the standard expected of a serving officer and demonstrated a failure to act diligently and or efficiently. As such, the Panel considered that the proven conduct amounted to a breach of the following Standards of Professional Behavior: Honesty and Integrity (Integrity Only), Authority, Respect and Courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable conduct.

Gross Misconduct / Misconduct / Neither

In all the circumstances, the Panel considered that the proven conduct amounted to a grave dereliction of duty and amounted to Gross Misconduct.

DECISION ON OUTCOME

Legal Considerations

The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended) provides that, where a panel finds the case against the officer subject of misconduct proceedings proven as to Gross Misconduct, they can impose one of the following disciplinary actions:

1. Dismissal Without notice
2. Final Written Warning
3. Reduction in Rank

In considering whether the proven conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct or Misconduct, and in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended) the Panel was mindful that in relation to disciplinary action regarding a Former officer, a finding of Gross Misconduct means a finding that the former officer would have been dismissed if the officer had not ceased to be a member of the service.

The College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes (2023) provides that in determining the appropriate outcome the panel should have regards to aggravating and mitigating factors and the officer's record of service. The appropriate outcome is dependent upon the facts and circumstances of the particular case.

The purpose of the misconduct regime is threefold:

1. To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the Police Service.
2. To uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.
3. Protect the public.

The assessment of the seriousness of the proven conduct is central to the decision on outcome. In determining the appropriate outcome, the Panel must apply the following 3 stage test namely:

1. Assess the seriousness of conduct

2. Consider the purpose of imposing sanctions
3. Choose the sanction that appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the proven conduct.

In assessing the seriousness of the proven conduct the Panel must have due regard to the following:

1. The officer's culpability
2. The harm caused by the misconduct
3. The existence of any aggravating features
4. The existence of any mitigating features

The Panel must be mindful that the most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service as a whole.

Culpability

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 more severe the likely outcome.

Conduct which is intentional, targeted, deliberate or planned will generally be more culpable, than conduct which has unintended consequences, although the consequences of the officer's conduct is relevant to the harm caused.

Further, where harm is unintentional, culpability will be greater if the officer could reasonably have foreseen the risk of harm

The Panel considered that the proven conduct was planned, targeted, intentional and deliberate and the former officer was entirely responsible for the proven conduct. As such, the Panel considered that the proven conduct is very serious.

In all the circumstances, the Panel concluded that PC Jones's level of Culpability is **HIGH**.

Harm

The harm caused by an officer's actions can be considered in various ways, including reputational harm.

Further, public perception and the reputation of the police service are relevant when considering the harm or the risk of harm caused by the proven conduct.

In all the circumstances, the Panel considered that if the public were aware of the proven conduct, it would undermine public confidence in and the reputation of the police service.

Accordingly, the Panel considered that the level of harm caused by the proven conduct **is HIGH**.

Aggravating Factors

Aggravating factors are those tending to worsen the circumstances of the case in relation to the officer's culpability or the harm caused.

The Panel carefully noted a number of aggravating factors present in this case which included: -

- a) intentional, premeditated, targeted, or taking deliberate steps with malign intent (i.e. PC Jones's own sexual gratification);
- b) repeated or sustained behaviour over an extended period;
- c) continuing the behaviour after the officer realised, or should have realised, that it was improper;
- d) significant deviation from instructions, whether an order, force policy or national guidance;
- e) multiple proven allegations and/or breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

Mitigating Factors / Personal Mitigation

Mitigating factors are those that tend to reduce the seriousness of the misconduct. Some factors may indicate that an officer's culpability is lower, or that the harm caused by the misconduct is less serious than it might otherwise have been.

In this regard, the Panel was not provided with any evidence that would tend to reduce the seriousness of the proven conduct.

Similarly, as regards personal mitigation, the Panel was not presented with any such evidence.

Outcome

In considering the most appropriate outcome the Panel had regard to the seriousness of the repeated proven conduct and the purpose of the misconduct regime and thereafter, considered what is the most appropriate outcome in all the circumstances.

The Panel reminded itself 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

The Panel carefully considered the most appropriate outcome that reflects the seriousness of the proven conduct and considered that the proven conduct was so serious that a Final Written Warning would not have met the purpose of the misconduct regime.

In all the circumstances, the Panel having applied the structured approach considered that the most appropriate outcome would be dismissal without notice. Accordingly, the Panel determined that had PC Jones remained in service he would have been dismissed immediately without notice.

Barred List

The Police Barred List and Police Advisory List Regulations 2017 requires the Appropriate Authority to report to the College of Policing the outcome of these proceedings.

Panel

ACO: Dougie Henderson

IPM: Alexander Brown

IPM: Sian Barker

LQP: David Tyme

25 June 2026