In the matter of the Police (Conduct) Regulations2020
and in the matter of

Former Detective Sergeant Philip Greenwood

Decision of the Independent Chair Jonathan Roy

30th October2026

Preliminary matters

1. I have today conducted an accelerated misconduct hearing via Microsoft Teams and have given consideration to various breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour (SoPB) as pertain to Former Detective Sergeant (FDS) Philip Grenwood. The hearing was conducted in public on the application of the AA.

2. The Appropriate Authority was represented by Ms Atkin. Former officer Greenwood was not in attendance nor was he otherwise represented. Greg Wright attended for the Police Federation and DI Costello as FDS Greenwood's welfare officer. The Chair is satisfied that the former officer was fully aware of the proceedings and had the opportunity to attend the same as confirmed by Mr. Wright.

3. Former officer Greenwood left the force with his last day of service being 29th October 2026 and therefore is referred to as a former officer.

4. The allegation is set out in the Regulation 51 Notice (pages 1-3 of the bundle), served on the officer, as follows;

    4. *On one or more occasions on 23 October 2020, you contacted one or more adult sex workers ("ASW") from your work mobile telephone whilst on duty and for no policing purpose, namely:-*

a. *when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -9309;*
b. *when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -7116.*

5. *On one or more occasions between 12 November 2019 and 15 May 2022, you contacted one or more adult sex workers ("ASW") from your work mobile telephone whilst off duty and for no policing purpose, namely:-*
   a. *between 12 November 2019 and 7 May 2021, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -9309;*
   b. *on 16 February 2020, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -8220;*
   c. *on 23 February 2020, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -9238;*
   d. *on 15 March 2020, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -7668;*
   e. *on 13 November 2019, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -6101;*
   f. *on 13 November 2019, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -0154;*
   g. *on 16 February 2020, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -4362;*
   h. *on 13 November 2019, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -0743;*
   i. *on 17 November 2019, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -3012;*
   j. *on 15 May 2022, when you contacted an ASW via a telephone number ending in -1970.*

6. *Your actions as set out above were a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, specifically the standards of:-*
   a. *<u>Orders and Instructions</u>, in that you knew, or ought to have known, that engaging in personal contact with an ASW was contrary to the relevant force policy and/or procedure regarding the use of your work mobile device.*
   b. *<u>Discreditable Conduct</u>, in that, by your actions you brought discredit on the police force and/or undermined public confidence in it.*

7. *Your conduct as set out at paragraphs 4a – b, 5a – j and 6a – b above, individually and/or collectively, amounts to gross misconduct, in that the conduct is so serious that your dismissal could be justified.*

5. A Regulation 54 response has not been submitted by FDS Greenwood. He has, however, submitted a letter for consideration of the hearing. In this letter he denies the allegations and makes clear that his decision to resign is not to be interpreted as an admission of guilt on his part. Furthermore he contends that he has an explanation for the contact alleged, but has chosen not to divulge this explanation as it is 'sensitive'.

6. I have determined that the allegations are proven given the extensive and incontrovertible evidence set out in the bundle and these clearly breach the SoPB which relate to Orders & Instructions (the officer contacted sex workers on a GMP mobile device without any policing purpose and in contravention of force policies) & Discreditable Conduct (on any objective assessment his actions would have significantly breached public trust and were clearly opposed to NPCC national guidance).

7. I have determined that the proven breaches are sufficiently serious both individually and collectively as to justify dismissal thus I have found that they constitute gross misconduct.

Outcome

8. In coming to a determination as to the most appropriate outcome, I have considered the submissions of the Appropriate Authority as contained within the bundle of evidence submitted to me prior to this hearing, along with verbal submissions by the representative of the Appropriate Authority, Ms Atkin.

9. 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 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

10. I received written and verbal submissions from the Appropriate Authority that the appropriate disciplinary outcome in this case would have been dismissal without notice and the placing of his details onto the College of Policing's Barred List.

11. I have reminded myself that what is of paramount importance is the purpose of misconduct proceedings – these are expressly set out in the College of Policing's Guidance namely;

    1. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of the police service
    2. To uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct
    3. To protect the public

12. My approach has been to adopt the "3 stage approach" referred to in the College of Policing's Guidance when considering sanction. Namely to assess the seriousness of the misconduct, to keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions and to choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose bearing in mind the seriousness of the conduct in question.

13. Culpability denotes the officer's blameworthiness and responsibility for his actions. In this case the former officer is wholly responsible for his own actions. His actions were very clearly intentional, deliberate, and targeted toward adult sex workers. He was solely responsible for using his police mobile device to make repeated calls both on and off-duty with no policing purpose.

14. The potential harm of his actions over a period of time could, and should, have been perfectly obvious to FDS Greenwood and the potential reputational harm to policing ought to have been foreseen by him.

15. I therefore consider that FDS Greenwood's culpability must be regarded as high.

16. In terms of harm it is not alleged that any actual harm occurred.

17. The potential for significant reputational harm is however clear. Conduct such as that of FDS Greenwood would, if made known to the public, undermine the public's confidence in Greater Manchester Police & the wider service. The negative impact on the confidence of women and girls in policing, particularly in respect of the on-duty conduct of male police officers would undoubtedly be significant.

18. I assess the level of potential harm as medium - high.

19. Aggravating factors as defined at 4.76 of the HoG are present. The former officer was an experienced detective. He was well-aware of the potential for sex workers to be exploited, vulnerable or linked to crime.

20. His conduct deviated from local and national policy or guidance of which he was, or ought to have been, well-aware.

21. There are multiple proven allegations and breaches of the SoPB which occurred over an extended period of years.

22. I find that there are no mitigating factors present that impact the outcome decision – FDS Greenwood did not accept the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour in his written Regulation 54 response and advanced no meaningful mitigation.

23. With regard to personal mitigation, of those set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, I have taken into account FDS Greenwood's record of service. I note his previous good character during his police service. The personal mitigation advanced does not in any way detract from his conduct and is not ultimately relevant to the seriousness of his conduct in this matter.

24. 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 seriously and substantially diminish public confidence. In conclusion, I consider that the level of seriousness in this case is high.

25. Greater Manchester Police expects the highest standards of professional behaviour from its officers and staff both on and off duty. The behaviour of FDS Greenwood was a tangible breach of the trust placed in him both by GMP and the public he was supposed to serve as a police officer, especially a cohort of many vulnerable women who have every right to expect a higher standard of behaviour from officers. His conduct was totally unacceptable and in no way befitting of a police officer.

26. FDS Greenwood would have been dismissed without notice, had he not resigned, and as such disciplinary action is imposed.

27. I also order that FDS Greenwood's name be added to the College of Policing's Barred List.

28. This concludes today's hearing.