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

RE: PC 18019 Gary Knight

The following represents the Panel's findings in respect of the Police Misconduct hearing held at Greater Manchester Police Headquarters on 28 and 29 September 2026.

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) Investigating Officer's Report.

3 Log 3992 and Log 4001 both dated 28 June 2024.

4) Crime Reference: RI/06LL/0018287/24.

5) Body Worn Video footage of PC Knight.

6) Written accounts provided by the informant and witness.

7) Written Statement of PC Knight dated 12 December 2024 and R31 Response dated 9 January 2026.

9) PC Knight's Service Record and character evidence.

Witnesses

The Panel heard evidence from PC Knight.

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, 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 Facts as determined by the Panel

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 Knight within his written response and R31 Response, and during his live evidence.

Facts

On 28 June 2024 between 23:10-23:41 hours PC Knight attended an address in response to an incident report that an elderly man (PM) had been assaulted. On arrival at the scene of the incident PC Knight was informed by the bystanders at the location that PM had fallen backwards and hit his head.

At 23:29 hours PC Knight contacted the control room and said :

"[PM] 's got a nasty whack to the back of his head and a cut on his cheek that matches up to falling over—believe he has been intoxicated and stumbled over to the wrong address—ambulance on scene"

PC Knight had previously encountered PM on 12 November 2023 as a result of PM appearing drunk and having suffered a black out, cuts and bruising, and having to be helped home by a member of the public. PC Knight, based on his prior experience and how PM presented at the scene, considered that PM was particularly vulnerable.

Notwithstanding PC Knight's prior knowledge of PM and how he presented at the scene, PC Knight failed to obtain (or cause to be obtained) an account from PM as to how he came to be injured. Further, PC Knight failed to segregate PM from the person's present in order to speak to him privately to establish his account of how he came to be injured.

Furthermore, PC Knight failed to obtain (or cause to be obtained) an account from the third-party caller who reported the assault and or take any steps to secure or obtain any forensic evidence from the scene.

In the course of speaking with a colleague PC Knight stated:

'I don't think he's only fallen, I think he's brought it on himself a little bit', in that, use of force against PM had been in part caused by PM attending or trying to enter the address of a neighbour
.

The relevant crime report was cancelled as a result of PC Knight stating that, PM had confirmed that he had fallen over whilst being intoxicated and mistakenly attended an address which he believed to be that of his friend.

However, upon the attendance of an ambulance crew member, and whilst receiving treatment in the rear of the ambulance, PM stated:

'I didn't fall over, they threw me on the floor'.

Subsequently, PM died whilst in hospital. A post-mortem established that in addition to a scalp laceration PM had multiple fractured ribs on his right side lacerating his lung, a collapsed lung and hemothorax, and a fractured cheekbone, all of which was consistent with blunt force. trauma.

It was made clear that there was no suggestion that the alleged actions or omissions of PC Knight in any way contributed to PM's death, or that any other course of action the officer may have taken would have saved PM's life.

AA's Case

The AA maintains that PC Knight's conduct taken individually or cumulatively, amounted to a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour namely; Duties and Responsibilities, Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct and are so serious as to amount to Gross Misconduct and justify his dismissal.

PC Knight's Response to the Allegations

In general, PC Knight accepts that with hindsight he should have responded differently to the report of assault on PM. Notwithstanding this, he in any event acted in good faith and relied on his understanding of the facts and his previous dealings with PM in November 2023.

PC Knight maintained that his primary concern was to get medical treatment for PM and that he had developed a *"one track mind"* as a result of his previous dealing with PM.

In any event, PC Knight maintained that his conduct on the night did not amount to a dereliction of duty or deliberate disregard for PM or for what may have happened to PM. On the contrary, PC Knight maintains that his actions in relation to PM were aimed at safeguarding him given his obvious vulnerability.

STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOUR

Honesty & Integrity

The Panel had regard to PC Knight's explanation for his conduct and in particular his overriding motivation to safeguard PM. The Panel also noted the absence of any personal benefit that could be derived by PC Knight from the cancellation of the crime report.

The Panel noted that PC Knight's entry, as recorded in the crime report, did not contain any statement to the effect that PM had informed him that he had merely fallen. Instead, the entry provided a summary of PC Knight's, albeit mistaken perception of the circumstances of the incident. Subsequently, about 8 minutes later, an entry was made on the occurrence report by radio. This latter entry did not in itself cause the crime to be cancelled.

In all the circumstances, the Panel concluded that PC Knight genuinely believed that PM had not been assaulted and therefore was not dishonest in this regard.

Accordingly, the Panel determined that PC Knight's proven conduct (as detailed above) did not amount to a breach of the Standard of: Honesty & Integrity.

Duties & Responsibilities

The Panel concluded that PC Knight should have taken steps to establish PM's account of his injuries by taking him aside and further he should have investigated the third-party report of the incident.

Notwithstanding PC Knight's policing experience, his actions fell short of what was reasonably expected of an officer in the prevailing circumstances and as a result, the incident was not investigated as thoroughly as it ought to have been.

Accordingly, the Panel determined that PC Knight's conduct amounted to a breach of the Standard of: Duties & Responsibilities.

Discreditable Conduct

The Panel had due regard to the prevailing circumstances, the available body worn footage and PC Knight's admitted mistakes and concluded that, public confidence would not necessarily have been undermined if the public were made aware of all the facts.

Accordingly, the Panel considered that the proven conduct did not amount to a breach of the Standard of Professional Behavior of: Discreditable Conduct.

MISCONDUCT, GROSS MISCONDUCT OR NEITHER

The Panel considered whether the proven conduct amounted to Misconduct, Gross Misconduct or Neither. In considering this, the Panel considered that PC Knight was wholly responsible for the proven conduct. Notwithstanding this finding, the Panel determined that PC Knight did not deliberately set out to avoid his professional responsibilities and overall his focus was on safeguarding PM due to his vulnerability.

In all the circumstances, the Panel considered that the proven conduct justified disciplinary proceedings being taken and as such amounted to 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 Misconduct, they can impose one of the following disciplinary actions:

1. Written Warning

2. Final Written Warning

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 PC Knight was wholly responsible for the proven conduct which was, deliberate in that they were predicated upon his previous dealings with PM.

In all the circumstances, the Panel concluded that PC Knight's level of Culpability is Medium.

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.

The Panel noted that there was no harm caused to PM as a result of the proven conduct.

However, the Panel determined that if the public were made aware of all the circumstances (including PC Knight's acceptance that he had made mistakes), the proven conduct would not cause significant harm to the reputation of policing or damage to the public confidence.

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

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 had regard to the proven conduct and the prevailing circumstances and determined that there were no aggravating factors present in this case.

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.

The Panel had regard to the following mitigating factors:

The Panel noted that the proven conduct was confined to a single episode which it considered to be a mitigating factor.

As regards Personal Mitigation, PC Knight accepted full responsibility for his actions and made significant admissions at an early stage of the proceedings. As a result, no witnesses were required to attend the hearing to provide evidence.

Further, the Panel had regards to the numerous positive character statements provided in support of PC Knight and also noted that since this incident whilst PC Knight was on restricted duties, he continued to perform his duties to a high standard.

Outcome

In considering the most appropriate outcome the Panel had regard to the prevailing circumstances when the proven conduct occurred 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.

Further, the Panel was mindful that the purpose of misconduct proceedings is not to punish the officer concerned.

The Panel considered the less severe outcome before more severe outcomes.

The Panel carefully considered the most appropriate outcome that reflects the level of seriousness of the proven conduct as determined by the Panel.

In all the circumstances, the Panel having applied the structured approach considered that the most appropriate outcome is a Written Warning (of the standard duration of 18 months).

Panel:

Chair: ACO Jonathan Roy

IPM: Rosemary Lee

IPM: Margaret Fulham

LQP: David Tyme

12October 2026