

IN THE MATTER OF MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
REGULATIONS 2020 AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT)(AMENDMENTS)
REGULATIONS 2024

BETWEEN

THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF GREATER MANCHESTER POLICE
The Appropriate Authority

And

PC 3332 HUSSAIN

The officer

Hearing date 27TH July 2026

Chairs report giving reasons and findings

Summary of the case

At the misconduct hearing, the panel found a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour of Orders and Instructions, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct to be proven.

References

In this report:

‘The 2020 Regulations’ means the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as amended by the Police(conduct)(amendments) Regulations 2024.

‘The 2020 Home Office Guidance’ and ‘the Home Office Guidance’ refers to the Home Office Guidance Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness: Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing (issued under section 87 and 87A of the Police Act 1996 published on 5 February 2020).

‘The College of Policing Outcomes Guidance’ and ‘the outcomes guidance’ refers to the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings (issued under section 87 the Police Act 1996) published on 17 August 2022 and updated (by having paragraphs numbers added) in March 2023.

Parties, representatives, panel members and other attendees

The AA is the Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police who is represented during the proceedings by Mr Zander Goss

The Chair is ACO Jonathan Roy

The LQP is Mrs Jane Wilson.

The IPMs are Mr Mark Turner and Mr Christopher Lindley

The officer is represented by Mr Ryan Donoghue

The Chair delegated the report writing to the LQP.

No Media attended the hearing.

PC Hussain attended the hearing.

Publicity

In accordance with Regulation 36(2) of the 2020 Regulations, the AA published notice of the misconduct hearing on the Greater Manchester Police website.

Background to The Incident

PC Hussain was a response officer who was in a relationship with Ms A. When that relationship ended PC Hussain would attend in the vicinity of her home address and place of work.

PC Hussain spent an excessive amount of time in the area surrounding her address and her place of work.

PC Hussain was advised not to attend Ms A place of work or her address and continued to do so.

PC Hussain was then ordered not to attend Ms A's place of work or her address and continued to do so.

PC Hussain would be allocated to the P3 (**Middleton and Heywood Area**) area but continued to return to the P1 (**Rochdale**) area and attend near to Ms A's address in the P1 area.

Redactions

The panel had in advance of the hearing been provided with a bundle of statements, exhibits and documents ("the bundle") that had not been redacted. On the 27th July 2026, the panel members were provided with a printed, redacted bundle.

The panel was advised that any such matters that it had read in the unredacted bundle must be put out of the panel's minds. The only bundle that the panel were concerned with is the printed bundle that they received on the morning of the 27th July 2026.

The panel members confirmed that they had put such matters out of their minds.

Mr Goss and Mr Donoghue did not object to the panel continuing to determine the misconduct hearing.

Application to amend the Regulation 30 notice.

Mr Goss on behalf of the AA, made an application to amend the particulars of the Regulation 30 notice. Mr Donoghue did not object to this application.

The panel agreed to the Regulation 30 notice being amended.

Particular C(ii) currently read "On 14th October 2023 at 4.28 you drove down relevant address 1 past Ms A home address".

There had been an error in redactions, and this should read "address 2".

The radio location report referred to the correct address being "address 2" and the Regulation 31 response from PC Hussain also referred to the apparent error.

There was no change in the substance of the Regulation 30 notice, and the panel agreed to the amendment of the Regulation 30 notice.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

The Standards of Professional Behaviour are contained in Schedule 2 of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Discreditable Conduct

"Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty."

Orders and Instructions

"Police officers only give and carry out lawful orders and instructions. Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders".

Duties and Responsibilities

"Police officers are diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities".

Regulation 30 notice

It is alleged that you have breached the standards of professional behaviour in that

A. Whilst on duty on various dates on or between 12.10.23 – 06.05.24 you have attended in your Greater Manchester Police vehicle at locations in Rochdale which were linked to your former partner and have spent excessive amounts of time there without an operational or other policing purpose for doing so.

B. You were allocated to the Middleton area and as a result of spending excessive time in the Rochdale area, you were not in a position to undertake your allocated policing responsibilities or otherwise fulfil the duties and responsibilities of your allocated role.

C. In continuing the behaviour in 1 above, you have ignored direct instructions from supervision to remain in the Middleton area and not to attend locations linked to your former partner.

Particulars

A. You were previously in a relationship with Miss A which ended in October 2023. Miss A reported that after the relationship ended you attended her workplace, sometimes 3 or 4

times on the same evening. She also reported seeing you parked up near to her home address.

B. An analysis of your radio location data has revealed that you spent the following time in the vicinity of Miss A's place of work without an operational or other policing purpose.

- i. 18/12/23 - 36 minutes
- ii. 22/12/23 – 33 minutes
- iii. 30/12/23 – 37 minutes
- iv. 18/01/24 – 153 minutes
- v. 29/02/24 - 87 minutes
- vi. 08/03/24 – 49 minutes
- vii. 07/04/24 – 49 minutes
- viii. 18/04/24 – 41 minutes

c. An analysis of your radio location data has revealed that your vehicle was in the vicinity of Miss A's home address on the following occasions without an operational or other policing purpose.

i. 12/10/23 at 20.15 you arrived at address 2 in the area where you remained for 10 minutes before you undertook a vehicle stop at the location. 40 minutes.

ii. 14/10/2023 at 04:28 you drove down address 2, past Miss A's home address.

iii. 21/10/23 you parked on address 1 for 7 minutes

iv. 22/10/23 you drove down address 1 but parked on address 2 between for 3 minutes and then later for 16 minutes.

v. 23/10/23 you spent 36 minutes in the area of address 2. At 00:35 you appear to have driven down address 1. During your next shift you re-attended address 2 and were parked up in the area for 16 minutes, then again later for 3 minutes and then again later for 17 minutes.

vi. 01/11/23 at 23:25 hours, you drove onto or past address 1 however from this location you then attended Log **REDACTED** 011123 which refers to an incident on **LOCATION REDACTED** which is a 7-minute drive from address 2

vii. 12/11/23 at 00:49 hours you travelled down address 2 and then again at 02:13 hours however log **REDACTED** 121123 indicates you attended an incident at 02:25 hours at **LOCATION REDACTED**. This is approximately a 10-minute drive from address 2. On that occasion you were with PC Kenyon and pointed out to PC Kenyon Miss A's address.

viii. On 13/11/23 at 00:11 hours, you travelled down address 2 and onto address 1

ix. On 19/11/23 at 19:32 hours you drove onto address 1. You attended Log **REDACTED** 191123. The log notes that you arrived at 18:48 hours and were released at 20:15 hours when you gave an update for the log to be closed as a verbal altercation incident at **LOCATION REDACTED**. This is approximately an 8-minute drive to address 2 and it is likely that you attended address 2 following this incident.

x. On 10/04/24 you were in the area of address 2 between 02:45 and 02:49 and then attended an incident (log: **REDACTED** 100424) arriving at 02:54. The journey time suggests you drove to the incident from address 2

xi. On 05/05/24, you were on address 2 for 14 minutes from 11:21 hours. Although you were shown to have attended an incident (log REDACTED 0505024) at 11:32 hours, the location is a 7–12-minute drive to the location from address 2. Due to data quality issues your radio was not shown at the incident address at the time Control Works states you arrived.

xii. On 06/05/24 you visited address 2 three times between 07.00 and 11.00. You attended an incident (log REDACTED 060525) involving a possible drunk/drug driver which was the near to REDACTED, a 6-minute drive away from address 2. All other incidents you were allocated to were after 1100hrs and were all in the Middleton and Heywood areas.

d On January 8th, 2024, PS 17539 Swift and Inspector 13495 Mason had cause to speak to you about your attendance at Miss A's address and place of work on duty and you were advised to stay away from Miss A and these locations. On May 8th, 2024, you were told again by PS Swift to cover the Middleton area, but you continued to gravitate back towards Rochdale.

The allegations set out above are in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to:

Discreditable Conduct: Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

Duties and Responsibilities: Police officers are diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities.

Orders and Instructions: Police officers only give and carry out lawful orders and instructions. Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders. The allegations if proven are so serious that dismissal could be justified if proven, and separately and jointly amount to gross misconduct.

Regulation 31 response

Background

(Introduction redacted)

3. The Officer adopts the contents of the prepared statement he provided during his Misconduct interview. However, the officer notes that the A's case alleged in the Regulation 30 Notice has significantly shifted from that originally alleged in the Regulation 17 Notice, such that elements of his prepared statement are no longer relevant and new matters fall to be addressed for the first time in this Regulation 31 Response.

4. The Officer does not accept that his conduct amounts to Gross Misconduct.

5. The Officer does accept that the totality of his conduct amounts to Misconduct.

6. The standards accepted to be engaged are Duties and Responsibilities and Orders and Instructions. The Officer does not accept that the standard of Discreditable Conduct is engaged.

Regulation 31(2)(c)(i) The allegations that the Officer disputes and their account of the relevant events

7. The Officer has been a serving Greater Manchester Police Officer since 15th March 2021.

8. The Officer has been a serving response officer for the majority of his service, having also worked in the District Investigations Unit, the Burglary Investigations Unit and the Initial Investigations Unit.

The officer's relationship with Ms A

9. The Officer was in a relationship with Miss A for around 1 year and 3 months. The Officer felt at the time like the relationship was a good one, albeit on reflection now considers that there may have been indications during the relationship that Miss A was not committed to it.

10. The relationship was ended by Miss A on 25 October 2023, when she sent a text telling the officer that she was unable to do this anymore. However, in the week so prior to this, Miss A had changed how she was acting towards the Officer and the Officer found out that Miss A had been unfaithful to him during the relationship.

11. Despite this, the end of the relationship was not acrimonious, and the Officer and Miss A would exchange messages on occasion even after the end of the relationship.

12. The Officer found the breakdown of this relationship very difficult. It is only with the benefit of time, and with matters being placed into sharper focus by the investigation the Officer has been subject to, that the Officer has been able to reflect and identify how much of an effect the end of the relationship had upon him, emotionally.

13. The Officer was offered the support of Occupational Health at the time of being spoken to by his supervisors when he disclosed the breakdown of the relationship. The Officer wishes, with the benefit of hindsight, that he had accepted this offer when it was first made. The Officer did eventually accept a referral to Occupational Health in May 2024.

14. The Officer notes that it is no longer alleged that his behaviour towards his former partner was inappropriate. However, to the extent that this is relied upon in the AA's case as currently presented, the Officer does not accept that any of his actions as reflected in the Regulation 30 Notice allegations were intended to have any effect, or would have had any effect, upon Miss A. To the contrary, the Officer did not want to see Miss A after the relationship breakdown, as this would have made the processing of the breakdown even more difficult for him.

Allegation A Attending locations relating to Miss A

15. Allegation A reads as follows:

A. Whilst on duty on various dates on or between 12.10.23 06.05.24 you have attended in your Greater Manchester Police vehicle at locations in Rochdale which were linked to your former partner and have spent excessive amounts of time there without an operational or other policing purpose for doing so.

16. Due to the passage of time, it is very difficult for the Officer to recall the specific details of and/or reasons for some of his actions as reflected in the Particulars.

17. The Officer accepts that his radio location data shows that he has either spent time in or travelled past locations which are close to Miss A's home address and/ or her place of work. However, the Officer denies that all of these instances were without an operational or other policing purpose and denies that any of these instances were an attempt to see or contact Miss A (if that is what is alleged).

18. Further details are provided in response to the Particulars,

Particulars a

19. Particulars a read as follows:

a You were previously in a relationship with Miss A which ended in October 2023. Miss A reported that after the relationship ended you attended her workplace, sometimes 3 or 4 times on the same evening. She also reported seeing you parked up near to her home address.

20. The Officer accepts that he was in a relationship with Miss A which ended in October 2023.

21. The officer accepts that after the relationship ended, he attended Ms A's workplace at **REDACTED**. The reasons for this are addressed further in response to Particulars b below. However, the Officer denies that he would have attended 3 to 4 times on the same evening. The Officer considers that attending **Miss A's workplace** 1 to 2 times per day would have been part of his usual daily routine at the time.

22. Miss A has not provided a witness statement, and the Officer understands that she has not engaged with the AA's investigation. As such the account of Ms A relied upon is limited to a Pocket Notebook entry dated 9 May 2024, which is sparse in detail and generic, such that it is difficult for the Officer to fully understand and/or respond to.

23. As is set out later in this Response, the Officer considers it unfair for the AA to seek to rely upon this account from Miss A and will submit that the AA should remove this evidence and related Allegations from the case against him.

24. The Officer accepts that Miss A may have, on occasion, seen the Officer parked up close to her home address. The reasons for this will be set out in response to Particulars c, below.

Particulars b

25. Particulars b read as follows:

b An analysis of your radio location data has revealed that you spent the following time in the vicinity of Ms A's place of work without an operational or other policing purpose.

[Dates between 18 December 2023 18 April 2024 quoted]

26. it is notable from the radio location map that the area relied upon by the AA as being "in the vicinity of Ms A's place of work" is broader than just **the workplace** where Ms A worked and covers a number of surrounding streets running off (the road near to **Miss A's workplace**)

27. The Officer would regularly frequent **Miss A's workplace** and/or the petrol station on (the road outside it) before, during and after the relationship with Miss A. This would include the Officer attending **Miss A's workplace** to buy coffee before, during, or after a shift and/or attending the petrol station to buy his lunch, during his shift.

28. The Officer also recalls having conducted several traffic stops on (the road outside **Miss A's workplace**) and the surrounding area, as part of his policing duties. (The road) is a common area for such stops and the Officer would often utilise the petrol station as a safe and sensible area in which to pull vehicles over. The Officer is able to provide specific examples if required but the AA is invited to review the officer's incident history, as well as Traffic Offence Reports, and check whether any of the instances relied upon could relate to a genuine policing purpose.

29. All but 2 of these instances of the officer allegedly spending time in the vicinity of Ms A's place of work were for periods of less than 50 minutes. Those instances could fairly be explained by the Officer being on his lunch break in the usual area where he would take this break.

30. In relation to the remaining two instances 18 January 2024 (153 minutes) and 29 February 2024 (87 minutes) the Officer cannot recall the specifics due to the passage of time and the fact that exact times of day are not provided in the report, but considers it implausible that he could have been stationary in his police vehicle for periods of this length without this being identified by Control/Comms and him being asked why he had been in the same location for

such a lengthy period. The Officer therefore considers it most likely that such instances related to genuine policing purpose and the AA is again invited to review the officers job history to identify whether any of these instances may be linked to a policing purpose. The Officer has reviewed his Pocket Notebook and located the following entries of relevance:

a) 18th January 2024 - The Officer recorded that he was on the "P1 van 2 with PC Hussain". The officer recorded two jobs that day, one of which involved an arrest at 17:35 and would have required the prisoner to be transported to custody. The Officer considers it was unlikely that he was actually driving the van on this date, such that his location would have been partially out of his control.

b) 29 February 2024: The Officer recorded that he was single-crewed and, during the shift, stopped a vehicle at the petrol station on (the road). The Officer seized the vehicle under section 165A of the Road Traffic Act 1988. This requires the vehicle to be recovered, which can take up to 90 minutes.

31. For the avoidance of doubt, the Officer denies that any of his attendances in the area around Ms A's place of work were with the intention of seeing or speaking to Ms A. The AA's evidence shows that Ms A ordinarily worked weekends only and many of the instances relied upon by the Authority are weekdays. The Authority has provided no evidence to demonstrate that Ms A would have been working at **Miss A's workplace** on any of the specific dates relied upon.

Particulars c

32. Particulars c read as follows:

c An analysis of your radio location data has revealed that your vehicle was in the vicinity of Ms A's home address on the following occasions without an operational or other policing purpose.

[Dates and locations between 12 October 2023 6 May 2024 quoted]

33. As the Officer explained in his written statement at interview, (Address 2) is a key through-route between (2 busier roads) such that it would be entirely normal for the Officer to drive down (Address 2) when on patrol in the Rochdale area. As such and save where relevant to Allegations B and/or C, the Officer denies that the fact he was either driving down, or parked up on, (address 2) could be said to categorically reflect him acting without an operational or other policing purpose. The Officer recalls conducting a number of traffic stops on (address 2) as part of his usual role.

34. Further as part of the officers ordinary policing duties he would drive down many streets and pull over in many areas, when on patrol and/or awaiting instructions from Control/Comms. It is not the case, and the AA does not appear to suggest, that just because the Officer was stationary in his police vehicle, he was acting outside without an operational or other policing purpose.

35. The Officer does, however, accept that, following the breakdown of the relationship with Ms A, he would often drive down and park up on (address 2), and on occasion drive down (but not stop on) (address 1). This was part of the officers processing of the breakdown of the relationship with Miss A, which he found placed a significant emotional strain upon him. The Officer may park up just to gather his thoughts, or to reflect on the relationship, or sometimes to simply deal with his emotions, on occasion sitting in his police vehicle alone and crying. The Officer would never park up on (address 1), however, and would usually park at either end of (address 2) therefore some distance from Ms A's home address.

36. The officer's response to specific instances relied upon in the particulars are set out below.

37. 12 October 2023: The Officer and Miss A were still in a relationship at this point, and the Officer recalls that this was the date of Ms A's REDACTED's birthday. The Officer was parked up in his police vehicle, awaiting instructions or allocation to a job, and exchanged text messages with Miss A.

38. 14 October 2023: The allegation that the officer drove down (address 1) appears contrary to the AA's own evidence in the radio location report where the analyst comments that "it is highly likely that Moneeb Hussain was travelling down (address 2) at this time. The AA is therefore invited to reflect on this part of the particulars. However, the Officer accepts that he may have driven down (address 1) on occasions, as part of his normal patrols. When in a relationship with Miss A, the pair had an ongoing joke where Miss A would ask the Officer to keep his street safe, and the Officer would drive down her street and send Ms A a text message along the lines of "your street is still safe." The Officer and Miss A were still in a relationship at this point.

39. 21 and 22 October 2023: The Officer and Ms A were still in a relationship at this point. However, this was during the period when the relationship was breaking down and, whilst he cannot specifically recall, the Officer was likely speaking to Miss A and processing the situation that was developing in their relationship.

40. 23 October 2023: The Officer's possible reasons for driving down and/or stopping on (address 2) have already been addressed. It is alleged that the officer "appears" to have driven down (address 1) and the radio location refers to a realistic probability that he drove down (address 2). This part of the Particulars and the supporting evidence lacks the necessary level of assurance to say that the Officer actually drove down (address 1), as Appendix 1 to the radio location reports confirms reflects only a 40-50% level of probability.

41. 1 November 2023: The radio location report states that it is "likely" that the officer was driving down (address 2) past the junction of (address 1). The Officer has already set out why he may have done this. The fact that the radio location report author deems it likely that the Officer only drove down (address 2) must mean that it is less than likely that he actually drove down (address 1).

12 November 2023: The Officer accepts that he drove down (address 2) on two occasions. However, the Officer considers that PC Kenyon has presented a partial picture of the events of that night. The Officer and PC Kenyon were the allocated P1 (Rochdale) van during this night shift. (address 2) and (Miss A's workplace) are both part of the P1 area. PC Kenyon mentioned that her partner lived on (REDACTED) and asked the Officer where Miss A lived. It was in these circumstances that the Officer informed PC Kenyon where Miss A lived and that they drove past the location.

43. 13 November 2023: The Officer cannot recall the specifics of this date. Again, the radio location report states that it is "highly likely" that the officer was travelling down (address 2) but that there was a realistic probability that he drove down (address 1). The realistic probability conclusion lacks the necessary level of assurance to be relied upon. The officer has explained why he would travel down (address 2) above.

44. 19 November 2023: The Officer cannot recall the specifics of this date. The Officer has explained why he would travel down (addresses 1 and 2). The Officer would not, nor is it suggested that he would, stop on (address 2).

45. 10 April 2024: The Officer cannot recall the specifics of this date. The Officer has explained why he may have been on (address 2) as alleged. The radio location report shows that the Officer only spent 4 minutes on (address 2) on this date.

46. 5 May 2024: The Officer cannot recall the specifics of this date. The Officer has explained why he may have been on (address 2) as alleged.

47. 6 May 2024: The Officer cannot recall the specifics of this date. The Officer has explained why he may have been on (address 2) as alleged. It is notable that the document prepared by Paul Hamer, relating to this date, states that he was unable to check whether other resources were also allocated to attend (address 2) at the time when the Officer was shown there. It is also not suggested that the Officer spent an inappropriate amount of time on (address 2), as this date does not appear as a date of concern in the relevant section of the radio location report.

48. Particulars d read as follows On January 8th, 2024, PS 17539 Swift and Inspector 13495 Mason had cause to speak to you about your attendance at Ms A's address and place of work on duty and you were advised to stay away from Miss A and these locations. On May 8th, 2024, you were told again by PS Swift to cover the Middleton area, but you continued to gravitate back towards Rochdale.

49. The Officer accepts that he had a discussion with PS Swift and Inspector Mason on 8 January 2024, in which he was advised to stay away from Ms A's home address and/or place of work. The Officer wishes, on reflection, that he had listened to this advice more closely. The Officer considers that his judgement at the time of the discussion was likely clouded due to the effect of the end of the relationship upon him.

50. The Officer also accepts that on 8 May 2024 he was told by PS Swift to cover the Middleton area. Save where specified in the allegations relating to particular dates, it is difficult to understand what "gravitate back towards Rochdale means. However, the Officer accepts that he has continued to spend operational time in Rochdale, when allocated to Middleton. This is primarily due to the officer's familiarity with Rochdale area and the locations where traffic offences would most frequently be committed.

51. Equally, if the Officer was spending time in Middleton and there was little activity of concern and/or policing interest, the Officer may move back to Rochdale on the belief that this was an area where his policing presence would bring greater benefit.

52. The Officer would also naturally travel back to Rochdale towards the end of each shift, as he would return to Rochdale Police Station. As such, the Officer may have moved closer to the Rochdale area as his shift progressed, to place him in closer proximity to the police station in preparation for the end of his shift.

53. The Officer therefore accepts that, where specifically particularised and/or supported by evidence, he has failed to act in accordance with the advice and orders of his superior officers.

54. However, the Officer denies that stopping at other locations (i.e. not REDACTED), such as the petrol station on the Road and/or driving down (address 2) generally would amount to ignoring the advice given to him on 8 January 2024.

55. In relation to the account of the events of 20 April 2024 set out in the witness statement of PC Williams, the Officer notes this is not specified in the Particulars, and it is unclear whether the AA relies upon this as relevant to the Allegations against the Officer. However, the Officer disputes the account provided by PC Williams. The Officer accepts that he said that they should go "for a spin" meaning that they should go out on a short patrol as they were nearing the end of their shift and would be travelling back to the station a short time later. However, it was PC Williams who first raised the fact that Miss A lived in the (address 2) area and opened Apple Maps on his iPhone, which he proceeded to show to the Officer and attempt to guess where Miss A lived. The Officers were on patrol for only a short period before returning to Rochdale Police Station.

Allegation B Spending time in Rochdale when allocated to Middleton

56. Allegation B reads as follows:

B. You were allocated to the Middleton area and as a result of spending excessive time in the Rochdale area, you were not in a position to undertake your allocated policing responsibilities or otherwise fulfil the duties and responsibilities of your allocated role.

57. The Officer has responded to this Allegation in his response to Particulars d above. The Officer accepts that he has on occasion continued to focus on the Rochdale area, when allocated to Middleton. The Officer's reasons for this are set out above.

Allegation C Ignoring direct instructions from supervision

58. Allegation C reads as follows:

C. In continuing the behaviour in 1 above, you have ignored direct instructions from supervision to remain in the Middleton area and not to attend locations linked to your former partner.

59. Again, the Officer has set out his response to this Allegation in the response to Particulars b- d above. The Officer accepts that he had ignored instructions from his supervision to remain in the Middleton area and not attend locations linked to his former partner, to the extent set out above.

Summary

60. The Officer accepts that, during the full period of events relied upon by the AA, there are occasions when he has attended locations close to Ms A's home address and /or place of work. Many of these were before the Officer received advice from his senior officers on 8 January 2024.

61. Further, the Officer does not accept that all the occasions particularised in the Regulation 30 Notice arose for non-operational or other policing purposes.

62. The actions of the Officer must be viewed in the context of the full period relied upon by the AA being in excess of 6 months. There is also a significant period between 19 November 2023 and 10 April 2024 when it is not suggested that the Officer attended locations close to Ms A's home address and the instances of attendance around Ms A's place of work are limited (and not accepted by the Officer as not being for a genuine policing purpose).

63. It is submitted that the Authority has sought to place a particular (possibly sinister) interpretation upon the Officer's actions set out in the particulars and ignored a number of other possible and plausible explanations. The AA is invited to reflect upon its approach to this issue.

64. As set out above, the Officer does accept that he found the breakdown of the relationship with Miss A very difficult and that he was distracted from his operational and policing duties in the months following the breakdown. However, the Officer strongly disputes any suggestion that his actions were intended to, or would have, had any effect upon Ms A.

65. The Officer accepts that, on the basis set out above, he has failed to act at all times in accordance with the professional standards of duties and responsibilities and orders and instructions such that his actions amount to misconduct.

66. The Officer disputes that any of his actions would amount to a breach of the professional standard of discreditable conduct which requires a more significant level of breach than failing to comply with duties and orders and implies a level of public disapproval and concern. The Officer submits that such an allegation cannot be substantiated on the evidence which can be fairly relied upon against him.

Witnesses:

The following witnesses did not give live evidence, and their statements were read by the panel

PS Barton

In 2023 PS Barton was aware that PC Hussain was in a relationship with a person who worked at **REDACTED**. PC Hussain was open about this relationship and would regularly come into work with a coffee having visited on his way into work.

Around October or November 2023, PS Barton saw that PC Hussain did not appear to be himself and asked him what was wrong. PC Hussain became upset, started to cry, and told PS Barton that he and his partner had split up. PS Barton could not recall the reasons PC Hussain gave but did remember giving PC Hussain some reassurance, that the way he was feeling wouldn't last forever and to keep busy, take up an activity and if he needed anything, to come and speak to PS Barton again. Sometime between that day and February 2024 PS Barton overheard staff talking about PC Hussain being seen near to **REDACTED**. After this PC Hussain was spoken to by Inspector Mason and PS Swift about his behaviour. PS Barton was not present for this conversation. PS Barton raised the issue informally with PC Hussain who said that he and Ms A were still friends, still talked and that it wasn't anybody's business.

Sometime between the end of April 2024 and 05/05/2024 PC Barton heard officers mentioning that PC Hussain had been seen on address 2 on multiple occasions whilst on duty. PS Barton was aware that PC Hussain's ex-partner from **REDACTED** lived near to that location. This came from PC Kenyon and PC Williams following on from being teamed up with PC Hussain. Whilst teamed up they had gone to this location whilst on duty instead of attending an incident on one of the occasions. Because of this PS Barton started to conduct his own enquiries after feeling concerned with the nature of his actions. Ultimately, he felt it wasn't professional, possibly placed someone at risk and could be damaging to the force.

PS Barton started to monitor PC Hussain on Control Works Mapping and would often find him showing on address 2, but on several occasions, he was not able to screenshot them in time for reference.

PS Barton did however manage to collate some screenshots. PS Barton exhibited screen shots between the 30th April 24 and the 8th May 24.

PS Barton contacted Force Command & Control and asked for them to run an audit on PC Hussain's movements from 29/04/2024 21:00hrs until 30/04/2024 07:00hrs. This was a 10-hour night shift in which PC Hussain attended address 2 on 10 occasions.

On either 05/05/2024 or 06/05/2024 between 07:00hrs and 11:00hrs PC Hussain attended address 2 on 3 occasions. A screenshot of a team conversation between Pau Hamer and PS Barton was produced which corroborated this account.

On Wednesday 8th May 2024, PC Hussain had been placed on duty in the P3 area. The P3 is the Middleton / Heywood side of Rochdale to create space between him and address 2. Despite being put on the P3 area, PC Hussain has continued to gravitate to the P1/P2 side of Rochdale and continued to frequent address 2 as documented.

PC Hussain was told on more than one occasion to stay on the P3 area during this duty. PC Hussain was tasked with attending an incident at an address in Castleton which is just over the border between the P3 and P1 however Castleton was still 3.5 miles from address 2. Despite this PC Hussain has still made his way to address 2 after the Incident. PC Hussain has then attended an incident in Rochdale town centre, however after the incident in Rochdale town centre PC Hussain went back to address 2.

On one occasion during this tour of duty, PC Hussain has spent 15 minutes on address 2 before leaving and returning again, this time he has attended and PNC'd a vehicle or two. When asked by Comms his location he has told them CROXTON AVENUE which is 2 miles from address 2.

PC Quinn

PC Quinn stated that he had known PC Hussain for approximately 3 years and was aware that PC Hussain was in a relationship with a female that worked at REDACTED.

PC Quinn said that it became apparent that PC Hussain would only respond to traffic incidents. Around September 2023, PC Quinn raised with his supervision that he had had an extremely busy shift and had attended several grade one incidents and had accumulated a significant amount of work.

Throughout the evening, PC Quinn could hear other officers attending incidents and providing their updates via the radio airwaves. When PC Hussain could be heard, it was only in relation to minor driving offences with his location being near to REDACTED. This behaviour continued for a long time, and it became increasingly frustrating that the rest of the shift had to attend difficult and sometimes potentially dangerous incidents whilst PC Hussain would only look for traffic incidents, this included both responding to and proactively searching for traffic offences. PC Quinn raised a complaint to his supervisors because it always seemed to be that the only time, he would hear PC Hussain on the radio would be when he said, "PNC vehicle" on the road near to REDACTED.

PC Quinn said that it seemed that PC Hussain was allowed to use his shift time to do whatever he wanted to do, rather than actually respond to taskings.

PC Quinn said that he became aware that PC Hussain and his girlfriend had separated around October 2023. PC Hussain was quite upset. After this, it became apparent that PC Hussain's ex-partner lived on or near to address 2. The radio transmissions from PC Hussain changed to be vehicle checks on address 2 or another road which is in close proximity to address 2. These were balanced with further vehicle checks being made on the road near to REDACTED too.

PC Quinn was unsure as to how he became aware where PC Hussain's ex partner lived.

PC Kenyon told PC Quinn that she had been teamed up with PC Hussain in a van on a night shift. PC Kenyon said that after an incident they had attended address 2, going into a cul de sac whereby PC Hussain told PC Kenyon that his ex-partner lived on the street and pointed out her car and her friend's car and then said that his ex-partner would send him a text asking, "Why is he on her street". PC Kenyon had responded "That's weird".

PS Lucas

PS Lucas said that he was PC Hussain's direct manager for 14 months. PS Lucas was aware that PC Hussain was in a relationship with a female.

PC Hussain was upset and told PS Lucas that his relationship had ended. PS Lucas could not recall the conversation but did recall giving PC Hussain advice in regard to PC Hussain needing to give his ex-partner space, and PC Hussain should refrain from contacting her by any means and PC Hussain should refrain from attending locations he would have known her to be at. This advice was offered to guide PC Hussain. PS Lucas did not recall PC Hussain's exact response, but PC Hussain did show an understanding and acknowledgement of the advice.

PS Swift

On 8th January 2024, Inspector Mason and PS Swift spoke to PC Hussain regarding general work-related performance, and concerns raised by officers over PC Hussain's attitude at incidents, and his ex-partner. This meeting lasted 40 minutes. Inspector Mason and PS Swift raised the matter of concern from officers that PC Hussain was attending his ex-partners home address on address 2 and her workplace at **REDACTED**.

One of the points raised was that PC Hussain had driven PC Kenyon to address 2 and parked outside his ex-partner's address. When PC Kenyon has asked why he has parked up there, PC Hussain has pointed out that it was his ex-partners address and was checking out what the vehicles outside were. PS Swift noted that PC Hussain made no response or challenged the account of attending his ex-partner's address and checking what vehicles were outside. PC Hussain stated that the relationship was on and off and it was affecting his mental health

Inspector Mason and PS Swift asked PC Hussain if he needed any support with this but PC Hussain turned down any support.

PC Hussain reiterated that the relationship on and off and that the ex-partner would call and text him to get back together, or to talk. He was again advised that if this was the case then it might be in his interest to not engage with her further if it was negatively affecting his mental health. PC Hussain was told that if the relationship was over that PC Hussain should not be going to his ex-partners home address, or workplace. PC Hussain stated that he went to **REDACTED** for his coffee and PS Swift told him he should go elsewhere for coffee. PC Hussain was disgruntled with this and asked, why couldn't he get a coffee from where he wanted. PS Swift reiterated that if the relationship is over, it would be in PC Hussains best interest to get his coffee from elsewhere and not risk any allegations by his ex-partners.

On Wednesday 8th May 2024, PS Swift told PC Hussain that he was to cover the P3 area, which covered Middleton and Heywood. PS Swift was aware that whilst not at work, further concerns had been raised that PC Hussain was returning to his ex-partner's address. Despite being told by PS Swift that he was to go to the P3 area, PC Hussain returned to Rochdale Police station following his appointment given to him on briefing. Before 1800hrs, PS Swift asked PC Hussain whether he had finished with the appointment he was given at 1600hrs. On confirming he had, PS Swift have told PC Hussain that he needed to go onto the P3 channel and go to the P3 area.

PS Swift noted that if PC Hussain was previously placed on the P3 subdivision, he would not stay on the correct channel, and would remain either at Rochdale Police Station, or in the Rochdale area. PS Swift brought this up a number of times on duty, but PC Hussain would continue to frequent Rochdale.

Inspector Mason

Around October 2023, PS Lucas notified Inspector Mason of difficulties that PC Hussain was experiencing at work due to a recent breakup with his girlfriend.

On January 8th, 2024, PS Swift and Inspector Mason conducted a formal discussion with PC Hussain after having received information from PS Swift regarding concerning behaviour related to PC Hussain's ex-girlfriend's breakup, including reports of him driving past her residence and frequenting her workplace while on duty.

PC Hussain confirmed communication with his ex-girlfriend but denied any inappropriate behaviour. PC Hussain was advised against visiting Ms A during duty hours and was instructed to cease visiting her workplace. Following this, PC Hussain was placed on a development plan by PS Swift.

On March 9th 2024, during an unrelated meeting, PC Hussain reiterated his struggle with the breakup, expressing uncertainty about reconciliation and Inspector Mason advised PC Hussain to focus on moving forward and offered continued support.

Inspector Mason was advised of further instances of PC Hussain visiting Ms A's street while on duty.

Inspector Taylor

In January 2024, Inspector Taylor met Chief Inspector Saville at **REDACTED**. Whilst sat in **Miss A's workplace**, CI Saville saw a police car parked outside and said something to the effect of "Who's in that car?" and "Is that him from B Relief?" Inspector Taylor saw a marked patrol car outside in the parking bays at the front of the shop. It was facing inwards towards **Miss A's workplace**, but Inspector Taylor could not see who was inside the vehicle and the occupant did not come into **Miss A's workplace**.

Chief inspector Saville

Sometime in January 2024, CI Saville met Inspector Taylor at **Miss A's workplace** when he saw a marked patrol car pull up to the front entrance of the shop. CI Savill recalled commenting to Inspector Taylor that the officer will be surprised to see them when they walk in. No one got out of the patrol car, so CI Saville looked out of the window to see who it was and saw PC Hussain. However, initially he could not recall his name but remembered he was on the B relief team. PC Hussain was sat in his patrol car and appeared to be using his phone. After around 10 minutes, PC Hussain reversed the patrol car and drove out of the service station and out of sight.

The following witnesses gave live evidence:

PC Kenyon

On Sunday 12th November 2023, PC Kenyon said she was working a night shift from 21:00hrs-07:00hrs and was tasked with covering the Rochdale area in a fully livered police van with PC Hussain. PC Kenyon was unaware of the exact time, but PC Hussain was driving the police van and began to drive down address 2. PC Kenyon was initially under the impression that they were conducting pro-active policing and just showing a police presence within the local area, however PC Hussain turned into a cul-de-sac off address 2. Whilst they drove up the street, PC Hussain pointed to a house on the right-hand side and informed PC Kenyon that this was his ex-girlfriend's house. PC Hussain then proceeded to state that her car was outside the house and so was one of her friend's cars. PC Hussain slowed the van down as they drove past the house and then continued to the top of the street and turned the van around as it was a dead end. As they drove back past the house to exit the cul-de-sac back onto address 2 PC Hussain said something along the lines of: "She'll ring me soon asking why I was on her street". PC Kenyon responded with "That's weird". PC Hussain then began to tell PC Kenyon about the breakup with Ms A and that he was devastated by this.

PC Kenyon said that the incident did not sit well with her, so at her earliest convenience, she spoke with PS Swift and made him aware of what had happened that night.

PC Kenyon mentioned the incident to a couple of colleagues and told them that it made her feel uncomfortable and they then advised her to speak with supervision, which she had already done.

PC Williams mentioned to PC Kenyon that on the 21st April that PC Hussain had driven PC Williams to the same location that PC Hussain had taken PC Kenyon to.

Cross examination

PC Kenyon stated that the date of the incident was the 12th November 2023, but PC Kenyon did not give her statement until the 9th May 2024, and she had given a statement because she had been approached by her inspector and asked to give a statement. She stated that she had not made any notes at the time.

It was put to PC Kenyon that she had asked PC Hussain to drive past her partners address to check that he had got home. PC Kenyon denied this stating she did not raise any suggestion that they should drive past her partner's address.

PC Kenyon stated that she did not ask PC Hussain where his partner lived as she was already aware of where Ms A lived.

It was pointed out that in his statement PS Swift had said that PC Kenyon had told PS Swift that PC Hussain had parked outside the address. PC Kenyon said that she could not recall them parking.

PC Kenyon said that there was no discussion about the address of her former partner and PC Kenyon did not point out to PC Hussain the address of her former partner who she had separated from a long time ago.

PC Kenyon accepted that she had had discussions with other officers about PC Hussain, but they had not joked about PC Hussain.

PC Williams

PC Williams said that he knew that PC Hussain had separated from his girlfriend. It was rumoured that Ms A lived in address 2.

PC Kenyon told PC Williams that she had been paired up with PC Hussain and that he had taken her on address 2 to be proactive. PC Kenyon said that PC Hussain's behaviour was weird, and she did not know what to do about it.

On a separate occasion PC Williams was paired with PC Kenyon when they became aware that PC Hussain was dealing with an incident on address 2 and PC Williams and Kenyon shared their thoughts that it was a coincidence that PC Hussain was on address 2.

Following this, PC Williams has heard PC Hussain shout up multiple times for PNC's from address 2 and has heard PC Hussain state on other incidents that he was making from address 2.

On the 20th April 2024 PC Hussain and PC Williams had to transport a prisoner to custody. On the way back to Rochdale, PC Hussain said something along the lines of "Shall we go for a spin around the block". PC Williams was hesitant as they both still had paperwork to complete however PC Hussain stated that they had plenty of time. Although PC Williams did not know the area well, he knew they were approaching address 2 and knew that this was PC Hussain's ex partner's address. Following this PC Williams then said, "Of course you would take us here". PC Hussain replied words to the effect of "Fuck off. You know she doesn't even live on here"

PC Hussain was scanning the street. However, on one particular street on the right PC Hussain looked to his right through the window into this street. However, PC Williams did not get the name of the street and could only describe it being halfway down address 2. PC Williams said to PC Hussain "She doesn't live on address 2, she lives off one of the streets".

PC Williams told PC Kenyon where PC Hussain had taken him and PC Kenyon said that PC Williams needed to tell supervision.

Cross examination

PC Williams accepted that there had been conversations with colleagues about where Ms A lived. He accepted that he had spoken to PC Kenyon about PC Hussain's actions.

It was put to PC Williams that he was relying on rumour about PC Hussain being in the address 1 and 2 area. PC Williams said that he had heard PC Hussain shout up on multiple occasions about being on address 2, but he could not recall the exact number of times that PC Hussain had called from address 2.

PC Williams said that he could not recall if he had told PC Hussain that he had been watching him on maps but accepted that was something that he could have said.

PC Williams said that he would not usually go out and be proactive towards the end of a shift.

When PC Williams and PC Hussain were on address 2, PC Williams took out his phone to look at maps because he was looking at the names of streets as he did not know the names of the relevant roads. PC Williams accepted that PC Hussain did not stop the police vehicle on address 2 or pull into address 1.

PC Williams said that he had discussed this incident with colleagues as he was young in service and wanted advice.

PC Williams said that he did not recall any individual jokes about PC Hussain, but when the details of a specific incident were put to PC Williams, PC Williams accepted that was something that a specific officer may have said.

In response to questions from the panel, PC Williams said that he could not recall if PC Hussain was specifically designated to P3 or P1 on the 20th April 2024.

PC Hussain

PC Hussain joined the police force in April 2021. He was a response officer in Rochdale, which meant that if a job came in, he could be allocated to it. If there were no allocated jobs, then he was expected to be proactive. PC Hussain said that he enjoyed pulling cars over and checking cars. PC Hussain said that when he was on patrol he would move around, and would check on side roads, because there was a greater risk of a burglary on a side road.

PC Hussain said that he was in a relationship with Ms A from August 2022 and the relationship ended on 25th October 2023. He found the breakup to be one of the toughest things that he had ever had to deal with. He felt down and he struggled to do day to day jobs. In May 2024, PC Hussain spoke to his welfare officer and asked for help. He has now utilised that support and is in a much better position.

He said that he had been offered support by senior officers but did not take it. He thought he could deal with it himself and it was just a phase. "As a man I thought I could deal with it". PC Hussain stated that if this were to happen again, he would seek support and there is no shame in that.

PC Hussain said that Ms A worked part time, mainly weekends at REDACTED, but he could not recall her exact hours. He had used Miss A's workplace several times a day before he started his relationship with Ms A. He continued to use Miss A's workplace whilst he was in a relationship with Ms A. After the relationship ended, he would still visit Miss A's workplace, but not to see Ms A. He tended to use REDACTED as he could not deal with the thought of seeing her. PC Hussain said that he would use the petrol station which is on the same site as Miss A's workplace. PC Hussain denied that he had visited the REDACTED 3 or 4 times in an evening.

On the 18th January 2024, PC Hussain said that he was on shift. He provided a copy of his pocket notebook, but there were no entries in the notebook to assist as to why he was in the area of REDACTED for 153 minutes, but said that he was not there to see Ms A. PC Hussain said that he was working the whole of that shift with another officer who was called Mohammed Hussain.

On the 29th February 2024, PC Hussain said that he was in the area of REDACTED as he had stopped and seized a car. That car needed to be recovered, and PC Hussain had to stay with the car and that could take up to 90 minutes.

PC Hussain said that he had put posts on Instagram REDACTED. These were friendly messages from Ms A.

PC Hussain said that he had patrolled address 1 and address 2 before he met Ms A. He said that address 2 was part of his patrol area and he knew it well.

He accepted that during his relationship with Ms A, he would infrequently visit her whilst on duty. When he was in the relationship with Ms A, he would park up on address 2 to drop at home after they had been out. When the relationship ended, he would park up at the same location on address 2 and would sometimes just cry. He regarded it as a comfort spot.

When the relationship with Ms A ended, he would still patrol the address 2 area.

PC Hussain was taken through the specific dates in the Regulation 30 notice and said that he could not recall what he was doing on those occasions. As per the radio location analysis report, PC Hussain accepted that he was in the area. PC Hussain said that there were policing purposes for him being there and he did vehicle stops.

He said that up to the 19th November no concerns had been raised with him about being in the area.

PC Hussain accepted being in the police vehicle with PC Kenyon. PC Hussain said that PC Kenyon was on her telephone to her partner and asked PC Hussain if they got a chance, could they drive past her partners house to check her partner had got home safely and then PC Kenyon gave PC Hussain her partners address.

PC Hussain accepted that he drove into address 1 as PC Kenyon was asking questions about his relationship with Ms A, and he pointed out where Ms A lived. PC Hussain said that PC Kenyon did not say "That's weird".

On the 8th January 2024, PC Hussain accepted that he had a meeting with Inspector Mason and PS Swift. PC Hussain said that they wanted to give him some advice and look after him. Concerns were raised that he was going to the coffee shop excessively and they told him that they wanted what was best for him and he was not to go there anymore. They said that PC Hussain was to go elsewhere to avoid confrontation.

PC Hussain said that he could not specifically recall being told not to go near Ms A's address, but PC Hussain did accept the contents of Inspector Mason and PS Swift's statements.

PC Hussain saw the contents of this conversation as being friendly advice and did not regard it at the time as being a lawful order, but looking back it was an order and he accepted that he should have followed it. PC Hussain accepted that after the 8th January 2024, he continued to use Miss A's workplace. It was a habit. That was where he got his coffee from before and during the relationship with Ms A. He continued to go to address 2.

PC Hussain said that nothing was said to him about spending time in the P1 area when he was allocated to 3.

PC Hussain said that he was still carrying out policing duties in the P1 area, even though he had been told to go to P3. He was issuing reports and tickets.

PC Hussain accepted that he was in the vehicle with PC Williams and they were heading to Rochdale when PC Hussain suggested going for a spin. PC Hussain said he and his colleagues were pushed to be proactive and were told not to go back to the police station till 6am. PC Williams did not offer any resistance to the suggestion that they go for a spin. PC Hussain accepted that PC Williams did say "Of course you would take us here" when they got onto address 2.

PC Hussain said that other police officers were "taking the mick" out of him and asking where he had come from and saying, "Bet you've come back from your ex's". Other police officers laughed at him.

8th May 2024, PC Hussain accepted that he was allocated to the P3 area and that was where he should have stayed. He accepted that he spent time in P1 when he was told to be in P3, saying that "P1 was an area I knew well".

PC Hussain said that shifts always finished at Rochdale police station and so towards the end of the shift he would start to move towards P1 as it was some distance to get back from P3.

PC Hussain said that he was suspended on the 9th May 2024.

Cross examination

PC Hussain said that he accepted that he had been to address 2 after the 8th January 2024 when he had been told to avoid it.

He accepted that he had been to **Miss A's workplace** after being told not to go there.

He accepted that the contents of the meeting with PS Swift and Inspector Mason on the 8th January 2024 was an order and not a request.

PC Hussain accepted that there was a conversation in May 2024 about being told to stay on P3 area.

PC Hussain also accepted that P1 and P2 constituted a large area. Address 2 is a short street compared to the overall area and address 2 is a cut through road, but it is not the only through road.

PC Hussain accepted that PC Williams had heard PC Hussain shout up for PNC checks on address 2. PC Hussain said that he did not stop a vehicle every time he did a PNC check.

In response to questions from Mr Goss, PC Hussain accepted that he gravitated towards address 2 for a non-policing purpose.

PC Hussain accepted that he had driven PC Williams to address 2 at some time after the 8th January 2024, which was after he had been instructed not to go to addresses connected to Ms A.

PC Hussain maintained that PC Kenyon asked PC Hussain to drive past her partner's address to check he had got home safely.

PC Hussain accepted that he had attended at address 2 on the 8th May 2024.

It was put to PC Hussain that if he was assigned to the P3 area and went into the P1 area, he could not to his job in P3.

The panel raised questions

The panel noted that PC Hussain in evidence had submitted a pocket notebook with an endorsement that he was on patrol with PC Mohammed Hussain on the 18th January 2024. The panel noted that there was no evidence from PC Mohammed Hussain and that PC Hussain had referred to logs in his pocket notebook which had not been provided to the panel.

PC Mohammed Hussain

In response to the panels queries, PC Mohammed Hussain provided an email to PSD with a copy of his pocket notebook for the 18th January 2024. PC Mohammed Hussain said that he could not recall anything specific about the 18th January 2024 but said that his pocket notebook confirmed that he had been working with PC 3332 Hussain on that day.

A log was later produced for the 29th January 2024 which confirmed that PC Hussain was dealing with the recovery of a vehicle for 87 minutes.

Pre prepared statement dated 23rd April 2025 used in interview under caution

1. I was served with a Regulation 17 Notice on 10th May 2024 as part of an investigation by the Professional Standards Directorate.

2. This Regulation 17 Notice states that I may have breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of: a. Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct

3. I am informed that these allegations relate to alleged conduct regarding my former partner, Miss A It is alleged:

a. That I have parked outside **REDACTED**, which is the work address of my ex-partner, Miss A, without any reason to be parked there.

b. That I have filled up patrol cars multiple times per tour of duty at the petrol station opposite **REDACTED**.

c. That I have regularly parked near to my ex-partner's home address on Relevant Address 2 where I had no operational reason to be in the area.

4. It is alleged that my behaviour constitutes a dereliction of duties, distracted me from potential genuine allocation to duties and ignored instruction from supervision to desist in this behaviour.

The allegation is assessed at the level of Gross Misconduct.

Misconduct Caution

6. I do not have to say anything but it may harm my case if I do not mention when interviewed, or when providing any information under Regulation 18(1) or 31(2) or 31(3) or 54 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, or Regulation 20 of the Police (Complaints & Misconduct) Regulations 2020, something which I later rely on in any misconduct proceedings or accelerated misconduct hearing or any appeal proceedings.

7. This account is given to the best of my recollection, however some of the events in question took place over a year ago and therefore I may not be able to recall everything that occurred perfectly. However, I have recalled events as precisely as possible and am providing this account to the best of my ability in the circumstances.

Account

8. I am Police Constable Moneeb Hussain of Greater Manchester Police.

9. At the outset, I deny that my actions amounted to Gross Misconduct.

10. (left blank)

11. I can confirm that Miss A is my ex-partner. We split up on 25th October 2023 after she lied to me about another man. A couple of weeks prior to this when we were having issues, I went to see PS Barton and PS Lucas, my supervising Sergeants at the time, during shift and I burst into tears whilst telling them what was happening. My recollection is that PS Lucas sent me home and that they both advised me that if Miss A was asking for space, I should give it to her. They offered me support and I was extremely grateful for this.

12. I accept that there will have been occasions when I went to REDACTED or the petrol station next to it during the course of my shift. This will have occurred both before and after my split with Miss A as a usual course of my refreshment break or filling up the car, given that it is very close to Rochdale Police Station. It is a convenient location for fuel, coffee and food.

13. I am aware that PS Swift has stated that in January 2024, he advised me that I should go elsewhere for coffee rather than REDACTED and that I did not follow this advice. This was raised by Inspector Mason during a conversation with him and PS Swift on 8th January 2024, rather than PS Swift. I did not respond to Inspector Mason when this was said. I appreciate that I did not follow the advice that Inspector Mason had provided and that if I had done so, I would likely not be in this situation. However, I took this as personal advice from my Inspector, rather than a lawful order. I accept now that it was foolish not to listen to him. However, I did not go to REDACTED when I expected that I would run into Miss A

14. I do not accept that I have ever filled up a police car at the petrol station up to 5 times in a single shift, and I would anticipate that records of this could be checked. There have been occasions where I will have visited this location multiple times during a shift, such as when I have started the shift by getting a coffee, then potentially fuelling up the police car and later getting some food. There would also be a number of times when I would pull cars into the car park by the petrol station as a convenient location during a traffic stop.

15. At no time did I ever intend to go to REDACTED to see Miss A, and in fact did not want to see her given that it was a difficult break up for me. Following our breakup I only ever saw Miss A on two occasions at or near her work. This was firstly on one occasion where I went REDACTED and she served me, joking that she had stirred my coffee with her finger, and the other was where I pulled a VW Golf over into the petrol station car park. Miss A came out of REDACTED and came to speak to me in my car, asked to have a quick chat with me and told me to get home safe.

16. The suggestion that Miss A wrote 'Leave me alone' on a The Coffee Shop cup and that I brought it into the police station or posted it on Instagram is absolutely ridiculous and the result of someone spreading a rumour for no other reason than to cause me hurt. I did on occasion post a photo of the coffee I had bought where Miss A had written a funny message on it. For example, I have enclosed two examples of this, one where she had written "4 the loser" on the lid with a love heart and one where she wrote "Princess". She never wrote anything on there like 'Leave me alone'.

17. I enjoy being a proactive Police officer and have always wanted to be a traffic officer. Therefore, I accept that I will spend a lot of my shift in a car if possible and would tend to proactively police traffic matters, so long as it did not negatively impact any of my other policing duties.

18. Travelling down relevant address 2 would have been a regular part of my job, particularly when based on the P1 area due to the fact that this road is a key through road between (2 busier roads)

19. I accept that there were some occasions where I have parked up on relevant address 2 during the course of my duties. This would normally be towards the end of my shift and as

part of my normal patrols. Miss A was aware that I would do this and that I had explained on one occasion that it assisted me with processing my feelings after the breakup as it was the area that we would park up and chat when we were in a relationship. I would usually continue working whilst doing this and it at no point impacted my work or made me unavailable for any potential calls. However, I admit that there was at least one occasion where I was parked up on relevant address 2 and simply cried. On this occasion, whilst parked on relevant address 2 a car with extensive damage drove at speed onto relevant address 2 from (another) Road, which included sparks flying from the wheel due to the damage. I immediately activated my emergency equipment and caused the vehicle to stop. I had no idea how many people were in the car so shouted up for backup, albeit it transpired that there were only two occupants. This incident is referred to in PC Quinn's statement.

20. On 8th May 2024 I accept that I parked up on during my shift. I was travelling back from a job in Castleton. It was near the end of the shift and so I ran a short patrol around the P1 area to see if there was anything proactive I could undertake. Whilst travelling along relevant address 2, Comms asked me for an update on the job and I offered to send it via Teams. I sent the update and noticed that Miss A drove past me. I did not speak to her or signal towards her and left to attend a Grade 1 emergency call in the Town Centre shortly after this.

21. I accept that there were occasions when I was assigned to the P3 area but travelled into the P1 area. The two main reasons for this were that I knew P1 as an area very well, having policed it regularly, and secondly there were a number of officers on our shift that were not trained to drive to the level of immediate response. As such, if an emergency call came in, I would seek to attend in order to assist my colleagues.

22. However, I do acknowledge that there have been occasions where I have been in the P1 area when I should have been in the P3 area as per my direction. I do wish to clarify one matter regarding this that has been raised in the statement of PS Swift. There was an occasion where I left Rochdale Police Station during my shift. Shortly after leaving, I spotted a vehicle that had been the result of a stop some days prior where I arrested the driver for drug driving and later issued a PG9 for the vehicle and he had later failed to stop when I saw him again. I noted that the car did not appear to have rectified the issues for the PG9 and I shouted up for a PNC check. I then followed the car to Croxton Avenue and asked for more patrols to attend but nobody was available. I pulled the driver over and informed him that he would be reported for failing to stop and the PG9 offences.

23. I accept that shortly after this I was on (another road) Road and may have travelled via relevant address 2. I believe that I came across a white van and issued another ticket to the driver. PS Swift then contacted me and instructed me to head to the P3 after I had finished where I was and I headed to the P3.

24. The issue of my driver training was raised one further time after I raised an issue with PS Swift to Inspector Mason. PS Swift put me on shift as the appointment car and allocated officers to immediate response vehicles that did not have the necessary driver training to utilise these vehicles. I went to another department and raised the question of whether I could obtain a vehicle, to which they said yes. PS Swift shouted at me from the door and took the keys from me, grabbed my coat and vest and pulled me forwards and escorted me to the Inspector's office. I raised the issue with Inspector Mason after he had asked everyone else to leave and said that PS Swift was not fit to be a Sergeant. Inspector Mason told me to take a break initially and then come back. When I came back, he told me that what PS Swift had done was wrong and asked what I wanted to do. I said I didn't want to do anything, and it was left at that.

25. The suggestion from PC Kenyon of the events of 12th November 2023 is taken very much out of context. We had been double crewed on a night shift and ended up driving down relevant address 2. However, this was because PC Kenyon had initially asked me if I could drive past her partner's house, as part of our regular patrol to make sure that he got

home safe. I have no idea why she asked to do this, but I agreed, but we never actually drove there due to incoming incidents taking priority. After this, she asked where my ex-partner lived and other questions about our relationship. I confided in PC Kenyon about my relationship with Miss A and when we were nearby I drove down relevant address2 and briefly onto relevant address 1 to show her. It was at this time that PC Kenyon asked if Miss A and I were going to get back together and I told her I didn't know. I had confided in her as a friend about this during a time that I was struggling with the fallout of the relationship with Miss A. In hindsight, I should not have driven to show PC Kenyon where Miss A lived, but we were still on patrol in the area and did not suffer any kind of diminished response to any incident as a result.

26. I further dispute PC Williams' account of the events of 21st April 2024. I accept that I suggested on the way back to Rochdale that we 'go out for a spin'. What I meant by this was to do a quick patrol as we were near the end of the shift and would be heading back to switch over the vans shortly. I agree that at one stage we drove along relevant address 2. At this time PC Williams said that he believed that this was where Miss A lived and he pulled up his Apple Maps, attempting to show me the various side streets and saying words to the effect of 'is this the street she lives on'. Shortly after, we travelled back to Rochdale Police Station.

27. I have no recollection of the specific incident referred to by C/Insp Saville and Insp Taylor, but I accept there will be a number of occasions where I have either aimed to go to **REDACTED** and then been immediately called out to another job, or have parked up in the car park to review my next appointment or a log for an incident I was about to attend, or to make a phone call in the course of my duties, rather than driving back to Rochdale Police Station to do so.

Summary

28. In summary, I wish to confirm the following.

29. I have been to **Miss A's workplace** and the petrol station on (name of Road) for professional reasons and refreshment breaks. I have never attended this location, either before or after Miss A and I broke up, to in any way stalk, harass or follow Miss A. I have not parked up outside **Miss A's workplace** without a sufficient policing reason to do so.

30. I have attended at relevant address 2 on a large number of occasions for professional reasons.

31. I have attended at relevant address 2 whilst I was on duty for personal reasons. These were not at any time to stalk, harass or follow Miss A. I had spoken with Miss A and on some occasions, I would sit there in order to help process my emotions following our breakup and on occasion I would cry. I accept that this is not the purpose that I was there for as a police officer, however I was struggling following the breakdown of my relationship with Miss A.

32. I acknowledge that there were occasions when I would be within the P1 area of Rochdale when I was assigned to the P3 area. Looking back, I believe that the cause of this may have been that I was familiar with the P1 area, having policed it regularly for some time, and found comfort in policing an area I knew well.

33. On reflection, the breakdown of my relationship with Miss A caused me more issues than I had initially thought and that I was able to understand at the time. The impact upon me of the breakdown of this relationship caused me to make some poor decisions.

34. More than anything, I regret that I did not take up more of the support that I was offered at the time. I am grateful to the members of my supervision team for offering me this support and wish I had accepted more help than I did. Almost immediately upon my release from custody after my arrest, I realised that I needed help and asked my welfare officer to help me

get some support in place and access therapy. I am pleased to say that I was able to access this and that it has helped a lot.

35. Overall, having reflected upon my behaviour, I accept that my actions amount to Misconduct in respect of the Standard of Professional Behaviour of Duties and Responsibilities. Whilst I am dedicated to my work and would have attended any call that I was asked to attend or deal with any incident that I became aware of myself, I accept that I was not where my supervisors had directed me to be and was not fully available to attend to my duties.

36. Whilst I believe that the breakdown of my relationship was the cause behind my actions, it does not excuse the poor decisions that I made or my behaviour.

37. All I hope for is the opportunity to return to the hardworking, earnest and dedicated version of myself that I was before the breakdown of my relationship with Miss A and that I would hope my supervision could attest to me being.

38. I understand and appreciate that the interview must still take place and that you will have a number of questions that you may need to ask as part of this investigation. However, on the advice of my Federation Representative and Solicitor I will not be answering any of these questions. A signed copy of this statement will be provided to you at the conclusion of the interview.

Radio Analysis Location Report

The panel were provided with a Radio Analysis Location Report which covered dates between the 12th October 2023 and the 8th May 2024.

The Radio Location Report detailed the following -

Number of minutes PC Hussain spent within **Miss A's workplace** area on weekends (05.30 hours to 23.30 hours)

Number of minutes PC Hussain spent within **Miss A's workplace** area on weekdays (4.30 to 23.20 hour)

Number of minutes PC Hussain spent within **Miss A's workplace** area outside of the coffee shop opening hours.

Number of minutes PC Hussain spent in address 2 area

The report set out the radio location events in highlighted areas.

(The panel noted that the analyst set a location filter for 100 metres around **Miss A's workplace**.)

(The panel noted that the analyst set a location filter for 39.5 meters around address 1, and between 22.1meters and 39.5 meters around address 2.

The panel were also provided with a map showing the boundaries of P1, P2 and P3 together with the location of address 1 and 2 and **Miss A's workplace**.

The Issues to be Considered

The Standards of Professional Behaviour for all police officers are set out in the regulations and are expanded upon in the College of Policing Code of Ethics, which all officers are expected to adhere to.

The panel was reminded of the following:

The panel must not speculate about other matters such as other evidence it believes might be available, what it believes someone else might have said, or what it believes some other document, not in the bundle, might have said. If there are, in the panel's judgement, 'holes' or 'gaps' in the evidence, then that is a matter that the panel must consider in deciding whether the AA has proved the allegations it makes.

Misconduct' is defined as a breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action, and 'Gross Misconduct' is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.

For an adverse finding against the officer, it is not necessary for every single fact/allegation made against him in the Regulation 30 Notice to be proved. It is sufficient to prove only some of the facts/allegations, so long as what is proved amounts to a breach of the standard (or one of the standards) identified in the Regulation 30 Notice.

The panel noted that it is the AA who brings these allegations - it is the AA, therefore, who must prove them.

This standard of proof is concerned with whether the panel is satisfied something has been proved on "the balance of probabilities". These are not criminal proceedings, and the panel does not need to be 'sure' of the matters founding any of the charges.

The starting and ending point of the panel's analysis of these allegations is the wording of the Regulation 30 Notice. Those are the matters the AA seeks to prove. The panel is only determining the allegations set out in the Regulation 30 Notice and nothing more.

The panel was provided with a number of statements from people who know the officer personally and professionally and heard live evidence from the officer.

The panel must consider the character evidence in addition to the evidence it had heard in the hearing room or read in the hearing bundles.

Good character arises from the lack of any previous findings against the officer

Good character is not a defence to the allegation, but it is relevant to the panel's consideration of the case in two ways. First, PC Hussain had given evidence. His good character is a positive feature of the officer which the panel should take into account when considering whether the panel accept what he told them. Secondly, the fact that the Officer has not offended in the past may make it less likely that he acted as is now alleged against him

Any assertions of fact in those character statements pertaining to these particular allegations must be disregarded

The weight to be attached to the character evidence is a matter for the panel. But the panel must state what weight, if any, it has put on the character evidence in its written reasons.

The panel were also reminded that PC Hussain had accepted that he had breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to Orders and Instructions and Duties and Responsibilities. He accepted that the breaches amounted to misconduct only. PC Hussain did not accept that there had been a breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour of Discreditable Conduct.

The panel took the following approach:

- a. First, to consider the facts of the case and to make findings in relation to each of the facts alleged by the AA.
- b. Second, to determine if facts were found proved, whether they constituted one or more breach(es) of the relevant Standards.
- c. Third, to consider if any conduct is found proven against PC Hussain if that amounts to Misconduct or Gross Misconduct
- d. Fourth, if appropriate, to decide what the outcome should be.

Character bundle

The panel have received and reviewed a bundle of statements from people who know PC Hussain. It is clear from this bundle that these witnesses have assessed PC Hussain to be a person of good character.

The panel noted that the majority of the character references stated that they had known PC Hussain since the latter part of 2025 and 2026. PC Yousaf stated that he had known PC Hussain since 2021, and Mr Ali had known PC Hussain since 2021 in a personal capacity.

The panel have given limited weight onto the statements in the character bundle. The panel have noted that PC Hussain has accepted that he has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to Orders and Instructions and Duties and Responsibilities

Admitted facts

The panel found the following facts to be admitted.

1. PC Hussain was in a relationship with Ms A from August 2023 until 25th October 2024.
2. Ms A lived at Address 1 which is in a Cul de sac and is in the P1 division.
3. Address 1 is accessed by driving down Address 2. Address 2 is a road that runs between 2 larger roads. Address 2 could be regarded as a “cut through”
4. Ms A worked at REDACTED. REDACTED is in the same grounds as a petrol station which housed a shop and a large forecourt.
5. PC Lucas became aware that PC Hussain and Ms A had separated. PC Lucas advised PC Hussain to give Ms A “space” and not to contact her and to refrain from attending locations that he would have known her to be at.
6. On a date in January 2024, CI Saville saw PC Hussain sitting in a police vehicle outside Ms A's workplace.
7. On the 12th November 2023, PC Kenyon was covering a 9pm to 7am shift. PC Hussain was driving the police vehicle. At 00.11 on the 13th November 2023, PC Hussain drove into address 1 and pointed out the address of Ms A and the cars belonging to Ms A and Ms A's friends. PC Hussain then announced that Ms A would “ring me soon asking why I was on her street”. PC Kenyon reported the matter to PC Quinn.
8. 8th January 2024, PS Swift and Inspector Mason had a formal meeting with PC Hussain stating that concerns had been raised that PC Hussain was attending address 2 and Ms A's workplace. PS Swift told PC Hussain that if the relationship with Ms A was over then PC Hussain should not be going to her address or place of work and that PC Hussain should get his coffee from another place and not risk any allegations by ex-partners. Inspector Mason advised PC Hussain to cease visiting Ms A place of work. The meeting lasted 40 minutes.
9. PC Hussain was given a lawful instruction and order by Inspector Mason and PS Swift.
10. On the 20th April 2024, PC Hussain was the driver of a police vehicle. PC Hussain drove PC Williams to address 2. PC Williams knew that Ms A lived in that area.

11. On the 8th May 2024, PC Hussain was told to patrol and remain in the P3 area.
12. At a point during his patrol, PC Hussain was told to attend an incident in Castleton which is located in the P1 boundary.
13. The incident in Castleton is 3.5 miles away from Address 1.
14. After dealing with the incident in Castleton, PC Hussain went to address 2 and did not return to P3. Whilst stationary on address 2, Ms A drove past PC A.
15. PC Hussain was later deployed to an incident in Rochdale town centre, which is in the P1 area, upon leaving this incident, PC Hussain returned to address 2. He did not immediately return to P3.
16. PS Barton called PSD on the 8th May 2024.
17. There is no evidence that PC Hussain has approached Ms A, or used violence to her, or spoken to her either at her place of work or at addresses 1 or 2.
18. PC Hussain accepted in evidence that his shifts would end at Rochdale Police Station which is in the P1 area. Consequently, PC Hussain would move back to Rochdale towards the end of his shift as P3 area was some distance away from the police station.

The following facts were not admitted

PC Hussain stated that PC Kenyon raised the subject of where Ms A lived and asked PC Hussain to go past PC Kenyon's partners address to check he had got home.

It was put to PC Williams that he was relying on rumours about PC Hussain being in the area of address 1 and 2 as opposed to hearing PC Hussain shout that he was in addresses 1 and 2.

Findings on disputed facts

The panel found PC Kenyon to be a credible witness.

PC Hussain said that it was PC Kenyon who asked PC Hussain to drive past her partners address to check that he had returned home. PC Kenyon stated that she would not do this and stated that her partner was an experienced police officer on a different shift. The panel did not accept that PC Kenyon would need to check that an experienced, long-standing police officer had returned home.

PC Kenyon says that she was sufficiently concerned about PC Hussains actions that she reported the matter to supervision at her earliest convenience but could not recall the date the matter was reported. PS Swift confirmed that the incident was reported to him.

The panel noted that PC Hussain accepted that he did drive to Ms A's address on this occasion with PC Kenyon in the vehicle, stating words to the effect that Ms A would call him to find out why he was on her road.

The panel found on the balance of probabilities that PC Hussain did attend Ms A's address on this occasion but did not find that PC Kenyon asked PC Hussain to drive past her partners address to check that he had returned home.

PC Williams gave evidence that he had heard PC Hussain shout up on multiple occasions from address 2. PC Williams said that he could not recall how many times.

PC Williams was asked if he had told PC Hussain that PC Williams was watching PC Hussain on maps. PC Williams conceded that he could not recall if he had said this, but it was something that PC Williams could have said. PC Williams was asked if officers had made a specific joke about PC Hussain. PC Williams again stated that he did not know, but the specific joke was something that a particular officer could have said.

The panel found PC Williams to be a credible witness. He was clear in his account but was prepared to concede points.

The panel find on the balance of probabilities that PC Williams did hear PC Hussain radio in from address 2 on several occasions and was not simply relying on rumour.

The panel find that after the end of the relationship with Ms A, that Ms A had given a pocket notebook entry stating PC Hussain had attended her workplace and parked near to her home address. The panel noted that this was not accepted by PC Hussain and Ms A had not been called as a witness and was not available for cross examination.

The panel noted that in his pre prepared statement, PC Hussain confirmed that PS Swift advised PC Hussain to go elsewhere for coffee rather than the coffee shop and that PC Hussain did not follow this advice. In the same document the officer also accepts that he would park up at address 2 which was near to Ms A address. He did this to process his feelings after the breakup.

In his regulation 31 response the officer accepted that he would go to **Ms A's workplace** once or twice a shift. He also accepted that he would park up on address 2.

PC Hussain also accepted that he would use the petrol station to purchase petrol and to buy food and drink. PC Hussain also accepted that he stopped cars on the petrol forecourt.

The panel do not accept that PC Hussain entered the coffee shop building 3 or 4 times a day. But the panel find that on PC Hussain's own admission, he attended in the vicinity of **Ms A's workplace**, which would include **her workplace**, petrol station, shop and forecourt three or four times a day.

The panel noted that in is Regulation 31 response, PC Hussain stated "The Officer accepts that Miss A may have, on occasion, seen the Officer parked up close to her home address".

In his pre prepared statement PC Hussain states "Following our breakup I only ever saw Miss A on two occasions at or near her work. This was firstly on one occasion where I went through **REDACTED**, joking that she had stirred my coffee with her finger, and the other was where I pulled a VW Golf over into the petrol station car park. Ms A came out of **her workplace** and came to speak to me".

The panel find on the balance of probabilities that Ms A would have seen PC Hussain on occasions at her place of work and parked up near to her home address.

Assessment of the evidence given to the panel

The panel note that the evidence of PS Swift, PS Lucas, PS Barton, Chief Inspector Saville, Inspector Taylor was not challenged.

The radio analysis location report was not challenged, although PC Hussain's representatives made reference to the probability yardstick, and also to the fact that the area around the coffee shop was measured at 100 meters, compared to the area around address 1 and 2.

PC Hussain

The panel noted that PC Hussain had stated that he had a policing purpose to be in the area of **Ms A's workplace** on the 29th February 2024. The panel specifically asked for the logs in

relation to that incident and that corroborated what PC Hussain had said regarding the 29th February 2024.

The panel however did not find PC Hussain to be a credible witness. The panel found that PC Hussain's explanation as to why he went to address 1 with PC Kenyon to be implausible. The panel did not accept that PC Kenyon had asked PC Hussain to drive past her partners home address. The panel found that it was implausible that PC Kenyon would need to check that her partner, who was an experienced officer had got home safely.

The panel found it to be implausible that PC Hussain would go to address 2 to try to come to terms with the breakdown of his relationship with Ms A. The panel noted that PC Hussain said that he did not want to see Ms A. He accepted that he saw Ms A on the 8th May 2024, drive past him on address 2, and that he later he went back to address 2. In addition, the panel accepted that PC Hussain went to address 1 with PC Kenyon and said, "She will call me to see why I have been on her street". The panel cannot reconcile PC Hussain saying this with the fact that PC Hussain alleged that he did not want to see Ms A and yet went to her address believing that she would contact him.

The panel also noted that PC Hussain attended at **Ms A's workplace** on numerous occasions, including dates when Ms A could have been working, when he could have seen Ms A or come into contact with her. This was contrary to PC Hussain's assertion that he did not want to see Ms A.

PC Hussain could not explain why on the 8th May 2024 he came back to address 2 when he had been ordered to work on the P3 area. The panel noted that address 2 was further away from the P3 border than the police station.

Decision on outcome

The panel found the following

The panel found that PC Hussain was in the vicinity of **Ms A's workplace** on the 29th February 2024 for 87 minutes. The AA provided a log which indicated that PC Hussain was present for 87 minutes to recover a seized vehicle. The panel found that PC Hussain had an operational or policing policy in the vicinity of **Ms A's workplace** on the 29th February 2024.

The panel found that PC Hussain was in the vicinity of **Ms A's workplace** on the 18th December 2023, 22nd December 2023, 30th December 2023, 18th January 2024, 8th March 2024, 7th April 2024 and the 18th April 2024. The panel found that the AA had not proven that PC Hussain did not have a policing purpose or operational purpose to be in the vicinity of **Ms A's workplace**.

The panel found that having a policing purpose for being in the vicinity of **Ms A's workplace** was different to being ordered not to go there or being ordered to work on the P3 area.

Before the 8th January 2024, PC Hussain was correctly patrolling the P1 area and could be conducting PNC checks around address 1 and 2 and **Ms A's workplace**.

After 8th January 2024, PC Hussain was instructed not to go to **Ms A's workplace**. However, if a situation arose near to **Ms A's workplace**, such as the seizure of the vehicle on the 29th February 2024, that would amount to an operational or policing purpose, even though PC Hussain had been told not to go there.

However, the panel did find that spending 153 minutes in the vicinity of **Ms A's workplace** on the 18th January 2024, to be excessive, noting that this was after PC Hussain had been ordered not to go to **Ms A's workplace**.

12th October 2023, PC Hussain was parked at address 2 for a period of 40 minutes. In his Regulation 31 response, he states that this was because he was waiting for instructions. The panel find that the AA have not proven that this was not for a policing or operational purpose.

14th October 2023, PC Hussain drove down address 2. The panel find the AA has not proven that this was not for an operational or policing purpose.

21st October 2023 –PC Hussain parked at address 1 for 7 minutes. The panel find that this was not for a policing or operational purpose.

22nd October 2023- PC Hussain drove down address 1 and then parked on address 2 for 3 minutes and later 16 minutes. The panel find that in his Regulation 31 response the officer states that he was likely to be talking to Ms A about the breakdown of their relationship. The panel find that this was not for an operational or policing purpose.

23rd October 2023 – the panel do not find this to be proven. There is reference to “Your next shift” but no details of when that shift was.

12th November 2023 – The allegation states that PC Hussain was with PC Kenyon and PC Hussain pointed out Ms A address. This is not the incident that PC Kenyon refers to in her evidence. In her evidence PC Kenyon stated that she came on duty on the 12th November at 9pm. Sometime during her shift, she was taken to Address 1. The radio analysis report shows that PC Hussain drove down address 2 on 2 occasions at 00.49 and 02.13 on the 12th November 2023. The panel find that the AA have not proven this was NOT for an operational or policing purpose

13th November 2023. PC Kenyon in evidence states that PC Hussain drove her to Ms A's address. The radio location analysis corroborates PC Kenyon's account. The panel found that this journey was not for an operational or policing purpose.

19th November 2023 – The panel did not find this to be proven. The panel found that the AA did not provide clear evidence to prove this allegation.

10th April 2024- The panel find that on the 8th January 2024, PC Hussain had been instructed not to attend Ms A's address or place of work. Although this was not the actual road Ms A lived on, PC Hussain was very near to the junction of address 1, as per the Radio Analysis Location Report. PC Hussain was stationary on address 2 for 4 minutes. The panel found that this was not for an operational or policing purpose.

5th May 2024. PC Hussain had been instructed not to attend Ms A address or place of work. Although this was not the actual road Ms A lived on, it was very near to the junction of address 1, as per the Radio Location Analysis report. PC Hussain was stationary on address 2 for 14 minutes. The panel found that this was not for an operational or policing purpose.

6th May 2024 – The panel found that this was not for an operational or policing purpose. PC Hussain attended Address 2 on 3 occasions between 7 and 11 am, although it was not the actual road that Ms A lived on; it was very near to the junction of address 1, as per the Radio Location Analysis report.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found the breach of the Professional Standard of Duties and Responsibilities to be proven.

On the 8th May 2024, PC Hussain was allocated to work in the P3 area and was told to stay there. It is accepted by the AA that on 2 occasions that same shift he was tasked with attending the P1 area to deal with specific policing incidents. He had been told to return to

the P3 area on completing his task in P1. PC Hussain did not immediately do this and went to address 2 on 2 occasions during that shift. In addition, PC Hussain was shown to be stationary in the vicinity of **Ms A's workplace** for 5 minutes as per the radio location analysis whilst on this shift, when he had been told to go to the P3 area.

The panel was provided with a copy of a map setting out the P1, P2 and P3 area. The map illustrated that P1 was in the north of the division and P3 was in the south of the division. Address 1 and 2 were further north than the police station. There was a significant distance between address 1 and 2 and the boundary with P3. PC Hussain accepted in evidence that Rochdale Police Station was "some distance away" from P2 area.

By attending address 2 PC Hussain placed himself further away from the P3 boundary and so any potential response time in attending an incident in the P3 area was increased. Officers are placed in locations to reduce the risk of delays in any potential call outs.

PC Hussain was not in a position to expeditiously carry out urgent tasks in P3 when he had placed himself in P1.

The panel also noted that PC Hussain stated in his pre prepared statement (paragraph 35) "I accept that I was not where my supervisors had directed me to be and was not fully available to attend to my duties".

The panel found on the balance of probabilities that PC Hussains actions amounted to a Breach of the Professional Standard of Orders and Instructions.

The panel found that on the 8th January 2024 PS Swift and Inspector Mason spoke to PC Hussain about his attendance at Ms A's address and place of work on duty. Inspector Mason ordered PC Hussain to cease visiting Ms A's place of work and PS Swift ordered PC Hussain to stop visiting Ms A's address or place of work. This was a lawful instruction or order.

On the 8th May 2024 PC Hussain was told again by PS Swift to cover the Middleton area. That was a lawful instruction or order, but PC Hussain continued to gravitate to the Rochdale area.

On the 8th May 2024, PC Hussain attended a policing incident in the P1 area. When that incident was concluded, PC Hussain did not return to P3 area but went to address 2.

PC Hussain then dealt with a second policing incident in Rochdale town centre which is in the P1 area. After concluding that incident, PC Hussain did not return to the P3 area but went back to address 2.

Attending at address 2 on the 8th May 2024 was in direct contravention of the order to remain in the P3 area.

The panel also found that on previous occasions, PC Hussain had been told to work in P3 but continued to gravitate back to P1, against instruction.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel find that PC Hussain's behaviour as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation and the Particulars of Misconduct have the potential to discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in the police service.

Police officers behave in a manner that does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in policing whether on or off duty

The panel found that on the 8th January 2024, PS Swift and Inspector Mason ordered PC Hussain not to go to Ms A's place of work or her address. Despite this order, PC Hussain attended address 2 and Ms A's place of work.

The panel found that PC Hussain was told to go to P3 area and remain there, yet he continued to attend at address 2.

The panel found that PC Hussain was told not to attend Ms A's place of work or address partly out of concern for PC Hussain's welfare. The panel noted that the instruction was given in the context of the breakdown of PC Hussain's relationship with Ms A. Officers should behave conscientiously to prevent situations developing.

The panel found that policing is a disciplined profession. There is an expectation within the police force and by members of the public that a police officer will do what he is told by supervision. The panel found that the public would be horrified to hear that a serving member of the police force is not following orders and instructions or fulfilling his duties and responsibilities. The panel noted that the order not to attend Ms A place of work or

The panel reminded itself that it is not necessary to prove that actual discredit has been brought to the police service, it is sufficient that the officer's behaviour had the potential to do so. The public have a clear expectation in relation to how police officers should behave.

Discreditable conduct can cause the community to lose trust and confidence in the service.

R v Chief Constable of Wiltshire v Police Appeal Tribunal 2012.

The Judge rejected an argument that because the police officer's foul text messages had not reached the public domain that lessened the gravity.

"I consider (counsel) is correct when he submits that it was reasonable for the panel to focus upon the nature of the words used rather than whether or not the words actually reached the public domain. The plain fact is that if any of the interested party's text or email messages had reached the public domain there would likely have been a very significant adverse comment about his conduct, The rape message, would in my judgement have led to a very significant adverse comment upon the interested party's behaviour and undoubtedly would have brought discredit upon his force"

The panel is clear that PC Hussain's behaviour had significant potential to bring the police force into disrepute and damage public confidence and therefore amounted to Discreditable Conduct. The public would not expect a police officer, to disobey an order and instruction or not fulfil his duties and responsibilities. Had the public become aware of the details of this case, it would damage the public trust in the police force.

Gross misconduct - Is defined as so serious that the sanction of dismissal without notice could be justified.

Misconduct – A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious as to justify disciplinary action.

PC Hussain's behaviour was deliberate, intentional and repeated. There was potential for harm to be caused.

PC Hussain's actions impacted on other officers, and it was clear that other officers were talking about PC Hussain's actions and felt the need to report the matter to supervision.

The panel did not accept PC Hussain's assertion regarding the level of misconduct.

The panel finds that all breaches individually and collectively amount to gross misconduct, namely a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal without notice, this is due to the nature and severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

Sanction

The panel heard submissions on sanctions from Mr Goss and Mr Donaghue

The panel considered the Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Hearings, and the panel bore this in mind in its deliberations.

The panel had sight of and considered PC Hussain service record.

The panel adopted the three-stage process as outlined in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings to determine the appropriate sanction.

The panel bore in mind the threefold purposes of the police misconduct regime namely:

- (a) Maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
- (b) Uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct
- (c) Protect the public

The panel was reminded that misconduct proceedings are not designed to punish police officers,

"The panel is then centrally concerned with the reputation or standing of the profession rather than the punishment of the doctor" (or police officer) per *Rachid v General Medical Council*.

The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the conduct.

This is assessed by reference to

The officer's culpability

The harm caused by the misconduct

The existence of aggravating features

The existence of mitigating features

The panel noted that the College of Policing Guidance on Police Conduct Hearings reminded the panel that it must look at the appropriateness of the least onerous sanction before going on to consider more onerous sanctions and always chose the least severe outcome that deals adequately with the issues identified whilst protecting the public interest. If an outcome is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings impose it even where this would lead to difficulties for the individual officer.

The panel first considered the seriousness of the proven allegations

Outcome

The panel directed itself that it must consider the officers' conduct is not serious simply because the same action on his part involves him breaching multiple Standards of Professional Behavior. The panel accepted that it is the conduct proven that matters, not the number of Standards of Professional Behavior he has breached.

Culpability

The panel found that PC Hussain's conduct was deliberate and intentional in PC Hussain drove to address 1 and 2 and to the coffee shop. He was not taken there by someone else.

The panel found that PC Hussain had no policing purpose to be at address 1 on the 13th November. Despite that, he took PC Kenyon there.

Culpability denotes an officer's blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions. PC Hussain was the only person to blame for his actions.

The panel also found that PC Hussain did not have an operational or policing purpose to be at address 1 or address 2 on the 21st and 22nd October, the 13th November 10th April 2024 and the 5th May and 6th May 2024.

The panel found that PC Hussain did not have an operational or policing purpose to be at address 2 on the 8th May 2024 on 2 occasions, in direct contravention of an order to patrol in P3.

The panel assessed the culpability as high.

Harm

The panel found that there was a risk of reputational harm to the police force. PC Hussain in his pre prepared statement said that he accepted that "I was not where my supervisors had directed me to be and was not fully available to attend my duties".

If an emergency had arisen on P3 whilst PC Hussain was rostered to work in the P3 area, but he had placed himself in P1, then there was a significant risk that PC Hussain would be delayed in getting to that emergency. This created a risk of harm to the public and that would create a risk of reputational harm to the police force.

The panel also found that there was a risk of reputational harm to the police force, if the public were to find out that a serving police officer was choosing where he wanted to patrol, despite being given orders to patrol in another area.

Most members of the public would follow instructions given by police officers and would expect that police officers are following instructions given by supervision.

If police officers are not following instructions given by supervision, then this could affect police officers' ability to police the public by consent.

The Outcomes Guidance at 4.66 states "Always take misconduct seriously that undermines discipline and good order within the police service, even if it does not result in harm to individual victims."

The panel found that the instruction to not attend Ms A's place of work or her address was given in the context of the breakdown of the relationship with Ms A, although the panel are clear that there is no evidence that PC Hussain has used violence towards Ms A, or made threats to Ms A or even approached Ms A or spoke to her.

The panel assessed the harm as high.

Aggravating features

The panel was mindful not to double count matters that have already formed part of the assessment of culpability and harm.

The panel found that PC Hussain's behavior was repeated and sustained and continued over many months.

PC Hussain continued in his behavior after he should have realised he was acting improperly. PC Hussain accepted in evidence that other officers had been talking about him and that he was the brunt of jokes. He was warned by PC Lucas, and then by Inspector Mason and PS Swift.

There was a significant deviation from instructions.

The panel found that there are aggravating features.

Mitigating features

The panel found that PC Hussain was very upset about the breakdown of his relationship with Ms A and struggled emotionally.

The panel noted that PC Hussain made admissions of misconduct in his pre prepared statement and also his Regulation 31 response.

The panel does not accept that there was any evidence of genuine remorse, responsibility or insight by PC Hussain for his actions.

The panel therefore found that there were mitigating factors

Taking all matters into consideration, the panel assessed the seriousness of the conduct as high.

Personal mitigation

The panel was mindful as to the weight that they should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings and that the interests of the police service and the protection of the public are more important than those of the individual officer.

The panel did accept that PC Hussain experienced emotional distress at the breakdown of his relationship with Ms A.

The panel noted that PC Hussain had not committed any misconduct in the past and was of good character.

The panel accepted that PC Hussain had been hardworking since his return to work In August 2025.

The panel considered PC Hussain's personal mitigation and gave it limited weight.

Sanction

The College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings reminded the panel that the panel must look at the appropriateness of the least onerous sanction before going on to consider the more onerous sanctions and always chose the least severe outcome.

The panel considered whether a final written warning would be consistent with the public interest.

The panel concluded that a final written warning would not serve to mark the seriousness of the conduct or deter others from similar conduct and fulfil the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

The panel considered the matter fully including the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behavior.

The panel came to this conclusion because PC Hussain was told by PS Lucas that PC Hussain should refrain from contacting Ms A by any means and refrain from attending locations he would have known her to be at. That advice was offered simply to guide PC Hussain.

PS Swift and Inspector Mason had a 40-minute meeting with PC Hussain where they instructed him not to attend Ms A's place of work or address. PC Hussain continued to attend Ms A's place of work, thus ignoring the instruction and order that PC Hussain had been given.

PC Hussain was told repeatedly to remain in the P3 area and did not do so.

On the 8th May 2024, PC Hussain was told to work in the P3 area. He did not remain there. The panel accepted that he was directed to attend 2 incidents in the P1 area, but on concluding those incidents he did not return to P3. Instead, he chose to drive to relevant address 2 on 2 occasions which was further away from the P3 area. This was a flagrant breach of the order and instruction to stay in P3.

Other police officers were commenting that "It seemed that PC Hussain was allowed to use his shift time to do whatever he wanted to do, rather than actually respond to taskings."

PC Hussain was showing a blatant disregard for Orders and Instructions and Duties and Responsibilities. He had been advised about what he should do in the aftermath of the breakdown in his relationship with Ms A. He had been ordered and instructed to keep away from Ms A and addresses that she frequented and then ordered and instructed to remain in the P3 area so that he could carry out his duties and responsibilities as a police officer.

The panel found that PC Hussain would have been aware what was expected of him and what he should do. He was on notice about the consequences of his actions and chose to ignore what he was told.

The panel found that a final written warning would not serve to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service or protect the public and would not uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.

The gravity of PC Hussain's breaches of the Standard of Professional Behaviour means that the panel do not consider that any sanction less than dismissal without notice is justified.

As such the panel's decision is that PC Hussain should be dismissed without notice and placed on the College of Policing's barred list

