

In the Police Misconduct Panel.

In the Matter of Chief Constable of Civil Nuclear Constabulary v Former PC Kevin Moore.

Decision.

1. This is the decision of the Police Misconduct Panel convened on Wednesday 28th January 2026 to consider the allegations of professional misconduct brought against Former PC Kevin Moore (Former PC Moore). The Panel sat for 1 day. The Panel comprised Assistant Chief Constable Michael Vance (Panel Chair), Mr Seán McHugh (Independent Panel Member) and Ms Susannah Dengate (Independent Panel Member). The Panel was assisted by Mr Gregor McGill (Legally Qualified Adviser). The Appropriate Authority (“AA”) was represented at the hearing by Mr Johnathon Landau. Former PC Moore did not attend the Panel Hearing, having declined to take part in the investigation or hearing. Former PC Moore was not represented at the hearing.

Legal and Regulatory Background.

2. The statutory and regulatory basis of the Panel lies in the Police Reform Act 2002 and the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (“the 2020 Regulations”) as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Rules 2024. In addition, the Panel is to have proper regard to the Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing issued by the Home Office also issued in 2020 known as the “HOG”.
3. The 2020 HOG states at paragraph 1.4: *“The procedures described in this guidance are designed to accord with the principles of natural justice and the basic principles of fairness. The process and procedures covered by this guidance, along with the accompanying legal framework, should be administered accordingly and applied fairly and consistently to everyone. The guidance on the individual procedures is designed to further the aims of being fair to the individual who is subject to the process, as well as all parties involved. It is intended to assist with arriving at a correct assessment of the matter in question and providing public and policing confidence in the system.*
4. Later in the HOG the duty of the panel is summarised thus: *“The persons conducting misconduct hearings will consider the facts of the case and will decide the facts (on*

the balance of probabilities) and whether the officer's conduct amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither".

5. Having determined the facts and deciding what they amount to, the Panel is then enjoined to decide what to do about them. The Panel therefore proceeded in accordance with this basic structure.
6. The purpose of the Police Misconduct Regime is set out in the most recent Guidance from the College of Policing (2023) on the outcomes in such proceedings. It states at paragraph 2.3 that it is threefold, namely (1) to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service; (2) to uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct; and (3) to protect the public. It is not meant to be primarily punitive, but it is accepted that misconduct proceedings can sometimes have that effect on officers involved in them.
7. The appropriate standards of professional behaviour for Police Officers are set out in Schedule 2 of the 2020 Regulations and the standard said to be engaged in this case is as follows: **Authority Respect and Courtesy**- *Police Officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy. Police Officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals*"; **Equality and Diversity**: *Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly*; **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.*
8. Regulation 41 (15) of the Conduct Regulations provides that the person(s) conducting the misconduct proceedings must review the facts of the case and decide whether the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
9. Misconduct is defined as a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross Misconduct is defined as a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.

Relevant Regulatory Case Law.

10. In **Bolton v Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512** Lord Bingham MR said in the context of solicitor's disciplinary proceedings that it was required of lawyers practising in the UK "*that they should discharge their professional duties with integrity, probity and complete trustworthiness*". He said that the most fundamental purpose of professional disciplinary proceedings was to maintain the profession's reputation and to "*sustain*

public confidence in the integrity of the profession... a profession's most valuable asset is its collective reputation and the confidence which that inspires."

11. In the case of **Redgrave v Metropolitan Police [2003] 1 WLR 1136**, the Court of Appeal adopted Lord Diplock's description of the purpose of disciplinary proceedings in *Ziderman v General Dental Council* [1976] 1 WLR 330:

"The purpose of disciplinary proceedings against a dentist who has been convicted of a criminal offence by a court of law is not to punish him a second time for the same offence but to protect the public who may come to him as patients and to maintain the high standards and good reputation of an honourable profession".

12. In the case of **R(Green) v Police Complaints Authority [2004] UKHL 6 at 78**, Lord Carswell said as follows:

"Public confidence in the police is a factor of great importance in the maintenance of law and order in the manner which we regard as appropriate in our polity. If citizens feel that improper behaviour on the part of police officers is left unchecked and they are not held accountable for it in a suitable manner, that confidence will be eroded".

13. In the case of **R(Coke-Wallis) v Institute of Chartered Accountants [2011] UKSC 1 at 60**, Lord Collins reaffirmed the purpose of professional disciplinary proceedings to be:

"...to protect the public, to maintain public confidence in the integrity of the profession and to uphold proper standards of behaviour...."

14. The weight to be given to personal mitigation, because of the nature and purpose of those proceedings, was discussed further in the case of **Williams v Police Appeal Tribunal [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin) at paragraph 67** where Holroyde J (as he then was) stated as follows:

"..the importance of maintaining public confidence in and respect for the police service is constant, regardless of the nature of the gross misconduct under consideration. What may vary will be the extent to which the particular gross misconduct threatens the preservation of such confidence and respect . The more it does so, the less weight can be given to personal mitigation".

Ethical Policing Principles.

15. The Ethical Policing Principles are a series of guiding statements that should be used to help people in policing do the right things, in the right way, for the right reasons.
16. One of the Ethical Principles is Respect and Empathy. In the relevant part of the principles dealing with “Acting with Respect”, the Ethical Principles state that police officers treat everyone with dignity, respect, patience and courtesy wherever possible. The appropriate words in the context of this case are “dignity” and “respect”.
17. It is against that Ethical Principle that the Panel has judged the actions of Former PC Moore in this matter.

Allegations faced by Former PC Moore.

18. Former PC Moore faced the following allegations:

“FORMER PC MOORE REGULATION 30

FACTS

At all material times you were a Police Constable serving with the Civil Nuclear Constabulary and were bound by the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

It is alleged that whilst on the Initial Foundation Program 103 (IFP) you made unwarranted and inappropriate comments to a colleague, namely PC X.

Particulars of unwarranted and inappropriate comments:

1) During the first week of the course, officers complete a form stating what weekends they intend on returning home. Whilst PC X was completing her form you approached her and said, “IF EVER YOU WANT TO GO HOME FOR THE WEEKEND YOU CAN JUMP IN WITH ME”.

Later that day or the next day you again approached PC X and said to her, “I’LL TAKE YOU HOME AT WEEKEND IF YOU WANT BUT I WON’T TAKE ALEX OR JOANNE”. The reason given was that they lived too far away.

Later that week PC X discovered that PC’s 3373 Alex Strizhov and PC 3359 Joanne Grearson reside near her in the Cumbria area and therefore had concerns as to why you offered to take just her home.

- 2) *During the first few days of the IFP PC X and you were sitting on a table for two whilst having lunch. At this time, you looked at PC X and said to her, "THIS IS LIKE A DATE AND I DON'T EVEN DATE MY WIFE". This comment made PC X feel very uncomfortable.*
- 3) *On Friday 23rd August 2024 at your Attestation Ceremony, PC X and you were sitting next to each other in the court room. During conversation with yourself, PC X informed you that she had heard strange noises coming from the hotel room next to her own. You then said to PC X, "I BET YOU HAD A GLASS TO THE WALL LISTENING", at which time you began to make groaning noises indicating a female reaching orgasm.*
- 4) *Around lunchtime on Monday 26th August 2024 whilst sat on a table with colleagues in the garden area at the Hilton Garden hotel you asked PC X, "WHICH IS YOUR ROOM?" followed by "I WAS SURE I SEEN SOMEONE NAKED". This led PC X to believe that the person you saw naked may have been herself. 7A*
- 5) (a) *PC X then changed the topic of conversation to that of self-defence training and the fact that she was a little apprehensive about it, due to most officers on the course being male and that she may find it difficult as men are stronger than women. After PC X made this comment you looked her up and down in a sexualised manner and whilst looking directly into her eyes said, "I WOULD LET YOU PIN ME DOWN".*
(b) *You continued to make comments to other colleagues present, which due to being upset she did not hear fully. As you continued to stare at PC X, she presumed the comment was made about herself so asked you, "What did you just say?" You replied, "I SAID MAYBE SHE LIKES BEING CHOKED" and whilst doing so kept looking PC X up and down in a sexual way.*

It is further alleged that after returning to your course, your misconduct continued in that you:

- (a) *made derogatory and inappropriate comments to colleagues in relation to PC X, in relation to your removal from IFP 103 and in respect of an interaction with a young child whom you saw drawing on your car; and*
- (b) *Repeatedly stared at PC X.*

Particulars of further misconduct:

6) On Monday 24th March 2025 in Ennerdale classroom at Griffin Park you were introduced to colleagues on the IFP 104. You informed them that you had been suspended for 7 months for making sexually inappropriate comments to a female officer on IFP 103. You then boasted about being suspended with full pay.

7) At midday on Tuesday 25th March 2025 in the canteen area at Griffin Park you stared intently with crossed eyebrows at PC X and appeared to be staring her down.

8) On Thursday 27th March 2025 whilst in Derwent classroom at Griffin Park you boasted, "YOU SHOULD GET SUSPENDED FOR 7 MONTHS WITH PAY IT'S GREAT".

9) At 10.00 hours on Tuesday 1st April 2025 whilst in the canteen at Griffin Park you were part of a conversation in which a colleague was discussing a move to the Maryport area of Cumbria. You stated you previously resided in Maryport and then said, "IT'S A SHITHOLE". You then went on to say, "A 3-YEAR-OLD KID WAS ONCE DRAWING ON MY CAR AND I SHOUTED AT HIM TO GET OFF MY CAR YOU STUPID LITTLE CUNT".

10) On Thursday 3rd April 2025 you boasted to a colleague from IFP 103 that you had been the subject of a suspension from the CNC for 7 months on full pay.

11) On either Monday 7th April or Tuesday 8th April 2025 you were sat with colleagues on the black sofas outside the main PST Suite discussing a colleague who had left the 7B course. At this time, you said, "WELL I GOT FULL PAY SUSPENDED LEAVE FOR BEING SEXUALLY INAPPROPRIATE".

12) At 15.00 hours on Thursday 10th April 2025, you were just outside the pedestrian access point at Griffin Park with colleagues when recruits from IFP 103 walked past heading towards their minibus.

(a) You said to those colleagues present, "DO YOU SEE THAT BLONDE LASS THERE?" to which PC Charters replied, "Yes". You then said, "THAT'S THE BITCH THAT GOT ME SUSPENDED".

(b) PC Jones said, "We know". You then leaned forward and said to PC Charters, "SHE'S A FUCKING CUNT, HONESTLY".

13) On multiple occasions when having lunch in the canteen area at Griffin Park you stared at PC X and were fixated on her.

ALLEGATIONS

It is alleged that your conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of:

Respect and Courtesy,

Equality and Diversity, and

Discreditable Conduct.

It is alleged that your misconduct, whether jointly or separately is so serious that it would justify your dismissal were you still a serving officer.

Documents and material available to the Panel.

19. The Panel had access to the following information:

- A Hearing Bundle numbered 1-159.
- An Opening Note prepared by AA Counsel.
- A Schedule of contact with Former PC Moore evidencing his intention to take no part in the Misconduct Proceedings.
- The service record of Former PC Moore.

Analysis and decision.

Preliminary Matter.

20. The Panel Chair recognized that the first set of allegations (allegations 1-5) had previously been considered under the Regulation 13 procedure. A decision had been made that, following consideration of those allegations, Former PC Moore would be removed from the Initial Foundation Programme (IFP) that he had been assigned to (IFP 103) and would continue on IFP 104. Having resumed his training on IFP 104, the further allegations (allegations 6-13) were made against Former PC Moore, and subsequently the Regulation 30 Notice set out above was served on Former PC Moore covering all the allegations.

21. The Panel Chair was referred to the High Court case of **Barnes v Chief Constable of Thames Valley [2023] EWHC 2737 (Admin).** In that case it was suggested that it was incumbent on the AA to choose to proceed under Regulation 13 or choose to proceed via

the misconduct framework set out in the relevant Police Conduct Regulations. The High Court (Lavender J) concluded that

- the legislative frameworks do not require an election of one set of proceedings to the exclusion of the other, and
- that neither of the proceedings are of “judicial tribunals” such as to engage issue estoppel or the collateral attack doctrine.

22. Having received that advice (from both Counsel to the AA and the Legally Qualified Advisor), the Chair was satisfied that it was appropriate to consider all the allegations on the Regulation 30 Notice served by the AA on Former PC Moore.

Allegation/fact 1.

23. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) The evidence of PC X. PC X gave clear evidence of the comment being made in her statement (at pages 112-117 of the trial bundle). PC X also gave clear evidence of subsequently challenging Former PC Moore about this comment and others and that he accepted that his comments were unacceptable.
- (b) Support for the allegations made by PC X was given in the statement of PC Grearson (pages 132-136 of the hearing bundle). In her statement PC Grearson stated that she met PC X in Abingdon Town Centre on 26th of August 2024. She asked her if she was OK and PC X became upset and started crying. She disclosed that Former PC Moore had made inappropriate sexualised comments to her. PC Grearson stated that the comments needed to be challenged to ensure that they were not made to anyone else and offered to be with PC X if she had a conversation with Former PC Moore to challenge the comments. PC X stated that she would deal with it herself. She saw PC X subsequently speak to Former PC Moore in private and after the conversation, PC X told her that Former PC Moore had accepted that his comments were unacceptable. This evidence gave clear support to the account given by PC X, both of the nature of the allegations and the acceptance of the unacceptable nature of them by Former PC Moore.
- (c) The only account that the Panel had in relation to this allegation/fact from Former PC Moore (and indeed any of the allegations made against him) was the statement that he gave through his Federation Representative. This was dated 11th October 2024 (hearing bundle at pages 84-86). In that account, Former PC Moore accepted that there was a conversation with PC X and other PC’s on the course about

travelling home at weekends and the possibility of car sharing. His account did not, however, deal with the specific concern raised by PC X in her allegation that when he spoke to her about this arrangement, he was only prepared to give her a lift and not the other PC's. Former PC Moore has not co-operated with the investigation, has not provided an account in interview and has not served a Regulation 31 Response to the allegations made against him. Given that and given that the account given by him does not deal with the specific allegation made by PC X, the Panel accepted the account given by PC X as an honest and truthful account about this particular matter and therefore preferred the account given by PC X over the partial account given by Former PC Moore.

Allegation/fact 2.

24. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:
- (a) The evidence of PC X. PC X gave clear evidence of the comment being made in her statement (at pages 112-117 of the trial bundle). PC X also gave clear evidence of subsequently challenging Former PC Moore about this comment and others and that he accepted that his comments were unacceptable.
 - (b) Support for the allegations made by PC X was given in the statement of PC Grearson (pages 132-136 of the hearing bundle).
 - (c) In his written account, Former PC Moore effectively accepted that this conversation took place but denied that it was in anyway inappropriate or that PC X seemed uncomfortable with the conversation. PC X was clear in her statement the nature and content of the conversation made her feel uncomfortable. The Panel was satisfied that the nature of the conversation was inappropriate between colleagues (especially colleagues who did not know each other well), was suggestive and likely to make PC X feel uncomfortable. The Panel therefore preferred the account given by PC X about this conversation to the account given by Former PC Moore.

Allegation/fact 3.

25. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:
- (a) The evidence of PC X. PC X gave clear evidence of the comment being made in her statement (at pages 112-117 of the trial bundle). PC X also gave clear evidence of subsequently challenging Former PC Moore about this comment and

others and that he accepted that his comments were unacceptable. The Panel noted in respect of this allegation that it was a very particular and specific allegation, and it would be difficult to misunderstand the nature of the noises or be mistaken about what they were. The Panel had also seen no evidence to explain why PC X would make up such an allegation against Former PC Moore.

- (b) Support for the allegations made by PC X was given in the statement of PC Grearson (pages 132-136 of the hearing bundle).
- (c) In his account referred to above, Former PC Moore denied that this incident happened at all. He believed that PC X may have mixed him up with someone else. The Panel considered that explanation but did not find it to be a credible explanation for the following reasons:
 - (i) This was a very specific allegation made by PC X. In her statement, she was very clear about what happened and that it was Former PC Moore who made the sounds complained of.
 - (ii) PC X was sitting right next to Former PC Moore and could not have been confused or mistaken about the nature of the noises being made, and that the noises were being made by him.
- (d) The Panel considered the statement made by PC Napier (pages 125-7 of the hearing bundle). PC Napier was sat in the row behind PC X but could not recall where Former PC Moore was sat. PC Napier could not recall any conversation between PC X and Former PC Moore and did not hear any noises as alleged. The Panel had no reason to doubt the evidence of PC Napier and concluded that just because PC Napier did not hear any noises, that did not mean the noises were not made in the way alleged by PC X. The Panel was satisfied that the statement of PC Napier did not undermine the truthfulness of the account given by PC X and the Panel preferred the account given about this matter by PC X over that given by Former PC Moore.

Allegation/fact 4.

26. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision are as follows:
- (a) The evidence of PC X. PC X gave clear evidence of the comment being made in her statement (at pages 112-117 of the trial bundle). PC X also gave clear evidence of subsequently challenging Former PC Moore about this comment and others and that he accepted that his comments were unacceptable.

- (b) Support for the allegations made by PC X was given in the statement of PC Grearson (pages 132-136 of the hearing bundle).
- (c) In his account referred to above, Former PC Moore accepted in broad terms a conversation as alleged by PC X took place. He again did not accept the specific allegation made by PC X. His account is that he raised it in general conversation and when PC X suggested that it might have been her at the window, he told her to be careful. The account of the conversation given by PC X is very different in that she stated that Former PC Moore asked which room was hers and then stated that “I was sure I seen someone naked”. The Panel considered the two accounts and preferred the account given by PC X for the following reasons:
- (i) PC X had given a clear account of the conversation she had with Former PC Moore about this matter.
 - (ii) PC X had already received a number of inappropriate comments from Former PC Moore and the Panel was satisfied that she would have been alert to any other comments being made. She was likely to have listened closely to the words that Former PC Moore used to her.
 - (iii) The nature of the conversation was a strange one for Former PC Moore to have instigated. It was suggestive and inappropriate, especially as there were few female members of the cohort. It was also consistent with the pattern of behaviour engaged in by Former PC Moore towards PC X.
 - (iv) For the above reasons, the Panel preferred the version of events set out PC X in her statement about this matter over that put forward by Former PC Moore.

Allegation/fact 5 (a).

27. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:
- (a) The evidence of PC X. PC X gave clear evidence of the comment being made in her statement (at pages 112-117 of the trial bundle). PC X also gave clear evidence of subsequently challenging Former PC Moore about this comment and others and that he accepted that his comments were unacceptable.
 - (b) Support for the allegations made by PC X was given in the statement of PC Grearson (pages 132-136 of the hearing bundle).
 - (c) The statement of PC Hogarth (at pages 123-4 of the hearing bundle) provided further support to the evidence of PC X about this matter. In his statement PC

Hogarth stated that he heard Former PC Moore say to PC X, “I’d let you pin me down” or words to that effect.

- (d) In his account referred to above, Former PC Moore accepted making the comment alleged by PC X to her but stated that it was an off the cuff comment. He denied that it had any sexual context and denied that he stared at PC X when he made the comment. The Panel considered the account given by Former PC Moore about this matter and did not consider his account to be credible for the following reasons;
- (i) The comment made by Former PC Moore had clear sexual connotations. It was an inappropriate comment for one colleague to make to another.
 - (ii) The comment could only be interpreted as an invitation to PC X to do to him what he suggested -i.e. pin him down.
 - (iii) Given the clear sexual connotations, and the invitation that the words used by Former PC Moore suggested, it was reasonable to conclude that former PC Moore would be looking directly at PC X when making the statement. He would be looking for a reaction from her to his comment and invitation. Otherwise, why make it?
 - (iv) This comment needed to be viewed in the context of the pattern of behaviour entered into by Former PC Moore as alleged by PC X.
- (e) For the above reasons, the Panel therefore preferred the account given by PC X about this allegation rather than that of Former PC Moore.

Allegation/fact 5(b).

28. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) The evidence of PC X. PC X gave clear evidence of the comment being made in her statement (at pages 112-117 of the trial bundle). PC X also gave clear evidence of subsequently challenging Former PC Moore about this comment and others and that he accepted that his comments were unacceptable.
- (b) Support for the allegations made by PC X was given in the statement of PC Grearson (pages 132-136 of the hearing bundle). She specifically recalled that PC X stated that Former PC Moore made a comment about choking PC X.
- (c) Further support for the account given by PC X is contained in the statement of PC Platts (at pages 130-131 of the hearing bundle) in which he said when dealing with this incident in his statement that he heard PC Moore mention ‘choking’

which appeared to be aimed towards PC X. He said he could not recall the full context of why Former PC Moore said that to PC X as he was also involved in other conversations on the table. His evidence was that he was so concerned by what he heard that he said to Former PC Moore “Oh no Kevin”, in a disapproving way. He stated that Former PC Moore said in response “I don’t know she might like it”.

(d) In his account about this matter, Former PC Moore stated that he was with a group of fellow PC’s and they were talking about the restraint training. The subject of chokeholds came up, and he wondered whether they would be taught about those. His comments about choking were in no way meant to be sexual and were not directed at PC X. The panel considered this account given by Former PC Moore and did not consider it to be credible for the following reasons:

- (i) PC X gave an account of Former PC Moore talking about choking.
- (ii) This comment came very soon after the comment about letting PC X pin him down. That comment was clearly sexual and the Panel was satisfied that this comment was a follow on sexual comment to the previous one about being pinned down.
- (iii) It was not just PC X who heard this comment but also PC Platts who was so concerned about what he heard that he challenged Former PC Moore about it.
- (iv) This comment needed again to be viewed in the context of the pattern of behaviour entered into by Former PC Moore as alleged by PC X.

Allegation/fact 6.

29. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) The statement of PC Broadhead (pages 158-159 of the hearing bundle) in which he said that he first met Former PC Moore in a classroom called Ennerdale in Griffin Park. That was the first day Former PC Moore was introduced to the IFP 104 (the class that Former PC Moore joined when he returned from suspension). PC Broadhead dated that meeting as the 25th of March 2025 in his statement. When talking to Former PC Moore, Former PC Moore stated that he had been suspended with pay for 7 months for making a sexually inappropriate comment to a female colleague from IFP 103. He then boasted about being suspended with

pay which PC Broadhead believed showed that Former PC Moore had not learnt from his suspension.

- (b) Although the main evidence on this allegation is provided by PC Broadhead, the Panel also noted the following evidence that supported the evidence of PC Broadhead:
- (i) Statement of PC Jones (page 148-149 of the Hearing Bundle) in which he stated that Former PC Moore had a habit of bragging about the fact he was suspended for 7 months with pay.
 - (ii) Statement of PC Lewis Nuttall (pages 150-151 of the hearing bundle) in which he stated that throughout the time Former PC Moore was on the course he constantly boasted that he had been the subject of a suspension from work for 7 months, sat at home doing nothing yet receiving full pay.
 - (iii) Statement of PC Peacock (page 153-155 of the hearing bundle) stated that Former PC Moore said something to the effect that he had been suspended for 7 months with full pay. He did this in a boastful type of way making him believe he was quite proud of that fact.
- (c) Former PC Moore provided no account in relation to this allegation made against him. His initial statement made to his Federation Representative did not deal with this allegation. Former PC Moore had not given any response to this allegation, either in a recorded interview or by serving a Regulation 31 Notice in response to the allegations, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

Allegation/fact 7.

30. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) Statement of PC Broadhead (pages 158-9 of the hearing bundle) who stated that on the 25th of March 2025 at approximately 1200, lunch time, in the Griffin Park main canteen, he witnessed Former PC Moore stare at the female officer from IFP 103 with crossed eyebrows almost starring her down.
- (b) Earlier in his statement, PC Broadhead referred to the fact that Former PC Moore was open about the fact that he had been suspended with pay for 7 months for making a sexually inappropriate comment to “a female colleague from IFP 103”. His statement made it clear that when PC Broadhead referred in his statement to “the female officer from IFP 103”, in the part of his statement dealing with this incident, he was referring to the officer that Former PC Moore said had made the

allegations against him. The Panel were satisfied from all the evidence served in this matter that this officer was PC X.

(c) Although the main evidence on this allegation was provided by PC Broadhead, the Panel also noted the following evidence that supported the evidence of PC

Broadhead:

(i) The statement of PC Jones (pages 148-9 of the hearing bundle) who stated that every time Former PC Moore saw this female (meaning PC X), it was almost like he was fixated on her and he would watch her whatever she was doing.

(ii) The statement of PC Jackson (pages 144-5 of the hearing bundle) in which PC Jackson stated that he noticed that Former PC Moore watched PC X when she was in the canteen at the same time as him. He described Former PC Moore as always have his eyes “locked onto her” when she was in the canteen. He described this behaviour on the part of Former PC Moore as “strange” and making him, and others, feel uncomfortable.

(iii) The statement of PC Nuttall (pages 150-151 of the hearing bundle) in which he stated he observed Former PC Moore on multiple occasions, whilst sat in the canteen, stare constantly at a female from one of the other IFP courses when she was in the canteen at the same time as us. The way he constantly looked at this female gave him the impression he was fixated with her. He would not take his eyes off her and not even blink when she was around.

(d) Former PC Moore provided no account in relation to this allegation made against him. His initial statement made to his Federation Representative did not deal with this allegation. Former PC Moore had not given any response to this allegation, either in a recorded interview or by serving a Regulation 31 Notice in response to the allegations, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

Allegation/fact 8.

31. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

(a) The statement of PC Broadhead (pages 158-9 of the hearing bundle) in which PC Broadhead stated that on the 27th of March 2025, he witnessed Former PC Moore state “ You should get suspended for 7 months with pay, it’s great”. This took place in Derwent classroom in Griffin Park.

- (b) Former PC Moore had provided no account in relation to this allegation made against him. His initial statement made to his Federation Representative did not deal with this allegation. Former PC Moore had not given any response to this allegation, either in a recorded interview or by serving a Regulation 31 Notice in response to the allegations, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

Allegation/fact 9.

32. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) The statement of PC Broadhead (pages 158-9 of the hearing bundle). PC Broadhead stated that on the 1st of April 2025 at approximately 1000 hours in the Griffin Park canteen, he was with PC Peacock when Former PC Moore came and sat down with them. PC Broadhead and PC Peacock were discussing having to move up to Cumbria and one of the places that they were considering was Maryport. Former PC Moore stated that he used to live in Maryport and that “It is a shithole”. He then went on to state “A three-year-old kid was once drawing on my car and I shouted at him get off my car you little stupid cunt”.
- (b) The statement of PC Peacock (pages 153-155 of the hearing bundle) gave a similar but not identical account of the conversation. PC Peacock stated that Former PC Moore stated that “Maryport’s a shithole, I used to live there”. When describing how Former PC Moore described interacting with the young child, he described Former PC Moore stating that he said “Get the fuck away from my car you little bastard”. When PC Peacock challenged him about his behaviour to a young child, Former PC Moore is said to have replied “I don’t give a shit the little twat”.
- (c) Accepting that there is a slight difference between the words said to have been used by Former PC Moore in this incident as described by PC’s Broadhead and Peacock, the Panel was satisfied that the incident as described by the PC’s, and the conduct of Former PC Moore, was deeply inappropriate to a young child under the age of 5 (as described by Former PC Moore). Whatever precise language was used by Former PC Moore, it was deeply disrespectful and abusive to a vulnerable child. Given his reaction when challenged by PC Peacock, the Panel concluded that Former PC Moore had little or no insight into how inappropriate his actions here were- both in the original incident and in apparently taking pride in the telling of the story.
- (d) Former PC Moore had provided no account in relation to this allegation made against him. His initial statement made to his Federation Representative did not deal with this

allegation. Former PC Moore had not given any response to this allegation, either in a recorded interview or by serving a Regulation 31 Notice in response to the allegations, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

Allegation/fact 10.

33. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) The statement of PC Jackson (pages 144-145 of the hearing bundle in which PC Jackson stated that on the week of the 3rd April 2025 he was coming into work early to get changed into his kit when he came into the changing rooms where Former PC Moore was speaking to a PC from IFP 103. The changing room was quite an enclosed space and as a result they opened the conversation up to him. PC Jackson stated that Former PC Moore was bragging about how he got 7 months full pay by being suspended.
- (b) The statement of PC Broadhead (pages 158-9 of the hearing bundle) supported the statement of PC Jackson. It is PC Broadhead who dated this incident as happening on the 3rd April 2025. In his statement PC Broadhead stated that he and PC Jackson walked in on Former PC Moore who was boasting to another colleague about being suspended.
- (c) Former PC Moore had provided no account in relation to this allegation made against him. His initial statement made to his Federation Representative did not deal with this allegation. Former PC Moore had not given any response to this allegation, either in a recorded interview or by serving a Regulation 31 Notice in response to the allegations, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

Allegation/fact 11.

34. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) The statement of PC Broadhead (pages 158-9 of the hearing bundle). In his statement PC Broadhead stated that during one of the breaks in the morning during PST he and colleagues were sat outside the main PST suite on the black sofas by the water cooler discussing losing one colleague as he had suffered an injury. Former PC Moore stated that he got suspended for 7 months with pay for being sexually inappropriate. This prompted PC Broadhead to reply “Well don’t be sexually inappropriate then” .
- (b) The account of PC Broadhead is supported by the statement of PC Jackson (pages 144-5 of the hearing bundle). PC Jackson stated that on the 7th -8th of April 2025 he

and his colleagues had PST and whilst on a break, he and others were talking about a colleague who has left. PC Jackson stated that Former PC Moore said at this point “Well I got full pay suspended leave for being sexually inappropriate”. This prompted PC Broadhead to respond by saying “Well don’t be sexually inappropriate then”.

- (c) Former PC Moore had provided no account in relation to this allegation made against him. His initial statement made to his Federation Representative did not deal with this allegation. Former PC Moore had not given any response to this allegation, either in a recorded interview or by serving a Regulation 31 Notice in response to the allegations, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

Allegation/fact 12 (a) and (b).

35. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) The statement of PC Dean Charters (pages 146-7 of the hearing bundle) PC Charters stated that on Thursday 10th of April 2025 one half of his course was conducting practical scenario training at Griffin Park. During this exercise, he and colleagues went just out of the pedestrian access point and conducted a practical scenario just outside. At approximately 15:00 whilst PC Charters, PC Jones and Former PC Moore were observing some of the other recruits conducting their training, the police recruits on the course ahead of them walked out of the pedestrian access point and walked towards their minibus in view of them. Upon seeing PC X as she walked past, Former PC Moore turned to him and said... “Do you see that blonde lass there?”. PC Charters replied “yes”. Former PC Moore then said...”That’s the bitch that got me suspended”. PC Jones replied “ We know”. PC Jones said this in a manner which would insinuate he wanted Former PC Moore to stop talking as PC Jones said it in a sharp and abrupt way to end the conversation. However Former PC Moore continued, leaning forward towards him and said...”She’s a fucking cunt honestly”.
- (b) The statement of PC Jones (pages 148-9 of the hearing bundle). PC Jones stated that at approximately 15:00 on 10th of April 2025 whilst observing other recruits conduct scenario training, the group of students from the IFP 103 course exited through the pedestrian gate heading towards their minibus. Within that group was PC X. Upon seeing her, Former PC Moore turned to him and PC Charters and said “Do You See that blonde haired lass there” to which PC Charters replied “Yes”, Former PC Moore then said “That’s the bitch that got me suspended”. Following

that comment from Former PC Moore, PC Jones abruptly said “Yeah, we know.” in a sharp manner in an attempt to stop Former PC Moore from saying anything further. Former PC Moore then said “She’s a fucking cunt”.

- (c) Former PC Moore had provided no account in relation to this allegation made against him. His initial statement made to his Federation Representative did not deal with this allegation. Former PC Moore had not given any response to this allegation, either in a recorded interview or by serving a Regulation 31 Notice in response to the allegations, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

Allegation 13.

36. The Panel found this matter proved. The reasons for this decision were as follows:

- (a) The statement of PC Jones (pages 148-9 of the hearing bundle) who stated that every time Former PC Moore saw PC X, it was almost like he was fixated on her and he would watch her whatever she was doing.
- (b) The statement of PC Jackson (pages 144-5 of the hearing bundle) in which PC Jackson stated that he noticed that Former PC Moore watched PC X when she was in the canteen at the same time as him. He described Former PC Moore always have his eyes “locked onto her” when she was in the canteen. He described this behaviour on the part of Former PC Moore as “strange” and making him, and others, feel uncomfortable.
- (c) The statement of PC Nuttall (pages 150-151 of the hearing bundle) in which he stated that he observed Former PC Moore on multiple occasions, whilst sat in the canteen, stare constantly at a female from one of the other IFP courses when she was in the canteen at the same time. The Panel is satisfied from all the evidence in this case that this female was PC X. The way he constantly looked at this female gave PC Nuttall the impression he was fixated with her. He would not take his eyes off her and not even blink when she was around.
- (d) Former PC Moore had provided no account in relation to this allegation made against him. His initial statement made to his Federation Representative did not deal with this allegation. Former PC Moore had not given any response to this allegation, either in a recorded interview or by serving a Regulation 31 Notice in response to the allegations, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

Breaches of the Professional Standards.

37. **Authority, Respect and Courtesy:** The panel is satisfied from the matters found proved against Former PC Moore that he engaged in a course of conduct against PC X, in which he continually made inappropriate sexualised comments to her. In doing this, he breached this standard. He then continued to breach this standard when he returned to work by his conduct in continually staring at her, which made his colleagues feel uncomfortable, and speaking about her to his colleagues in a disrespectful and abusive way. His comments to and about PC X were clearly not in accordance with the relevant Ethical Standard.
38. **Equality and Diversity:** The Panel is satisfied that Former PC Moore breached this standard by engaging in a course of conduct against female PC, which involved continually making inappropriate and highly sexualised comments to her. He further described her in highly derogatory terms to colleagues. The Panel is satisfied that he would not have treated a male member of staff in the same way.
39. **Discreditable conduct:** The Panel is satisfied by the evidence set out above that this standard is breached as the matters found proved against former PC Moore are capable of bringing discredit on the Civil Nuclear Constabulary.

Level of Misconduct.

40. The Panel assessed the seriousness of this conduct by following the guidance set out in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes (2023 edition).
41. The panel assessed the seriousness of the proven conduct by reference to
- The officer's culpability;
 - The harm caused by the Misconduct;
 - The existence of any aggravating features; and
 - The existence of any mitigating factors.
42. **Culpability:** The panel noted the following:
- The Panel was satisfied that the conduct of Former PC Moore was intentional, deliberate and targeted against PC X.
 - The conduct engaged in by Former PC Moore could be considered to constitute violence against women and girls. The comments made were highly sexualised and involved a suggestion of choking, which involved actual violence. The Panel took particular note of the guidance given in paragraph

4.62 of the College of Policing Guidance which stated that this sort of conduct carried out by a police officer, whether on or off duty, will always have a high degree of culpability.

- The Panel assessed the culpability of Former PC Moore as **High**.

43. **Harm:** the Panel identified the following:

- The Panel was satisfied that the Conduct of Former PC Moore would likely cause concern to the public and reduce confidence in the police if it was known by the public that a police officer was regularly making inappropriate and highly sexualised comments to a female colleague. The Panel was also satisfied that the public would be further concerned that, having been given an opportunity to continue his career, he continued to treat the same officer with disrespect by being abusive about her to colleagues.
- The Panel was satisfied that the public is rightly concerned about this type of behaviour carried out by police officers. A number of high profile cases have done very great damage to the reputation of the police and, although these matters were not of the same level of seriousness, they were serious in their own right and caused distress to PC X. This type of behaviour reinforces the negative views of the public about police officers.
- The Panel found the harm caused by this conduct was **High**.

44. **Aggravating factors:** The Panel identified the following:

- The Panel found malign intent, namely sexual gratification.
- The behaviour was regular, repeated and sustained over a period of time.
- Former PC Moore continued the behaviour after he should have realised the behaviour was inappropriate.
- There were multiple proven allegations and breaches of the standards of professional behaviour.

45. **Mitigating factors :**The Panel identified no mitigating factors on behalf of Former PC Moore.

46. Having found the factors set out in paragraphs 42-45 above, the Panel concluded that this conduct cumulatively was at the level of **Gross Misconduct**, that is conduct that was so serious as to justify dismissal, the sanction being a matter for the next stage of the proceedings.

Applying the Sanction.

47. The Panel considered the appropriate outcome for this matter using the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings [2023 Edition].
48. The Panel reminded itself of the threefold purpose of police misconduct proceedings, namely to:
- Maintain public confidence in and reputation of the police service.
 - Uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.
 - Protect the public.
49. The Panel relied on its findings on seriousness set out in its findings on determining the level of Misconduct in these proceedings. The Panel adopted and relied on its findings and assessment of culpability, harm, and the identification of the relevant aggravating factors and lack of mitigating factors set out at the initial stage of these proceedings.
50. The Panel considered the Service Record of Former PC Moore. The Panel was not provided with any mitigation on behalf of Former PC Moore.
51. The Panel had reference to paragraph 3.31 of the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceeding referred to above. This section deals with former officers. The Panel noted that where the Panel has concluded that the conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct, it can only consider two outcomes: disciplinary action or no disciplinary action. Where the finding is Gross Misconduct and disciplinary action is imposed, this can only be that the former officer would have been dismissed if still serving. No other sanction can be enforced. If the finding is Gross Misconduct but the Panel determines that dismissal is not justified, then no action will be taken, and the Gross Misconduct will be recorded.
52. Given that the Panel had already concluded that the culpability of Former PC Moore as a result of the misconduct found proved was High, the harm and potential harm caused by his conduct was High, the presence of a number of aggravating factors and a lack of any mitigation factors, and the Panel had received no further evidence to change that assessment, the Panel concluded that disciplinary action was necessary in this case. The Panel was not satisfied that a Final Written Warning would be a proportionate sanction in that case, given the repeated nature of the conduct found proved and because Former PC Moore had continued to treat PC X without respect or courtesy when he returned to duty after his suspension. Given the finding by the Panel that disciplinary action was necessary, the only sanction that could be passed by the Panel in these circumstances

was that Former PC Moore would have been dismissed if he was still a serving member of the Civil Nuclear Constabulary. It is only by imposing this sanction that the Panel could uphold the threefold purpose of Police Misconduct proceedings. The Panel concluded that all three limbs of this threefold purpose were engaged in this case and justified this sanction.

ACC Michael Vance- Panel Chair.

Seán McHugh -Independent Panel Member.

Susannah Dengate- Independent Panel Member.

January 2026.

