

IN THE POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING

PURSUANT TO THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE (CONDUCT,
PERFORMANCE AND APPEALS TRIBUNALS) REGULATIONS 2020

IN THE MATTER OF:
FPS CHRISTOPHER GODFREY

DECISION OF THE PANEL

ACC Justin Bibby (Chair)
Alison Abu (independent Panel Member)
Deborah Fajoye (independent Panel Member)

INTRODUCTION

1. This hearing has been held on 1-3 December 2025 at RAF Wyton. The Panel consisted of ACC Justin Bibby (Chair) and Independent Panel Members Ms Alison Abu and Ms Deborah Fajoye. Ms Dale Simon was the Legally Qualified Advisor (LQA) to the Panel. The hearing was held in public.
2. The Ministry of Defence Police (the RA) was represented by Mr Charles McCombe. PS Godfrey was not in attendance and was unrepresented.

APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN ABSENCE

3. At the pre-hearing in these proceedings on 17 November 2025 the RA informed the Chair that correspondence had been received from PS Godfrey indicating that he was not going to attend the hearing scheduled to commence on 1 December 2025 and that he had tendered his resignation and had been signed off sick with stress. As a serving officer PS Godfrey is under a duty to attend misconduct hearings. The RA indicated that if PS Godfrey did not attend the hearing on 1 December an application to proceed in the absence of the officer would be made.
4. Counsel for the RA informed the panel of the relevant provisions and caselaw to be considered when determining an application to proceed in the absence of the subject officer. It was submitted that the RA had notified PS Godfrey of today's hearing date and that correspondence from PS Godfrey indicating that he would not be attending demonstrated that he was fully aware of the hearing. It was further submitted that PS Godfrey had not requested an adjournment and there was no information before the panel to suggest that the officer would attend in the future if the case were

adjourned. It was also submitted that although PS Godfrey had made reference to being signed off sick, the detail in the medical certificate fell far short of the detail required to grant an adjournment on medical grounds and in any event no such adjournment had been requested.

5. In determining whether to proceed in the absence of PS Godfrey, the panel had regard to the purpose of police misconduct hearings, the overall interests of justice and fairness to PS Godfrey and the RA, the circumstances of the case, the submissions made by counsel for the RA and the legal advice from the LQA. In the opinion of the panel, it was clear that PS Godfrey was aware of the hearing and had chosen not to attend, therefore he had voluntarily absented himself. He had provided a full response to the allegations against him in his interview and regulation 30 response, therefore it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the hearing in his absence.

ALLEGATIONS AND PANEL ROLE

6. The allegations facing PS Godfrey are set out in the Regulation 29 Notice served upon him under the Ministry of Defence Police (Conduct, Performance and Appeals Tribunals) Regulations 2020. It is alleged that he:

(1) Bullied officers under your command and created a demeaning work environment by shouting and swearing at them; and

(2) Discriminated against female officers under your command by subjecting them to worse treatment than their male peers. In particular:

2.1 You shouted at a female subordinate in relation to incorrect uniform when she was with male peers whose uniform was incorrect in the same way;

2.2 You singled out female subordinates for unfair and demeaning criticism, in particular by:

(a) Shouting at female officers who had been tasked by another officer to do an armoury check in the following terms:

'How many fucking patrols did you do yesterday covering 66?'. How many fucking patrols did you do yesterday? So she can fucking do her fitness tests in between patrols? I am fucking sick of this, and this shite with you and [PC B] helping Gordon, it doesn't take fucking 2 of you to read and write down fucking gun numbers, you're taking the fucking piss!'

(b) Saying aggressively to a female officer, 'Who the fuck are you talking to? I'm the sergeant, I make the fucking decisions' when she tried to explain the posting she had been given for the day.

(c) Subjecting female officers to a higher level of scrutiny during training, standing over an officer and being repeatedly and excessively critical of her difficulty in tying a knot, and telling male officers not 'help the girls' with tasks.

2.3 You subjected a female officer to unnecessary manhandling by lifting her physically from one boat to another.

2.4 You spat on a female officer's boots.

2.5 You made demeaning comments about female officers and women:

- (a) By saying to a male subordinate, 'I have a few names of guys I want upstairs. The girls up there are up there for the wrong reasons';
- (b) By saying that a female subordinate 'better not stand too close to the heater', referencing her wearing of make up;
- (c) By suggesting that a female subordinate was in incorrect uniform due to 'not wanting to mess her fucking hair up';
- (d) By referring to male officers talking to each other as 'worse than woman';

(3) It is alleged that this behaviour breached the standards of Authority, Respect and Courtesy; Equality and Diversity; and Discreditable Conduct. It is alleged that these breaches amounted to gross misconduct.

7. The purpose of professional disciplinary proceedings is to protect the public and to maintain the high standards and good reputation of the profession. It is the role of the Panel to:
- First, ascertain the facts.
 - Second, determine on the basis of those facts, whether PS Godfrey has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as alleged.
 - Third, determine whether the admitted or otherwise identified breaches amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct or neither.
 - Fourth, decide on the appropriate outcome.

CASE SUMMARY

8. In November 2004, PS Godfrey the Officer joined the Ministry of Defence Police ("MDP"), having served with Central Scotland Police since 2000. In 2008, the Officer was promoted to Sergeant and joined the Clyde Marine Unit. In 2019, he returned to the Clyde Marine Unit, having spent a number of years at Garlogie and then the police training centre at Wethersfield. In December 2023, he joined Team A within the Convoy Group. It is alleged that, whilst PS Godfrey with serving with MDP he bullied officers under his command and discriminated against female officers. As detailed in the allegations above. PS Godfrey denies all of the allegations made against him in his Regulation 30 response.

FINDING OF FACTS

9. In advance of this hearing the panel were supplied with the documents in accordance with the MOD Police (Conduct, Performance and Appeals Tribunals) Regulations 2020 which included a copy of the papers served on PS Godfrey, PS Godfrey's Regulation 17 and 30 responses to the RA and a

transcript of PS Godfrey's disciplinary interview. In determining the facts in this case, the panel had regard to:

- All documents and materials in the hearing bundle, Regulation 29 notice and Regulation 30 response whether they were explicitly referred to or not during the hearing.
- The oral evidence of PC A, PC B, PC Franchetti, PC Williamson, PC Peace, PC C, PC Metcalfe, Insp. Irvine, Insp. Dagleish and PC Wylie.
- The six character statements submitted by PS Godfrey about the officer's good character
- The video submitted by PS Godfrey
- The submissions made on behalf of the RA
- The legal advice provided by the LQA.

10. In considering the facts the panel is aware that the burden of proof is on the RA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. This means that the panel must be satisfied that it is more likely than not that a fact is true before they can find it to be true. In line with the principle derived from *Byrne v General Medical Council* [2021] EWHC 2237 (Admin), the panel recognised that there is only one standard of proof in civil and regulatory cases, namely whether the facts in issue more probably occurred than not. The seriousness of an allegation does not of itself require more cogent evidence.
11. The panel drew no adverse inference from PS Godfrey's nonattendance at the hearing. In considering whether the burden of proof has been satisfied in this case, the panel had regard to the character references submitted on behalf of PS Godfrey and his previous good character which speak to his credibility and positively support a lack of propensity to act in the manner alleged.
12. The panel considered each allegation of fact against PS Godfrey in turn. Determining firstly whether the facts alleged were proved on the balance of probabilities before going on to determine whether any facts found proved collectively or individually breached the standards alleged.

Allegation (1): the Officer bullies officers under his command and created a demeaning work environment by shouting and swearing at them.

13. It is alleged by the RA that PS Godfrey bullied officers under his command by creating a demeaning work environment by shouting and swearing at them. The RA relies primarily on the evidence of PC A, PC B, PC Franchetti, PC Williamson and PC Peace to prove this allegation. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
14. PC A adopted the content of her written statements as her evidence. In the opinion of the panel the officer's oral evidence was balanced and consistent

with her written statements. The panel therefore found her to be a credible witness. In PC A's written statements, she describes PS Godfrey's behaviour as dismissive, controlling and aggressive; she states that on a number of occasions he shouted at her and used inappropriate language including the word "cunt". As a result of this behaviour, PC A found herself feeling extremely anxious when PS Godfrey was present in the workplace and describes feeling like she was "walking on eggshells" and his actions caused her to feel embarrassed and demoralised.

15. In her oral evidence PC A stated that she used to enjoy working on Team A prior to the arrival of PS Godfrey. She stated that after PS Godfrey joined the team in December 2023 the atmosphere changed. She described PS Godfrey as "abrupt and rude," with a tendency to talk loudly and slam doors.
16. PC B adopted the content of her written statement as her evidence. In the opinion of the panel the officer's oral evidence was balanced and consistent with her written statements. The panel therefore found her to be a credible witness. In her written evidence she stated that the general atmosphere and morale within the Convoy group had never been lower, attributing this to the way in which the Officer conducted himself on a daily basis, describing him as a "bull in a China shop". She describes his management style as militant, in that he regularly screamed and shouted at staff, acted in an aggressive manner and never praised officers for good work. She explained that, over time, the atmosphere and conditions which PS Godfrey created on the Convoy Group became unbearable and started to have a negative impact on her wellbeing in the workplace.
17. In her oral evidence PC B stated when she joined the Convoy Group she used to enjoy her work. She stated that after PS Godfrey's arrival she dreaded going to work, due to his unpredictable moods and his management style which she described as "very angry" and "abrupt."
18. PC Franchetti adopted the content of his written statements as his evidence. In the opinion of the panel the officer's oral evidence was consistent with his written statements. The panel therefore found him to be a credible witness. In his written statements PC Franchetti describes the negative impact that PS Godfrey had within the Convoy Group since he started, noting his poor management style and the aggression he displays within the workplace. He describes the general atmosphere and morale within the Convoy Group as being "*at rock bottom*". In oral evidence PC Franchetti described PS Godfrey's management style as "abrupt and selfish" stating that he would "bark orders" and use profanity such as "*fucking do something*". He also describes PS Godfrey would "*stomp about and slam doors*".
19. PC Williamson adopted the content of his written statements as his evidence. In the opinion of the panel the officer's oral evidence was consistent with his written statements and the evidence of other witnesses who were managed by PS Godfrey. The panel therefore found him to be a credible witness. In determining the credibility of this officer, the panel noted that he had been the subject of two disciplinary findings. However, in the opinion of the panel the findings did not relate to his honesty or integrity and

as such they did not adversely impact his credibility as a witness. In his written statements PC Williamson describes the general atmosphere and morale within the Convoy Group as shocking and extremely uncomfortable, due to the PS Godfrey's brash, abrupt and unprofessional management style; he also describes feeling as though things were "*ready to blow up at any time*". In oral evidence, PC Williamson described PS Godfrey's behaviour as "brash" and stated that he would not want anyone to speak to his daughters in the manner that PS Godfrey spoke to others. He also described how he was especially "*brash*" towards PC A and PC B.

20. PC Williamson also refers to a specific incident of alleged bullying on 8 February 2024, when he reported for duty and explained to PS Godfrey that he was unfit to be armed due to lack of sleep as a result of an escort being cancelled at short notice. He states that notwithstanding this explanation, PS Godfrey put him under extreme and unnecessary pressure to be armed. PC Williamson felt that he had to discuss this with the Duty Inspector as he felt he was being forced into doing something that he knew was both wrong and dangerous. The Duty Inspector agreed with PC Williamson and he was not armed.
21. PC Peace adopted the content of his written statements as his evidence. In the opinion of the panel the officer's oral evidence was consistent with his written statements and the evidence of other witnesses who were managed by PS Godfrey. The panel therefore found him to be a credible witness. In his written evidence PC Peace states that the general atmosphere and morale within the Convoy Group was "*terrible*", attributing much of that to PS Godfrey's management style which he described as "*old-school, militant and out of date*", adding that, at times, PS Godfrey was "*an aggressive person*". In oral evidence PC Peace stated that he witnessed PS Godfrey "*barking orders*" and standing over people at their desks, which he described as "*inappropriate*" and "*militaristic*". He also stated that he seemed to not want the females to be there.
22. PC Peace also states that he recalls a specific Focus Group Meeting, where he was shocked by the unprofessional manner in which PS Godfrey was responding to questions by officers; he recalls an officer asking why they were doing something, to which PS Godfrey responded by saying "*cos I'm telling you to fucking do it*".
23. The panel also noted the descriptions of PS Godfrey's management style provided by the two Inspectors on the Marine Convoy Group who provide character evidence for PS Godfrey. Inspector Irvine describes PS Godfrey's management style as "*harsh and abrasive*" and Inspector Dalgliesh described PS Godfrey's management style as "*inappropriate*" during his oral evidence and in his written statement states that PS Godfrey's management style "*appears aggressive and domineering with very little room for negotiation or compromise*".
24. PS Godfrey denies the allegation of bullying in his regulation 30 response he states:

"At no point have I ever bullied any officer. My robust managerial approach may have been misconstrued. I acknowledge that I have used choice language but no more so than anyone else in the CMU."

25. PS Godfrey was asked during his misconduct interview whether he thought his robust management style could be perceived as unprofessional or abrupt or potentially aggressive and he responded:

"I don't know what unprofessional -- I haven't been provided with any training to change my management style. I can understand some people may feel threatened by that. That's not intentional, that's just my way of getting the point across. Sometimes I will raise my voice. Swearing is used in everyday language upstairs and in most parts of the job, I should imagine, people swear, people use bad language.

As I said, a lot of the things we know, being police officers, officer presence, I'm a big load and I don't look soft and cuddly and that may, I don't know, what's the word I'm looking for, not frighten, intimidate people. Yes, I do I know I look intimidating."

26. PS Godfrey was asked whether he thought he had a short fuse and if he was easily angered and he responded: *"I become frustrated easily if I've had to tell someone the same thing again and again"*; and when asked how he would vent that frustration he responds: *"I would raise my voice, I would possibly swear"*. In response to being asked specifically about his use of the word *"cunt"* he states that the word is used a lot in Scotland, he states that he would not use the word directly to someone if he did not know them, *"But it doesn't mean that I wouldn't say to someone else "She's a cunt"*.

27. In respect of PC A, he states in interview:

"She is nervous around me. I open the door and she's frightened. I haven't even said anything or done anything."

28. The panel also had regard to the paragraph 6.24 of MDP's Bullying, Harassment, Discrimination and Victimisation Complaints document which provides that:

"Bullying is behaviour from a person or group that's unwanted and makes someone feel uncomfortable, including feeling:

- frightened*
- less respected or put down*
- made fun of*
- upset*

Examples of bullying in the workplace could include:

- spreading a false rumour about someone*
- putting someone down in meetings*
- not allowing someone to go on training courses, but allowing everyone else to*
- giving someone a heavier workload than everyone else*

- *excluding someone from team social events*

29. In the opinion of the panel the evidence of the officers relied on by the RA to prove this allegation and PS Godfrey's responses in interview detailed above provides clear and consistent evidence that PS Godfrey created a demeaning working environment in which he regularly shouted and swore at the officers in his team which consequently caused the officers that he managed to feel upset, frightened, less respected and put down. Further, in the opinion of the panel, PS Godfrey's admissions in interview that he was aware that his management style could be perceived as intimidating and that he knew that PC A was frightened of him demonstrated that PS Godfrey was aware of the adverse impact that his behaviour had on the officers that he managed. The panel therefore found the allegation of fact that PS Godfrey bullied officers under his command proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation (2): the Officer discriminated against female officers under his command by subjecting them to worse treatment than their male peers.

30. It is alleged by the RA that PS Godfrey consciously treated the female officers less favourably than their male counterparts because they are female. The RA relies on a number of specific incidents to prove this allegation of fact. The panel firstly considered each of the alleged incidents in turn and then determined whether the incidents found proved when considered collectively proved on the balance probabilities the alleged fact that PS Godfrey discriminated against female officers under his command by subjecting them to worse treatment than their male peers. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

2.1: PS Godfrey shouted at a female subordinate in relation to incorrect uniform when she was with male peers whose uniform was incorrect in the same way.

31. It is alleged by the RA that PS Godfrey shouted across a car park in front of members of the public at PC A about putting on her hat, and that she was with male peers at the time of this incident who were also not wearing their hats. The RA relies on the evidence of PC A, PC B and PC Williamson to prove this alleged incident. For the reasons detailed below, the panel concluded that there was sufficient evidence to prove on the balance of probabilities that PS Godfrey shouted at PC A for not wearing her hat; however, in the opinion of the panel there was insufficient evidence to support a finding on the balance of probabilities that male officers were present at the time of this incident and that consequently PC A had been treated less favourably on account of her gender. The panel therefore concluded that their partial finding of fact in respect of this incident did not support the allegation of fact that PS Godfrey had discriminated against

female officers and subjected them to less favourable treatment than their peers in regard to their uniform.

32. PC B states in her written statement that she was walking alongside PC A when PS Godfrey shouted across a car park in front of members of the public for PC A to get her hat on. She states that the volume of the shouting made both officers jump off their feet. PC B states that she got a fright, thinking something had happened. She also states that she has seen male officers being asked to put on their hats, but female officers, on the other hand, are screamed at in front of members of the public which she feels was done with the intention of belittling female officers.
33. PC Williamson states that he also witnessed this incident, which he says took place on 22 December 2023. He states that he was within the Convoy Group's computer office where he was joined by PS Godfrey. He heard PS Godfrey leave his office in a hurry muttering the words "fucking hats". He then heard PS Godfrey shout at PC A "get your hat on", on hearing this he looked out of the window and saw PC A with her hat in her hand and PC B walking past the civilian canteen. In oral evidence PC Williamson stated that male officers were also present at the time of this incident and that he felt that the way that PS Godfrey spoke to PC A was out of order.
34. PC A made no reference to this incident in her written statements but in her oral evidence she stated that she could recall an incident when she was shouted at for not wearing her hat but she could not recall when it happened. She made no reference to male officers being present at the time of the incident.

35. PS Godfrey states in his regulation 30 response:

"I have indeed criticised people due to their standard of dress. The uniform for MDP officer is non-negotiable. Being assigned to the unit it became apparent that a lot of the officers were lax with regard their appearance. I have had to speak to officers on numerous occasions about their appearance. I will have indeed shouted at people about their uniform and ensuring that hats required to be worn landside. No matter who was inappropriately presented they would be told to have full uniform on. It made no difference to me if the officer was male or female."

Panel determination

36. In the opinion of the panel the evidence of PC A, PC B and PC Williamson are consistent in that they all reference an incident when PS Godfrey shouted at PC A to put her hat on, although recollections as to when and where the incident occurred vary. The panel also noted that PS Godfrey accepted that he had shouted at officers for not wearing their uniform correctly and, therefore, concluded on the balance of probabilities that PS Godfrey had shouted at PC A for not wearing her hat. The panel were of the opinion, however, that there was insufficient evidence to support a finding that male officers had been present and that PC A was consequently subjected to less favourable treatment in this regard.

2.2: the Officer singles out female subordinates for unfair and demeaning criticism, in particular by:

(a) shouting at female officers who had been tasked by another officer to do an armoury check in the following terms ...

37. The RA relies on the evidence of PC Franchetti, PC A and Inspector Dalgleish to prove this alleged incident. The panel found this alleged incident proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
38. PC Franchetti states that on 4 March 2024, PS Godfrey stormed into the refreshment room, where he and PC A were, and describes the following exchange taking place:

"He [PS Godfrey] stood and very loudly said to PC A "How many fucking patrols did you do yesterday covering 66?". PC A seemed nervous and didn't respond straight away, PS GODFREY then asked again "How many fucking patrols did you do yesterday?" His demeanour appeared that he was angry and agitated [sic]. PC A replied "3". She then tried to justify this however PS GODFREY rased [sic] his voice further and said "so she can fucking do her fitness tests in between patrols? I am fucking sick of this, and this shite with you and [PC B] helping Gordon (PS NIVEN), it doesn't take fucking 2 of you to read and write down fucking gun numbers, you're taking the fucking piss!"

39. There is no dispute that this incident was brought to the attention of Inspector Dalgleish, who spoke to PC Franchetti, PC A, PC B and PS Godfrey about what had happened. Inspector Irvine was present for the meetings with the latter three officers. PCs A and B explained that they were frightened of the Officer and did not want to work with him anymore, but they did not want any action taken against him and just wanted him to be spoken to. They wanted the incident to be resolved by way of an informal resolution and neither PC A nor PC B was comfortable facing PS Godfrey at the time. Both officers were later removed from his line management and at their request were transferred to a different section with immediate effect.
40. There is also no dispute that in his discussion with Inspector Dalgleish, PS Godfrey admitted that he should not have raised his voice to PC A. He was apologetic and commented that he had already apologised to PC A. Inspector Dalgleish told him that all of his section were unhappy with him; this evidenced his extremely poor style of management.
41. In his regulation 30 response PS Godfrey states:

"It was a constant battle to have officers assist others. It was frustrating. I accept that I probably did shout and swear. This would have been a result of continued excuses from most officers in the team over a protracted period."

42. In interview PS Godfrey admitted raising his voice and swearing at PC A and stated that he would behave in the same way towards a "big lad".

However, he accepted on reflection that it was not an appropriate way to speak to staff.

Panel determination 2.2(a)

43. The panel found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities in light of the consistent evidence provided by the witnesses relied on by the RA and the admissions made by PS Godfrey.

(b) saying aggressively to a female officer, "Who the fuck are you talking to? I'm the sergeant, I make the fucking decisions" when she tried to explain the posting she had been given for the day

44. The RA relies on the evidence of PC C to prove this alleged incident. The panel found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
45. PC C adopted her witness statement as her evidence. In the opinion of the panel PC C's oral evidence was consistent with her statement and as such they found her to be a credible witness. PC C stated that on 17 August 2023, she was working in the office adjacent to the duty sergeant's office when, at around 8am, PS Godfrey asked her "PC C what is your remit today?". PC C responded explaining that she was "on an admin day to catch up on force medicals work". She then states that PS Godfrey entered the neighbouring office and contacted the shift Inspector, asking them to confirm what PC C was doing today, noting that she "claimed" she was on an admin day.
46. PC C states that she could tell from PS Godfrey's tone that he was unhappy, so she wanted to clarify with him that Inspector Dalglish had approved her admin day and was aware of what she was doing. It is alleged that PS Godfrey responded by raising his voice aggressively, stating: "Who the fuck are you talking to? I'm the sergeant, I make the fucking decisions". PC C describes this confrontation as "shocking and upsetting". She reported the incident to Inspector Dalglish, but declined to make a formal complaint. In oral evidence PC C confirmed that she did not make a formal complaint at the time because she had reported the matter to Inspector Dalglish and she was happy to leave him to deal with the matter.
47. In his regulation 30 response PS Godfrey denies that this incident occurred he states:

"at no time did I shout and swear at this officer. Any conversation I had with this officer about her working patterns was overheard by Inspector Ian Irvine. I have a clear recollection of this."

48. The panel noted that Inspector Irvine made no reference to overhearing this conversation in his statement and that he was not specifically asked about this incident when he gave oral evidence.

Panel determination 2.2(b)

49. In considering whether this incident had been proved on the balance of probabilities the panel had regard to the fact that the RA relied solely on the evidence of PC C to prove this allegation. The panel noted the similarities between PC C's account of PS Godfrey responding to her aggressively and the allegations of fact found proved in respect of PS Godfrey's bullying behaviour towards officers in the Marine Convoy. The Panel also noted PS Godfrey's admissions in interview that when he was frustrated by a situation, he would raise his voice and possibly swear, and his further admission in respect of 2.2 (a) above as to feeling frustrated by officers trying to avoid assisting others. Considering these circumstances the panel preferred the evidence of PC C and found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities.

2.2(c) subjecting female officers to a higher level of scrutiny during training, standing over an officer and being repeatedly and excessively critical of her difficulty in tying a knot, and telling male officers not 'help the girls' [sic] with tasks.

50. The RA relies on the evidence of PC A, PC B, PC Williamson, PC Franchetti and PC Peace to prove this alleged incident. The panel found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
51. PC A states that on 14 January 2024, during training exercise at Loch Long with PCs B, Williamson and Smye an incident took place while she was attempting to tie a knot. PC A describes being asked to "*tie a bow line now*" by PS Godfrey. PC A states that she had been having difficulty tying the knot earlier in the day so she asked for a minute to practice. PS Godfrey responded with words to the effect of "*I'm not trying to be a 'cunt' but this is why I have asked you*". PC A felt that she was being asked to do it again in order to set her up to fail. The pressure of PS Godfrey being there was making her tie the knot incorrectly and she felt that she had been singled out. PC A recalls PC B also being asked to tie a bow line and that after this, the group went on to do a towing exercise, during which PS Godfrey told PC Smye "*Not to help the girls*".
52. PC B recalls this incident, where PC A was asked to tie a bow line and struggled at first, describing the way in which PS Godfrey conducted himself as "*shocking and unprofessional*". She states that PS Godfrey yelled at PC A about not being able to tie a knot. She also recalls the towing exercise later in the day when PS Godfrey shouted that no one is to help the girls. She notes that they are a team and everyone "*mucks in*", but it almost feels like an extra test for PC A and her as they are female. PC B also recalls a training day in March 2024 when the Officer told the male officers in the Convoy Group not to help the girls during a towing exercise.
53. PC B states that PS Godfrey was always far more intrusive into what the female officers were doing on a daily basis whilst carrying out routine duties and secondary duties in comparison with the male officers on the team.
54. PC Williamson also recalls a towing exercise during which PS Godfrey instructed the male officers within the Convoy Group not to help the female

officers. He believed that PS Godfrey wanted the female officers to fail and was seeking to single out the female officers.

55. PC Franchetti recalls PS Godfrey repeatedly asking where PCs A and B were, which felt more than he was asking about any other officer.
56. PC Peace states that female officers on the Convoy Group have more pressure on them to prove their worth, which is attributable to the way in which PS Godfrey treats them; in his opinion this was different to the way in which he treats the male officers in the Group.
57. In his regulation 30 response PS Godfrey states:

“I have indeed stated “do not help the girls”. This was not misogynistic but the reverse. I had to ensure that all officers are capable and self-proficient. Things can easily go wrong on the water. I was trying to train them, the female officers, to the level of RYA Coastal Skipper rather than just day skipper. This was for their benefit. The female officers in my team could hold their own. I possibly should not have stated this, but it was done with the best of intentions. I did not stand over an officer while saying this and was not excessively critical of her. All officers must be able to tie a bowline, this may have to be done at night, in driving rain, bitter cold and a rough following sea, officers must be able to react and if it appeared I was overly critical of an officer that was not my intention. It was to prepare them for what may occur.”

Panel determination 2.2(c)

58. In the opinion of the panel the evidence relied on by the RA was consistent and credible. The panel noted that PS Godfrey accepts that he used the phrase “do not help the girls” and that he claims that his focus on female officers being able to tie a bowline was the opposite of misogynistic as he was trying to train them to the level of RYA Coastal skipper rather than just day skipper. In the opinion of the panel PS Godfrey’s explanation for focusing on the female officers in the team lacked credibility. He provides no reason for deciding that only the female officers needed to be trained to a higher level and he clearly had not communicated his stated intention to the female officers or anyone else on the team. The panel therefore preferred the evidence relied on by the RA and found this alleged incident proved on the balance of probabilities.

2.3: the Officer subjected a female officer to unnecessary manhandling by lifting her physically from one boat to another.

59. It is alleged by the RA that later in the day on 14 January 2024, following the knot tying incident 2.2(c) above, that PC A was unnecessarily manhandled by PS Godfrey when he physically lifted her from one boat to another. The RA relies on the evidence of PCs A, B and Williamson and PC Wylie to prove this incident. The panel found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
60. PC A describes the incident as follows: she states that she was on the Rhib alongside the launch:

"I am 5ft 4 so getting from the Rhibs to the Police launch can be difficult. There's about a 4ft height difference between the Rhib and the outer deck. Generally when getting on board the launch I would grab the stanchions and request assistance by holding my hand out and then a colleague would hold my hand and take my weight as I climbed out. I was wearing my Rhib suit on top of clothes and my life jacket which is tac vest style, zip and buckle at the front and two crotch straps which generally are loose but I tighten mine a bit more just in the event of a fall into water. Only in an emergency would I grab anyone by the Rhib suit or life vest and it would be to get them out of the water... PS GODFREY was standing on the deck of the Police launch. I put my hand out to get assistance but without prompt or saying anything PS GODFREY grabbed me by my right shoulder and picked me up. My feet were off the floor and my arms were dangling and he put me on the back of the boat. The whole day had taken its toll and by that point I was just done. I wanted to get back to Faslane so I went and grabbed my belongings. He asked if I was OK but I just left."

61. PC A stated that she believed that PS Godfrey was trying to help her but that he went about it the wrong way. However, she felt that PS Godfrey could have handled the situation better. She stated that she did not want to be lifted off the boat but did need help. She stated that the whole day was *"demoralising and made her feel not good enough"*. She stated that she did not want to make a complaint in relation to this incident even though she appreciated that this was not the manner in which we should conduct ourselves. Since she had moved teams, she felt things were much better.
62. PC B witnessed this incident. She states that it was common practice for officers on a police launch to aid those onboard by lending a hand or using the handle on the life jacket to help officers onto the launch. However, on this occasion, she was left dumbstruck by the way in which PS Godfrey grabbed PC A by the scruff (i.e. grabbing her jacket) as opposed to her hand or the lifejacket handle and pulled her onto the launch. She considered PS Godfrey's actions to be *"overly assertive"* and she was *"shocked and taken aback"* by what she had seen.
63. PC Williamson recalls seeing PC A getting off the boat with one hand on the stanchion when PS Godfrey lent over and grabbed the back of her life vest by the hand and lifted her off her feet and put her onto the back of the police launch. He states that as he saw this, he thought to himself *"what the fuck"* and thought that PC A looked in *"total shock"*. He states that he asked PC A what that was about, to which she replied she did not know.
64. PC Wylie, a Marine Unit trainer, gives evidence as to the way in which an officer should move from one boat to another. In particular, he explains the ways in which the grab handle on an MDP lifejacket would be used. PC Wylie adopted his written statement as his evidence. The panel found PC Wylie to be a highly credible professional witness. In his oral evidence he confirmed that the method for moving from one boat to another varied according to the conditions and circumstances. He stated that the most usual way to assist someone onto the launch from a Rhib, if their hand was stretched out, would be hand to hand or arm to arm. He stated that *"in certain circumstances the grab handle wouldn't be a viable option"*. He

stated it would be appropriate to take hold of the grab handle in an emergency if the person had fallen into the water or was falling.

65. In his interview PS Godfrey states that grab handles are utilised by the marine unit to assist officers aiding the transfer of colleagues from Rhib's to launch. He continues:

“When a person is undertaking such a transfer, there are a number of factors that have to be taken into account, including, but not limited to, sea state, wind direction, tides and speed of craft. Officers are required to be aware of the possible sudden movement of watercraft that can occur.

An outstretched hand is not without significant risk. The use of the grab handle to assist in the transfer of persons is, in my opinion, and others, considered the correct and safest procedure. We are trained in the use of the grab handles to assist colleagues coming on board a launch from a RHIB. I deny doing anything wrong.”

66. PS Godfrey submitted a short video which he claimed was a training video demonstrating how an individual could be transferred from a Rhib using the grab handle on the back of their life vest. The Panel noted that the Rhib appeared to be moving quite significantly in rough waters in the video produced by PS Godfrey.

Panel determination 2.3

67. In considering this incident the panel had particular regard to the professional evidence of PC Wylie who had stated that the usual way to assist someone onto the launch if their arm was out stretched would be to hold their hand or their arm and that it would be appropriate to use the grab handle in emergency circumstances if someone was in the water or at risk of falling. The panel noted neither PS Godfrey or any of the witnesses relied on by the RA make any reference to the water conditions being particularly rough or hazardous. In the opinion of the panel, although PC Williamson described PS Godfrey taking hold of the back of PC A's life vest, and PC A and PC B describe PS Godfrey taking hold of the shoulder area/clothing; all three of these officers state that PC A's arm was out stretched out when PS Godfrey took hold of PC A and proceeded to lift her onto the launch.

68. In the opinion of the panel PS Godfrey's assertion that the safest way to transfer someone onto the launch even if their hand is outstretched is to physically lift them by their grab vest, was undermined by the evidence of PC Wylie. In the opinion of the panel there was no evidence of the weather conditions being adverse or of PC A appearing to be at risk of falling, that would require PS Godfrey to ignore her outstretched hand and take hold of her clothing or her grab handle. The panel therefore found on the balance of probabilities that PS Godfrey had unnecessarily manhandled PC A by lifting her onto the launch.

2.4: the Officer spat on a female officer's boot.

69. It is alleged by the RA that in February 2018, PS Godfrey was a trainer on a firearms tactics course at the training centre at Wethersfield and that during drill instruction PS Godfrey spat on the boots PC Metcalfe a female officer. The RA relies solely on the evidence PC Metcalfe to prove this incident. The panel found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
70. PC Metcalfe adopted her witness statement as her evidence. In the opinion of the panel her oral evidence was consistent with her statement and as such the panel found her to be a credible witness. PC Metcalfe states that during drill instruction PS Godfrey looked down at her boots, he did not believe that she had used polish to shine her boots and then spat on her boot. PC Metcalfe states that she told PS Godfrey that she was not happy with his behaviour, and he appeared to affronted and combative and he was “very cold” towards her and did not speak or interact with her for the rest of the training. PS Godfrey denies the allegation.

Panel determination 2.4

71. In the opinion of the panel, there were similarities between PC Metcalfe’s description of PS Godfrey becoming combative when she expressed her displeasure with his actions and the accounts provided by officers on the Marine Convoy in respect of PS Godfrey’s assertive and aggressive manner. In the opinion of the panel the inherent probability of PC Metcalfe fabricating such a serious allegation in the absence of any obvious motive or history with PS Godfrey was low. Therefore, having found PC Metcalfe to be a credible witness the panel preferred her account over that of PS Godfrey and found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities.

2.5: the Officer made demeaning comments about female officers and women:

- (a) by saying to a male subordinate, “I have a few names of guys I want upstairs. The girls up there are up there for the wrong reasons”.

72. It is alleged by the RA that on 25 February 2024, PS Godfrey made the comment detailed above to a male officer. The RA relies on the evidence of PC Franchetti To prove this allegation. The Panel found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
73. PC Franchetti states that he recalls PS Godfrey saying “I want grafters up there like you [PC Franchetti] and John [PC Williamson], I have a few names of good guys that I want upstairs, the girls are up there for the wrong reasons”. PC Franchetti said that he believed PCs A and B were doing a good job, but did not challenge PS Godfrey on the content of the comments made.
74. PS Godfrey denies making this comment in respect of female officers. He accepts, however, that he has stated that “there are officers up there for the wrong reasons”.

Panel determination 2.5(a)

75. In the opinion of the panel PC Franchetti was a credible and reliable witness and the panel found his account clear and detailed. The panel noted PS Godfrey's denial of making this comment specifically in relation to female officers, however, in light of PS Godfrey's proven behaviours in respect of female officers on the Marine Convoy and his admission that PC A "got under his skin" the panel preferred the evidence of PC Franchetti, and determined that it was more probable than not that PS Godfrey did say that "some of the girls up there were there for the wrong reasons". The panel therefore found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities

(b) by saying that a female subordinate "better not stand too close to the heater", referencing her wearing of makeup".

76. It is alleged by the RA that during a range day, a female officer underperformed and, in response, PS Godfrey described her as having "fucked up" and that he also told a female officer not to stand too close to the heater, referring to her makeup. There is no direct evidence from the female officer involved. The RA rely on comments made by PC B in a management meeting held with PI Alan Kennedy on 8 April 2024 that was recorded within PSD02 and produced by the investigating officer DS Nicola Power. The note states:

"[PC B] stated that during a range day, in relation to a colleague PC Carly Metcalfe who underperformed when shooting, PS Godfrey stated "She fucked it up". [PC B] also stated that PS Godfrey, referring to an officer on the range wearing make-up that "She better not stand too close to the heater", referring to the amount of make-up that the officer was wearing."

77. PS Godfrey denied this incident in his regulation 30 response. However, in interview PS Godfrey was asked about an incident on the range day where a female officer failed to achieve the required level and you described her as "having fucked up". PS Godfrey responded:

"I'll qualify that because I failed that same pistol shoot, I said "As did I, I fucked up" I passed it on a retake. Again it's been cherry picked to suit an agenda".

78. PS Godfrey admitted that he had made the make up comment, but he stated that it was meant as a joke. PS Godfrey also accepted that the joke was in bad taste.

Panel determination 2.5(b)

79. The panel noted PS Godfrey's denial of making both of these comments in his regulation 30 response even though he had fully admitted making the "make up" comment as joke in his interview. The panel therefore found the alleged "make up" comment proved on the basis of PS Godfrey's admission

in interview. In the opinion of the panel this inconsistency between PS Godfrey's interview and his regulation 30 response undermined the reliability of PS Godfrey's recollection of specific events.

80. With regard to the "fucked up" comment the panel noted that there was no direct evidence from the female officer involved in the alleged incident. However, the panel considered the recorded note from the management meeting on 8 April 2024, which documented PC B's account of the incident to be a reliable source of evidence. The panel noted that in his Regulation 30 response, PS Godfrey denied the alleged context in which the "fucked up" comment had been used but admitted to using the phrase in a broader context, including self-criticism. However, the panel found that the evidence from the management meeting note, was more persuasive. The panel, therefore, concluded that it was more likely than not that the comment was made as alleged, and found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities.

(c) by suggesting that a female subordinate was in incorrect uniform due to "not wanting to mess her fucking hair up"

81. It is alleged by the RA that on 22 December 2023, the same day on which PS Godfrey shouted at PC A about her hat, that PC Williamson witnessed PS Godfrey coming back into the office and recalled him saying that PC A *"is as bad as that Jamie Byrne not wanting to mess her fucking hair up"*. The RA relies solely on the evidence of PC Williamson to prove this allegation. PS Godfrey denies this allegation.

Panel determination 2.5(c)

82. In the opinion of the panel PC Williamson was a credible witness whose evidence had been found to be consistent with the evidence of other officers relied on by the RA in respect of PS Godfrey's attitude towards members of the team and women in particular. The panel had regard to the inconsistencies in PS Godfrey's evidence referenced above. The Panel therefore preferred the evidence of PC Williamson over that of PS Godfrey and found this incident proved on the balance of probabilities.

(d) by referring to male officers talking to each other as "worse than woman"

83. It is alleged by the RA that PC Williamson recalls the Officer entering the refreshment room on an unspecified date and upon seeing two male officers speaking saying *"You're worse than women"*. The RA relies solely on the evidence of PC Williamson to prove this allegation. PS Godfrey denies that the incident happened.

Panel determination 2.5(d)

84. For the reasons detailed above the panel preferred the evidence of PC Williamson over that of Godfrey and found the incident proved on the balance of probabilities.

Panel determination allegation 2

85. Having considered each of the specific incidents relied upon by the RA to prove allegation 2, namely that PS Godfrey discriminated against female officers under his command by subjecting them to worse treatment than their male peers. The panel went on to consider whether the incidents found proved considered collectively proved on the balance that PS Godfrey had discriminated against female officers on the grounds of their gender.
86. In determining this issue, the panel had regard to the definition of direct discrimination contained in the relevant guidance, the incidents found proved, the evidence of PS Godfrey and his good character, the submissions made on behalf of the RA and legal advice from the LQA.
87. In the opinion of the panel the incidents found proved demonstrated a pattern of conduct whereby on numerous occasions female officers had been treated less favourably than their male colleagues. In the opinion of the panel the demeaning language used by PS Godfrey about female officers and his focus on their abilities suggested that the female officers had been treated less favourably due to their gender. The panel therefore found allegation 2 proved on the balance of probabilities.

BREACH OF STANDARDS

88. Having found allegations 1 and 2 proved on the balance of probabilities., the panel then went on to consider whether any of the allegations or facts found proved breached the standards of professional behaviour alleged by the RA. In the opinion of the panel the facts found proved clearly demonstrated a substantial departure from the standards of professional behaviour in respect of authority, respect and courtesy, equality and diversity, and discreditable conduct.

GROSS MISCONDUCT OR MISCONDUCT

89. Having found the breaches of the standards as set out above, the panel carefully considered whether the breaches amount to gross misconduct or misconduct. Misconduct is defined in the Regulations as meaning a breach of the standards of professional conduct that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross misconduct is defined as a breach of the standards of professional conduct that is serious as to justify dismissal. The panel reminded itself of the circumstances of this case, the breaches of the standards found proved, the need to protect public confidence in, and the reputation of the Police Service, the need to maintain high professional

standards and the need to protect the public and officers and staff by preventing similar misconduct in the future.

90. In assessing the seriousness of the misconduct, the panel had regard to the outcome guidance and determined that PS Godfrey was fully culpable for his actions which were deliberate. Actual emotional harm had been caused to a number of officers and the level of reputational harm to the MDP was also high. The incident was particularly aggravated by the bullying and discriminatory behaviour of PS Godfrey and his lack of insight into the impact of his behaviour. The panel found no mitigating factors that were relevant to the facts of this case.

91. The panel had regard to the outcome guidance which provides that misconduct involving bullying and discrimination “*should be considered especially serious*”. The panel concluded that PS Godfrey’s conduct was extremely serious due to the sustained nature of his bullying and discriminatory behaviour, therefore the panel found that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct.

OUTCOME

92. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction the Panel have had regard to PS Godfrey’s service record, the character references produced by him his written responses to the allegations, the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf the RA and the legal advice received from the LQA. The panel applied the three-stage procedure set out in the guidance. The Panel assessed the seriousness of the misconduct, keeping in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions and chose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

Seriousness of the misconduct

93. In assessing the seriousness of the misconduct, the Panel have considered:

- i. The officer’s culpability for the misconduct.
- ii. The harm caused by the misconduct.
- iii. The existence of any aggravating factors.
- iv. The existence of any mitigating factors.

94. Culpability is defined as the blameworthiness or responsibility of the officer for their actions. The panel determined that PS Godfrey was highly culpable for his behaviour

- His actions were deliberate
- He was in a leadership position
- The facts found proved include an allegation on manhandling a female officer

95. Harm can be caused in several ways, the guidance emphasises how the public might perceive such behaviour if it were to become known is a

relevant factor to take account when making a determination of harm. PS Godfrey's actions caused emotional harm particularly to the female officers that he targeted for less favourable treatment. The risk of reputational harm to the MDP was also significant in light of heightened public interest in respect of misogyny in the police service. The panel therefore determined that the level of harm was high in this case.

96. The Panel considered the following to be aggravating factors in this case:

- Bullying over a sustained period of time
- Unlawful discrimination over a sustained period of time
- The officer was subject to a previous final written
- Multiple victims
- Multiple serious breaches of professional standards

97. The aggravating features in the guidance (4.76) is not an exhaustive list, the panel noted that PS Godfrey demonstrated a lack of insight and remorse in respect of the impact of his behaviour on other the panel found this to be an aggravating factor also.

98. The Panel were cognisant of the guidance at 4.79 around mitigating factors, being careful not to conflate mitigation that goes to conduct and personal mitigation. The Panel found that there were no mitigating factors that were capable of diminishing the seriousness of PS Godfrey's conduct .

99. In respect of personal mitigation, the panel noted the number of positive character references. However in accordance with the guidance the Panel gave this little weight in all the circumstances of this case.

Purpose of the Sanction

100. The Panel kept in mind at all times the threefold purpose of imposing sanctions, namely: (a) maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; (b) upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; (c) protection of the public. Of these, the maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service is paramount.

Choosing the most appropriate sanction

101. The Panel had careful regard to the purpose of outcomes and that they are not intended primarily to be punitive. The Panel also had regard to the need for outcomes to be proportionate. In line with the guidance at 7.4, the panel considered the least severe outcome first. The panel found that no personal mitigation had been put forward on behalf of PS Godfrey.

102. The panel determined that PS Godfrey's behaviour constituted a serious and sustained departure from the professional standards set by the

MDP and which the public can rightly expect from the police officers who serve them. There is no place in the police service for officers who commit acts of bullying and misogyny, this type of behaviour is totally inconsistent with the values of the MDP. Therefore, in the opinion of the panel a final written warning would not reflect or be sufficient to address the seriousness of PS Godfrey's conduct nor would such an outcome uphold high standards in policing or deter misconduct. In these circumstances, the Panel determined that the only appropriate sanction in this case was that of dismissal without notice.