



In the matter of the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020;

APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY FOR
THE BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE

V

Former PC Ronald Davis [4247]

[CASE REF CM/137/26]

Regulation 63 Outcome Report

Location: Online via Microsoft Teams

Date: 25th August 2026

Chair: Chief Constable Lucy D'Orsi

Outcome: Gross Misconduct

Sanction: Would Have Been Dismissed



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Case Reference: CM/137/26

Investigating Officer: DC Mark Silk

Subject Officer (Rank, Number, Name): former PC Ronald Davis

Date of Determination: 25th August 2026

Chairperson: Chief Constable Lucy D'Orsi

Allegations

Allegation One

It is alleged that, on 31st May 2026, you were on duty and driving a marked police vehicle. Whilst responsible for the vehicle you:

- a. Used the vehicle for a non-policing purpose, driving to Northolt;
- b. Caused or permitted members of your family to be passengers in the vehicle during this journey, without good reason or policing purpose;
- c. Exceeded the safe and permitted number of passengers for the vehicle;
- d. Failed to use legally required child car seats, without a valid exemption;
- e. And by doing the above (a) to (d), you failed, without reasonable excuse or lawful authority, to be properly available for operational deployment.

If proven, it is alleged your conduct would be a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

- Honesty and Integrity (Integrity Only)
- Orders and Instructions
- Duties and Responsibilities
- Authority, Respect and Courtesy
- Discreditable Conduct

**British Transport Police****Accelerated Misconduct Hearing****Regulation 63 Determination****British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020****Allegation Two**

It is alleged that, on 10th June 2026, you reported for duty for a safety-critical operational role, whilst the level of alcohol in your breath exceeded the permitted level.

If proven, it is alleged your conduct would be a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

- Fitness for Duty
- Honesty and Integrity (Integrity Only)
- Orders and Instructions
- Duties and Responsibilities
- Discreditable Conduct

Allegation Three

It is alleged that, on 31st May 2026 and/or 10th June 2026, you provided misleading accounts to PS Gordon regarding the incident described in Allegation One.

If proven, it is alleged your conduct would be a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

- Honesty and Integrity
- Authority, Respect and Courtesy
- Discreditable Conduct

Representation

The AA was represented by Lauren Hulett

Former PC Davis was represented by PC Brian Williams of the British Transport Police Federation



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Preliminary issues and applications

Former officer provisions

The AA made an application that this case be dealt with under the Former Officer provisions. The application was unopposed. I granted that application, on the basis that former PC Davis retired on the 20th August 2026.

Anonymity application

An application for anonymity was made by PC Williams. A short written application was provided at 11:56 on the 21st August 2026. [REDACTED]

A request was made by the Proceedings Officer shortly afterwards for clarification as to whether any [REDACTED] evidence would be provided in support of the application, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. As far as I am aware, no response was provided.

At the hearing on the 25th August 2026, I invited oral submissions on former PC Davis' behalf and PC Williams confirmed that he was not relying on any [REDACTED] evidence, and that none would be submitted for my consideration. I asked in particular whether there were any specific concerns [REDACTED]



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The AA opposes the application on the basis that:

(a) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(b) In those circumstances, the matters relied upon by the Officer do not outweigh the public interest in conducting the proceedings openly, nor do they rebut the presumption in favour of transparency.

In assessing whether it would be justified to impose a restriction on the hearing in the form of an anonymity order, I have considered not only the application itself and the submissions from both parties but also the relevant Home Office Guidance at paragraphs 11.75 – 11.87, which gives helpful assistance on how to approach such a decision. I have in mind the following, in particular:

- (a) Anonymity orders may be appropriate in cases where there is some form of operational sensitivity. This does not apply here;
- (b) The presumption should be of transparency where possible;
- (c) The welfare of the officer should be considered, particularly where there may be a severe adverse effect on the officer's health or there are dangers or threats to the officer that might arise from being named publicly.

I have carefully considered points (a) and (b) above alongside the welfare of former PC Davis. I appreciate that the end of his policing career, (his resignation having taken effect before this hearing) is



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

a matter of regret for him [REDACTED]

I have not been provided with any evidence whatsoever that would assist me in determining that there should be a limitation placed on the transparency of these proceedings [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] PC Williams was given the opportunity to address me in writing in advance of the hearing, and orally in the course of the hearing itself. I therefore consider that former PC Davis has been given a fair opportunity to provide as much information as possible in support of this application.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

There is no evidential basis to make such a determination. Former PC Davis' wishes on anonymity do not outweigh the public interest in transparency in these proceedings. I therefore refuse the application for anonymity.



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Attendance/hearing arrangements

I received a bundle of evidence prior to the hearing. This included the Regulation 51 Notice served on former PC Davis, his Regulation 54 Response, the documentary evidence underlying the allegations and bodyworn footage.

No character evidence was submitted.

Former PC Davis was not present at the hearing. Through his Regulation 54 response, he made full and frank admissions to each of the allegations.

I also considered the Opening Note on behalf of the AA.

The allegations

Former PC Davis faced three allegations, as follows:

Allegation One

It is alleged that, on 31st May 2026, you were on duty and driving a marked police vehicle. Whilst responsible for the vehicle you:

- a. Used the vehicle for a non-policing purpose, driving to Northolt;
- b. Caused or permitted members of your family to be passengers in the vehicle during this journey, without good reason or policing purpose;
- c. Exceeded the safe and permitted number of passengers for the vehicle;
- d. Failed to use legally required child car seats, without a valid exemption;
- e. And by doing the above (a) to (d), you failed, without reasonable excuse or lawful authority, to be properly available for operational deployment.

If proven, it is alleged your conduct would be a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

- Honesty and Integrity (Integrity Only)
- Orders and Instructions
- Duties and Responsibilities

**British Transport Police****Accelerated Misconduct Hearing****Regulation 63 Determination****British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020**

- Authority, Respect and Courtesy
- Discreditable Conduct

Allegation Two

It is alleged that, on 10th June 2026, you reported for duty for a safety-critical operational role, whilst the level of alcohol in your breath exceeded the permitted level.

If proven, it is alleged your conduct would be a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

- Fitness for Duty
- Honesty and Integrity (Integrity Only)
- Orders and Instructions
- Duties and Responsibilities
- Discreditable Conduct

Allegation Three

It is alleged that, on 31st May 2026 and/or 10th June 2026, you provided misleading accounts to PS Gordon regarding the incident described in Allegation One.

If proven, it is alleged your conduct would be a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

- Honesty and Integrity
- Authority, Respect and Courtesy
- Discreditable Conduct



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Findings of Fact

In respect of allegations (1) and (3), the evidence of PC Malik and PS Gordon, read in conjunction with the telematics report at [117-121] is cogent and compelling. In respect of allegation (2), PS Gordon's evidence, including his bodyworn footage, is irrefutable. Former PC Davis also admits the allegations in their entirety. I therefore find each allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

Turning now to whether this is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour:

The conduct, taken individually or collectively, amounts to multiple breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour. Former PC Davis also accepts that this is the case.

I find that former PC Davis breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

Allegation one: Orders and Instructions, Duties and Responsibilities, Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.

Former PC Davis deliberately abandoned his duties to convey his family somewhere in a police vehicle, without permission or lawful authority. He also did so in manner which was unsafe. He also abused his powers and/or authority in using the police vehicle as he did. I therefore find breaches of each of those Standards.

I do not find a breach of Honesty and Integrity, (Integrity rather than Honesty being relied upon by the AA). The other Standards more adequately capture the nature of the proven misconduct.

Allegation two: Fitness for Duty, Orders and Instructions, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct.

Former PC Davis was not fit for duty, by reason of his alcohol consumption. He therefore not only breached the relevant BTP policy [154-178] but has failed to diligently perform his duties. Reporting for duty when unfit to do so brings clear discredit on the police service. I therefore find breaches of each of those Standards.

I do not find a breach of Honesty and Integrity, (Integrity rather than Honesty being relied upon by the AA). The other Standards more adequately capture the nature of the proven misconduct.



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Allegation three: Honesty and Integrity, Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.

Former PC Davis deliberately mislead PS Gordon on two separate occasions. His actual state of knowledge was that he knew that the reason for his absence was not that he had taken the police van to be cleaned and had been conducting errands. He also knew that he had not driven his family to Kings Cross, and yet he chose to give PS Gordon that account. That was objectively dishonest, and lacked integrity. It also shows a complete lack of respect for PS Gordon and brings obvious discredit upon the police service.

Turning now to whether this amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct, I find that it amounts to gross misconduct. Former PC Davis also admits that that is the case.

I have addressed my mind to the seriousness of the conduct, by reference to the guidance provided in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcome. I have considered: culpability for the conduct, harm caused by it, aggravating and mitigating factors. I have taken care not to 'double count' each of those factors.

On culpability, I find that this was high for the following reasons:

- (a) Former PC Davis appears to have taken a decision on the 30th May 2026 that he would not perform his duties with PC Malik as required, given that he contacted PC Malik to see if he was content to be single crewed the next day. This shows a degree of planning about the 31st May;
- (b) He also brought his family to BTP premises on the 31st May 2026, obtained access to a police vehicle and to drove them to Northolt for a non-policing purpose. This is not a case of one brief lapse in judgment caused by the pressure of a spontaneous operational event. This is the definition of a sequence of deliberate decisions to clearly act contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour;
- (c) When challenged by PS Gordon, former PC Davis' initial response was to lie about his actions;
- (d) It would have been obvious to such an experienced officer that what he was doing at all points was not appropriate or acceptable and therefore he could reasonably have foreseen a risk of harm;
- (e) There is no evidence before me that calls into question his ability at the time to have appreciated that what he was doing was wrong.



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

On harm, I find that the degree of harm cause was high, for the following reasons:

- (a) Former PC Davis' conduct, in every respect, undermines discipline and good order within the police service;
- (b) The policing operation on the 31st May 2026 was a significant one which was focussed on ensuring that an estimated crowd of over one million people could participate in the Arsenal parade safely. It was a significant event to Londoners, and to the wider population, and the public rightly would have expected that the police officers entrusted to facilitate it were doing so diligently. BTP officers and other policing colleagues should also have been able to expect that each of them would perform their duties in a manner that would keep them safe. Serious harm could have been caused to the public, or to PC Malik, given that he was forced to undertake his duties in an unsafe manner because of former PC Davis' absence;
- (c) Serious harm could have also been caused to the infant occupants of the vehicle, had an accident occurred, and;
- (d) Serious harm would be caused to the reputation of BTP and the police service more generally if the public were aware of the circumstances of this case.

I now turn to aggravating factors:

- (a) Whilst it was not pleaded as a separate allegation, it is significant that former PC Davis asked PC Malik to cover for him, and effectively lie on his behalf, if he were challenged about his absence. To put a colleague in such a compromising position is woefully unacceptable;
- (b) This is not a single incident, but a course of conduct over an entire shift, and beyond;
- (c) There are multiple proven breaches of the Standards;
- (d) There is a degree of personal advantage to former PC Davis' conduct, in that he has chosen to facilitate transporting his family around whilst on duty, in a BTP vehicle, at BTP's expense;
- (e) It is an abuse of former PC Davis' powers to have abused his access to a police vehicle in the manner that he has done, and;
- (f) Being entirely absent as he was on the 31st May, driving the occupants in an unsafe manner and being unfit for duty on the 10th June both represent significant deviations from instructions, orders and Force Policy.

In respect of mitigating factors, I find as follows:



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

- (a) I have not been invited to consider any mitigating factors that might reduce culpability or harm, and I find that there are none present, and;
- (b) I give former PC Davis credit for his full admissions.

For all of those reasons, I consider that this conduct is so serious as to amount to Gross Misconduct.

Outcome

I have considered what outcome would be proportionate on the facts of this case and would satisfy the purpose of the regulatory regime, which is to maintain the high standards and good reputation of an honourable profession, to ensure that public confidence is and can be maintained, and also to protect the public.

I have had regard to Part 4 of the College of Policing Guidance on Outcome, and I have approached my decision as follows:

- I have assessed the seriousness of the misconduct
- I have kept in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions
- I have chosen the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

I have also considered the BTP values:

- We are proud to protect
- We care
- We do the right thing
- We strive to be better every day
- We are one BTP

I have considered whether a Final Written Warning would be appropriate and proportionate. However, I conclude that that would not be a proportionate outcome. The appropriate sanction is that former PC Davis would have been dismissed without notice had he still been a serving officer.

I repeat the findings I have made on seriousness of the proven misconduct. Such behaviour, taken individually or collectively, is incompatible with the values of BTP and with policing in general, and is so serious that dismissal is the only outcome that can properly maintain high standards and protect public confidence.



British Transport Police

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Regulation 63 Determination

British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Publication

I require the Appropriate Authority to publish public notice of the outcome of this hearing on the BTP website for a minimum of 28 days. This notice should include:

- o Name of the officer concerned
- o Date of the hearing
- o Time of the hearing
- o Place at which the hearing took place
- o Conduct that was the subject matter of the case and my findings as per this report

I have also directed that any matters relating to former PC Davis' sensitive personal data must be redacted.

Appeal Notice

You have a right of appeal to the Appropriate Authority, but may only appeal on the following grounds:

- The finding or disciplinary sanction imposed was unreasonable;
- There is critical new evidence that could not have reasonably have been considered at the misconduct hearing; or
- There was a serious breach of the procedures set out in the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.

You have 10 working days to appeal once you have received the Outcome Report. If you wish to appeal, you must do so in writing to the British Transport Police Authority at btpa-enquiries@btp.police.uk.

You should state your grounds of appeal, whether you require a transcript of the hearing in whole or part, and whether or not you consent to the appeal being determined without a hearing.

In addition to the above, it is important you are aware that following the conclusion of this misconduct hearing which has resulted in a formal sanction, a record of this finding will be recorded on the Police National Database (PND).

Schedule 8 of the Policing and Crime Act 2017 created two statutory-approved lists, the police barred list and police advisory list.

The barred list will hold Information in relation to Police Officers, Police Staff and Special Constables dismissed for Gross Misconduct or unsatisfactory performance/attendance, or who it is found at a Hearing would have been dismissed if they had not retired or resigned before the outcome of the case was determined.

An individual's inclusion on the barred list will act as an absolute bar to being employed or appointed by a police force or other specified law enforcement bodies.

Non-Home Office Forces are not currently included in the legislation. However, the College of Policing recommends to those not so covered by the legislation at this time, i.e. BTP, should put a record on PND for those who would have been added to the Barred and Advisory Lists had they been employed by a Home Office force.