



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

APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY FOR THE BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE

V

PC James Hill [0281]

CASE REF CM/130/26

Regulation 63 Outcome Report

Location: Ivason House, London Bridge

Date: 17th September 2026

Chair: Chief Constable Lucy D'Orsi

Outcome: Gross Misconduct

Sanction: Dismissal Without Notice

Case Reference: CM/130/26

Investigating Officer: IO Sarah Jones [5948], Professional Standards Department

Subject Officer: PC 0281 James Hill

Date of Determination: 17th September 2026

Chairperson: Chief Constable Lucy D'Orsi

Introduction

1. On 16th September 2026 I conducted an accelerated misconduct hearing for PC 0281 James Hill ('the Officer') under regulation 55(1) of the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ('the Regulations'). I submit this report to the appropriate authority ('the AA') under regulation 63(1), setting out my finding, my reasons for it and the disciplinary action I have imposed.
2. Numbers in bold square brackets refer to the paginated accelerated hearing bundle of 74 pages. 'AB' refers to the Officer's anonymity application bundle.

Representation and attendance

3. The AA was represented by Lauren Hulett, Proceedings Unit Lead. I was assisted by a legal adviser, Matthew Holdcroft of counsel, whose advice on

the law was given openly and forms part of the record. Also present were Mullai Marinuthu (Proceedings Officer) and investigator officer Sarah Jones.

4. The Officer did not attend and was not represented. His police friend, Andrew Murphy of the British Transport Police Federation, did not attend. The hearing commenced at 18:23 hours and was held in public, subject to the directions recorded below.

Documents considered

5. In making my determination I have had regard to the following and referred to them as necessary:
 - (a) the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, including the Standards of Professional Behaviour at Schedule 2;
 - (b) the Home Office Guidance, *Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness: Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing* (2020) ('HOG');
 - (c) the College of Policing *Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings* (2023) ('the Guidance');
 - (d) the College of Policing Code of Practice for Ethical Policing (2023) and Code of Ethics (2024);
 - (e) the accelerated hearing bundle, including the Regulation 51 notice [3]–[6], the Regulation 49 certificate [8], the Regulation 17 notice [9]–[13], the investigator's Regulation 21(3) statement and memorandum

[14]–[20], the statement of Female A and her exhibits [21]–[39], the statement of PC Haigh and her exhibits [40]–[62], and the correspondence with the Officer and his police friend [63]–[74];

(f) the AA’s Case Summary dated 14th September 2026 and its written responses to the anonymity application dated 11th and 15th September 2026;

(g) the Officer’s anonymity application and supporting material (AB 1–9) and his emails of 10th, 14th and 15th September 2026 [68]–[69], [72], AB 8.

Preliminary matters

6. **Anonymity.** On 8th September 2026 the Officer applied for his name and identifying details to be withheld from the public notice, the hearing and any published outcome, relying on his mental health, the position of his family and Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights. I refused that application at the start of the hearing for the reasons given in a separate written ruling, which forms part of the record. In summary, I accepted that the Officer is unwell and that his welfare is a factor of real weight, but the evidence did not establish that withholding his name was strictly necessary, and Article 2 was not engaged on the material before me. I directed under regulation 59(2)(c) that the content of the Officer’s medical evidence and the detail of his application are not to be published; that the woman concerned is to be referred to as ‘Female A’ and not identified; that the AA

take the welfare steps set out in that ruling and confirm to me in writing that it has done so; and that publication of any notice or outcome naming the Officer be deferred for 48 hours after that confirmation, as a welfare measure. Those directions apply to the publication of this report.

7. **Proceeding in the Officer's absence.** The Officer told the AA through his police friend on 1st September 2026 that he would not attend [67], and confirmed on 10th September 2026 that he was too unwell to attend [72]. He was offered, more than once, the opportunity to participate remotely and did not take it up [63], [68], [70]. He did not seek an adjournment. He was informed of his right to be legally represented or to be represented by a police friend [5]–[6], as regulation 61(2) requires. He had admitted gross misconduct and put his mitigation in writing. The medical material addressed the question of publicity and did not state that he was unfit to participate. I was satisfied that it was fair to proceed in his absence under regulation 57(3)(b), and I did so.

8. **The Officer's position on the allegation.** Regulation 61(5) requires me to give the Officer the opportunity at the beginning of the hearing to say whether he accepts that his conduct amounts to gross misconduct. He was given that opportunity in writing. The AA wrote to him on 14th September 2026 asking him to confirm his position [70]. He replied the same day: 'I recognise what I did was wrong and not professional. I apologise to all people involved ... and I accept this is gross misconduct' [68]. That confirmed

the message he had sent through his police friend on 1st September 2026:

‘I accept it’s gross misconduct, not much more I can say is there’ [67].

The allegation

9. The allegation in the Regulation 51 notice [4] is as follows:

It is alleged that, on or around 7 July 2024 and thereafter, having obtained the personal contact details of [REDACTED] (Female A) during the course of your police duties, you used those details to initiate and pursue inappropriate personal communications with her for the purpose of developing an improper emotional relationship. In doing so, it is alleged that you abused your position as a police officer.

10. The AA alleges that this conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Honesty and Integrity (integrity only), Authority, Respect and Courtesy, and Discreditable Conduct, and that it amounts to gross misconduct, namely a breach of the Standards so serious as to justify dismissal.

The Officer’s response

11. The Officer made no representations under regulation 18 during the investigation [19]. He did not complete a Regulation 54 response form. His response is contained in his email of 14th September 2026 [68]–[69], which the AA placed in the bundle. In it he:

- (a) apologises 'wholeheartedly' for his actions, recognises that what he did was wrong and unprofessional, and accepts that it is gross misconduct;
- (b) asks me to consider the 'actual objective content and context of the messages', which he says contrast with aspects of Female A's statement made two years after the event; says that he stated he found her attractive, 'which i definitely should not have done', and made it clear he was not single; says that he left the decision to communicate to her, put her under no pressure, did not seek to meet her or start an affair, and stopped when she indicated she did not wish to continue;
- (c) says that he 'inexplicably' sent a single further message about a year later, for which he cannot give an explanation;
- (d) says that he does not remember attempting to add Female A on Instagram;
- (e) relies on 19 years' police service, good performance reviews, two commendations, and service at terrorist incidents and in dangerous situations, and says that he has 'made a huge error, one I am going to pay for forever' and accepts any outcome.

The evidence and my findings of fact

12. Regulation 61(15) requires me to review the facts of the case. Although the Officer admits gross misconduct, I have examined the evidence for myself and I make my findings on it. The evidence consists of the contemporaneous ControlWorks log [45]–[59], the export of the Officer’s work mobile telephone [43], Female A’s screenshots of the messages [33]–[35], [37], [39], the Origin directory and CoreVet records of the Officer’s work and personal numbers [61], [62], and the statements of Female A [21]–[31] and PC Haigh [40]–[41]. The messages are not in dispute. The Officer’s own account of them is that they were wrong, and he does not challenge their content.

13. I find the following facts.

(a) At 03:49 on Sunday 7th July 2024 the force control room received a 999 call from staff at the Royal Station Hotel, Newcastle. A naked woman had been found in a corridor; she did not know how she had come to be there and was very upset and intoxicated. The incident was graded Immediate; the THRIVE assessment recorded a threat of harm to the woman as high and the concern for her welfare as serious [45], [49]. The Officer, then a temporary sergeant, attended with PC 1184 Peacock, arriving at 03:53 [51], [54].

(b) The woman was Female A, then aged 26. She had been drinking with friends at a birthday celebration, had lost her memory of the later part of the evening, and came to in the corridor with no clothes. She was

confused, frightened and embarrassed. The attending officers told her that she might have been 'spiked'. The log recorded her involvement as 'VUL' (vulnerable) [57]. She was, on any view, a vulnerable member of the public in the immediate aftermath of a distressing and potentially criminal event.

- (c) In the course of the incident the Officer obtained Female A's personal mobile number. He called it twice from his work telephone, at 04:02 and 04:30, in an attempt to locate her telephone [43]. The officers recovered her belongings, and at about 05:00 drove her to her parents' home, some 30 to 40 minutes away [56], [57]. Before leaving, the Officer told her that he would contact her in a couple of days to check how she was. At 05:55 he sent her a text from his work telephone giving his work number and email address and offering to deal with anything if, on reflection, she was unhappy about what had happened [23], [43]. I accept that up to this point the Officer's contact had a legitimate welfare purpose.
- (d) Female A had left a toy gun from her fancy-dress costume in the police vehicle. On Thursday 11th July 2024 the Officer texted her from his work telephone to ask whether she wanted it back [43]. She replied on 12th July, thanking him and declining. He replied that if she were ever through Newcastle, she should 'come say hello', and that the gun had 'become quite popular in the office' [24], [43].

- (e) On Saturday 13th July 2024, between 14:51 and 23:53, the exchange on the work telephone became personal. The Officer said he would send a photograph of the gun 'in action' but his work telephone did not send photographs; that he had been 'wearing [it] just earlier'; 'This is probably quite unprofessional of me isn't it, I shouldn't really be bothering you!'; 'Obviously don't want to overstep!'; and 'I nearly sent a photo of the gun from my own phone but that probably is overstepping!' [24], [43]. Those messages show that the Officer knew, as he wrote them, that he was crossing a professional boundary.
- (f) At 23:58 on 13th July 2024 the Officer moved the exchange to his personal mobile telephone, [REDACTED] [37], [62], and sent Female A a photograph of himself in uniform wearing her toy gun on his belt, with the words 'I should not be doing this haha!' [25], [33]. I find that the move to his personal telephone was deliberate. It took the exchange outside the channel that had a policing purpose and outside the reach of any audit of his work telephone.
- (g) On Sunday 14th July 2024 the Officer sent a series of messages from his personal telephone [26]–[28], [34]. He commented on Female A's appearance in her costume ('you still somehow pulled the outfit off ... if I'm allowed to say that') and on her appearance in the bedsheet in which the hotel staff had covered her ('if I'm kind of being honest you kind of pulled that off too'). He wrote: 'I really shouldn't be doing what

I'm doing now though'; 'I met you through work, really shouldn't now be messaging like this. And I'm not single so again, being bad in that respect. But I dunno, I was drawn to you and just wanted to chat'; 'Found you extremely attractive and I don't know, I did something I've never done before and messaged someone I met through work privately'; 'Ball is well and truly in your court for this'; and 'a big concern was how we've come to talking. I could get in some trouble at work if you ever complained for example'. He sent a photograph of himself in a changing-room mirror holding the gun, adding 'I'll show you the gun very shortly haha ... that is NOT a euphemism [sic] by the way!'. He asked whether she was doing anything that night, suggesting the football 'could be an excuse to get out'. Female A replied that she did not want to cause trouble with his partner, that she did not mind 'innocent chat but out of respect for your partner obviously that's it', and that if it went any other way she would not reply. The exchange ended that day. She screenshotted the messages the following day and kept them in a hidden folder [29].

- (h) Almost a year later, on Sunday 6th July 2025 at 15:18, the Officer sent Female A a further unsolicited message from his personal telephone: 'Hey, how are you? May not remember me but I found this at work if it helps jog the memory....', with a photograph of her toy gun [30], [35], [39]. She blocked his number. She describes her reaction: 'This made my stomach go into knots and I thought Eugh, this is wrong' [30].

- (i) Female A did not report the matter. She explains why: she felt conflicted, embarrassed and partly to blame for having replied; she was worried about the consequences for the Officer; she did not know how to report it, and feared that if she went to a police station he might be there; and, when the messages turned sexual, she 'did not want to come across too stern' because 'He knew where I lived. I did not want to be on the bad side of him' [28], [30]. The matter came to light through an internal audit of the Officer's work telephone in April 2026 [40]. Female A gave her statement on 8th July 2026 after the investigator contacted her.
- (j) Female A's account of the effect on her is measured and I accept it. At the time she saw the Officer as someone who had made her feel safe, 'like a knight in shining armour', and she was 'a bit naïve'; the message that he was not single set off 'alarm bells' and she felt disappointed; the innuendo about the gun 'was so obviously sexual' and 'got to' her; she 'just wanted the messages to stop'. Looking back she considers the messages 'a lot worse and more severe than I thought at the time', says 'I do think I was vulnerable at the time and PC Hill took advantage of that', and says that if she had to deal with the police again in a similar situation she would want to deal with a female officer [25], [27], [28], [31].

14. Two matters on which I make no finding. Female A believes that some months after July 2024 the Officer tried to add her on Instagram, but she has no record of it [29]; the Officer says he does not remember doing so [69]; the allegation does not rely on it, and I leave it out of account. The AA's evidence also refers to the investigation having concerned more than one woman [40]; only the conduct towards Female A is before me and I have confined myself to it.
15. The Officer asks me to look at the objective content and context of the messages rather than at Female A's later description of them. I have done so. The findings above rest on the messages themselves, which he sent and does not dispute, and on the contemporaneous log. Read objectively, the messages show a police officer who had met a vulnerable woman on duty a week earlier, who had her number because of that duty, and who used it to tell her that he found her extremely attractive, to send her photographs of himself, to make a sexual innuendo, and to float meeting her that evening, while telling her in terms that he knew he should not be doing it and that he could be in trouble at work if she complained. I accept that he applied no overt pressure, that he said he was not proposing an affair, and that he stopped when she drew a line. Those matters go to the seriousness of the conduct. They do not alter its character. I also accept that the message a year later was a single message; it was also unsolicited, sent to a woman who had not been in contact with him for a year, and accompanied by a photograph of the object that connected them to the night he had met her.

Finding on the allegation

16. On the evidence I am satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the conduct alleged occurred: having obtained Female A's personal contact details in the course of his police duties, the Officer used them to initiate and pursue inappropriate personal communications with her for the purpose of developing an improper emotional relationship, and in doing so abused his position as a police officer. The Officer also admits the conduct and admits that it amounts to gross misconduct. I find the allegation proven under regulation 61(16)(a) and, independently, under regulation 61(16)(b).

Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

17. **Honesty and Integrity (integrity only).** Police officers act with integrity. The Officer had Female A's number only because he had attended, as a police officer, an incident in which she was vulnerable and in need of protection. He used that information, and the trust that the encounter had created, to pursue a personal relationship with her. He knew that he was doing so, said so in the messages, and moved to his private telephone to do it. That is a failure of integrity and an abuse of his position. I find this breach proven.
18. **Authority, Respect and Courtesy.** Police officers act with self-control, treat members of the public with respect and courtesy, and do not abuse their powers or authority. Female A was entitled to be treated professionally by the officer who had attended to her when she was at her most vulnerable. Instead, within days, she received comments on her appearance in the

costume she had been wearing and in the bedsheet she had been given to cover herself, a declaration of attraction, sexual innuendo, and an invitation to go out. The imbalance between them was obvious: he was the officer who had dealt with her, who knew where she lived, and whose goodwill she felt she could not afford to lose. He gave no thought to that. I find this breach proven.

19. **Discreditable Conduct.** Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it. Any member of the public learning that an officer who had rescued a vulnerable woman from a hotel corridor at 4 o'clock in the morning had, within a week, used her number to tell her he found her extremely attractive and to send her photographs of himself would be dismayed, and their confidence in the police would be damaged. Female A's own reaction - that she would want a female officer if she ever needed the police again - is the clearest illustration. I find this breach proven.

Misconduct or gross misconduct

20. Misconduct is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross misconduct is a breach so serious as to justify dismissal (regulation 2). In deciding which this is, I have assessed the seriousness of the conduct by reference to the Officer's culpability, the harm caused, and the aggravating and mitigating factors, as

the Guidance directs (paragraphs 4.2–4.4), taking care not to double count (paragraph 4.15).

21. **Culpability.** I find the Officer's culpability to be high.

- (a) The conduct was deliberate and it was sustained over several days, with a further deliberate act a year later.
- (b) The Officer knew at the time that what he was doing was wrong. His own messages say so repeatedly: 'quite unprofessional', 'overstepping', 'I should not be doing this', 'I really shouldn't be doing what I'm doing now', 'I could get in some trouble at work if you ever complained'. He continued regardless. That is the aggravating feature the Guidance describes as continuing the behaviour after the officer realised it was improper (paragraph 4.76).
- (c) He was the senior officer at the incident, a temporary sergeant, and it was he who had obtained Female A's number. All police officers hold a position of trust; his responsibility at that incident heightened it (paragraphs 4.12, 4.45).
- (d) He moved the exchange to his personal telephone at the point at which it became personal. That was a step taken to keep the contact away from any policing channel.
- (e) The Guidance is explicit. Abuse of position for a sexual purpose, defined to include pursuing 'a sexual or improper emotional relationship with any member of the public', is 'a form of serious

corruption’ (paragraph 4.44). Officers ‘must not, under any circumstances, use their professional position to initiate or pursue a sexual or improper emotional relationship with a vulnerable person’ (paragraph 4.50). Female A was vulnerable when he met her, and he knew it: he and his colleague had told her she might have been spiked and had driven her home to her parents.

22. **Harm.** I find the harm to be high.

- (a) Harm to Female A. She had trusted the Officer as the person who had made her safe. His messages turned that trust into something she had to manage: she felt unable to rebuff him plainly because he knew where she lived; the innuendo distressed her; the message a year later made her stomach ‘go into knots’; and she has lost confidence in dealing with male officers. That is real harm to an individual whose personal circumstances made her susceptible to it (paragraph 4.65).
- (b) Harm to public confidence. Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual to undermine public confidence; where an officer commits an act that would harm public confidence if the circumstances were known, that is to be taken into account (paragraphs 4.66, 4.69). Women who call the police when they are frightened, intoxicated or possibly drugged must be able to trust that the officer who comes will not use the encounter to pursue them. Conduct of this kind strikes at that trust. The Guidance identifies APSP

as capable of causing 'substantial damage to public trust and confidence in the police' and as 'particularly serious where the subject of the officer's behaviour is a vulnerable person' (paragraph 4.44).

23. **Aggravating factors.** Taking care not to double count matters already reflected above, I find the following aggravating features (paragraph 4.76): the deliberate steps taken, including the move to a private telephone; malign intent, in that the contact served the Officer's personal and emotional interest and had a sexual undertone; the abuse of trust and position; the repetition over a period, including the message a year later; the continuation after the Officer recognised it was improper; and the vulnerability of the person concerned.
24. **Mitigating factors.** The factors that reduce the seriousness of the misconduct itself (paragraph 4.81) are limited. The July 2024 messages were confined to about a week; the Officer said in terms that he would leave Female A alone if she wished, and did so when she drew a line; he did not seek to meet her beyond the suggestion about the football; there is no suggestion of any further contact after July 2025. He has admitted the conduct and that it amounts to gross misconduct, and I give him credit for that, while noting that the admission came only after the Regulation 51 notice, no representations having been made during the investigation.
25. **Conclusion on seriousness.** Weighing those matters, this was a deliberate abuse of the Officer's position towards a vulnerable woman met on duty,

pursued in the knowledge that it was wrong, and repeated a year later. It is conduct which the College of Policing describes as serious corruption. I find that the breaches, individually and together, are so serious as to justify dismissal. The conduct amounts to gross misconduct. The Officer admits that it does.

Outcome

26. Having found gross misconduct, regulation 62(1) requires me to impose disciplinary action, which may be a final written warning or dismissal without notice. In deciding which, I have followed the three-stage approach in Part 4 of the Guidance, derived from *Fuglers LLP v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin) at [28]: to assess the seriousness of the misconduct; to keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions; and to choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct.
27. **Seriousness.** I have set out my assessment above and I adopt it here. The seriousness of the conduct is high.
28. **The purpose of sanctions.** The purpose of the police misconduct regime is threefold: to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service; to uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct; and to protect the public (paragraph 2.3). Misconduct proceedings are not designed to punish (paragraph 2.7). The most important purpose is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the profession as a

whole, and that objective takes precedence over the impact of the sanction on the individual officer (paragraph 4.4; *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512). Outcomes should be no more than is necessary, and I should consider the less severe outcome before the more severe and choose the least severe outcome that deals adequately with the issues identified while protecting the public interest (paragraph 2.8). Where gross misconduct has caused, or could have caused, serious harm to individuals or to public confidence, dismissal is likely to follow, and the impact of the misconduct on the standing and reputation of the profession as a whole is a factor of the greatest importance (paragraph 4.74).

29. **Personal mitigation.** I have had regard to the Officer's record of police service as regulation 62(8)(a) requires. His personal record shows that he joined the British Transport Police on 30th March 2020 after prior service with the Metropolitan Police Service from 08/02/2010 - 29/03/2020; it records no previous misconduct finding in BTP. He tells me that he has served for 19 years, has consistently received good performance reviews, has two commendations - one for entering a burning house and one for pulling a woman to safety from a bridge - and has responded to terrorist incidents and been assaulted on duty [69]. I have no reason to doubt that account, and I acknowledge it. I take into account his apology, which I accept as sincere, his expressed remorse and insight, and his acceptance that he 'can no longer accept I am a good police officer any more' [69]. I take into account the consequences for him and his family of losing his career, and

the state of his mental health as described in the material before me, which I have addressed in my separate ruling. His ill-health post-dates the conduct and is not a mitigating factor as to its seriousness; I consider it as part of his personal circumstances. Under regulation 62(8)(d), I note that none of this mitigation was raised before the Regulation 51 notice was served; given that the Officer was invited to respond and did so, I do not reduce the weight I give it on that account.

30. The weight that personal mitigation can bear is limited. As Holroyde J explained in *R (Williams) v Police Appeals Tribunal* [2016] EWHC 2708 (QB) at [67]–[68], where the gross misconduct threatens the maintenance of public confidence and respect in the police, the weight which can be given to personal mitigation is less than it would be in a court imposing a punishment, and personal mitigation, however impressive, cannot carry the same weight as it might in a different context. The Guidance is to the same effect: if the misconduct is so serious that nothing less than dismissal would be sufficient to maintain public confidence, personal mitigation will not justify a lesser sanction (paragraph 6.6).
31. **The appropriate outcome.** I have considered first whether a final written warning would be a sufficient outcome. It would not. A final written warning would tell the public, and Female A, that an officer may use the number of a vulnerable woman he met on duty to pursue her for his own emotional and sexual interest, knowing it to be wrong, and remain a police officer. That

is not a message that maintains public confidence in this force or in policing.

The Officer's long service and commendations show what he was capable of as a police officer; they make it more troubling, not less, that he behaved in this way, and they cannot outweigh the seriousness of what he did. The AA submits that nothing short of dismissal is appropriate. I agree.

32. I have also considered the values of British Transport Police - we are proud to protect; we care; we do the right thing; we strive to be better every day; we are one BTP. The Officer's conduct towards Female A is incompatible with each of them. Dismissal is the only outcome that maintains the high standards of the police service, protects the public, and preserves public confidence.

Disciplinary action

33. My decision is that PC 0281 James Hill be dismissed without notice. Under regulation 62(2) the dismissal has effect from the date on which it is notified to him.

Notification and welfare

34. The AA is to notify the Officer of the outcome by sending him a copy of this report as soon as practicable (regulation 63(3)). That notification is to be made in the manner directed in my ruling on the anonymity application: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The AA is to confirm to me in writing that those steps have been taken.

Publication

35. Under regulation 63(5) I require the AA to publish this report on the force website for a period of not less than 28 days (regulation 63(7)), subject to the harm test in regulation 6 and to the following redactions under regulation 63(8)(b), which give effect to the directions I made under regulation 59(2)(c):

- (a) the woman concerned is to be referred to as 'Female A' throughout, and her name, address, date of birth, telephone number and any other detail likely to identify her are to be redacted, including from the quoted allegation at paragraph 9;
- (b) the content of the Officer's medical evidence and the detail of his anonymity application are not to be published, beyond the fact that an application was made on health grounds and refused; paragraphs 6 and 29 contain no clinical detail and may be published as they stand;
- (c) publication of this report, and of any notice of outcome naming the Officer, is deferred until 48 hours after the AA has confirmed to me in writing that the welfare steps at paragraph 34 have been taken.

36. The Officer's name, the date, time and place of the hearing, the conduct that was the subject matter of the case and my findings are to be included in the published notice.
37. I note that the British Transport Police is not within the barred-list provisions of the Policing and Crime Act 2017. In accordance with the College of Policing's recommendation to forces outside that legislation, I recommend that the AA place a record of this finding and outcome on the Police National Database in the same terms as would apply to an officer of a Home Office force who had been dismissed for gross misconduct.

Right of appeal

38. The Officer has a right of appeal against the finding and the disciplinary action in accordance with the Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020 and the British Transport Police (Police Appeals Tribunals) Regulations 2020. If he wishes to appeal, he must give notice to the appropriate authority within 10 working days of receipt of this report, as set out in the appeal notice below.

Lucy D'Orsi

Chief Constable

British Transport Police

21st September 2026

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.