

## RESTRICTED

Date 2021	Officer /Staff member	Allegation Type	Allegation Details	Outcome	Source
February 2021  Misconduct Hearing	Staff	Discreditable Conduct/ Instructions/Confidentiality <b>Code of Ethics- Accountability &amp; Integrity</b>	A misconduct Hearing was held for a staff members as it was alleged that the member of staff made several false instruments with the intention to induce somebody to accept them as genuine. One of the results of which, were the staff member dishonesty receiving five days dependent's leave. It is also alleged that the staff member accessed police systems without a lawful policing purpose and then kept the sensitive documents in a vehicle in a public car park. The member of staff was also alleged to have been operating a business interest / secondary employment without obtaining authorisation and therefore breached force policy.	A Misconduct Panel found that the matters were proved and amounted to Gross Misconduct. The member of staff was dismissed without notice. The member of staff has been placed on the College of Policing Barred List. The member of staff has appealed against this and an appeal hearing will take place on 4 <sup>th</sup> March 2021. The appeal was not upheld	Internal Conduct
February 2021  Accelerated Misconduct Hearing	Police Officer	Discreditable Conduct/ Confidentiality <b>Code of Ethics Respects/ Fairness</b>	It is alleged that the officer, whilst on duty, took and shared a number of photographs, some of which contained personal and sensitive information of members of the public, crime scenes and documentation. Some of the photographs had distasteful, inappropriate and unprofessional comments attached to them dismissed had he still been serving	Prior to proceedings the officer resigned but Chief Constable Watson determined that the officer would have been dismissed had he still been serving The officer has been placed on the College of Policing Barred List	Internal Conduct

RESTRICTED

**RESTRICTED**

<p>February 2021</p> <p>Misconduct Meeting</p>	<p>Police Officer</p>	<p>Duties &amp; Responsibilities</p> <p>Code of Ethics- Accountability &amp; Objectivity</p>	<p>It was alleged that an officer breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The officer failed to record a victims allegation of rape on South Yorkshire Police systems</li> <li>2. The officer then failed to adequately investigate the allegations of rape and sexual assault</li> <li>3. It is also alleged that the officer failed to take appropriate action to safeguard the victim from future harm from the alleged perpetrator</li> <li>4.</li> </ol>	<p>The officer accepted allegations 1 and 2 and the Chair, Detective Superintendent Cowley, who has experience of working in the Protecting Vulnerable People Department, found that the 3<sup>rd</sup> allegation was also proven and that cumulatively they amounted to misconduct.</p> <p>The chair decided that the most appropriate outcome was a Final Written Warning.</p>	<p>Public complaint</p>
<p>March 2021</p> <p>Misconduct Hearing</p>	<p>Police Officer</p>	<p>Orders &amp; Instructions, Duties &amp; Responsibilities, Discreditable Conduct</p>	<p>An officer accepted that they failed to conduct sufficient investigations into the multiple allegations of rape and/ or sexual assault; they failed to interview C1 about the alleged assault, sexual assault and rape(s) that took place overnight from 19 July 2007 to the morning of 20<sup>th</sup> July 2007 and they failed to provide any update to C1. This was part of an independent investigation (Operation Linden) undertaken by the IOPC. The investigation involving this officer commenced in 2015 and concluded in 2019. The officer admitted that these were breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Orders &amp; Instructions, Duties &amp; Responsibilities and Discreditable</p>	<p>The panel, chaired by an independently appointed legally qualified chair and including a senior police officer and an independent member of the public concluded that taking all of the circumstances into consideration, the most appropriate outcome was a Final Written Warning</p>	<p>Conduct</p>

RESTRICTED

**RESTRICTED**

			Conduct and that this cumulative conduct constitutes Gross misconduct		
April 2021  Misconduct Hearing	Police Officer	Honesty and Integrity, Authority, Respect and Courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct.	It was alleged that an officer visited a witness at her home address in relation to investigating an allegation of assault by her ex partner. Whilst at the address it was alleged that the officer made inappropriate and unprofessional sexualised comments, and that the officer inappropriately touched her in a sexualised manner. Furthermore, after leaving the address it was alleged that the officer made inappropriate and unprofessional contact with the witness by text message The officer denied the breaches	The panel, chaired by a legally qualified chair and including a senior police officer and an independent member concluded that taking all of the circumstances into consideration, found that all of the allegations were not proven, and determined that the most appropriate outcome was no further action.	Internal Conduct
July 2021 Accelerated Misconduct Hearing	Police Officer	Confidentiality, Discreditable Conduct, Honesty and Integrity, Orders and Instructions and Duties and Responsibilities	It was alleged that an officer had accessed the police computer system on 6 occasions without a legitimate policing reason. He had also failed to report a notifiable association with two individuals. This conduct amounted to gross misconduct.	The proceedings were chaired by Chief Constable Poultney who determined that the officer be dismissed without notice The officer has been placed on the College of Policing Barred List	Internal Conduct

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

July 2021 Misconduct Meeting	Police Officer	Confidentiality	An allegation was made that as a result of a personal tweet by a serving officer, the identity of a vulnerable member of the public was disclosed.	The matters were presided over by an independent Chief Inspector who concluded that the matter was not proven. However, the Chief Inspector identified 'Practice requiring improvement' and a referral was made for Reflective Practice Review Process, which is not a formal disciplinary outcome.	Public Complaint

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

--	--	--	--	--	--

RESTRICTED