

NORTH YORKSHIRE POLICE

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS DEPARTMENT

REGULATION 43 NOTICE



NOTICE OF OUTCOME OF MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS REGARDING ALLEGED BREACH OF STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOUR

GROSS MISCONDUCT HEARING

REGULATION 43 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

Name:	Callum Storr	Rank & Number:	Former PC 1516
Name of complainant (if applicable):			
Case reference number:	CM/71/21 & CM/6/22		

You are hereby given notification of the outcome of misconduct proceedings which relate to your alleged breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour. Details are as follows:

Misconduct Hearing

Date(s) of misconduct proceedings:	7 th September 2026 – 8 th September 2026
Location:	Police Headquarters, Crosby Road, Northallerton and Virtual

Allegations from Regulation 30 Notice

It is alleged that the conduct of FPC Storr breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as follows:

1. Factual background

- On 24 November 2021, whilst on duty you received a briefing in respect of Ms A where officers were warned about interactions with her due to her history of relationships with officers.
- Later, on 24 November 2021, whilst on duty you attended at the home address of Ms A following a report of domestic abuse.
- In February 2022 contact was made between you and Ms A.
- Between 9 February 2022 and 11 February 2022, it is alleged that you breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that:

2. Allegation 1

You entered into an inappropriate and sexual relationship with Ms A which included:

- Contact via social media, messages and telephone
- Meeting Ms A in person
- Having sexual intercourse with Ms A

The above conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

1. Discreditable Conduct
2. Authority, Respect and Courtesy

3. Factual background

- (a) In 2018, you were a member of a WhatsApp group 'Big Rose Stag Do'.
- (b) On 17 and 18 October 2018 two inappropriate (Category 5) images were shared within that WhatsApp group.
- (c) You saved those images to your mobile phone.
- (d) It is alleged that you breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that
You had inappropriate (category 5) images on your mobile phone that were accessible to you whilst you were a serving police officer.

4. Allegation 2

The above conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

1. Discreditable Conduct

1. Preliminary Matters

- 1.1 Between the 7th and 8th September 2026, a virtual gross misconduct hearing was coordinated by North Yorkshire Police.
- 1.2 This full written decision follows an outline of the panel conclusion and reasons delivered orally on 8th September 2026.
- 1.3 The hearing was convened to hear allegations relating to Former Police Constable (FPC) 1516 Callum Storr.
- 1.4 FPC Storr did not attend the hearing.
- 1.5 The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by Counsel Andrea Parnham.
- 1.6 FPC Storr, ('the Officer') was represented by the Police Federation, Tony Barnes.
- 1.7 The panel comprised of ACO Sarah Jackson and Independent Panel members, Paul Harvey and Cai Mallett.
- 1.8 The panel was provided with a main electronic bundle of evidence amounting to 575 pages. The AA provided a 15-page written opening note ahead of the hearing. Before the start of the hearing, FPC Storr submitted a 5-page opening note via his Federation Representative. A supplementary training bundle (exhibit NJC/3; a 76-slide PowerPoint) was later provided. The panel also considered FPC Storrs record of service.
- 1.9 The appointed Legally Qualified Person was Katherine Wood. Legal advice was provided to all parties in advance of, and during, the hearing.

2. Role of the Panel

- 2.1. To manage the Misconduct Hearing in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as amended by the Police (conduct) (amendment) Regulations 2024 and 2026.
- 2.2. Regulation 33 (13): The person or persons conducting the misconduct proceedings shall review the facts of the case and decide whether the conduct of the officer concerned amounts-

(b) In the case of a misconduct hearing, to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
- 2.3. Regulation 33(14): The person or persons conducting the misconduct proceedings shall not find that the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct unless- (a) he is or they are satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this is the case; or (b) the officer concerned admits it is the case.

2.4. The Home Office Guidance: Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness provides:

9.6 The purpose of a formal misconduct meeting/hearing is to:

- a) Give the police officer a fair opportunity to make their case having considered the investigation report, including supporting documents, and to put forward any factors the police officer wishes to be considered in mitigation (in addition to the submission which must be sent in advance to the person(s) conducting or chairing the meeting/hearing for his/her consideration).
- b) Decide if the conduct of the police officer breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in a way that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action (misconduct) or in such a way that is so serious as to justify dismissal (gross misconduct). This determination is based on the balance of probabilities and having regard to all the evidence and circumstances. Those making the judgment on the level of seriousness of the breach of the standards can be partially guided by the Code of Ethics.
- c) Consider what the outcome should be if the misconduct is proven or admitted. Consideration will be given to any live written warnings or final written warnings (and any previous disciplinary outcomes that have not expired) and any early admission of the conduct by the police officer. Those making the decision on outcome should consider the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings.

9.7 All proceedings should be conducted in a fair and open manner following the principles of natural justice. That is to say that a duty to act fairly is incumbent on all parties to the proceedings. That includes the parties to the hearing providing the necessary notices and documents in a timely fashion and participating in the proceedings in a reasonable, courteous and fair manner. Both the appropriate authority and the officer concerned should be allowed to make their case free from interference and the person conducting or chairing the proceedings should be demonstrably free of bias.

- 2.15 Discredit can be brought on the police by an act itself or because public confidence in the police is undermined, or is perceived to be undermined. In general, it should be the actual underlying conduct of the police officer that is considered under the misconduct procedures, whether the conduct occurred on or off-duty. However, where a police officer has been convicted of or cautioned for a criminal offence, that alone may lead to discipline or vetting action irrespective of the nature of the conduct itself. In all cases it must be clearly articulated how the conduct, conviction or caution discredits the police.
- 2.17 Police officers have some restrictions on their private life. Some of these restrictions are set out in the Police Regulations 2003. These restrictions have to be balanced against the right to privacy in common law and right to a private life, as set out in Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998. Therefore, in considering whether a police officer has acted in a way which falls below these standards while off-duty, due regard should be given to that balance and any action should be proportionate, taking into account all of the circumstances.
- 2.18 As a result of the nature of the office of constable, a police officer is always subject to the Standards of Professional Behaviour even when off-duty. As such police officers should not behave in a manner that discredits the police service or undermines public confidence at any time. Police officers must be particularly aware of the image that they portray when representing the police in an official capacity even though they may be off-duty (e.g. at a conference). In determining whether a police officer's off-duty conduct discredits the police, the test is not whether the police officer discredits themselves but the police as a whole.

2.5. As the Officer has from 24th June 2022 resigned from the police, the proceedings are conducted in accordance with Misconduct Procedures for Former Officers in chapter 20 of the Home Office Guidance.

3. Standard of Proof

- 3.1 Regulation 33 (14) (a) balance of probabilities applies.

3.2 The Home Office Guidance: Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness provides:

9.10 In deciding matters of fact, the persons conducting the misconduct meeting or hearing must apply the standard of proof required in civil cases, that is, the balance of probabilities. Conduct will be proved on the balance of probabilities if the persons conducting the meeting or hearing are satisfied by the evidence that it is more likely than not that the conduct occurred. The balance of probabilities is a single unvarying standard (i.e. there is no sliding scale). The seriousness of the allegation of misconduct and/or the seriousness of the consequences for the officer do not require a different standard of proof, merely appropriately careful consideration by the panel before it is satisfied of the matter which has to be established. The inherent probability or improbability of the conduct occurring is itself a matter to be taken into account when deciding whether, on the balance of probabilities, the conduct occurred.

9.11 In making a decision whether the alleged conduct of a police officer is proven or not, the persons conducting or chairing will need to exercise reasonable judgement and give appropriate careful consideration to the evidence.

4. Home Office Guidance- Standards of Professional Behaviour

4.1 The Panel have had regard to the following;

Discreditable Conduct

Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.

5. The Code of Ethics and Policy

- 5.1 The panel has had regard to the Code of Ethics, in particular those passages relating to Conduct.
- 5.2 It has received and considered the College of Policing and NPCC's guidance Maintaining a professional boundary between police and members of the public.

6. The Alleged Misconduct

- 6.1 The allegation of misconduct is set out in the notice of referral to the misconduct proceedings under Regulation 30. We have carefully read and considered the documents provided to us under Regulation 30, including copies of the witness statements and records. The former Officer has provided a Regulation 31 response. He was interviewed under caution on three occasions and gave a prepared statement. He gave no responses to most questions asked. He denies the allegations.
- 6.2 An anonymity direction has been given in relation to the complainant, who we shall refer to as Miss A and another witness, who shall be referred to as Miss B. In addition, directions have been given in relation to the use of material at the hearing, including the contents of the bundle for the panel's consideration.
- 6.3 The hearing has been conducted as a remote hearing. This direction was made to assist the attendance of the former Officer. He was also told that he could attend for parts of the hearing should he be unable to attend for the duration. He has not attended. There has been no oral evidence at the hearing. We have considered all documentation provided to the panel, we have also taken account of the knowledge and experience of the panel members.
- 6.4 We have considered the written and oral submissions made by Ms Parnham on behalf of the Appropriate Authority. The former Officer has provided a written opening which the panel has read and which his Federation Representative, Mr Barnes, read out to the hearing and into the record. The panel is satisfied that that FPC Storr is aware of the date and time of the hearing and his ability to join remotely. The panel is satisfied that he is aware of the purpose of the hearing and that the panel can proceed in his absence. He has not sought to adjourn the hearing. The panel proceeded in his absence in accordance with Regulation 37 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

which, by virtue of paragraph 27 of Schedule 1 of the Regulations, extends to former Officers.

6.5 The Panel has considered all relevant evidence presented.

6.6 The panel has a copy of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 and has been provided with a copy of the Home Office Guidance. The panel has also considered The College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023).

7. Findings of Fact and Reasons for Them

7.1 Introduction and General Observations

7.1.1 Former PC Storr joined North Yorkshire Police on 28.09.2020.

7.1.2 On 24th November 2021 the NYP were called to a domestic dispute between Miss A and her then partner. They made allegations against each other, resulting in Miss A's partner being arrested. Later that day, FPC Storr attended with a colleague (PC F) upon Miss A to take the details of her complaint. She told him that she did not wish to make a complaint and she did not support a prosecution. She signed FPC Storr's police notebook to that effect. After returning to the station, FPC Storr went back to Miss A's home area on his own and made enquiries of her neighbours. FPC Storr recorded that Miss A challenged him and told him she did not want him talking to her neighbours.

7.1.3 The focus of the allegations brought before the panel are the interactions between FPC Storr and Miss A thereafter. Miss A alleges that around one week later FPC Storr began to follow her on social media and they exchanged messages via SnapChat. Miss A's relationship with her then partner ended in January 2022 and she and FPC Storr had sex on two occasions in February 2022. Following a complaint by Miss A, FPC Storr was arrested on suspicion of Misconduct in Public Office. He was subject to bail conditions, including not to contact Miss A. He was subsequently arrested for attempting to pervert the course of justice, it being alleged that he had failed to comply with the terms of his bail. No further action was taken in relation to criminal prosecution.

7.1.4 On being arrested in February and March 2022, FPC Storr's mobile telephones were seized and downloaded. Upon reviewing the download, it was noted that FPC Storr had material which was considered sexual, racist/Islamophobic, antisemitic and offensive. There were also two videos which met the criteria for Category 5 extreme pornography, as they depicted bestiality. FPC Storr was again arrested. No further action was taken.

7.2 Specific Allegations

The specific allegations that the former Officer faces are:

On 24 November 2021, whilst on duty you received a briefing in respect of Miss A where officers were warned about interactions with her due to her history of relationships with officers.

Later, on 24 November 2021, whilst on duty you attended the home address of Miss A following a report of domestic abuse.

In February 2022 contact was made between you and Miss A

Between 9 February 2022 and 11 February 2022, it is alleged that you breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that:

Allegation 1

You entered into an inappropriate and sexual relationship with Miss A, which included

- a. Contact via social media, messages and telephone
- b. Meeting Miss A in person
- c. Having sexual intercourse with Miss A

The above conduct breaches the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to

- 1. Discreditable Conduct
- 2. Authority, Respect and Courtesy

Further,

In 2018 you were a member of a WhatsApp group “Big Rose Stag Do”

On 17 and 18 October 2018 two inappropriate (category 5) images were shared within that WhatsApp group

You saved those images to your mobile phone

It is alleged that you breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that

Allegation 2

You had inappropriate (Category 5) images on your mobile telephone that were accessible to you whilst you were a serving police officer

The above conduct breached the standards of Professional Behaviour relating to

1. Discreditable Conduct

- 7.3 The panel has considered the written evidence placed before it and the submissions of Miss Parnham on behalf of the AA and the written opening provided by FPC Storr.

Allegation 1

- 7.4 There are reasons to question the credibility of both Miss A and FPC Storr. The panel has treated the accounts of both with caution and has focussed on factual matters that are agreed between the AA, Miss A and FPC Storr or where there is additional evidence which supports the accounts given by Miss A or FPC Storr.
- 7.5 There is no dispute and the panel is satisfied that on 24th November 2021 FPC Storr came into contact with Miss A as part of an investigation into domestic abuse. There is no dispute and the panel is satisfied that FPC Storr had attended a briefing and was aware that there were reasons to be cautious around Miss A and the actions that were required to be taken by officers. In the statement provided by PC F, which is not challenged by FPC Storr, PC F describes FPC Storr approaching him and asking him to attend the home address of Miss A with him due to the briefing that indicated that any attendance should be double-crewed. On the way there, FPC Storr reminded PC F about precautions they had been advised to take. Whilst there, Miss A said that she knew PC F as a friend of the father of her unborn child and was unhappy that PC F had attended. Miss A did not support a

prosecution of her then partner and signed FPC Storr's police notebook to that effect. On return to the station, FPC Storr raised the complaint that had been made about PC F with his superior. A complaint had also been made by Miss A to her domestic abuse worker regarding the attendance of PC F.

- 7.6 Despite having the briefing clearly in mind, FPC Storr disregarded the advice to attend Miss A double-crewed and returned to her home area alone immediately thereafter to make enquiries of her neighbours. He therefore disobeyed the instructions that he had received, namely to go double-crewed. Whilst there, he did not activate his body-worn camera, despite Miss A leaving her property to confront him about talking to her neighbours, which she was displeased with. The panel is satisfied that the events of 24th November 2021 were unusual, would have been memorable; and that Miss A would be someone whom FPC Storr would remember. At his third interview on 17th January 2023, in his written response, FPC Storr accepted that he did attend on Miss A on 24th November 2021. He acknowledged that he had attended a briefing with regards to Miss A. He denied that he recognised her in February 2022.
- 7.7 Given the circumstances of the police being involved, being in response to a domestic abuse incident where Miss A had made threats to harm herself, the panel is satisfied that FPC Storr would have been aware that Miss A was vulnerable.
- 7.8 The panel cannot be sure when it was that contact between Miss A and FPC Storr commenced after 24th November 2021 or who initiated the contact. It is clear that they had been communicating via Tinder and SnapChat before moving into text messaging. FPC Storr's Tinder profile included information that he worked for a uniformed service. Miss A sent him a screenshot of this profile and commented "*guess what I do nee noooooorr*". She was clearly aware that he was a police officer. He had sent Miss A a short video of himself in full police uniform, apparently taken in a police station.
- 7.9 This is action that is expressly warned against in the training that FPC Storr had attended. The College of Policing and NPCC guidance on maintaining professional boundaries make it clear that a sexual or intimate relationship between a police officer and a member of the public who they had come into contact with during the course of their work might contravene the Standards of Professional

Behaviour. The responsibility for maintaining appropriate boundaries clearly lies with the officer. On 6th October 2020 FPC Storr had attended a training session from the PSD and PSIU of NYP which clearly explained what Abuse of Position for a Sexual Purpose is deemed to be. Within that same briefing, FPC Storr's own on-line presence was used to illustrate ways in which police officers may open themselves to unsolicited contact if their social media privacy settings are not sufficiently restricted. Miss A admits that she had set out to manipulate FPC Storr into entering a relationship with her. He complains that he is a victim of her behaviour which fits with his commentary that he was the victim and that NYP did not do enough to protect him. The panel rejects this. He had plenty of opportunity to reflect on his activity and had detailed guidance as to what would be expected of him to protect himself. He simply chose not to put that into action.

- 7.10 Further, the panel is satisfied that when FPC Storr and Miss A began communicating, he knew who she was. FPC Storr asserts that he did not make the connection between the person he met on his duties on 24th November 2021 and the person he began communicating with. The panel does not find this credible. Even if he had not known straight away, he ought to have known within a short period of time. The name she gave him was a shortened version of the name of the person he met only weeks before. His original interaction with her would have been memorable due to the specific briefing ahead of his attendance and the subsequent complaints from Miss A. Miss A and FPC Storr spent around 2 hours in a car during which time they had sex, which was ample opportunity for the FPC to remember who she was. Despite this, he still met her the following day and they had sex again. At the time FPC Storr was a police officer and his observational skills and ability to recollect information are key to that role.
- 7.11 The panel is therefore satisfied that FPC Storr entered into an inappropriate relationship with Miss A, which included contact via social media, messages and telephone calls, meeting Miss A in person and having sexual intercourse with her. He did so knowing that she was vulnerable. The AA has therefore proven its case.
- 7.12 FPC Storr has therefore breached the standard of professional behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct as he has behaved in a manner which would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it.

- 7.13 FPC Storr has also breached the standard of professional behaviour relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy as he has abused his authority by engaging in an improper and sexual relationship with a vulnerable person.

Allegation 2

- 7.14 FPC Storr had two mobile telephones which were subject to downloads, the first phone on 18th February 2022 and the second phone on 10th March 2022. On both occasions, when downloaded, two videos which depicted bestiality and fell within Category 5 were identified. The videos had originated from the same WhatsApp chat. There was a high volume of media exchanged within that chat which was not saved on the phones at the point of download. The videos had been shared in October 2018 and therefore before FPC Storr joined the police. At the time the phones were downloaded, the WhatsApp application was not set to automatically download the media shared.
- 7.15 FPC Storr asserts that he did not know the videos were on his phone and that he had not interacted with them.
- 7.16 The panel rejects this. It notes that they were the only two items of media from that specific WhatsApp chat that had been saved on FPC Storr's phone. This leads the panel to conclude that either they were the only two items that FPC Storr had chosen to save, or in the alternative, if they had been automatically saved, they were the only two items that he had chosen to retain. Further, the panel is reinforced in its view that these were specifically retained by FPC Storr by the fact that his phone was noted to also contain extreme material which was of a sexual nature, racist, Islamophobic, antisemitic and otherwise offensive. The origin of this other material is not known. Whilst this other extreme material was not included in the particulars of allegation two, the panel noted that the existence of odious material on FPC Storr's phone demonstrated a pattern of the possession of offensive material. The panel is satisfied that the allegation has been proven.
- 7.17 FPC Storr has therefore breached the standard of professional behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct as possessing extreme pornography is conduct that would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it.

8. Conclusions on the basis of the findings

- 8.1 We have found that the former Officer has breached the professional standards of behaviour relating Authority Respect and Courtesy, and in relation to Discreditable Conduct.
- 8.2 We have considered whether the conduct amounts to gross misconduct. In doing so we referred ourselves to the four-stage test for seriousness as laid down in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Misconduct Proceedings. We do consider that the breach of the standards of professional behaviour relating to Authority, respect and courtesy and in relation to Discreditable Conduct is so serious as to justify dismissal and we do find gross misconduct proved.
- 8.3 In relation to Allegation 1, the panel notes that violence against women and girls is a matter of national concern, particularly in the policing context. Miss A was a vulnerable person. FPC Storr acted contrary to instructions and guidance in the manner in which he conducted himself online and in entering into an intimate, personal relationship with Miss A.
- 8.4 In relation to Allegation 2, the material on FPC Storr's phone was offensive and extreme.
- 8.5 In all the circumstances, the findings of the panel are such that FPC Storr has behaved in a manner that is incompatible with the office of Constable.

9. Outcome

- 9.1 There is a three-fold purpose in police misconduct proceedings:
- a) to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service
 - b) to uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
 - c) to protect the public
- 9.2 In assessing seriousness of the conduct which informs the outcome, we have to consider:
- a) the officer's culpability for the misconduct
 - b) the harm caused by the misconduct
 - c) the existence of any aggravating factors

d) the existence of any mitigating factors

Culpability

- 9.3 Culpability denotes the Officer's blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions. The more culpable or blameworthy the behaviour in question, the more serious the misconduct and the more severe the likely outcome.
- 9.4 The conduct which FPC Storr engaged in with Miss A was behaviour that he willingly engaged with and we have found was contrary to his training and instruction. He received a specific briefing with regards to Miss A. He disobeyed a specific instruction, which raises his level of culpability. He was aware that she had made a complaint about PC F who attended upon Miss A with him. He then returned to her home area alone and later entered into an intimate relationship with her, knowing that she was a vulnerable person. Whilst Miss A has admitted that she set out to manipulate FPC Storr to engage with her, the responsibility to maintain appropriate boundaries lay with FPC Storr. His behaviour may have amounted to Misconduct in Public Office.
- 9.5 The panel has found that Miss A was a vulnerable person and that FPC Storr was aware of her vulnerability. That FPC Storr thereafter engaged in an inappropriate relationship with someone who he knew to be vulnerable is an aggravating feature that adds to his culpability. Violence against women and girls perpetrated by a police officer, whether on- or off-duty, will always have a high degree of culpability, with the likely outcome being severe.
- 9.6 The videos which were downloaded we have found were deliberately saved or retained. FPC Storr has therefore chosen to have material available to him which is offensive and the possession of which may amount to a criminal act.
- 9.7 We have found the level of culpability to be very high.

Harm

- 9.8 The harm caused by the former Officer's conduct has already been touched upon. It includes consideration of the impact the misconduct has on public perception of the police service and the public's confidence in police. He has disobeyed instructions.

- 9.9 Abusing his position to engage in a sexual relationship with a vulnerable person is harmful to that person. Possession of offensive material is not a victimless act, as such material perpetuates sexual abuse and harmful attitudes.
- 9.10 Misconduct involving sexual impropriety significantly undermines public trust in the profession. The public perception of FPC Storr's behaviour will have a significantly harmful effect on police reputation.

Aggravating factors

- 9.11 In terms of aggravating factors, there is a pattern of behaviour that has been identified. There is significant national concern regarding abuse of power in the pursuit of personal relationships by police officers. The behaviour towards Miss A continued after FPC Storr ought to have known it was inappropriate and in the context of his knowledge of her vulnerability. FPC Storr still considers that he is the victim in this and has taken no responsibility for his own actions and the harmful impact of what he has done, both to Miss A and to his colleagues within the police.

Mitigating factors

- 9.12 There are few mitigating factors that the panel can identify. We acknowledge that he came into possession of the images before he joined the police. There is no evidence that he set out to target Miss A. The former Officer has shown no remorse or insight into his actions and has not accepted his responsibility for his actions. He offered no comment in interview. The only positive the panel has been able to identify is that he has resigned from the force.
- 9.13 We have read the record of police service for the former Officer. He was only in the police for a very short period of time. We note that he has previously been reprimanded for attending duty having taken an illicit substance. He has also been reprimanded for running a business which he had not declared, although the written warning has lapsed, and therefore no weight was attached to this finding.
- 9.14 The former Officer has not attended before the panel. In his opening he identifies personal mitigation in the form of his public service, family circumstances and the impact upon him of being subject to criminal investigation and disciplinary procedures. There is limited weight that can be placed on these matters.

- 9.15 The panel has only two options before it- to take no action or to say that the former Officer would have been dismissed with immediate effect if he had not already resigned. The evidence against FPC Storr is overwhelming.
- 9.16 The panel was alert to the fact that the purpose of misconduct proceedings is not to punish an Officer. The outcome should be no more than necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings.
- 9.17 The panel firstly considered whether taking no further action would be sufficient.
- 9.18 Having regard to the purpose and all the matters set out in our seriousness assessment, the panel considered that taking no further action was not sufficient when considering the high level of culpability associated with the proven allegations.
- 9.19 His behaviour is such that he has demonstrated that he plainly has no future in the police service. The panel is satisfied that if he had been serving he would have been dismissed without notice and must therefore be placed on the barred list.
- 9.20 In accordance with Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 the Officer has a right to appeal to a Police Appeals Tribunal against the findings and outcome of a misconduct hearing.

Cai Mallett	ACO Sarah Jackson	Paul Harvey
Independent Panel Member	Chair	Independent Panel Member

08.09.2026

Determination of your alleged breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

- ☐ Misconduct
☒ Gross Misconduct
☐ Misconduct / Gross Misconduct Not Found (if neither state outcome below)

.....
Outcome – Dismissal without notice & placement on the barred list

Current status of the officer

- ☐ Subject of Management Restrictions
☐ Suspended
☒ Resigned Whilst Under Investigation

Misconduct Hearing

Where the person conducting or chairing the misconduct proceedings decides the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to **misconduct**, in accordance with regulation 41(15) The disciplinary action available at a misconduct hearing is:

- ☐ **Written Warning** - in which case this document constitutes the written warning (see explanatory notes 13, 14 & 15 attached)
☐ **Final Written Warning** - in which case this document constitutes the final written warning (see explanatory notes 13, 14 & 15 attached)
☐ **Reduction in Rank**

Where the person conducting or chairing the misconduct proceedings decides the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to **gross misconduct**, in accordance with regulation 41(15) The disciplinary action available at a misconduct hearing is:

- ☐ **Final Written Warning** - in which case this document constitutes the final written warning (see explanatory notes 13, 14 & 15 attached)
☐ **Reduction in Rank** - where Regulation 42 paragraph (5) or (6) below applies.
☒ **Dismissal** - The former officer would have been dismissed if they had remained a serving member of a police force.
☐ **Dismissal without Notice** – where Regulation 42 paragraph (5) or (6) below applies.

Regulation 42 (5) - This paragraph applies where a final written warning was in force on the date of the severity assessment under regulation 14(1) of these Regulations or under regulation 16 of the Complaints and Misconduct Regulations.

Regulation 42 (6) - This paragraph applies where it is decided at misconduct proceedings that the officer's conduct amounts to misconduct, and the decision is based on the officer's conduct arising from more than one incident and those incidents are not closely factually connected.

Person Chairing Misconduct Hearing:

Details of reasons for determination and outcome are stated below.

Signature:		Date: 11 th September 2026
------------	---	---

Determination and Outcome of Misconduct Meeting / Misconduct Hearing

Right to Appeal (for full details see notes attached)

The following rights of appeal shall apply subject to various conditions and limitations as follows:

- Misconduct Meeting** – You have the right to give written notice of appeal to the Appropriate Authority within 7 working days of receipt of this notice (unless the period is extended by the Appropriate authority). If you admitted that your conduct amounted to misconduct you may only appeal against the disciplinary action imposed. If you denied the misconduct, you may appeal both the finding and the disciplinary action. The only grounds for appeal are that the finding / disciplinary action was unreasonable; that there is crucial new evidence or that there was a serious breach of procedure. (Regulation 45 (2) Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020).
- Misconduct Hearing** – You have the right to give written notice of appeal to the Police Crime Commissioner within 10 working days of receipt of this notice (you may give notice within a reasonable time after the end of such a period, the Chair of the Police Appeals Tribunal shall then determine whether it was reasonably practicable for notice to be given within the period and allow or dismiss the appeal).

Details of the person to whom you may submit your appeals are as follows;

Name/Address. Police Crime Commissioner's Office, Harrogate Police Station, Beckwith Head Road
Harrogate, North Yorkshire HG3 1FR

If you admitted that your conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct you may only appeal against the disciplinary action imposed. If you denied the misconduct or gross misconduct you may appeal both the finding and the disciplinary action. The only grounds for appeal are that the finding / disciplinary action was unreasonable; there is new evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the original hearing or there was a serious breach of the procedure. (Police Appeals Tribunal Rules 2020)

Service of Notice

I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this notice and my attention has been drawn to the accompanying notes.

I authorise a copy of this notice to be forwarded to my Staff Association.

Yes ☐

No ☐

Signature of Officer concerned:		Date:	
---------------------------------	--	-------	--

If the notice is not given to the officer by the person investigating, please append the name and signature of the person giving the notice below: -

Name:		Signature:		Date:	
-------	--	------------	--	-------	--

EXPLANATORY NOTES

- This notice has been issued to confirm to you or inform you as soon as practicable and in any case within 5 working days of the conclusion of the misconduct proceedings, of the finding of the person or persons conducting the misconduct proceedings and any disciplinary action imposed. This written notice shall also set out a summary of the reasons for the finding(s) and outcome in this case (in accordance with Regulation 43 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020).
- Where the case was decided at a Misconduct Meeting** and the officer concerned is an officer other than a senior officer (senior officer is a police officer holding a rank above that of Chief

Superintendent), you may give written notice of appeal to the Appropriate Authority within 7 working days of receipt of this notice. This period may be extended by the Appropriate authority.

3. **Misconduct Meeting Appeals** shall be determined by a police officer at least one rank higher than the person who conducted the misconduct meeting or a police staff member who is more senior than that person. If the person who conducted the misconduct meeting was a police staff member then the appeal shall be determined by a member of a police force who is more senior than that person.
4. If the officer concerned is other than a senior officer and submits a notice of appeal following a misconduct meeting, you shall as soon as practicable be given written notice of the name of the person appointed to conduct the appeal meeting and the name of the person appointed to advise that person.
5. If you admitted at the misconduct meeting that your conduct amounted to misconduct you may only appeal against the disciplinary action imposed. If you denied the misconduct, then you may appeal both the finding and the disciplinary action. The grounds for appeal are that the finding / disciplinary action imposed was unreasonable; that there is crucial new evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the misconduct meeting; that there was a serious breach of the procedures or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.
Regulation 45 Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.
6. Where the officer concerned is a senior police officer and the case was decided at a misconduct meeting, he or she may give written notice of appeal within 10 working days following receipt of this notice, to the relevant Policing and Crime Commissioner and any such appeal shall be determined by a police appeals tribunal.
7. The proceedings at both a misconduct meeting and a misconduct hearing shall be recorded verbatim. As part of the notice of appeal, you may request a transcript of the misconduct meeting proceedings or part thereof (Regulation 44, Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020) or a transcript of the misconduct hearing proceedings or part thereof (Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020).
8. **Where the case was decided at a Misconduct Hearing** you may give written notice of appeal to the relevant police authority within 10 working days following receipt of this notice. Notice of appeal may be given within a reasonable time after the 10-day period and it shall be for the chair of the police appeals tribunal to determine whether or not it was reasonable for notice to be given within the 10 day period and grant leave to appeal or dismiss the appeal application.
9. Misconduct hearing appeals shall be determined by a police appeals tribunal.
10. If you admitted at the misconduct hearing that your conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct (as the case may be) then you may only appeal against the disciplinary action imposed. If you denied the misconduct / gross misconduct, then you may appeal both the finding and the disciplinary action. The grounds for appeal are that the finding / disciplinary action imposed was unreasonable; that there is evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the original hearing which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action; that there was a breach of the procedures or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.
11. In all cases the written notification of outcome of misconduct proceedings under Regulation 43 Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 shall include the details of the person to whom an appeal should be sent.
12. Any disciplinary action (outcome) shall have effect from the date on which you receive a copy of the Regulation 43 Notice finding of the person(s) conducting the misconduct proceedings and the disciplinary action imposed. Where notification was given orally at the conclusion of the hearing, the disciplinary action (outcome) shall take effect from that date.
13. If the outcome was a written warning or final written warning, then a record of Regulation 43 notice shall be placed on your personal file until such time as the warning is expunged. **A written warning shall remain live for a period of 18 months and a final written warning shall remain live for a period of 2 years from the date on which it takes effect.**
14. You should be aware that if you have a live final written warning and are subject to further misconduct proceedings then those proceedings shall be a misconduct hearing and you will be at risk of dismissal from the service.

15. Subject to a written warning or final written warning being expunged, in cases of misconduct meetings or misconduct hearings where the outcome is a written warning or a final written warning, revelation of this information to the CPS may be required under Chapter 18 of the Disclosure Manual. Advice as to the question of revelation can be obtained from the Professional Standards Directorate. The Professional Standards Directorate will give you advice in relation to when the warning or final warning should be revealed.
16. Revelation must, if applicable, be made by submission of a completed MG6B with each relevant witness statement provided.
17. You need to be aware of the potential impact of a failure to comply with the requirements of Chapter 18 of the Disclosure Manual. Where this is the case the result may be unfairness to the accused but also convictions that are vulnerable to appeal. Where a police officer fails to fulfil their obligations, this may result in misconduct proceedings being taken against them.