NORTH YORKSHIRE POLICE

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS DEPARTMENT

NOTICE OF OUTCOME OF ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING

NOTICE OF OUTCOME OF ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING REGULATION 63 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

Name:	Aron Davies	Rank & Number:	Former PC 1252
Name of complainant (if applicable):			
Case reference number:		CM/53/25	

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

Date(s) of misconduct proceedings:	**Friday 22nd October 2026**
Location:	**Police HQ, Crosby Road, Northallerton**
Persons conducting Accelerated Misconduct Hearing:	CC Tim Forber

Allegation(s)	**Allegations from Regulation 51 notice** **Allegation 1** PC Aron Davis was the Officer in the case in a matter that a female, who is a Youth Justice Worker, contacted him about. He thereafter obtained her personal number and began to contact her. The officer's contact with her was inappropriate because of the following: The contact took place on his personal phone whilst he was on duty. The contact which took place whilst the officer was on duty was excessive and not related to his duties. The officer knew, or ought to have known, that the conduct was inappropriate. The conduct breached the standards of professional behaviour in relation to Duties and Responsibilities. Such conduct, individually and/or cumulatively, amounts to gross misconduct in that it is so serious as to justify dismissal. **Allegation 2** PC Davies arranged to meet the same female whilst on shift on the 26th October 2025. This was a social visit and not connected to any work-related matters. The officer stated on his police radio that he was attending as he was "just getting a statement signed for band 3". He then changed his status to committed -Non deployable". However, the officer was attending to see this female. The officer has attended at the female's house for around a period of 1 hour.

	The Officer then confirmed in a voice note to her the following morning that he had told a lie about what he was doing. The conduct breached the standards of professional behaviour for Honesty and Integrity. Such conduct amounts to gross misconduct in that it is so serious as to justify dismissal.

Determination of the person or persons chairing or conducting the accelerated misconduct hearing

☒ Gross Misconduct
☐ Case returned to Appropriate Authority to be dealt with under Part 4 of the Conduct Regulations
☐ Case Dismissed

Outcome *(if found to be misconduct or gross misconduct)*

☒ Dismissal without notice
☐ Reduction in rank
☐ Final written warning

Signature of person chairing hearing:		Date:	23/10/2026

Details of reasons for the determination and outcome are stated below.

Determination and Outcome of Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Findings of the hearing:

The officer admitted the allegations and that they amounted to Gross Misconduct.

My determination as to sanction was that had he still been a member of North Yorkshire Police he would have been dismissed without notice. He was therefore placed on the police barred list.

Reasons for findings:

1. This is my determination in the accelerated misconduct proceedings relating to a now former officer PC Davies, who has tendered his resignation.

2. The appropriate authority was represented today by Mr Mallett, of counsel. The officer was not represented and has elected not to attend.

3. As a preliminary issue I was asked to confer anonymity to the complainant in this case under regulation 59, which I do. I will refer to them as “B”.

4. The allegations, as set out in the regulation 51 notice, can be summarised in this way:

   1) that PC Davis obtained that phone number of B while was OIC in a matter pertaining to B, and then used it to contact B excessively via his personal phone while on duty about matters which were not related to his duty;
   2) that on 26th October 2025 PC Davis arranged to meet B while on duty, which he represented over his radio was for getting a statement when in fact this was a social visit to B.

   It is alleged that this conduct amounts to a breach of the standard of professional conduct of Duties and Responsibilities and of Honesty and Integrity, respectively. It is submitted by the AA that these breaches amount to a gross misconduct.

5. The officer has served a regulation 54 response in which he accepts breach of both allegations, and that those breaches amount to gross misconduct.

6. My task, at this first stage is to:
   a. first, determining the facts, based upon what is admitted by the officer or proven on the balance of probabilities;
   b. second, determining whether on the basis of those facts the officer has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour alleged;
   c. third, deciding whether the breaches found amount to gross misconduct or not.

7. The fourth (dependent on the findings under (b) and (c) above), deciding what the outcome should be, is considered at stage 2.

8. Depending on those findings at ‘Stage One’ of proceedings, if the conduct is found to constitute gross misconduct, the outcomes available to me are

   a. To impose disciplinary action, that is, make a finding that the officer concerned would have been dismissed if the officer had not ceased to be a member of a police force, or,

b. Take no action.

9. Given the period of the allegations in this case, per the interpretation at regulation 67 of The Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025, the amended Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 apply.

10. I remind myself of the three-fold purpose of 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, and
    c. to protect the public.

11. These proceedings are not punitive, but are "centrally concerned with the reputation and standing of the profession" (Guidance on Outcomes, 2.7).

Facts

12. I have read the statements of belief, the investigation report, and all relevant material in the bundle. I remind myself that it is the AA's case to prove the facts alleged on the balance of probabilities, but I am also entitled to rely on the officer's admissions.

13. I find the following as proven:

    a. On 15th September 2025 PC Davies made first text communication with B, who was the youth worker for a missing person. This message was from his work device and was work related.

    b. On 24th September 2025 the officer messages B from his personal device for the first time. The frequency of these messages increased and were decidedly personal rather than work-related. It is noted that the officer sent messages during work hours on 29th September between 07.00 to 19.00, 30th September between 07.00 to 19.40, 23rd October between 07.00 to 19.45, 24th October between 07.00-19.15 and 25th October (07.00-19.00). There is a large volume of both text and voice note messages doing these times.

c. On 26th October 2025, while on duty, the former officer suggests calling at B's house. The following exchange takes place:

   i. B: "serious question, what are you going to say if they track you and they're like "why are you in [redacted] at this random house. What do you say then?"
   ii. Officer "I'm having a professional discussion with you about youth justice service obviously. That's what we talk about isn't it?"… "that's my excuse, I can stick to it"

d. Concurrently, the former officer made contact with the control room via his police radio and informed them he was travelling to this area to get a "statement signed for band 3". His status was therefore changed from "available" to "committed-not deployable".

e. The officer travelled to B's house and was there from 21.51 until 23.03. He was not conducting any work business during this attendance and was unavailable to perform any of his normal police duties during this time.

f. In a voice note to B on 27th October 2025, the officer rehearsed a conversation he had with a colleague who had questioned him about why he had been in [redacted]. The officer said "just getting some stuff signed, getting information from Band 3, the girl we took off from days". He described himself as "feeling the heat" from this line of questioning.

g. The former officer continued to exchange messages with B until 23rd November 2025, when the conduct was reported to police [redacted]

h. The officer gave no comment when interviewed on 2nd December 2025, but gave a prepared statement on 15th April 2026 when re-interviewed. He admitted to sending the messages. The officer has also admitted attending her house on 26th October 2025. He has offered his apology for his behaviour, though admits he gave no thought to the propriety of his conduct at the time.

Breach

14. Those facts being found, I move to assess whether those facts constitute a breach of the professional standards.

15. In respect of allegation 1, I find that the officer did not act diligently and in the exercise of his duties: after obtaining the mobile number for legitimate purposes, the officer began to use this for his own means, via his personal device and during his working hours, to pursue a personal relationship with B. He then abandoned his duties entirely by visiting B's property for over an hour during his working day. This is entirely at odds with the duties and responsibilities of an officer, and I therefore find him in breach.

16. In respect of allegation 2, I am referred to the test for dishonesty in Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd [2017] UKSC 67. In my determination, it is entirely plain that the untrue statement given to the control room was dishonest: the voice note to B after the fact reveals that he was intentionally attempting to disguise the fact of why he had attended the area, for the purpose of pursuing a personal relationship with B during work hours. It was, objectively, dishonest in nature. I therefore find a breach of honesty and integrity.

17. I remind myself of the definition of gross misconduct as prescribed by Regulation 2: "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal", and I further find that these breaches, individually and together, amount to gross misconduct.

Seriousness

18. Taking the staged approach prescribed by the guidance on outcomes:

    a. Culpability: these were intentional and deliberate acts, committed in pursuit of personal gain. There were texts over a long period during which the officer would or should have been aware that what he was doing was wrong, but did not desist. Attending B's property was a complete and total derogation of duties. Additionally, the officer would have known that in acting in this way, he was reducing the working capacity of his team and placing additional strain on police resources. Lying to his control room about where he was and repeating the lie to another

officer the next day amounts to a repeated and sustained misconduct. A lack of honesty is entirely incompatible with the duties of an officer. The culpability is therefore high.

b. Harm: As noted by the AA, this is the "type of conduct will have undermined public confidence in policing. An officer who acts with a lack of honesty and integrity will inevitably damage the public's overall perception of officers". If known, this conduct would be highly damaging to confidence in the police, who must be trusted to be diligent and honest. The harm is also therefore high.

c. Aggravation: given that I have marked the persistent action in culpability, I do not aggravate the misconduct further for this. There was also an element of malign intent, seeking as he was a personal relationship with B while in the course of his duties. There were attempts to conceal his wrongdoing, but again I take care not to double count.

d. Mitigation: this serves at this stage to reduce the officer's culpability. To that end I note the full and frank admissions made by the officer and the remorse he has expressed.

Outcome

19. Having now heard submissions on outcome, and having considered the officer's antecedents, I am ready to deliver my findings on outcome.

20. I remind myself again of the purpose of these proceedings set out at paragraph 2.3 of the Guidance on Outcome. Of the structured approach prescribed at 4.2, I have already outlined by findings on seriousness, and I therefore bear in mind purpose of imposing sanctions, and will impose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose.

21. I must take into account at this stage any personal mitigation. I am told that this misconduct took place at a difficult time in the officer's life, in particular in respect of his relationships at home. I am reminded, however, of the limitations of personal mitigation in misconduct proceedings, as protection of the public and maintaining high standards is paramount.

22. The only appropriate outcome in this case is to impose disciplinary action, which is to say a finding that the officer would have been dismissed if still serving. It is entirely unacceptable and for this officer to use his time on duty to pursue a personal relationship, both in term of the distraction of sending numerous messages during the day and in travelling to B's house while he was charged with performing his duties. This, alone, would be sufficient to terminate the officer's career. The fact that he then subsequently lied about this conduct to the force is of the highest concern. Dishonesty is incompatible with policing. Clearly, if the officer cannot be trusted to be honest, then he has not place within the police service.

23. The officer will accordingly be placed on the Barred List.

Right to Appeal

You have the right to appeal to a police appeals tribunal.

Service of Notice

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

Signature of Officer concerned:		Date:	

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

Yes ☐ No ☐

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

1. This notice has been issued to inform you as soon as practicable, and in any case within 5 working days of the conclusion of the misconduct proceedings, of the findings 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 63 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020).

2. The proceedings at a misconduct hearing shall be recorded verbatim.

3. You may appeal the determination of an accelerated misconduct hearing to a police appeals tribunal. This appeal shall be given in writing to the relevant Police force before the end of 10 working days, beginning the day after the receipt of this notice.

4. As part of the notice of appeal, you may request a transcript of the misconduct proceedings or part thereof.

5. Misconduct hearing appeals shall be determined by a police appeals tribunal. 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.

6. If you admitted at the misconduct proceedings that your conduct amounted to gross misconduct then you may only appeal against the disciplinary action imposed. If you denied the 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.

7. Any disciplinary action (outcome) shall have effect from the date on which you receive a copy of this Regulation 63 notice.

8. If the outcome of these proceedings was a final written warning then a record of this Regulation 63 notice shall be placed on your personal file until such time as the warning is expunged. A final written warning shall remain live for a period of 2 years or for any such period as the person determining the sanction may determine, up to a maximum of 5 years.

9. 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.

10. Subject to a final written warning being expunged, in cases of proceedings where the outcome is 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 Department. The Professional Standards Department will give you advice in relation to when the warning or final warning should be revealed

11. Revelation must, if applicable, be made by submission of a completed MG6B with each relevant witness statement provided.

12. 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.