

IN THE MATTER OF POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

Case Number: CM/00064/22

Wiltshire Police

-v-

Inspector 1678 Andrew Moreton

1. The Panel sat on February 12th, 13th and 14th 2024. The Panel was chaired by Peter Cadman, Solicitor, sitting with Mr. George Beilby (independent Panel member) and Superintendent Chris Ferrick.
2. Mr John Beggs KC, counsel, represented the Appropriate Authority (AA) and Mr Chris Morris, counsel, represented Inspector Moreton (the Officer).

SCHEDULE 2

ALLEGATIONS

1. The Officer faced the following allegations:

It is alleged that your conduct fell below the Standards of Professional Behaviour, in that:

Being an officer with the Wiltshire Police, on different unknown dates between April 2020 and September 2022 you behaved in an inappropriate and / or misogynistic and / or demeaning manner towards female officers and staff, contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Particulars

1. During the said time period, you paid undue attention to female officers and female members of staff including MG, SD, LG, HM, CG, EY
2. You were demeaning, belittling and dismissive of AO. On one occasion you told her that you had been a “predator”. Your unprofessional conduct towards other women caused her to repetitively warn you (and other female colleagues) about your conduct and comments.
3. You were aggressive, intimidating and rude towards ME.
4. MG started after her initial training in January 2021:
 - a. In your capacity as Force Incident Manager in the CCC you showed inappropriate interest in MG.
 - b. You invaded her personal space.
 - c. On one occasion you told her words to the effect of that you “loved to pull on ponytails when I get a blow job”.
 - d. MG was sporting a ponytail on that occasion.
 - e. On other occasions you stared at her breasts when talking to her.
5. You made comments to SR (who tutored MG) that you would “like to bang her”, in reference to a random female.
6. JW was a female junior member of staff. You told AO that JW was “a bit of me” meaning “I wouldn’t mind a bit of her”. Shortly afterwards you approached JW.
7. You showed undue interest in CG:
 - a. You showed off to her.
 - b. You said words to the effect of “no-one says no to me” to her.

- c. You told her (falsely) that you had slept with your sergeant's wife
- 8. You (falsely) told CP that you were "shagging" or "had shagged" Sgt's wife.
- 9. In AH's presence you claimed (falsely) that you had "shagged" a subordinate's wife.
- 10. Your said conduct amounts to:
 - a. harassment of female officers and staff within the meaning of s.26(1) Equality Act 2010; and/ or
 - b. sexual harassment of female officers and staff within the meaning of s.26(2) Equality Act 2010.
- 11. Your said conduct was in breach of the following Standards of Professional Conduct:
 - a. Honesty and Integrity, integrity only: in that your conduct towards these female officers and staff lacked integrity;
 - b. Authority, Respect and Courtesy, in that you did not act with self-control or respect or courtesy towards the aforementioned females;
 - c. Equality and Diversity, in that you discriminated unlawfully against female officers and staff;
 - d. Discreditable conduct, in that your said conduct is likely to bring discredit upon the police service.

Your said conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

- 4. Prior to the hearing the Chair made the following directions:
 - (a) That the witnesses MG, AO, SR, LH, LG, ME, CG, CP, AH, and VU give evidence.
 - (b) That the hearing be in public
 - (c) That Notice of the hearing be published.

- 4.1 The Officer had filed a Regulation 31 Response.

EVIDENCE CALLED

- 5. The following paragraphs 5.1 to 5.64 are a summary of the evidence heard and not a complete record. All evidence heard was considered by the Panel as were all the written witness statements and documents in the hearing bundle and all the video evidence.

The Panel was shown a Wilshire Police training video about experiences of sexism of officers and staff of Wilshire Police

MG

- 5.2 She adopted her witness statement. At the time of the events, she was a civilian employee but by the time of the hearing she was a Police Constable and had been since November 2023. She had been a police staff member from November 2020 and started at the control room in Devizes in January 2021 and at that time she was 23 years old.
- 5.3 AO was one of her supervisors. The control room had been split during COVID and those based in Swindon in due course returned to Devizes. AO told her that, if Inspector Moreton made her uncomfortable at any time, she was to let her know. At that stage she had not met him. He joined the control room a few weeks later.
- 5.4 She recalled that he would pull a chair and sit between her and her tutor SR. She felt that he was in her personal space and often had his legs outstretched and open. He would talk about personal matters including having a girlfriend half his age but not often about work, not leaving until she started talking on an open channel or turned away from him. When he moved away, he would go to other females, and he had a type young and pretty in appearance.
- 5.5 One morning she was finishing a night shift. He came in about 5.45/6.00 for his shift even though most supervisor would not get until around 06.30 and go straight for handover. He sat behind her splitting her from SR. Her hair was in a ponytail, and he looked at her hair saying he "love to pull on ponytails when I get a blowjob". She was offended and found it a shocking comment. She looked at SR, but nothing was said, and she gave a false laugh.
- 5.6 She did not raise this at once with anyone as he was her Inspector, and she was still in her probation. She was frightened and scared what would happen if she made a report
- 5.7 On occasions when he was talking to her, he stared at her breasts, and this made her uncomfortable. He did focus on her breasts, and this was sexual.
- 5.8 She did confide with a colleague, PC, probably within a day
- 5.9 She did not recall speaking to SR the day before he made his statement.

AO

- 5.10 She adopted her witness statement.
- 5.11 She found Inspector Moreton patronising and dismissive. When she raised concerns, he said it was all OK and always seemed rushed even though she had two thirds of the staff to manage on her own. However, she accepted that he could be compassionate and supportive and that her PDR with him was constructive.
- 5.12 She had seen the Inspector looking oddly at MG and this made AO uncomfortable. She recalled MG telling her that the Inspector was

looking at her (MG's) breasts but she did not want it taken any further and she had been adamant about this before it was told by her.

- 5.13 He asked her about the name of a new staff member, and she told him that she was JW. He said "a bit of me" and she took this to mean his type of girl. He said this in a sing/song voice, and it had lecherous undertones. It was possible to see across the room to where she was sat. She recalled that he was on the windowsill when he said this. Later in the shift he went over to JW.
- 5.16 She discussed R with the Inspector one to one and this was about R's predatory behaviour. The Inspector said he had been a predator. There was nothing jokey about the way he said it and it was unpleasant.
- 5.17 She does recall MG telling her about the ponytail. MG was very nervous telling her and was distressed and crying. She was told about the ponytail matter, and it was a shocking disclosure. She did not recall blowjob being said but MG was quite upset at the time.
- 5.18 She was shown the Wiltshire video, and this made her increasingly infuriated, and she walked out in tears.
- 5.19 She wrote a 2-page email on August 17th 2022 to Chief Inspector DD and the contents are true. She had made notes about what had happened, but they have been thrown away.

SR

- 5.20 He adopted his witness statement.
- 5.21 He considered Inspector Moreton to be confident rather than Jack the Lad.
- 5.22 He confirmed that the Inspector had, during a game of guess the character in the Control Room, said that he would like to bang her. He accepted that in his statements he referred to other similar silly comments made by the Inspector and that meant that these would also have been with a sexual connotation
- 5.23 He had not heard the Inspector say anything untoward to MG despite sitting next to her. They sat in little Perspex booths. He never saw him staring at her chest and would have challenged him.

ME

- 5.24 She adopted her witness statement.
- 5.25 She was a supervisor in the Control Room and had worked there for over 11 years.
- 5.26 The Inspector was asleep on shift and, although this was unusual, it does happen. He was aggressive to her and to others. On one occasion this arose from a firearms incident which he thought was not being handled properly. On another occasion an elderly lady was lost in Devizes in the early hours of the morning, and he was cross that we were helping her. He became very intimidating and stormed off. Her team approached her and said they did not want to work with the Inspector, and one called him a nightmare

LH

- 5.27 She adopted her witness statement.
- 5.28 She recalled his comment one day when the staff had come in to work in ordinary clothes. It was for charity. He was sitting back, very comfortable, legs wide apart and said it was like a school disco.
- 5.29 She recalled that MG told her about the ponytail incident. She was not working on the shift when she understood it had happened and she thought others had already been told. She did not report it as she thought others had already been told and that supervisors already were aware, and it was being escalated. All she knows is what MG told her.

LG

- 5.30 She adopted her witness statement. At the time of the events, she worked in the Control Room, but she is now a local crime investigator.
- 5.31 She recalled the Inspector making a beeline for her and he said he recognised her, but they had not worked together before. She accepted that one of her sisters works for the police.
- 5.32 Afterwards, he kept looking over at her and she tried to avoid eye contact. She was uncomfortable. Further, if she raised any query he would come over even if the query just needed a yes or no answer.
- 5.33 She noted that he paid more attention to females including MG and PC.
- 5.34 MG told her about a ponytail incident that made her very uncomfortable, but she could not recall what was said. She thought that if blowjob was mentioned in that conversation, she would have recalled it.

IT

- 5.35 He adopted his witness statement. He was a supervisor at the Control Room and had worked there since 2004.
- 5.36 He had never seen the Inspector do anything inappropriate.
- 5.37 He did recall silly games at work, and it was just joviality including a guess who game. He did not hear any inappropriate behaviour and he did not hear a comment like "would like to bang her". If the words were used that was not acceptable in any way and that was obvious.
- 5.38 He recalled an incident with a birthday cake and EY but did not think she was uncomfortable.

CG

- 5.39 She adopted her witness statement. She confirmed that she had been uncomfortable with the Inspector at work, but it was difficult to put into words why. It was feelings, what the Inspector said and how he said it. There was dominance and he was the person in charge of the conversation. When he asked her to come to his office, she felt uncomfortable. On one occasion he asked her if he had offended her. She did try to

keep her distance from him.

- 5.40 In one meeting he did say that no one says no to him, and she understood this to mean he could get away with things and can do what he wanted. He did talk about a tribunal, but she could not recall the exact words.
- 5.41 She does recall him saying that he had slept with Sgt wife. She knew PS but only as a person she had sent a work email to, and she did not know his first name or any nickname. It was not her that used the nickname. It was the Inspector as she did not know that name. He did not use crudity when saying this just said he had slept with her. He just volunteered this information. She felt it was inappropriate and strange at the time and she felt that she and her colleagues were in shock.
- 5.42 She said that she was friendly with the Inspector's wife and had been to her birthday party.

AH

- 5.43 She adopted her witness statement. She started working for Wiltshire Police in 2019 and was a Citizens in Police supervisor. She witnessed him talking about personal stuff and this was out of the ordinary in view of his rank especially to young females including CG and CP.
- 5.44 She knew that CG was a friend of a friend of the Inspector's wife.
- 5.45 When he came to their room, he was quite leering and full of himself and "letchy" to females. When he was there, she turned away and tried to work. She did recall him saying that he was "shagging someone's wife". She was shocked and it was inappropriate and was with people he hardly knew. She recalled him using the nickname.
- 5.46 He knew who his audience was when he said this.
- 5.47 She denied that she had an agenda against the Inspector.

VU

- 5.48 She adopted her statement. She was an HR Business Partner and had worked for Wiltshire Police for 27 years.
- 5.49 She considered AO to be very kindly, empathetic and sympathetic and emotionally aware. She thought that she was too kind to staff and there were problems about nonattendances at work. She did mention this to the Inspector to look at, but she had no expectations as to what he would do as he was her manager not this witness.

Inspector Moreton

- 5.50 He gave an account of his roles in Wiltshire Police since joining in 1999 as a Special Constable and in 2001 as a Police Constable. At the time of the events, he was 47/48, a mature man of senior rank. He said that he expressed his sadness and reflection but accepted that no such acceptance or reflection was within his written replies to the allegations.
- 5.51 With regard to Allegation 1, he denied this allegation. He was aware that JG had said that he paid more attention to younger females than to men and that CK had also referred to his attention to young females. He accepted that is what they said, and this was a huge disappointment to him, and he had been misconstrued.

- 5.52 He was aware of the statement of JH, but she is a very close friend of his ex-wife. He was aware that CG stated that he steered conversation to personal topics and AH said that he talked about personal stuff. He accepted that the statement of DS GG referred to being uncomfortable and uneasy seven times. He accepted that his former partner had said that he made her feel uncomfortable and reported him for stalking. He accepted that he had got things wrong and made mistakes, but he did not accept her statement.
- 5.53 In answer to Allegation 2, he explained that there were difficulties when the Control Room had to be split because of Covid restrictions and he was based in Swindon with AO in Devizes. He denied that he was patronising or dismissive to her saying he was sad if he was misconstrued.
- 5.54 He and AO were dealing with R about allegations against R. The Inspector may have used the word predator to describe R but never said that he had been a predator. R was properly reported to Professional Standards.
- 5.55 In answer to Allegation 3, he had an arrangement with Wiltshire Police that he did not do night shifts because of his childcare obligations. However, he was ordered to do four-night shifts. He slept on shift, and he accepts that this was not appropriate but was essential. On one night he came back to the Control Room and there was a firearm incident which he thought was not being dealt with properly. He was cross and tired but does not recollect being rude and aggressive to ME.
- 5.56 In answer to Allegation 4, he denied the allegation. He denied saying the words alleged to MG. He did not recall speaking to her for 45 minutes and did not invade her space. He never made the comment about her ponytail and a blowjob. He was shocked and sad that she said that as he had made no sexual comment. He accepted that if said it would be shocking and, in every way, inappropriate. He accepted that it would be hard for her to call out an Inspector or come forward in the light of her age and his seniority, but he said that she was forthright.
- 5.57 He suggested that there was a benefit for her to make a false allegation because of the way the Inspector had dealt another member of staff. It was his view that MG and that staff member were friends although MG denied that. He suggested that she and other witnesses (Allegations 7,8 and 9) could have made up falsehoods for friends or that there were vulnerable creating leverage from their past. He accepted that he had no evidence to support any assertion of blackmail. He also suggested that her evidence was through the prism of her own experience, and he had not said the words alleged.
- 5.58 He did not stare at her chest but accepted that he didn't always maintain eye contact as that could be rude. He did not invade her space and would be about 30 centimetres away and he was never with her for 45 minutes.
- 5.59 He had asked her if she was offended, and this was not because of anything he had done but because she was very quiet.
- 5.60 In answer to Allegation 5 he recollected games being played and on reflection he accepts that it was not appropriate. He did not recollect engaging in the games himself and has no recollection of "would like to bang her" and, if said, that would be wholly inappropriate. He then said that he had participated in the games. He accepted that in his Regulation 31 response he had said that he had never participated in the games. He said that there was no reason for SR to lie unlike MG (charge 4) and CG, CP and AH who had reasons not to like him and whose comments were through the prisms of their own experiences.
- 5.61 In answer to Allegation 6, he did not recall who JW was. He did not say the words alleged but accepted that, if said, they were not appropriate, but it was not how he spoke and he was not a 21-year-old in Ibiza. He was never challenged by AO about any alleged words used.

- 5.62 In answer to Allegation 7(c), 8 and 9, he said that the three women were not telling the truth and that people see events through the prism of their own experiences. He also suggested that they were mistaken or had factored into their accounts rumour or gossip. He went on to suggest that they were lying. He said that it was CG who had mentioned nickname and he had told her not to use that name as he and PS had had disagreements in the past when the Inspector was infatuated with that officer's wife. He suggested that CG and his ex-wife were close friends. He denied using the words alleged. He accepted that if an inspector had boasted about shagging staff it was wholly inappropriate.
- 5.63 With Regard to Allegation 7 (a) and (b) he did say that he was very keen on an initiative and might have said that nobody says no without a clear reason, and this was about the initiative he was pursuing. He may have mentioned a tribunal and it was his passion to challenge. He was not showing off. He accepts that he went to the post room and her office was next door. He popped in to see if she was there and he had work matters to chase her about.
- 5.64 With regard to Allegation 10, he had not harassed females and did not discriminate

DECISION ON FACTS

6. The Panel gave careful consideration to all the material presented to it and all the evidence it had heard including oral evidence, written evidence in the hearing bundle and the video.
- 6.1 The Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof was on the Appropriate Authority and the standard of proof was on the balance of probabilities.
- 6.2 There were no health issues raised on behalf of the Officer either at the time of the events or at the time of the hearing.
- 6.3 The Panel had received supportive character witness statements, but they were of limited assistance in making decisions on the facts in this case.
- 6.4 The Panel had been invited to reach findings of fact with Regard to allegations 1 to 9 and, if proved then to identify whether each constituted a breach of any Standard (and if so which) and, if standards had been breached whether it was misconduct or gross misconduct.

ALLEGATION 1

The Panel looked at all the totality of the evidence before it including the Inspector's evidence and other evidence including that of AO, JG, CK PC, MG and CG

1. The Panel concluded from looking at all the evidence that the Inspector had between April 2020 and September 2022 paid undue attention to female officers.
2. In terms of the particularisation only the Panel omitted SD, HM and EY.
3. The Panel decided that this gave rise to Breaches of Standards of Integrity, of Authority, Respect and Courtesy, and of Equality and Diversity and of Discreditable Conduct.
4. The Panel considered this to be gross misconduct.

ALLEGATION 2

1. The Panel found that the Inspector was aware of the less forceful character of AO. While the Panel noted and accepted that he had to raise management matters with her (as he did in 1 to 1s) his approach to her elsewhere was demeaning, belittling and dismissive. This related both to when the Control Room was split because of COVID and when all had returned to Devizes. The Panel preferred her evidence in this regard. The Panel found her to be a careful and truthful witness.
2. The Panel noted the conflict of evidence between the Inspector and AO about the word "predator". The Panel preferred her recollection of events in that he did say he had been a predator. The Panel find the suggestion that the word was used only about R was implausible and that her recollection was not in error nor a misunderstanding.
3. There was evidence from AO and from MG that AO had warned officers about the Inspector, and they accept the evidence that she had warned him.
4. The Panel found that this breached the Standards of Authority Respect and Courtesy and of Discreditable Conduct.
5. It was misconduct only.

ALLEGATION 3

1. The Panel found this allegation proved.
2. The Inspector accepted that he had been asleep on duty for reasons that he had explained. When he woke, he was annoyed at what actions had been taken about a firearms incident and what he saw as errors and incorrect procedures being used. He felt he could be criticised for the failure.
3. He accepted his loss of control, and the Panel accepted the evidence of ME that he was aggressive, intimidating and rude to her and to others. He also openly criticised a Police Sergeant in a way that could be heard by all.
4. The Panel found this to be a Breach of the Standards of Authority Respect and Courtesy and of Discreditable Conduct.
5. The Panel found this to be misconduct.

ALLEGATION 4

1. The Panel found MG to be a nervous but truthful witness. The Panel noted that others had been informed about her concerns and about the Ponytail comment and that their recollections of what MG had said was not identical and that there were differences. The Panel noted the Inspector's evidence that the only Ponytail comment could have been his recollection of the comment of another officer some years before when she

said that if anyone pulled her ponytail she would be violent.

2. The Panel preferred the evidence of MG. She had no reason to lie, and no credible reason had been advanced to suggest that. The Panel found her to be a nervous but credible witness about what must have been a very difficult situation at the time of the events and thereafter. The Panel found it implausible that she would have concocted a story nor that this could be a result of her mishearing what the Inspector had said.
3. The Panel also believed her evidence that the Inspector had been staring at the breasts. She was clear and adamant about this and AO gave evidence of MG being uncomfortable.
4. The Panel found that all of the sub-paragraphs (a) to (e) were proved.
5. This was in breach of the Standards of Honesty and Integrity (Integrity only): of Authority Respect and Courtesy and of Discreditable Conduct.
6. This was gross misconduct.

ALLEGATION 5

1. The panel found this allegation proved.
2. On this point the recollection of SR was clear and he referred not only to the words in the allegation but also to other similar comments made by the Inspector. The witness's evidence was generally supportive of the Inspector, but he was certain that those words were said. The evidence of the Inspector was inconsistent and unclear varying from never engaging in any games to involvement in the games, but no recollection of the words alleged.
3. The Panel preferred the evidence of SR and had no doubt that the words were said.
4. The Panel found that this breached the Standards of Authority Respect and Courtesy, of Equality and Diversity and of Discreditable Conduct.
5. This was misconduct.

ALLEGATION 6

1. The Panel had conflicting evidence from AO and from the Officer.
2. The Inspector denied using the words "a bit of me" or their meaning but in evidence he said they were words for people in Ibiza accepting he knew the words and their meaning.
3. AO's evidence was consistent, and she was certain of the words said by the Inspector as they were so unusual. The Panel preferred her evidence. The Panel noted that JW did not know the Inspector but that was of little help to the Panel in reaching its decision as it was never alleged that any words were said in her presence or hearing.
4. The Panel found that this was in breach of the Standards of Authority Respect and Courtesy, of Equality and Diversity and of Discreditable Conduct.
5. The Panel found that this allegation was misconduct.

ALLEGATION 7, 8 AND 9

1. In these allegations there was evidence from three witnesses (two gave oral evidence) who give reasonably consistent accounts that the Inspector did say that he had had a relationship with the wife of a serving police officer with her also being a serving officer. The Panel reminded itself that CP did not give oral evidence even though her

attendance had been directed. The Panel had been told the health reason for her non-attendance and that had been accepted by counsel for the Inspector. For this reason her evidence could not be challenged by the Inspector and the Panel bore this in mind in evaluating this allegation.

2. In his evidence the Inspector asserted that the three witnesses might have for some reason have made a false statement against him and he even suggested that they may have been blackmailed. The Panel found this to be implausible. The Panel rejected the Inspector's evidence that CG had mentioned "nickname" and he had told her not to refer to him as they had history.
3. Further, he suggested that they might have been simply mistaken. The Panel rejected this as each witness was clear about what he had said, and totality of the evidence was that he was referring to the officer by a nickname and that was not known to CG. Indeed, her evidence was that she had sent emails to the officer but did not know him.
4. The Panel found that Allegations 7(c), 8 and 9 were proved.
5. With regard to allegation 7 (a) and b) the Panel did find that the Inspector was showing off and the words in (b) were part of that showing off.
6. The Panel found that the Inspector was showing off to CG.
7. The Panel found this to be in breach of the Standards of Authority Respect and Conduct and of Discreditable Conduct. He was referencing two serving officers and one was serving under him.
8. The Panel found that this was gross misconduct.

ALLEGATION 10

1. In the light of the findings of facts the Panel did find that (a) and (b) are established. Indeed, counsel for the Inspector conceded that if the Panel found the other allegations proved on the facts, this allegation would also be proved.
2. In terms of the basis of the decision it was that his conduct had the effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, humiliating and offensive environment not that his unwanted conduct had the purpose.

ALLEGATION 11

1. The Panel, as asked, has identified on each allegation which Standards have been breached and has also identified which allegation was found to be misconduct and which was gross misconduct.
2. The Panel find in their totality the allegations are gross misconduct.

The Panel also considered the Preamble to the allegations and find that the Inspector's conduct was inappropriate and misogynistic and demeaning.

DECISION ON SANCTION

- 7.1 The Panel heard helpful submissions from the AA and on behalf of the Officer. The AA submitted that the outcome should be dismissal while counsel for the officer suggested that a reduction in rank to Sergeant or to Constable.
- 7.2 The Panel had been provided with a bundle of character statements supporting the Officer.
- 7.3 The Panel reminded itself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime:

- (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

7.4 The Panel firstly assessed the seriousness of the misconduct.

7.5 Culpability.

The Panel identified that this included from its findings of fact;

- (a) deliberate conduct
- (b) some conduct where the conduct was unintentional but could have been foreseen
- (c) sexual impropriety
- (d) he was in a position of authority
- (e) Discrimination

7.6 Harm

The Panel identified that this included:

- (a) Psychological distress to a number of work colleagues
- (b) Reputational damage to the police service
- (c) High level of local and national concern

7.7 Aggravating factors.

The Panel identified that this included:

- (a) Multiple victims
- (b) Unlawful discrimination

7.8 Mitigating factors

The Panel identified that this included:

- (a) The events were over a relatively short period over a long police career.
- (b) Personal references but of limited weight in these proceedings
- (c) No previous matters

7.9. Personal mitigation

The Panel reminded itself that this carries less weight than in other areas, but the Panel noted:

- (a) The positive character witnesses.
- (b) That there were no previous disciplinary matters.

7.10. The Panel reminded itself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime and decided that all three were engaged. Sanction was not to punish the Officer.

7.11 The Panel noted that on the Inspector's behalf it was submitted that a reduction in rank would be an adequate sanction in all the circumstances. The Panel agreed that no lower sanction could be appropriate.

7.12 The Panel could not agree with that submission. Reduction in rank is not an adequate or proportionate sanction for the misconduct in this case. This was serious misconduct

over a period of time adversely impacting female employee's junior to him. His behaviour was manifestly unacceptable. The only adequate and proportionate outcome was dismissal.

Addendum.

7.13 The Panel has been asked to identify sanction appropriate to each allegation and the Panel concluded

Allegation 1 Dismissal

Allegation 2 Written warning

Allegation 3 Written warning

Allegation 4 Dismissal

Allegation 5 Written warning

Allegation 6 Written warning

Allegation 7, 8 and 9 Dismissal