

IN THE MATTER OF MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
REGULATIONS 2020 AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT)(AMENDMENTS)
REGULATIONS 2024

BETWEEN

THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF MERSEYSIDE POLICE
The Appropriate Authority

And

PC 7898 CARSON

The officer

Hearing date 11TH to 14th May 2026

Chairs report giving reasons and findings

Summary of the case

At the misconduct hearing, the panel found a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour of Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct to be proven.

References

In this report:

'The 2020 Regulations' means the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as amended by the Police(conduct)(amendments) Regulations 2024.

'The 2020 Home Office Guidance' and 'the Home Office Guidance' refers to the Home Office Guidance Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness: Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing (issued under section 87 and 87A of the Police Act 1996 published on 5 February 2020.

'The College of Policing Outcomes Guidance' and 'the outcomes guidance' refers to the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings (issued under section 87 the Police Act 1996) published on 17 August 2022 and updated (by having paragraphs numbers added) in March 2023

Parties, representatives, panel members and other attendees

The AA is the Chief Constable of Merseyside Police who is represented during the proceedings by Ms Chloe Hill.

The Chair is ACC Andy Ryan.

The LQP is Mrs Jane Wilson.

The IPMs are Mr Alan Rankin and Mr Chris Lindley.

The officer is represented by Ms Sarah Barlow.

The Chair delegated the report writing to the LQP.

No Media attended the hearing.

PC Carson attended the hearing on the 11th and the 12th May 2026.

Publicity

In accordance with Regulation 36(2) of the 2020 Regulations, the AA published notice of the misconduct hearing on the Merseyside Police website.

Redactions

The panel had in advance of the hearing been provided with a bundle of statements, exhibits and documents ("the bundle") that had not been redacted as agreed between the AA and Ms Barlow who represented the officer.

The panel members were provided with a printed, redacted bundle.

The panel was advised that any such matters that it had read in the unredacted bundle must be put out of the panel's minds. The only bundle that the panel were concerned with is the printed bundle that they received on the morning of the 11th May 2026.

The panel members confirmed that they had put such matters out of their minds.

Ms Barlow and Ms Hill did not object to the panel continuing to determine the misconduct hearing.

Background to The Incident

PC [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] lived [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] and in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Initially PC Carson and [REDACTED] would do [REDACTED] shopping. PC Carson had access to [REDACTED] bank account to pay for [REDACTED] shopping. The panel found that [REDACTED] gave PC Carson authority to use her bank account to pay for her shopping, to purchase ice creams and on behalf of [REDACTED] to buy birthday and Christmas presents for the [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

PC Carson went beyond the terms of his limited authority and used [REDACTED] bank account to pay for his family's weekly shopping and purchase items that were not commensurate with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] lifestyle.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

The Standards of Professional Behaviour are contained in Schedule 2 of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

(Honesty and) Integrity

"Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

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.

Regulation 30 notice

The details of your conduct that it is alleged has breached the Standards of Professional behaviour can be found below together with how that conduct is alleged to amount to gross misconduct.

Being an officer of the Merseyside Police between 24th February 2020 and 9th March 2023 you breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (conduct) Regulations 2020 as amended.

Particular of fact

From at least 2015 you befriended your next-door neighbour who was elderly and in poor health. That health deteriorated over time.

During that period, you began to do "jobs" for your neighbour, which included doing her shopping

██████████ believed she was smitten with you and held you in high esteem due in part to the fact that you were a police officer.

In order to do her shopping, she would give you her bank card.

During the period 24th February 2020 and 9th March 2023, you ██████████ caused the following total purchases to be made on her bank card that are not commensurate with her lifestyle. You cannot provide an explanation for this expenditure

	description	amount
1	Advantiscredit	£135.25
2	Amazon	£753.68
3	Ambrose Wilson MOT	£33.48
4	Argos	£42.99
5	BT Business direct/BT PLC Consumer	£214.34
6	Clear pay	£225.32
7	Coopers of Stortford	£142.85
8	Costa	£45.30
9	Costco	£35.83
10	Cotton Traders	£16.49
11	Defy Gaming	£85.94
12	Domino's pizza	£26.99
13	Euro Car Parts	£84.99
14	Faradays Bakery- Morecambe	£36.00
15	Glide App	£12.00
16	Greggs	£20.00
17	Halfords	£99.05
18	HM Com	£10.98
19	JD Williams	£65.00
20	Klara	£259.99
21	Manscaped	£99.00
22	McDonald's	£152.86
23	My Protein	£76.18
23	Original Gifts	£45.75
25	O2	239.19
26	Papa Johns	£42.15

27	Pitch up	£13.40
28	Pure Gym	£44.58
29	QVC.com	£239.19
30	Scotts of Stow	£42.15
31	Shark Ninja	£13.50
32	SP Mancaveinc.com	£44.58
33	SQ Rightio	£1,615.52
34	Starbucks	£755.00
35	Takeaway- JE	£115.10
36	Tesco	£24,727.35
37	Tool Station	£94.98
38	TU Sainsburys	£20.00
39	Uber Eats	£85.35
40	www.ridiculouslyri	£18.38
41	ww.zopa.com	£150.00

You also took control of her savings account, and you transferred the sum of £10,865 on the following dates in order to cover the expenditure in the current account.

	Description	amount
13.05.2021	TT	£242.00
16.07.2021	TT	£400.00
03.09.2021	TT	£500.00
15.09.2021	BP	£500.00
29.09.2021	TT	£2000.00
08.11.2021	TT	£500.00
10.11.2021	TT	£200.00
08.12.2021	TT	£700.00
20.12.2021	TT	£600
28.02.2022	BP	£1000
28.03.2022	TT	£1000
05.05.2022	TT	£800.00
29.05.2022	TT	£400.00
16.06.2022	TT	£1,223.00
19.07.2022	TT	£200.00

You registered your email address with [REDACTED] bank accounts so that you could transfer funds and carry out online transactions using the cards.

Particulars of Misconduct

Your said behaviour is in breach of the Standards of Professional Conduct of

Honesty and Integrity in that using [REDACTED] bank account to benefit you and your family you acted dishonestly and without integrity.

Discreditable Conduct that in using [REDACTED] bank account in the way in which you had to benefit you and your family, you have acted in a manner that is likely to bring the police service into disrepute.

Being an officer of the Merseyside Police between 24th February 2020 and the 9th March 2023 you breached the Standards of Professional Conduct as set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (conduct) regulations 2020 in that whilst carrying out tasks in order to assist your elderly and infirm neighbour, you failed to contact social services or other agencies to assist

her despite the level of squalor that was apparent in her house namely that the floor downstairs was littered with black bits, that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was sleeping on her couch, that the house smelt of urine and faeces and that the house was thick with dust. That it had water leaks and was damp and was in a generally poor state of disrepair. Your said behaviour is in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour of discreditable conduct as your actions in failing to seek assistance from the authorities for a person whom you had befriended and who put great store by the fact that you were a police officer had the propensity to bring the police service into disrepute.

Regulation 31 response

The officer denied deliberately befriending [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to take financial advantage of her.

The officer and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did jobs for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] such as shopping and visiting her and generally assisting her when she needed or asked for assistance.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] was a strong-minded lady despite [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

The officer would shop for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] but was never in possession of her bank card.

The Advantis credit transaction is a telephone bill payment for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] outstanding telephone bill

There were numerous purchases made with Amazon on behalf of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and gifts for the family on the instruction of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. On one occasion the Officer accidentally used [REDACTED] [REDACTED] card for his own purchase without her prior consent. The Officer immediately informed [REDACTED] [REDACTED] of the error, assuring her that he would pay her back in full and that her card had been removed from his account. In response to this, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] laughed and insisted that the Officer does not pay her back

The Officer has no recollection of making a purchase from [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

The Officer cannot remember anything specific purchased from Argos; it is possible that gifts were purchased by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for the Officer and his family, usually around birthdays or Christmas.

BT Business Direct: The Officer believes that this may be [REDACTED] [REDACTED] telephone bill direct debit, although he has no specific recollection of this.

The Officer cannot recall making any purchase to Coopers of Stortford. although the Officer has conducted an online search and it appears to be a homeware shop, and it is likely that this was a purchase made by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for herself.

The Officer recalls a purchase being made for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on the Officer's Costco membership account. The Officer cannot remember the specific purchase. Only members of Costco can make purchases from Costco.

Defy Gaming: This purchase relates to an Xbox controller purchased for the Officer's son's birthday.

Faraday's Bakery: This is an online bakery from which the Officer ordered frozen pies on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] behalf.

Halfords & Toolstation: One of these purchases was for a pressure washer which the Officer purchased using [REDACTED] [REDACTED] account in order for him to clean her newly paved/gravelled garden. The Officer would purchase items that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] needed to maintain her home, the other item he cannot recall specifically but will have been purchased at the request of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Manscaped: This is a purchase of a razor which [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was adamant that the Officer should purchase for himself; the Officer believes that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] probably saw an advert for this and thought the Officer may like it.

My Protein: This transaction was authorised by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in her presence and with her consent.

O2: This was a gift made by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to the Officer's wife after having missed her birthday by a couple of days; the Officer made the purchase using [REDACTED] [REDACTED] account in the presence of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. It was a one off, temporary upgrade fee; other than that, the monthly payments on the o2 contract remained with the Officer's account.

QVC: Purchases made by [REDACTED] for herself from QVC.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] requested and ordered a new vacuum cleaner from Shark Ninja.

Mancave: Gifts bought by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for the Officer's son.

Tesco: Shopping done on behalf of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

TU Sainsbury's: These purchases relate to birthday or Christmas gifts.

Police Supplies: A gift of a covert vest from [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Domino's Pizza. Papers Johns. Takeaway JE: The Officer believes these purchases may have been for an occasional treat dinner.

Costa. Greggs. McDonalds. Starbucks: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] would add funds onto various hospitality pre-payment applications. This was at her request.

Clear Pay. SQ Rightio, Cotton Traders. Euro Car Parts. Glide App. JD Williams. Klarna. Original Gifts. Pitch Up. Scots of Stow. WWW.ridiculouslyri: The Officer has no knowledge or recollection of these purchases.

Zopa.com: This was a bill that [REDACTED] asked to pay.

H&M: Birthday clothing for the daughter of the Officer, purchased at the request of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

The assertion that the Officer transferred £10,865 from [REDACTED] savings account to cover his own expenditure is incorrect. The Officer believes these may have been telephone transfers made by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and/or bill payments made by [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] bank required authorisation for her Tesco order by sending a text and email message containing a code. Due to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] not having a mobile telephone, the Officer linked his number and email to the account in order that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] could easily verify purchases.

The Officer denies that he failed [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in the manner alleged at allegation 2 or at all.

The officer does not accept any breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, whether as alleged in the regulation 30 Notice or at all, and it follows that it is denied that his conduct would amount to either misconduct or to gross misconduct as alleged.

The Officer's Case: The Officer joined Merseyside Police in 2020. He is of good character and has no previous misconduct sanctions/findings made against him.

The Officer is being asked to recall precise details of financial transactions made over a significant period of time some time ago. The account that he gives of the precise detail of each transaction attributed to him is his best recollection in the circumstances, however his memory will inevitably have been adversely affected due to the passage of time.

The Officer moved into his current home in February 2012. His relationship with [REDACTED] over that period of time developed from being neighbourly to being very good friends. [REDACTED] grew to become a grandmother figure to he and his family, all of whom were very fond of her. There would be joint BBQ's, Christmas, Easter and birthdays were celebrated, and [REDACTED] would treat the children with chocolate and other similar gifts. [REDACTED] was not 'infatuated', nor 'smitten' with him. [REDACTED] would see the Officer and his family nearly every day throughout the relevant period and have social interactions with him and his family, including tea parties with his children. [REDACTED] attended the wedding of the Officer in 2015 and became good friends with his grandmother. [REDACTED] had, over the years, become very much a part of the family of the Officer. When the Officer first became friendly with [REDACTED] she was mobile and would go for short walks. She did have some difficulty with [REDACTED] but did not [REDACTED]. In 2016/17 [REDACTED] had a fall, it was from this point that her [REDACTED] began to deteriorate, and the Officer began to help her by doing some shopping and driving her to the shops. On occasion there would be an issue with payment, and the Officer would pay for the shopping of [REDACTED] she would then refund him. He would also help her with other tasks, such as gardening (her garden had become infested with Japanese knotweed, this required professional removal).

As [REDACTED] mobility became more of an issue, the Officer introduced her to online shopping and [REDACTED] became an enthusiastic user of various online retailers. She would make regular purchases of items for herself. The details of the Officer were given to her bank (email and telephone number): this was for the sole purpose of verification of transactions. This happened only in the presence of [REDACTED] and in relation to purchases that she made. The Officer did add the card of [REDACTED] to his Tesco App; [REDACTED] insisted that he did this (she originally wanted to give him her card, he refused to take it) in order to be able to shop for her on occasions where her online order did not meet the minimum delivery requirements. [REDACTED] also insisted on paying for petrol on occasion to cover the expenses of the Officer in travelling to do her shopping. If the Officer tried to refuse this gesture, [REDACTED] would become extremely upset. The Officer shopped for [REDACTED] in the above way for a number of years, either by sitting with her and inputting details or ordering and then collecting her shopping for her. [REDACTED] also bought gifts for the family, she would do this by approving online purchases for specific items such as toys, and in particular a razor and a covert vest for the Officer. She would also treat the family by prepaying amounts on Apps such as Starbucks/Greggs.

The officer did on one occasion make a purchase accidentally by using the card of [REDACTED] in error when making an Amazon purchase, he realised the error and immediately offered to refund her. The Officer did assist [REDACTED] in organizing the payment of her utilities/bills by direct debit. [REDACTED] was a generous character and would give gifts and treats to the family fairly regularly. She would do this as the Officer and his family had a close relationship with her and would reciprocate in terms of assisting her and supporting her. At no point did the Officer put any pressure on [REDACTED] to allow him to use her money, rather [REDACTED] was insistent and forthright that the Officer should accept her gifts and contributions and would become upset if he tried to refuse. The Officer never purchased anything without the express permission of [REDACTED] (save for the one error identified in relation to Amazon). Throughout the period that the Officer and his family were close to [REDACTED] she quite obviously had mental capacity and was an independent and strong-willed woman; for example, [REDACTED] was very capable of vehemently disagreeing with her carers and/or doctors. At the time at which the Officer met [REDACTED] she was estranged from her family, in particular her daughter [REDACTED] and had been so for over a decade. Over the time that the Officer knew [REDACTED] she would never speak in any detail about her daughter or their estrangement. If [REDACTED] was ever raised as a topic of conversation, [REDACTED] would react in a hostile way and would shut the conversation down. She did tell the Officer that [REDACTED] had been violent to her by pushing her down the stairs, but other than this [REDACTED] said nothing about the nature of the breakdown of

the relationship. The Officer was not made aware that [REDACTED] lived a very short distance away from [REDACTED] until relatively recently. The Officer was first involved with [REDACTED] in August of 2022 when [REDACTED] had a fall and was admitted to hospital. [REDACTED] then re-appeared in the life of [REDACTED] and began to take over in relation to decisions around [REDACTED]. She asked that the Officer and his family not visit [REDACTED] in hospital, which at the time the family found strange, but abided by the wishes of [REDACTED]. When [REDACTED] was eventually released from hospital, she was upset that [REDACTED] had taken control of everything, including her finances. From this point, multiple agencies were involved with [REDACTED] and she had carers visiting daily. The Officer visited less frequently from this point onward, after [REDACTED] had come back into the life of [REDACTED]. During the time that the Officer would visit [REDACTED] he did not go upstairs in her home at all (save perhaps for on one occasion to check her boiler). Nothing that he saw when he did visit gave him cause for concern in terms of the living conditions of [REDACTED]. Further, from 2022 [REDACTED] had carers attending on a daily basis, prior to that she had regular visits from nurses/doctors/people delivering her prescriptions. The Officer recalls a particular carer who visited [REDACTED] regularly over a twelve-month period [REDACTED] he spoke with [REDACTED] occasionally and would like to think that if [REDACTED] were living in squalor, then her carers would have raised concerns. [REDACTED] never raised with the Officer any concerns that she had about the living conditions of [REDACTED] neither did [REDACTED]. The Officer believes that [REDACTED] has made these allegations maliciously; he believes that she may be jealous of him and his family's relationship with [REDACTED] and of the gifts that [REDACTED] has given and generosity that [REDACTED] has shown to him and his family over the years. The Officer believes that [REDACTED] took an immediate interest in the financial position of [REDACTED] as soon as she reappeared in [REDACTED] life. The Officer believes that [REDACTED] was not named as a beneficiary in the will of [REDACTED] and has challenged that will.

Application to amend the Regulation 31 response.

On behalf of PC Carson, an application was made to provide an amended Regulation 31 response. The AA had no objections to that request.

The panel agreed to the provision of the amended Regulation 31.

Amended Regulation 31 response dated 12th May 2025

1. This amended response is made in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 31 of the Police (conduct) Regulations 2020 ("the Regulations") on behalf of PC Carson ("the officer")
2. In September 2020 [REDACTED] left work and began an access to nursing (or similar) course and having completed that went to university in the following academic year (2021)
3. The [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] family was born in [REDACTED] and the officer joined the police in February 2020 (he took a salary drop in doing so)
4. The matters referred to at paragraphs 2. and 3. above combined to reduce the family income. The officer was faced with an ever-growing food bill and increased costs of living. This put a strain on finances and there were occasions when the officer was close to being unable to afford the basics, such as food for his children.
5. This situation pertained until February 2024 when the pay of the Officer went up. By July 2024, [REDACTED] had got a job. Between 2020 and February 2024 things had gradually eased as the pay of the officer increased annually. That said, the family were by no means on an even financial keel. The family finances are strained even now.
6. [REDACTED] became aware of the financial struggles of the family when [REDACTED] started her access to nursing course. The Officer cannot recall exactly how it came up, but either he

or [REDACTED] will have told her. This will have been in general conversation and neither the Officer nor [REDACTED] ever asked for financial assistance; however, when it was offered by [REDACTED] they reluctantly accepted the offer. Their circumstances did not really give them much choice and they were very grateful for the help.

7. By the time that [REDACTED] found out that the family were struggling, she had already set up the Tesco's App in order to allow the Officer to shop for her (this had included small amounts for his fuel). Having found out about the family finances, [REDACTED] gave the Officer permission to use her card on the App to shop for his family. She made it clear that the Officer did not need permission to pay for the family shop at Tesco, he could just use this as and when he needed to. This included periods when [REDACTED] was in hospital.

8. In terms of other purchases made, it is right that those already specifically identified were gifts or items (such as the pressure washer; Shark vacuum cleaner) that [REDACTED] had ordered, did not use and told the Officer to keep. In respect of items that the Officer cannot recall the general assistance that [REDACTED] would give was that if the Officer could not afford to purchase things that the family or he needed, [REDACTED] would offer to step in and buy them. He would not ask her to do this; it arose when he went round to see her and in general conversation. An example of this is the vest that she purchased for him. Whilst chatting to her he told her that he needed to borrow the vest of a friend in order to use on a covert mission. [REDACTED] said that she was surprised that it was not issued, she will have known that he could not afford to buy his own and so she said that she wanted to buy one for him and did so.

9. In respect of orders for women's clothing, other than the Sainsburys Tu expense (this was a clothing gift for his children), the Officer did not order women's clothing either for himself or for [REDACTED]. Similarly, whilst the Officer did order from Amazon on occasion (both for the family as gifts or for small items that [REDACTED] needed) he was not responsible for all of the Amazon orders. Transactions prior to 6th December 2021 on Amazon could not have been the Officer as his first Amazon purchase was the 6 th December 2021.

10. The only other person who completed online orders with [REDACTED] was his wife, [REDACTED]

11. [REDACTED] was aware of the willingness of [REDACTED] to support the family through a difficult time financially and orders not done by the officer are likely to have been done by [REDACTED] with the support and permission of [REDACTED]. These are likely to include orders for clothing and orders for household items from companies such as Scotts of Stowe and Coopers of Stortford. Whether these were purchases for [REDACTED] family or for [REDACTED] herself the Officer cannot say.

12. [REDACTED] never expected or asked for repayment, the subject was never discussed. However, the Officer and [REDACTED] always intended to repay her once they had got back on track.

Witnesses:

The following witnesses gave live evidence:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] confirmed that she had given statements to the police regarding her involvement with [REDACTED] and PC Carson and [REDACTED]

In her statement she said that her partner was [REDACTED] Her mother was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] to PC Carson and [REDACTED]

said that she and had been estranged for . In 2022, was informed that was in hospital. went to visit in hospital.

Around Christmas 2023, went to visit at home address. had warned that house was "in a state".

confirmed that the house was not in a good state. It smelt. The downstairs floor was littered with unknown back bits. Areas of the floor smelt of urine and faeces. The toilet was completely blocked with faeces and toilet paper and there were faeces and stained tissue paper in the bath, as if had been using the bath as a toilet.

had been sleeping on the sofa. The house was thick with dust and looked like it had not been cleaned or dusted in an extremely long time. There was minimal food. The only food in the house was sweet things such as bars of chocolate and cakes.

said that she was extremely upset that her mother had been living like that.

told that PC Carson and lived next door and how wonderful they were. said that children would visit and that PC did everything for . said that PC Carson had been doing shopping when was unable to do so due to poor mobility.

went and introduced herself to . confirmed that she knew that had a daughter that lived nearby. asked why the Carsons had not contacted about the state of the house. said that they did not want to bother but said that they were aware of the blocked toilet and the state of the house and had been planning to get one of their relatives in to fix the toilet.

started to get house in order in terms of cleaning and maintenance to get the bathroom working again, but the task was beyond her. A carer schedule was arranged.

confirmed that she told Social Services about the state of the house and that could not return there after being discharged from hospital.

In early 2023, had a fall and an ambulance was called. and attended at address and PC Carson and were also present. was refusing to go to hospital, and the back door key to the house was missing. stated that she was holding a set of keys to address and PC Carson took the keys out of hand and said that he would keep hold of them in case there were any other issues.

said that she had regular contact with Carson as and PC were doing shopping.

said that she thought was being helpful as was helping set up direct debits as a lot of accounts were defaulting and she was not paying her bills.

says that there was one occasion when had been called out of work to go to address due to an issue with the carers. As pulled up, was outside talking to the carers. was annoyed that was interfering with the carers since and PC had left to live in such a state, but did not confront in any way as she did not suspect of anything at the time.

Around July 2023, [REDACTED] went to visit [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] took a binder full of [REDACTED] paperwork to [REDACTED]. The binder contained unpaid bills and bank statements. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] started to work through the paperwork to ensure that [REDACTED] finances were in order. At this point [REDACTED] did not suspect that anyone had been using [REDACTED] account, but some purchases raised concern as they were not the sort of things that [REDACTED] would have spent money on. The initial concerns were the volume of supermarket payments and the amount of money being spent as [REDACTED]. There were fuel payments. [REDACTED] did not own a car. There were regular Starbucks payments. [REDACTED] did not believe that [REDACTED] would know what Starbucks was and, in any event, [REDACTED] did not have the access or the ability to purchase from Starbucks as she was mostly housebound and did not have access to the internet.

[REDACTED] said that she was concerned that the carers had been using [REDACTED] bank card, but on checking the statements it became clear that the purchases predated the arrival of carers.

[REDACTED] then started to suspect PC Carson and [REDACTED] as they seemed to show interest in [REDACTED] finances, and they had access to [REDACTED] bank card as [REDACTED] had told [REDACTED] this fact over text.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] went to speak to [REDACTED] about what they had seen on [REDACTED] bank statements. [REDACTED] put the idea to [REDACTED] that it could be PC Carson and [REDACTED] making the purchases. [REDACTED] appeared shocked and angry and consented to [REDACTED] contacting the bank, whereupon [REDACTED] bank card was cancelled. When [REDACTED] called the bank, it was clear to [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] knew that she had to use "My voice is a password" to access her account. After that point it was clear that [REDACTED] could not interact further on the phone.

[REDACTED] asked for the online banking to be registered to [REDACTED] email address, but the bank informed [REDACTED] that they could not add her email address as there was already an email address on file. The bank confirmed that the email address was in the name of [REDACTED].

At this point [REDACTED] considered calling the police but did not want to accuse PC Carson and [REDACTED] of something so serious. [REDACTED] continued to work through the bank statements, highlighting the unexplained purchases.

In May 2024, [REDACTED] found a purchase on the bank statement dated the 24th September 2021 to Police Supplies UK. This led [REDACTED] to suspect that it was PC Carson who was using the card for his own means as [REDACTED] knew that he was a police officer. At that point the matter was reported to the police.

[REDACTED] was aware that the matter had been reported to the police and initially was supportive. However, she became less supportive. [REDACTED] held PC Carson in high regard and was defensive of him.

[REDACTED] took photographs of the inside of [REDACTED] address on 23rd August 2022, and these were provided to the panel.

In March 2023, [REDACTED] was aware that some bank statements remained at [REDACTED] house. [REDACTED] had collected some statements but not all of them.

[REDACTED] confirmed that there was no internet access at [REDACTED] address. [REDACTED] had no idea about technology, she did not own a mobile telephone, tablet or computer and [REDACTED] would have no way of buying anything online.

The bank agreed to reimburse [REDACTED] £10,000.

Cross examination

confirmed that had previously told people that was violent towards . denied that she had ever been violent towards . confirmed that could be extremely difficult and was a strong character. If got an idea in her head, whether that was right or wrong, would not shift. confirmed that although she was estranged from if and met in the street, they would engage in conversation. Boundaries had been set between and and there was little contact.

confirmed that she knew that next-door neighbour was in the police force. said that she was happy about this. said that was infatuated with anyone that wore a uniform.

stated that she was not aware that was prone to falling. confirmed that was taken to hospital on the 6th August 2022, but was later released, but was back in hospital by the 23rd August 2022. It was put to that in August 2022, had capacity to make her own decisions. said that was "Debatable and I questioned it".

said that she had no issues with PC Carson when she first met him. He seemed pleasant and friendly. said that she did not tell PC Carson that he could not visit in the hospital, apart from when there was a breakout of norovirus.

confirmed that on discharge from hospital, the ambulance staff returned to her home address and that would have needed assistance to get into the house. confirmed that Occupational Therapy had been to address.

Carers were later arranged and the carers went into house 4 times a day. confirmed that she worked in collaboration with PC Carson and . said that she was not looking to challenge PC Carson on a whim.

said that she had a conversation with and pointed out to that it would have been easy for to find out where lived.

says that it became clear that there was an issue with bank account because the direct debits were failing. The were withdrawing and told that PC Carson, and the children had not been to visit. denied that she was "giving off a vibe" that she did not want the to visit .

told that had no issues with PC Carson and that would let PC Carson have the bank card to do her shopping. suggested to that PC Carson was making many purchases from bank account and said "I don't think (PC Carson) has done it"

Questions from the panel.

said that when she came back into life there were no items in the house that stood out. There was not a Shark Vacuum cleaner in the house and there was not a pressure washer, adding that she doubted that would know what to do with a pressure washer. confirmed that there was an old Hoover in the house.

████████ stated that the back garden had a patio which had been laid when ██████████ was a child and there was a gravelled area which had been laid some years earlier. The garden was unkempt.

████████

████████ said that ██████████ is his partner. ██████████ is ██████████ mum.

████████ became aware that ██████████ was in hospital in 2022. ██████████ said that as he got on better with ██████████ and he went to visit her. ██████████ told him that ██████████ had been visiting and had brought ██████████ drinks and snacks.

When ██████████ came out of hospital, ██████████ went through the Wiltshire Farm Foods catalogue and then ██████████ completed the order using ██████████ bank card to make payment of £80. Wiltshire Farm Foods delivered the order to ██████████ address but then called ██████████ to say that the bank card had been declined.

████████ told ██████████ that her card had been declined, to which ██████████ said, "That's rubbish". ██████████ produced a second card that was the same as the one that ██████████ had tried to use previously. ██████████ asked ██████████ why she had a second card and ██████████ said that she did not know. ██████████ appeared confused and said that her card had gone missing and said that she would have to transfer money from her savings account to her current account.

The following day ██████████ asked ██████████ if she had transferred the money from her savings account. ██████████ said that she had, but upon speaking to Wiltshire Farm Foods, it was clear that the card was still being declined.

████████ told ██████████ that she could not have transferred the money, but ██████████ maintained that she had, as PC Carson had been round to do it as he was going to do a TESCO order. ██████████ then spoke to ██████████ and asked what the process was for moving money from ██████████ savings account to her current account. ██████████ said that she did not get involved with that, but PC Carson sorted the finances out.

████████ said that he asked ██████████ for the details to ██████████ TESCO app as he was going to take control of ██████████ shopping. ██████████ said that she would get the details.

████████ said that after a while he suspected that things were not right with ██████████ bank account. ██████████ was getting her pension and winter fuel allowance paid into her account, and despite being in hospital for a long time, there was no money in her account. ██████████ said that on one occasion, ██████████ asked for her bank card as she wanted to buy Christmas presents for the Carson Children. ██████████ said that he would get them selection boxes and ██████████ said that she normally spent around £60 to £70 on the ██████████ children. ██████████ said that was excessive.

████████ said that he was shocked by the state of the house. PC Carson was a police officer. ██████████ Both held caring roles and yet ██████████ was left in squalor.

Cross examination

████████ said that he had limited interaction with PC Carson, but that ██████████ spoke more to ██████████

████████ said that the ambulance staff brought ██████████ home when she was discharged from hospital. Paramedics had taken her to the hospital. ██████████ said

that he did not know if [REDACTED] had her prescriptions delivered, but he accepted that carers came to the house after [REDACTED] was discharged from hospital. [REDACTED] accepted that when [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were estranged, [REDACTED] did not have any contact with [REDACTED] saying that [REDACTED] could be difficult and untruthful.

[REDACTED] said that initially he did not know that [REDACTED] had a savings account. He only became aware of that when [REDACTED] mentioned transferring money.

Questions from the panel

[REDACTED] said that when he went to visit [REDACTED] after not seeing her for a number of years, he was aware that she had a new television. He did not see a pressure washer or a new vacuum cleaner. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] still had an old-style Dyson. [REDACTED] said that the rear garden was overgrown. There was a shed that had been built in the 1970's by [REDACTED] dad. The garden did have a paved area but was overgrown with brambles that had been growing for about 5 years.

PC [REDACTED]

She said that on the 18th May 2024, PC [REDACTED] spoke to [REDACTED] who gave her the background to the alleged incident.

PC [REDACTED] then spoke to [REDACTED] in the presence of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that she had known her neighbours, PC [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for 10 years. [REDACTED] had attended the [REDACTED] wedding. [REDACTED] spoke positively about PC [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] said that she had encouraged PC Carson to join the police and she was proud of PC Carson. [REDACTED] said that she and PC Carson were great friends and PC Carson helped her out a lot over the years, especially with her shopping, and she felt safe having a police officer living next door.

[REDACTED] said that she gave PC Carson her bank card to do her shopping and initially PC Carson returned the card, but then [REDACTED] allowed PC Carson to keep the card and told him that if he was out with the children to use the card to buy ice creams [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that she gave PC Carson her bank card around each of the [REDACTED] children's birthday and at Christmas time so that PC Carson could buy presents for the children from [REDACTED] as he would know what to buy them.

PC [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] about transactions not connected with grocery shopping, ice creams or children's presents, such as the transactions with Manscaped and Police Supplies. [REDACTED] became defensive and said that PC Carson had been helpful to her. [REDACTED] was very verbal about not wanting PC Carson to get into any trouble and was insistent that he should not be sacked, or she would ensure that whoever had made that decision was sacked.

PC [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] house was in a poor state. The house smelt of urine and was unclean.

PC [REDACTED] contacted Starbucks, who confirmed that PC Carson held an account with Starbucks, but they did not provide details of the bank card that was linked to the account.

PC [REDACTED] said that a transaction had been made from [REDACTED] account to Manscaped which sold male grooming items. Manscaped were able to confirm that someone with the name [REDACTED] had made a purchase on the 6th May 2022, giving [REDACTED] address as a billing address.

PC [REDACTED] confirmed that when she spoke to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said that PC Carson could use [REDACTED] card to buy presents for [REDACTED] but [REDACTED] did not make any reference to allowing him to purchase presents for PC Carson or [REDACTED].

also made no reference to allowing PC Carson to use her card for the purchase of petrol. also said that she allowed the card to be used for the purchase of food shopping and not PC Carson's shopping.

Cross examination

PC confirmed that when she attended address, PC initially spoke to but this was not in the presence or earshot of PC said that she believed that had told that PC was coming to talk to her about PC Carson. PC confirmed that became defensive only when PC asked about the unusual spending. PC confirmed that appeared to have warm feelings towards PC Carson and and gave the impression that she saw a lot of PC Carson and

PC said that she believed that relied on PC Carson and valued him for his support.

PC confirmed that told PC that she did not have access to the internet and appeared confused about her bank account and how that worked. PC said that she got the impression that if was doing online shopping, she would need assistance. had an old bank card in her purse.

appeared worried that PC Carson was going to get into trouble and the more questions PC asked, the more withdrew. said that she did not want to get PC Carson in trouble and was forceful on that point, saying that she did not want PC Carson to get sacked.

PC said that she asked about the transactions to Police Supplies and Manscaped because they did not fit with lifestyle, and after that did not want to engage with PC so PC could not go through each of the transactions.

The following witness statements were read by the panel

said that she was the sister of and had a difficult relationship and did not see each other for many years. said that a couple of years ago, went to see said that "despite their difficult relationship, was still her sister, and she wanted to know she was OK".

said that house was in a state. The carpet was littered with crumbs and bits and was very unclean and it looked like was sleeping on the sofa as there was bedding on the sofa.

was concerned as had swollen legs and was using the wall to steady herself, and did not look to be in good health. encouraged to go to the doctor. said that her neighbours were very good to her. said that the neighbours would do shopping for her and that they took her bank card with them.

contacted said that there was paperwork and bank statements scattered around address. collected the paperwork and gave it to

PC

protected under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act. However, I have chosen to do this as follows:

██████████ the allegations made relating to ██████████ who I will refer to as ██████████ within this statement, are completely untrue and come from her estranged family members who have been absent from ██████████ life for a good period in excess of 10 years. I know the period of absence has been this long, if not longer as I moved into my current home in February 2012 and during this time ██████████ has not been in contact with ██████████ in any way. Since this period, my relationship with ██████████ has grown into more than that of just, that of neighbours. We are very good friends, and I would consider ██████████ to be a grandmother figure to my children who are also very fond of her. I think she would be very upset to know this process remained ongoing if she was made aware. I know ██████████ is very fond of my children, referring to them as the closest thing to grandchildren that she has, or at least assumed to have as she does not have any contact with ██████████ ██████████ has spent many hours interacting and playing with my children in the garden during summer days and evenings, partaking in barbeques and such like. ██████████ has watched my children grow up ensuring she always celebrated Christmas, Easter and their individual birthdays. Not to mention treating them throughout the year with chocolate and the like. ██████████ came to my wedding in 2015 and became good friends with ██████████ ██████████. Respectively they still talk, still ask about each other to this day, and on the odd occasion my nan comes to the house will pop in and have a chat. I feel like this has been an important part of ██████████ life due to her family being so absent. She has reluctantly to her become a part of our family. I say reluctantly, as she never feels entitled to, and I will use words used by her in the past, 'intrude'. I find this very sad to think that she feels as though interacting and being part of our family would be intrusive. I often think that if I were to move house, who would she see and interact with on a daily basis. Over the years I've tried to raise the topic of her relationship with ██████████ ██████████ more so around Christmas, however this has always been met with hostility and been shut down very quickly. I have never been aware of the full breakdown of the relationship, nor have I tried to find out more as that is not my business. But it was clear that ██████████ was not interested in resurrecting the relationship. Until recently, I was not aware that ██████████ lived only a couple of hundred yards down the road from ██████████. I am aware that ██████████ and her daughter ██████████ do not have a relationship even now when attending her house. ██████████ will remain in the car, and ██████████ ██████████ will go inside for a few minutes per visit. I've seen this first hand and it's usually to drop off a bag of groceries. Over the years ██████████ has alluded that their relationship broke down after the passing of ██████████ ██████████ husband. A number of years prior to me knowing ██████████ when ██████████ left home and grew close, grew a closer relationship with her aunt, who until recently I have only known as ██████████ ██████████ again an absent family member. I am aware from brief conversations that ██████████ moved to the ██████████ area when she married her husband, ██████████ ██████████ a long time ago. I do have a landline telephone number for ██████████. I got this from ██████████ many years ago on the understanding that should anything happen to ██████████ I was to contact ██████████ for that reason and that reason only. I have never been given any contact information for ██████████. When I moved into my home, ██████████ would often walk to, to the nearby bus stop and get a bus to the local shops. Even when the walk would take her a bit of time, again in her words, her "legs are bugged". I can't remember exactly when it, when it may be around 2016/2017, but it was during the spell of bad weather, I recall her falling over on one of her trips to the shops. She was cared for by members of public and put in a taxi home. I only discovered this a few days later, but she was insistent that she was fine, and doctors and nurses had been to see her at home. It is not uncommon to see the nurses attend her address to give check-ups and flu jabs etcetera. After that I offered to pick up a few bits for ██████████ to avoid her going out, just some basic things like milk and bread. This seems to be the, this seemed to be the start of helping ██████████. It seemed like the fall had knocked her confidence in some way, seemed relieved by the offer. I would drive her to the shops, help her with the shopping and then drive her home. She would sometimes withdraw cash from the ATM at Tesco Widnes and/or Warrington and use the cash to pay or

sometimes hold onto the cash and use her bank card. I recall one occasion there was an issue with her bank card. I can't recall in detail if it was a funds issue or new card and not the right, not the right pin number but I paid for her shopping, and she arranged for the money to be transferred back into my account. This was the day she discovered I did not need my bank card and was amazed that I could use my mobile phone to pay for things. I showed her the Tesco app that linked my club card and payment card together and she was amazed that you could do such a thing. Working full time and with ██████████ to look after it was not always possible to drive ██████████ to the shops. Typically, this would take a number of hours for a round trip due to ██████████ not being able to walk particularly quickly, and so I introduced her to the world of online shopping. This seemed to be the best thing since sliced bread for ██████████ she loved the idea that she could stay at home and have her shopping delivered. Her only previous knowledge of a service like this was by using the phone to order from the likes of QVC Shopping Channels or the Better Ware Magazine delivered via post. I registered her with an email address with the outlook (email address provided) in order to register her with her Tesco online grocery and club card account. This was used to order ██████████ shopping online and it's, and have it delivered to her address. Due to the new transactions being unusual, ██████████ needed authorisation from the bank, and so she made a call to them. From (inaudible) transactions, the bank needed to issue a one-time passcode to verify it was her making the transactions online. However, as ██████████ does not have a mobile, my mobile was provided to receive the text messages too. The bank also asked for contact, for a contact email address and again my email was used. Upon reflection and considering the current investigation, I realised that I should have simply provided the one I generated for the Tesco account. However, at the time it was merely a point of contact, and I didn't give it much thought. I was as always simply trying to help with upright intentions. There was no sinister intention behind my action. On occasion we would still go to the shops in order for ██████████ to go out of the house and look around the different areas of Tesco, such as Homeware etcetera, but mainly it would be done online. There were frequent occasions when ██████████ would require some shopping but not enough to place an online order due to the minimum charge and delivery fees etcetera. She would ask me to pick up items and try to give me her bank card. Initially I paid for items and gave her the receipt, and she would give me cash to the equivalent value. However, as the amount of cash she had at home reduced, she was insistent that I take her card. I advised I didn't want to do this as I didn't want or need to know her pin number, instead we added her card to my Tesco app. This is when ██████████ became more insistent that I use it. If I was going to buy her shopping, then I was to fill the car with petrol and to not worry about it. I didn't feel comfortable; however she was, she insisted that this was, is what I do and became emotional if I didn't. This continued for a number of years, and I would sit in ██████████ house with her and order whatever items she would ask for, then inputting her bank card details to complete the order. At no point did I retain her bank card. On occasion she would request a full shop at short notice and suitable delivery slot would not be available, for example having the shopping delivered between 22:00 and 23:00 hours isn't suitable for her so I would do a click and collect slot and go to collect the shopping for her. Again, ██████████ was insistent that I put petrol in my car for doing so. The introduction of online shopping led ██████████ to explore what else could be purchased online as this was a completely new experience for her. Instead of giving cash to the children for Birthdays, she would approve online purchase for gifts, typically toys from Amazon or similar sites. I did make one purchase after ██████████ used my account as I was registered for Prime and eligible for free delivery. Unfortunately, that purchase went through on ██████████ card. This was quickly realised and I immediately informed ██████████ I assured her I would pay her back and that her card had been removed from the account. This was an oversight, and I addressed it with her promptly. She laughed it off and insisted I did not need to pay her back. In hindsight, considering this investigation, I regret not paying the money, regardless of her wishes to ensure a clear audit trail. I cannot recall when this transaction occurred or its value. As the time progressed, I would be asked by ██████████ to take cheques and pay them into the Bank/Post Office to pay utility bills and so on. Again, this was done for a period of time, and I discussed Direct Debits with her, trying to encourage a modern way of paying

bills. This was when I set up energy bills with Eon Energy and if I recall right, we did the same for a BT account, telephone account to be paid by Direct Debit but I'm not a hundred percent sure on this one. I assume that it was all set up because I can't really recall the last time, she asked me to pay a bill with a cheque. She did not have a subscription for Sky or anything like that and she said her Council Tax was already sorted. This was the only involvement I had with ██████ finances, as she is a woman with capacity and other than mobility which I knew her GP was aware of and her periodic home visits, I did not need nor want to involve myself any further. Further down the line ██████ wanted to treat the ██████ more and more. She tried to give me her bank card on numerous occasions because she no longer kept cash in the house and wanted me to treat the children during half term and on days out etcetera. I was not comfortable taking her bank card, and so I reluctantly agreed that rather than take her bank card when we went on days out etcetera, I would use apps on my phone similar to the Tesco one such as Costa, Starbucks and Greggs to load the money onto respective cards to a value of her choosing, and then use the credit as and when leaving ██████ in possession of her bank card at all times. ██████ made it clear that she was very grateful for the help provided to her and would often try to provide money or offer to pay for things in some sort of way, insisting by now that when I nipped to Tesco I use her card and that I had full permission to do so for my own products as well as hers.

In a similar way, the same, ██████ does when we visit her, slipping cash into a pocket to pay for petrol and coming to see her, sneaking money to the children etcetera because she knew I would say no, and then claim that she is being offended and upset should I refuse. This is the type of relationship we had. That relationship has sadly broken down over recent months to the point of upset on Christmas Day because we could not go and wish her a Merry Christmas. Over the years we have always ensured ██████ had a Christmas dinner and that we went and spent some time with her on Christmas morning as we always have done, because if we didn't, she wouldn't see anyone. Alike that on most Sundays during the Winter when cooking a Sunday roast, we would always make sure we cooked enough to plate up a dinner for her and take it round. Not for any other reason than to try and involve her in our life. She would never agree to come into our home, as again in her words, it's our family home, for just us. And that I should hug the children and my wife and close the door to the world, but she was always grateful for the involvement. I am genuinely saddened and sickened that my actions to help, support and look after ██████ be misconstrued as an attempt to gain financially from her. It's also deeply insulting to my intelligence and integrity as a serving Police Officer to suggest that I would blatantly use my own details such as name, address, email and telephone number. As well as gifts sent to my home address if I was stealing from her. I am truly perplexed by this accusation. Surely, it's plain to see that an unscrupulous man would conceal these actions, use false names, VPN's and different addresses as a modus operandi. I sincerely hope I have conveyed my deep gratitude for ██████ generosity into making numerous purchases as gifts for me and our family over the years. As mentioned at the start of this statement, some of these purchases I can recall, while others I have no knowledge or recollection of. Her kindness and thoughtfulness have always been greatly appreciated. I will now address specifics.

Police Supply Purchase. ██████ was extremely happy and proud that I joined the Police in 2020, often telling stories of a late Uncle who was also a Police Officer and that she admired as a little girl growing up. From the day of joining, she wanted to buy me something, but I explained that all I need is provided for by the Force with the exception of my boots, a purchase that had already been made. Forgetting the above conversation we had, when I joined about 18 months prior chatting one day about work as we often would, I mentioned that I was working the plain clothes overtime shift, and I needed to pick up a vest from a colleague that I would wear under my coat to hold my radio etcetera. ██████ was delighted by this and said she would buy me one if the Force did not issue them. I found one online and the purchase was made with her full consent in her presence.

02 Upgrade. A purchase made with the consent and in the presence of [REDACTED] after she was upset having missed [REDACTED] birthday a few days earlier. She knew that [REDACTED] wanted a new watch, and paid the fee involved. To be clear that this fee was a one-off fee as an upgrade charge the contract and monthly payments made remained at my name, in my account, paid from my bank account.

Manscapes Order. Another purchase made with the consent and in the presence of [REDACTED] as a gift to me. She was adamant on buying me this after seeing the product advertised and that, and it's being the best one on the market. The transaction failed and I said not to worry about it, and that I didn't need it. The next day she asked to try again and that she would close the bank down if it did not work again. It failed and I said not to worry as I didn't need it. A couple of days later she was insistent on trying again. I set about the order, inputting my details as I would any other order assuming it would fail again. This time it worked, and I explained to her that it would be delivered to my house and I would let her know when it had been delivered.

Man Cave. Another purchase made on the back of a general chat, laughing about [REDACTED] growing up and using my shower gels, so [REDACTED] being [REDACTED] told me to order some for him from the website.

Scott's Of Stow. I've no knowledge of Scott's of Stow but from looking online they appear to be another homeware retailer, similar to that of QVC. I don't recall purchasing anything from here for her, but I do recall [REDACTED] placing an online order some Christmas decorations she had seen in a magazine, so it could be this.

[REDACTED] living conditions. With regards to the living conditions of [REDACTED] this is a lady of capacity and a stern if not stubborn proudness of her home in which she lives. Often telling me various stories about how her and [REDACTED] purchased the building as a former convenience shop, stripped it back to nothing and built the home she lives in now. She has made remarks over the years of wanting to give the place a lick of paint but not wanting to disturb what [REDACTED] had worked so hard on. I had no reason to go upstairs so I'm not aware of the conditions of the bathroom or issues with the toilet. One occasion I took my vacuum in and give the downstairs a going over when [REDACTED] was feeling run down, but I got the impression that she didn't like this, although nothing was actually said.

I am aware that [REDACTED] pays a monthly fee to a company through a charity such as Age UK or something similar that entitles them, her to a handyman of some sort of service. She has made me aware of numerous tasks she has had them carry out such as leaking kitchen tap, or a dodgy light switch etcetera. And similar odd jobs, but never an issue with the bath or toilet. During the Summer of 2022 [REDACTED] had fallen in her home and we think from what NWSA advised, spent a period of 3 nights on the floor in her living room and had sadly soiled herself. I was deployed to the Commonwealth Games in Birmingham at the time, so I had little knowledge around this particular incident as it was [REDACTED] who had found her, having been concerned not hearing from her for a few days. Usually when we pull up, [REDACTED] would pass out our mail or engage in conversation. Something I've got used to over the years and she does not have any visitors. On this occasion, [REDACTED] had to climb through an unlocked kitchen window to gain entry and call for an ambulance. This is when we first had any involvement with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was admitted to hospital for mixed periods over the next few months. [REDACTED] took over more and more and asked that we stop visiting [REDACTED] in hospital because it was not helping with her recovery. We thought it was strange but did not question this and looked forward to [REDACTED] coming home. When [REDACTED] come home, I visited and she was upset that [REDACTED] had taken over things, angry that she had been in the house and had moved things around and explained that [REDACTED] had taken over Power of attorney and cancelled all of her cards. She seemed upset by this as she was not going to be able to treat the family the way she always has without asking their permission. I thought of challenging this as she seemed more than upset by it, however given the multiple agencies involved at this stage I trusted that it had all been done above board. I explained to

██████ that they are all her family at the end of the day and that whilst it's unpleasant and she became unwell; it may have been a blessing in disguise for her and ██████ ██████ are now on talking terms. She explained that she had also been in contact with her sister who is going to come and visit, which again is a positive thing for her. ██████ remained at home and had frequent carers calling throughout the day to look after her. We still speak on occasion, however since this has dwindled significantly as I am fearful that it will be misconstrued also. This tends to be through the window, only now as ██████ is unable to stand for periods of time at the door and there is a key safe on the property for which I do not know the code, so unless the carers are present, I cannot gain entry to the property to speak to her in person. I am just glad that ██████ does have carers visiting frequently so that she is not alone.

During the course of 2024, prior to this investigation, I certainly noticed a decline in ██████ health and spoke to the carers when passing as she, she has a main carer called, in her own words, ██████ the ██████ who spends a lot of time with ██████ and seems to really care and enjoy the job she does. I have mentioned to her on occasion that the night carers would sometimes visit as late as 11pm. She was outraged by this as ██████ should take a particular medication at 10 because it needs to be spaced out by so many hours or of another, another medication. This was also raised to ██████ ██████ not sure if this relates to the decline of ██████ health.

These malicious allegations in my opinion stem from someone who does not have ██████ best interest at heart, instead they appear to be driven by jealousy and resentment towards the relationship I have with ██████ Possibly fuelled by concerns over reduction in any inheritance they may receive. These allegations are based on assumptions rather than facts and ██████ herself does not support them. While I understand how it may appear to an outsider, a simple conversation could have resolved any concerns. I have never taken advantage of ██████ Aside from the error I mentioned regarding the Amazon purchase, I have never spent money without ██████ consent or knowledge. I have always treated her with the same care and respect as I would a family member as she is very much a part of our extended family. It sickens me to think that anyone could believe there is any truth to these allegations. My commitment to ██████ wellbeing has always been paramount. I have consistently acted in the best interests ensuring her comfort and happiness. This ordeal has a profound and negative impact on ██████ myself and ██████ They have lost someone they viewed as a guardian and role model. ██████ has referred to ██████ as the closest thing she has to ██████ While I would never prevent them from interacting, I will now be hesitant about the level of interaction fearing further accusations. As I have already mentioned, this has been a horrible experience for me, ██████ ██████ and my wider family due to the negative impact on our daily lives ██████ ██████ Not to mention the financial strain. I am confident ██████ has also felt the injustice of this situation. I am disappointed to be subject to further investigation given that an external police force has already determined there is no case to answer. I trust that Merseyside Police will expedite their investigation just as Cheshire Constabulary did. This entire process has been deeply distressing, and I hope for a swift resolution and restore peace and normality to our lives.

Conclusion: With the aforementioned account submitted with complete transparency in mind, I firmly believe that I have not breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour, specifically Honesty and Integrity, Discreditable Conduct, nor Duties and Responsibilities. I do not believe that my behaviour amounts to any form of misconduct. Throughout my career I have always been committed to maintaining the highest levels of professionalism, ensuring that my actions reflect the values and responsibility of my role as a Police Officer in line with the oath I swore at my attestation. I now wish to exercise my right to silence'

Character bundle

The panel have received and reviewed a bundle of statements from people who knew PC Carson.

The Issues to be Considered

The Standards of Professional Behaviour for all police officers are set out in the regulations and are expanded upon in the College of Policing Code of Ethics, which all officers are expected to adhere to.

The panel was reminded of the following:

The panel must not speculate about other matters such as other evidence it believes might be available, what it believes someone else might have said, or what it believes some other document, not in the bundle, might have said. If there are, in the panel's judgement, 'holes' or 'gaps' in the evidence, then that is a matter that the panel must consider in deciding whether the AA has proved the allegations it makes.

Misconduct' is defined as a breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action, and 'Gross Misconduct' is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.

For an adverse finding against the officer, it is not necessary for every single fact/allegation made against him in the Regulation 30 Notice to be proved. It is sufficient to prove only some of the facts/allegations, so long as what is proved amounts to a breach of the standard (or one of the standards) identified in the Regulation 30 Notice.

The panel noted that it is the AA who brings these allegations - it is the AA, therefore, who must prove them.

This standard of proof is concerned with whether the panel is satisfied something has been proved on "the balance of probabilities". These are not criminal proceedings, and the panel does not need to be 'sure' of the matters founding any of the charges.

The starting and ending point of the panel's analysis of these allegations is the wording of the Regulation 30 Notice. Those are the matters the AA seeks to prove. The panel is only determining the allegations set out in the Regulation 30 Notice and nothing more.

The panel was provided with a number of statements from people who know the officer personally and professionally. In accordance with the case of *Donkin v The Law Society*, it is correct that these character references were provided to the panel at this stage. Where the issue is dishonesty, evidence of good character, is relevant to credibility and propensity.

The panel must consider the character evidence in addition to the evidence it had heard in the hearing room or read in the hearing bundles.

Good character arises from the lack of any previous findings against the officer

Good character is not a defence to the allegation, but it is relevant to the panel's consideration of the case. The fact that the Officer has not offended in the past may make it less likely that he acted as is now alleged against him

Any assertions of fact in those character statements pertaining to these particular allegations must be disregarded

The weight to be attached to the character evidence is a matter for the panel. But the panel must state what weight, if any, it has put on the character evidence in its written reasons.

The panel was advised that the authorities are clear that the concepts of dishonesty and want of integrity are separate and distinct.

The leading case on integrity is *Wingate, Evans and Malins v SRA 2018* which states

“Integrity is a broader concept than honesty

Integrity connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one’s own professional. That involves more than mere honesty. To take an example a solicitor conducting negotiations or a barrister making submissions to a judge or arbitrator will take particular care not to mislead. Such a professional person is expected to be even more scrupulous about accuracy than a member of the public in daily discourse.

The duty to act with integrity applies not only to what professional persons say, but also to what they do.

Obviously neither courts nor professional tribunals must set unrealistically high standards... The duty of integrity does not require professional people to be paragon of virtue. In every instance professional integrity is linked to the manner in which that particular profession professes to serve the public.”

The panel was advised that the officer had chosen not to give live evidence.

The panel were referred to the case of *Iqbal v SRA 2012* which stated, “Of course he was perfectly entitled to decline to give evidence, but it has been a principle in civil courts from time immemorial to take into account a person’s failure to give evidence when reaching a conclusion in respect of him.”

The panel were also referred to *Kuzmin v GMC* which held that, there has to be a prima facie case before an adverse inference is drawn and obviously any adverse inference by itself is not evidence, it has to support other material, but if both these things are in place and adverse inference can be drawn from a failure to attend or to give evidence to the extent that is fair, just and reasonable.

The panel took the following approach:

- a. First, to consider the facts of the case and to make findings in relation to each of the facts alleged by the AA.
- b. Second, to determine if facts were found proved, whether they constituted one or more breach(es) of the relevant Standards.
- c. Third, to consider if any conduct is found proven against PC Carson if that amounts to Misconduct or Gross Misconduct
- d. Fourth, if appropriate, to decide what the outcome should be.

The panel considered the bundle of evidence served and the amended regulation 31 response of the 12th May 2026 together with the bundle of character references that were provided on behalf of PC Carson and the live evidence given to the panel, when making its decision.

The panel did not draw any improper conclusion from the absence of PC Carson.

Assessment of the witnesses

██████████ ██████████

The panel had no doubt about the accuracy of the evidence given by ██████████ ██████████ but accepted that she ultimately had personal issues with PC Carson and that her judgement of PC Carson may have been adversely coloured by her views of PC Carson.

██████████ ██████████

The panel found [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to be a reliable and credible witness when giving evidence in relation to the events. The panel found that he did not embellish.

PC [REDACTED]

The panel found PC [REDACTED] to be a reliable and credible witness. PC [REDACTED] evidence on her interaction with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was clear and consistent.

PC Carson

The panel did not draw any improper conclusion from the absence of PC Carson. Once the panel had accepted that there was a prima facie case against PC Carson, the panel reminded itself that it was entitled to draw an adverse inference from PC Carson's failure to give evidence to the extent that it was fair, just and reasonable.

The panel concluded that it was able to draw an adverse inference from the failure to give evidence. The panel concluded that PC Carson had found that he was unable to answer questions and account for the spending on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] bank account.

Character witnesses

The panel had the opportunity to read the character witnesses statements when deciding on outcome. The panel accepted that the character witnesses were all providing their honest accounts of PC Carson. The panel noted that PC Carson had no previous findings of misconduct recorded against him or any convictions or cautions and reminded themselves of the good character direction that it had been given.

The panel have also concluded from this character assessment that PC Carson has no propensity towards dishonesty or lack of integrity.

Admitted or proven facts

The panel found the following facts to be admitted or proven

1. From at least 2015, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] lived [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to PC Carson [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was elderly and [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. She was isolated and became increasingly vulnerable over time as [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
3. In 2022, the Local Authority were not involved in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] care and there was no care package in place for [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
4. Medical records show that in 2022, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had capacity.
5. A summary of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] medical records was provided to the panel and was headed "Draft agreed facts". This sets out dates on which [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was admitted to hospital.
6. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was estranged from her [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
7. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] lived in close proximity to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
8. Initially PC Carson, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] were neighbours, but that relationship changed and they became friends. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was fond of PC Carson, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] PC [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] began to do jobs for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which included doing her shopping.
9. To allow PC Carson to do her shopping, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] gave PC Carson access to her bank accounts and bank card.
10. PC Carson added [REDACTED] [REDACTED] bank card to his TESCO app.
11. During the period February 2020 and May 2023 PC Carson [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] caused purchases to be made on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] bank card, that were not commensurate with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] lifestyle.
12. PC Carson registered his email address with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] bank accounts giving him the ability to transfer funds between accounts and carry out online transactions.

13. In 2019 PC Carson declared to the police that he had a default notice for a credit card, catalogue agreement and mobile telephone contracts which were in a repayment plan. He also had a County Court Judgement from 2013.
14. PC Carson and [REDACTED] were in financial difficulties in 2020.
15. PC Carson and [REDACTED] never contacted adult Social Services or any other agency or made any referral through the police to get [REDACTED] assistance.
16. [REDACTED] lived in squalor. The house was dirty and unsanitary. [REDACTED] slept downstairs on the sofa.

The regulation 30 notice asserts that [REDACTED] daughter believed [REDACTED] was smitten with PC Carson and held him in high esteem due in part to the fact that he was a police officer.

Whilst the panel accepted that [REDACTED] believed that [REDACTED] was smitten with PC Carson and held PC Carson in high esteem due in part to the fact that he was a police officer, the panel noted that was only [REDACTED] opinion, and that did not mean that it is a correct assertion of the fact.

However, the panel noted that it is clear from the evidence of PC [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] valued PC Carson's support, thought highly of him and did not want to get him into trouble.

The panel found that PC Carson also had access to [REDACTED] savings account and was involved in the transfer of up to £10,864 from [REDACTED] savings account to her current account to ensure there were sufficient funds to cover continued spending from the current account. Money was transferred from [REDACTED] savings account to her current account on multiple occasions. The panel noted that [REDACTED] bank account became overdrawn and a transfer was made on the 3rd September 2021 from [REDACTED] savings account to her current account to take her out of overdraft. Several days later there was a significant purchase that put [REDACTED] back into overdraft. The panel did not accept that [REDACTED] had the technological ability to make the transfers from her savings account to her current account either at all or without significant assistance. [REDACTED] did not have a mobile telephone, computer or tablet and her house did not have internet access.

Findings on the disputed breaches of The Standards of Professional Behaviour

Honesty and integrity

The panel find that PC Carson acted dishonestly in using [REDACTED] bank account.

[REDACTED] told PC [REDACTED] that she had given PC Carson permission to use her bank account to purchase [REDACTED] shopping, to purchase ice creams for the children and to buy Christmas and birthday presents for the Carson children.

The panel find that PC Carson knew that there were parameters to his use of [REDACTED] bank account and what those limitations were. PC Carson then used the bank account to make numerous purchases outside the parameters of his authorised use.

PC [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] about transactions that were unrelated to her shopping, ice creams and presents for the children, such as purchases from Manscaping and Police supplies. [REDACTED] then became defensive and said that PC Carson had been helpful to her. [REDACTED] then became verbal about not wanting to get PC Carson into trouble and was insistent that he should not be sacked.

[REDACTED] was happy to tell PC [REDACTED] that she had given PC Carson limited authority to use the account, but when further transactions were pointed out, [REDACTED] became defensive. The panel find that this was because [REDACTED] knew that PC Carson had overstepped the use of the card and gone outside the authorised parameters of use and that

he was going to get into trouble, and she did not want that to happen as she was fond of him.

The panel also note that PC Carson in his Regulation 31 response stated that [REDACTED] had made the online purchases. PC Carson said he had registered his email address with the bank only so that he could verify the transactions. Transactions only happened in the presence of [REDACTED] and in relation to purchases she had made. PC Carson said that he added [REDACTED] bank card to his TESCO app in order to do [REDACTED] shopping and to pay for petrol to cover his expenses when PC Carson travelled to do [REDACTED] shopping. PC Carson said that he never purchased anything without the express permission of [REDACTED]

In the amended Regulation 31 response, PC Carson stated that [REDACTED] had given him permission to use her card. [REDACTED] had made it clear that PC Carson did not need permission to pay for PC Carson's family shop, including times when she was in hospital.

The panel found that PC Carson had amended his Regulation 31 response at such a late stage in the proceedings, because he realised that he had to justify why purchases were being made from [REDACTED] account when she was in hospital.

Panel whilst accepting late submission of the amended Regulation 31 response noted that the late amendment was after the AA had closed its case and the change in stance that PC Carson showed in his amended Regulation 31 response regarding bank statement entries and expenditure in particular influenced the panels view that the officer lacked credibility.

The panel found that it was unclear as to whether PC Carson had physical possession of [REDACTED] bank card, but they did find that PC Carson did have [REDACTED] bank details saved to Amazon and the TESCO app.

It was clear to the panel that PC Carson was not the only person making transactions on [REDACTED] bank account. The panel accepted that [REDACTED] was also making transactions from [REDACTED] bank account. However, the panel found that PC Carson was also responsible for the transactions that [REDACTED] made. [REDACTED] had originally given PC Carson access to her accounts, but PC [REDACTED] actions enabled [REDACTED] also to make purchases from [REDACTED] bank account.

In deciding whether PC Carson was dishonest, the Panel approached that question by taking the following approach as per Ivey v Genting Casino

- a. The panel found that PC Carson knew that he had limited authority to use [REDACTED] bank account at the time when he made the unauthorised purchases. The panel considered the reasonableness of what PC Carson said that he knew or believed at the time.
- b. The panel considered that PC Carsons conduct in light of his knowledge at the time was dishonest by the objective standard of ordinary decent people.

The panel find that ordinary decent people would know that it was dishonest to use [REDACTED] bank account to make unauthorised purchases.

The panel also accept that by acting dishonestly, PC Carson did not act with integrity.

In accordance with the case of Chief constable of Thames Valley Police Misconduct Panel v White, PC Carson did not behave as "The totally correct police officer would" and as a police officer PC Carson did not do "the right thing".

On the balance of probabilities, the panel find that PC Carson used [REDACTED] bank account to benefit PC Carson and his family and acted dishonestly and without integrity

Discreditable conduct regarding the bank account

The panel reminded themselves that in order to prove a breach of the Standard relating to Discreditable Conduct, it is not necessary to prove that actual discredit has been brought to the police service; it is sufficient that the officer's behaviour had the potential to do so.

The standard of Professional behaviour states "Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty."

The panel find that members of the public expect police officers to act to a high moral code. The public do not expect police officers to act in a dishonest manner and without integrity. The panel believe that if members of the public were to find out that a serving police officer had acted dishonestly and without integrity, they would be shocked and PC Carson's actions therefore have the potential to discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in the police service.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel find that by PC Carson using [REDACTED] bank account in the way in which he did, it was likely to bring the police service into disrepute and find the breach of Standard of Professional Behaviour in relation to Discreditable Conduct to be proven.

Discreditable conduct in relation to not contacting social services or other agencies regarding the squalor in [REDACTED] house.

The panel find that there is evidence to show that [REDACTED] was living in squalor.

The panel acknowledge that other professionals, such as ambulance staff, medical staff and carers entered [REDACTED] home at various times.

Other than the hospital, there is no evidence that any person made a safeguarding referral. The panel find that PC Carson visited [REDACTED] regularly and he never raised a safeguarding issue or concern.

[REDACTED] held PC Carson in high esteem, partly due to him being a police officer.

Police officers are expected to meet high standards. Police officers are given training on vulnerabilities, and the expectation is that when such squalor is seen that a safeguarding referral will be made. PC Carson was a response officer and would be well aware of the need to complete a vulnerable persons referral form. The fact that no other professional made a referral is irrelevant.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel find that PC Carson breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour of Discreditable Conduct in that he failed to contact social services or other agencies to assist [REDACTED] despite the level of squalor that was apparent in her house.

Misconduct or Gross Misconduct

Gross misconduct - Is defined as so serious that the sanction of dismissal without notice could be justified.

Misconduct – A breach of the standards of professional behavior so serious as to justify disciplinary action.

The panel finds that all breaches individually and collectively amount to gross misconduct, namely a breach of the Standards of Professional Behavior that is so serious as to justify dismissal without notice. This is due to the nature and severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behavior.

Approach to Sanction

The panel heard submissions on sanctions from Ms Hill and Ms Barlow.

The panel also received advice from Mrs Wilson.

The panel considered the Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Hearings, and the panel bore this in mind in its deliberations.

The panel had sight of and considered PC Carson's service record.

The panel adopted the three-stage process as outlined in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings to determine the appropriate sanction.

The panel bore in mind the threefold purposes of the police misconduct regime namely:

- (a) Maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
- (b) Uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct
- (c) Protect the public

The panel was reminded that misconduct proceedings are not designed to punish police officers,

"The panel is then centrally concerned with the reputation or standing of the profession rather than the punishment of the doctor" (or police officer) per *Rachid v General Medical Council*.

The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the conduct.

This is assessed by reference to

The officer's culpability

The harm caused by the misconduct

The existence of aggravating features

The existence of mitigating features

The panel noted that the College of Policing Guidance on Police Conduct Hearings reminded the panel that it must look at the appropriateness of the least onerous sanction before going on to consider more onerous sanctions and always choose the least severe outcome that deals adequately with the issues identified whilst protecting the public interest. If an outcome is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings impose it even where this would lead to difficulties for the individual officer.

The panel first considered the seriousness of the proven allegations.

Outcome

The panel directed itself that it must consider the officers' conduct is not serious simply because the same action on his part involves him breaching multiple Standards of Professional Behavior. The panel accepted that it is the conduct proven that matters, not the number of Standards of Professional Behavior he has breached.

Culpability

The panel considered that PC Carson's conduct was intentional, deliberate and planned. PC Carson purchased items for the benefit of himself and his family. When [REDACTED] account went into overdraft, arrangements were made for money to be transferred from the savings account to the current account in order for him to continue being able to make purchases on [REDACTED] account.

The panel found that PC Carson held a position of trust in relation to [REDACTED] PC Carson adopted a caring role in relation to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in evidence said that she liked the fact that a police officer lived next door to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] held PC Carson in high regard.

The panel found that this is not a case of operational dishonesty.

The panel found that PC Carson's actions occurred when he was off duty.

The panel found that [REDACTED] was vulnerable. PC Carson recognised her vulnerability or should have recognised it. [REDACTED] was isolated and her mobility was deteriorating. These events commenced during COVID lockdown.

The panel assessed the culpability as high

Harm

The panel found that [REDACTED] suffered financial loss. Unauthorised transactions were made on her bank account and in addition when the account went into overdraft, [REDACTED] had to pay bank charges.

The panel found that if the public found out about PC Carson's acts then there was potential for public confidence in the police force to be undermined.

The panel found that the public would be shocked to hear that a police officer had breached the Standards of Professional Behavior of Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct and PC Carson's actions would impact on the standing and reputation of the police profession as a whole.

The panel assessed the harm as high.

Aggravating features

The panel was mindful not to double count matters that have already formed part of the assessment of culpability and harm.

The panel found that PC Carson committed these acts for financial gain or personal advantage.

PC Carson continued making unauthorised transactions after he realised or should have realised that it was improper to do so. When [REDACTED] bank account went into overdraft, that should have alerted PC Carson as to exactly how much money was being spent.

There was a failure by PC Carson to raise concerns or seek advice from other police officers or his supervision about [REDACTED] living conditions.

The panel found that there were aggravating features.

Mitigating features

The panel noted that PC Carson continued to work in the intervening years and performed his duties to a high standard and received a Chief Superintendent Commendation in February 2024 and as a consequence found that there were mitigating factors.

However, notwithstanding the above, the panel did not find that PC Carson has shown any evidence of genuine remorse, insight into his actions or accepted responsibility for his actions.

Taking all matters into consideration, the panel assessed the seriousness of the conduct as high.

Personal mitigation

The panel was mindful as to the weight that they should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings and that the interests of the police service and the protection of the public are more important than those of the individual officer.

The panel accepted that PC Carson has no previous misconduct finding.

The panel also had sight of PC Carson's record of service and the character references and noted that PC Carson had no propensity towards dishonesty or lack of integrity

The panel considered PC Carson's personal mitigation and gave it limited weight.

Sanction

The College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings reminded the panel that the panel must look at the appropriateness of the least onerous sanction before going on to consider the more onerous sanctions and always choose the least severe outcome.

The panel considered whether a final written warning would be consistent with the public interest.

The panel concluded that a final written warning would not serve to mark the seriousness of the conduct or deter others from similar conduct and fulfil the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

The panel considered the matter fully including the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behavior. The panel considered this matter to be serious due to the large amount of money that was involved and the fact that PC Carson's actions were repeated over an extended period of time and due to the vulnerabilities of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

The panel also concluded that honesty and integrity are a fundamental part of policing.

The panel noted the words of Lord Justice [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in *Salter v Chief Constable of Dorset*, which said that police officers "..... carry out vital public functions in which it is imperative that the public have confidence in them. It is also obvious that the operational dishonesty or impropriety of a single officer tarnishes the reputation of his Force and undermines public confidence in it.'

The gravity of PC Carson's breaches of the Standard of Professional Behaviour means that the panel do not consider that any sanction less than dismissal without notice is justified.

As such the panel's decision is that PC Carson should be dismissed without notice and placed on the College of Policing's barred list

Right of appeal

Paragraph 11.158 of the 2020 Home Office Guidance says:

A police officer has the right to appeal against the finding or outcome of a misconduct hearing to a Police Appeals Tribunal. The Officer must be informed of their right to appeal when notified out of the outcome (Regulation 43(2) of the Conduct Regulations).

Paragraph 9(1) of the Police Appeals Tribunals Rules 2020 provides:

Subject to rule 10, a police officer or former police officer who wishes to appeal to a tribunal must give notice of the appeal before the end of 10 working days beginning with the first working day after the day on which the officer is first supplied with a written copy of the relevant decision.

Publicity

In accordance with regulation 43(6) of the 2020 Regulations, the AA is required to publish this report on the Merseyside Police website for not less than 28 days, as soon as is practicable after it receives the report and has notified PC Carson.

If PC Carson exercises his right to appeal to a Police Appeals Tribunal, the AA will in due course be required to re-publish this report under regulation 26(11)(b) of the Police Appeals Tribunal Rules 2020.