



**WRITTEN DECISION OF ACCELERATED MISCONDUCT HEARING
AND NOTIFICATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO POLICE APPEALS
TRIBUNAL**

Regulation 63 Police (Conduct) Regulations, 2020

Officer's Name: Naseem Hoque Force No. 7637

Rank: Constable (Former)

**IN THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 AND IN THE CASE OF
FORMER PC Naseem Hoque.**

Particulars of Fact

Count 1

Being an officer of the Merseyside Police on between 14 July 2024 and 09 February 2026 you breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

1. On 14 July 2024, you were on duty between 14:00hrs and 00:00hrs you were working overtime and were deployed to Southport Police Station.
2. Having finished duty at 23:23hrs you drove to your home address in your personal vehicle VRM [REDACTED]
3. At 23.59 hours on 14 July 2024 whilst driving you contravened a red signal on the A570 Southport Road, you were travelling southbound towards County Road.
4. On 03 August 2024, you responded online stating that the driver of the vehicle was Mr [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Particulars of Misconduct

Honesty and Integrity: in that you dishonestly stated that Mr [REDACTED] was the driver of the vehicle, knowing this to be untrue.

Discreditable Conduct: in that in not responding lawfully to a notice of Intended prosecution you have acted in a manner that is likely to bring the police service into disrepute.

Particulars of Fact

Count 2

Being an officer of the Merseyside Police on between 16 May 2025 and 8 October 2025 you breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

1. On 16 May 2025, you were on duty and working from St Anne Street Police Station
2. Having finished duty at 15.45 (despite being rostered on until 18.00) you drove to your home address in your personal vehicle VRM [REDACTED]
3. At 18.51 hours on 16 May 2025 Whilst driving you drove at 35 mph in a 30 mph zone on Minshull New Road, Leighton, Cheshire, travelling towards West Street.
4. On 17 July 2025 you responded stating that the driver of the vehicle was Mr [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
5. You further stated in writing a mechanic was dropping my car off after it broke down, I have put the address down wrong I have corrected this. The contact number I have for him is [REDACTED]
6. In September 2025 you were contacted by Constable Watson of Cheshire Police. You accepted you had been driving, stating that you were mistaken about your nomination, you paid the fine and accepted 3 points on your licence on 8 October 2025

Particulars of misconduct

Your said behaviour is in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour of:

Honesty and Integrity: in that you dishonestly and were lacking in integrity when you stated that Mr [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was the driver of the vehicle, knowing this to be untrue likewise you knew that the phone number provided was not that of Mr [REDACTED]

Discreditable Conduct: in that in not responding lawfully to a notice of Intended prosecution you have acted in a manner that is likely to bring the police service into disrepute.

Decision of the Chair

I have heard details of the case against former PC Hoque which is listed as an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing before me today.

I have considered the evidence presented by the Appropriate Authority and reached my determination.

Prior to the hearing I have seen the following documentation:

- The Regulation 51 Notice
- The Appropriate Authority's bundle
- The Appropriate Authority's Opening Note
- The documentary evidence relating to the Notices of Intended Prosecution and subsequent correspondence.

I have heard submissions on behalf of the Appropriate Authority. Former PC Hoque has not attended the hearing and has not provided any response to the allegations.

I am satisfied that the former officer has been served with notice of these proceedings and is aware of today's hearing.

Having previously determined that it is appropriate for the hearing to proceed in his absence, I am satisfied that no unfairness arises from continuing in his absence.

Stage 1 Findings

In relation to the substantive matters I am satisfied that there is irrefutable evidence that on two separate occasions former PC Hoque provided false information in response to Notices of Intended Prosecution concerning the identity of the driver of his vehicle.

The first incident arose following a traffic offence committed on 14 July 2024. In response to a Notice of Intended Prosecution the former officer identified another individual as the driver of the vehicle.

The second incident arose following an offence committed on 16 May 2025. On that occasion the former officer again identified another person as the driver of the vehicle.

It was only when he was subsequently contacted by Cheshire Police that he acknowledged that the nomination had been incorrect and accepted responsibility for the offence.

I am satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the former officer knowingly provided false information on both occasions.

Having regard to the Standards of Professional Behaviour, I find that the following standards are engaged:

Honesty and Integrity

Police Officers are expected to be honest, act with integrity and not compromise or abuse their position.

Providing false information in a formal legal process designed to identify the driver of a motor vehicle is plainly dishonest. The conduct occurred on two separate occasions and involved deliberate misrepresentation rather than mistake.

I therefore find that the Standard of Honesty and Integrity is breached.

Discreditable Conduct

Police Officers must behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it.

Members of the public are entitled to expect Police Officers to comply with the law and to deal honestly with official processes.

Deliberately attempting to avoid responsibility for road traffic offences by falsely nominating other individuals is conduct which would undoubtedly undermine public confidence in policing.

I therefore find that the Standard of Discreditable Conduct is breached.

Gross Misconduct

Having considered the definition of gross misconduct, I find that these breaches are so serious as to justify dismissal.

Dishonesty strikes at the heart of policing. The conduct was deliberate, repeated and occurred over a significant period of time.

Public confidence in Police Officers depends upon their honesty and integrity. The conduct in this case is fundamentally incompatible with the standards expected of a Police Officer.

I therefore find that the breaches of Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct amount to gross misconduct.

Stage 2 Outcome

Culpability

I assess the former officer's culpability as high.

This case concerns deliberate dishonesty. The former officer knowingly provided false information in legal documents on two separate occasions.

These were not spontaneous acts but conscious decisions made to avoid the consequences of his own driving conduct.

The Guidance makes clear that dishonesty and lack of integrity are among the most serious forms of misconduct for a Police Officer.

The conduct involved a calculated attempt to frustrate lawful enforcement processes and therefore represents a significant departure from the standards expected of Police Officers.

Harm

I assess the harm caused by the misconduct as high.

Whilst there is limited evidence of direct harm having been caused to the individuals nominated by the former officer, there was clear potential for harm.

Individuals falsely identified as drivers may have been subjected to unnecessary police enquiries and potential legal consequences.

More significantly, the misconduct risks serious harm to public confidence in policing. The public is entitled to expect Police Officers to comply with legal processes rather than seek to circumvent them.

Knowledge that a Police Officer had twice provided false information to avoid liability for motoring offences would inevitably damage confidence in the integrity of the service.

Aggravating factors

I find the following aggravating features present:

- Deliberate dishonesty
- Repetition of the misconduct on more than one occasion
- Misconduct occurring over an extended period
- Abuse of the special position of trust held by a Police Officer
- Failure to take responsibility until challenged in relation to the second incident
- Conduct directed towards avoiding the legal consequences of his own actions.

Taken together, these features considerably increase the seriousness of the case.

Mitigating factors

I find no significant mitigating factors relating to the misconduct itself.

The former officer has not engaged with these proceedings and has not provided any explanation, admissions, character evidence or other material capable of amounting to mitigation.

Personal mitigation

I have considered the former officer's service record insofar as it is available to me.

However, I am guided by the authorities which make clear that personal mitigation carries limited weight in cases involving dishonesty.

The primary purpose of misconduct proceedings is the maintenance of public confidence in the police service and the upholding of professional standards.

In a case involving repeated dishonesty, any personal mitigation is substantially outweighed by the seriousness of the misconduct.

In assessing the seriousness of the misconduct I have followed the four-stage approach set out in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes.

In determining outcome, I have kept firmly in mind that the most important purpose of disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service.

Honesty and integrity are fundamental requirements of policing. Deliberately providing false information in legal documents on two separate occasions represents conduct wholly incompatible with continued service as a Police Officer.

Had former PC Hoque remained a serving officer, there is only one outcome that would adequately reflect the seriousness of the misconduct and maintain public confidence in policing.

Accordingly, I determine that former PC Hoque would have been dismissed without notice had he still been serving as a Police Officer.

I further direct that his name be placed on the College of Policing Barred List in accordance with the relevant regulations.

Publication of Outcome

25. In accordance with Regulations 43(1) and (6) of the 2020 Regulations, the AA shall publish a report of the outcome of these proceedings on its website for a period of not less than 28 days.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rob Carden', enclosed within a circular scribble.

Rob Carden KPM
Chief Constable
16 October 2026

The finding(s) of the Special Case Hearing and the outcome(s) imposed: -

Outcome	Indicate Below
Would Have Been Dismissed	x
Final Written Warning	
Gross Misconduct Not Proven – Case returned to Appropriate Authority	
Gross Misconduct Not Proven – Case dismissed	

Appeals

You have the right of appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal against any finding of gross misconduct made by the Chief Constable at this hearing unless that finding was made following acceptance by you that your conduct amounted to gross misconduct.

You also have the right of appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal against any disciplinary action imposed as a result of that finding. The Tribunal can increase any outcome imposed as well as reduce or overturn the decision of the special case hearing.

Your appeal must be based on one or more of the following grounds:

- That the finding or decision to impose disciplinary action was unreasonable
- That there is evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the special case hearing which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action, or
- That there was a breach of procedures set out in The Conduct Regulations, the Complaints and Misconduct Regulations or Part 2 of the 2002 Act or unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action.

You have **10 working days** beginning with the first working day after the day you have been served with this notice to provide the Police and Crime Commissioner with written notice of appeal. Application outside this period can be considered by the Chair of the Police Appeals Tribunal under Rule 9 of the Police Appeals Tribunal Rules 2020.

Should you wish to request a transcript of the misconduct proceedings (or part of the proceedings) then this should be made in your notice of appeal.

On receipt of your appeal notice the Police and Crime Commissioner will as soon as practicable supply the respondent (The Chief Constable), and in the case of a 'specified appeal' the IOPC, with a copy of the notice of appeal. The respondent shall then within 15 working days of receipt of the notice of appeal supply to the Police and Crime Commissioner a copy of this hearing decision notice, any documents made available to the panel who conducted your hearing and a copy of any transcript of the proceedings requested by you. A copy of any such transcript shall at the same time be supplied to you.

You are also required to provide to the Police and Crime Commissioner a statement of the relevant decision and your grounds for appeal, and any supporting documents. If your appeal is based on the ground that there is evidence that could not reasonably have been considered at the misconduct hearing which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action then you must also supply a list of any proposed witnesses as defined in Rule 13(5)(c) and a witness statement from each of those witnesses. If you consent to the appeal being determined without a hearing, then this consent must be given in writing.

These documents shall be supplied before the end of 20 working days from the day on which you are supplied with a copy of the transcript, or if no such transcript was requested before the end of 35 working days from the day you gave notice of appeal to the Police and Crime Commissioner. The Police and Crime Commissioner shall then supply a copy of those documents provided to the respondent as soon as practicable.

The respondent then has 20 working days from receipt of those documents to supply the Police and Crime Commissioner with a statement of response to the appeal, any supporting documents, and a list of any proposed witnesses as defined in Rule 13(9)(c) together with a witness statement from each proposed witness. The respondent must also give in writing any consent for the appeal to be determined without a hearing.

At the same time as supplying the above documents to the Police and Crime Commissioner the respondent shall provide you with a copy of those documents save in the case of the supporting documents a list of those documents only need be supplied. The Police and Crime Commissioner will then provide to the Chair a copy of all documents supplied to it under these Rules.

Both you or the respondent may apply to the Police and Crime Commissioner for an extension to a relevant period as defined in Rule 14(1). This application must set out the reason for such application and the period of extension required. A copy of the application will be supplied to the other party who will be asked if they consent to the extension. If the other party does not consent then the application will be forwarded to the Chair who will determine if an extension shall be granted and for how long.

Under Rule 15, on receipt of the supplied documents the Chair shall determine whether the appeal should be dismissed on the basis that either the appeal has no real prospect of success or there is no other compelling reason why the appeal should proceed. If the Chair considers that the appeal should be dismissed, before making his determination, he shall give you and the respondent notice in writing of his view together with the reasons for that view. You and the respondent may make written representations in response to the Chair before the end of 10 working days and the Chair shall consider any such representations before making his determination. The Chair shall give you, the respondent and the relevant Police and Crime Commissioner notice in writing of his determination. Where the Chair determines that the appeal should be dismissed the notification shall include the reasons for the determination.

Where an appeal has not been dismissed under Rule 15, the Chair must determine whether the appeal should be dealt with at a hearing. The Chair may determine that the appeal should be dealt with without a hearing, but only if you have so consented. Where the appeal is to be dealt with at a hearing the Chair shall give you and the respondent his name and contact details.

At any time following the provision of the documents mentioned in Rule 13(5) and (9), you or the respondent (the "requesting party") may apply to the Chair for disclosure of any document by the other party which is relevant to the appeal. The Chair may request the disclosure of any such document by the other party and where it is disclosed, a copy must be given to the chair and to the requesting party. Where a party does not comply with a request to disclose under paragraph (2), the party must give the Chair and the requesting party his reasons for non-disclosure in writing.

The Chair must cause you and the respondent to be given written notice of the date, time and place of the hearing at least 20 working days, or such shorter period as may with the agreement of both parties be determined, before the date of the hearing. Where you or the respondent (or both) have proposed witnesses under rule 13, the Chair must determine which, if any, witnesses may give evidence at the hearing. No witness may give evidence at the hearing unless the Chair reasonably believes that it is necessary for the witness to do so, in which case the Chair must where the witness is a police officer, cause that person to be ordered to attend the hearing; and in any other case, cause the

witness to be given notice that his attendance is necessary and of the date, time and place of the hearing.

You have the right to be represented at a hearing by a relevant lawyer or a police friend. Where you are represented at the hearing by a relevant lawyer, you may also be accompanied at the hearing by a police friend. If you choose not to be represented, the hearing may take place and the appeal may be determined without you being represented. The respondent has the right to be represented at a hearing by a relevant lawyer or by an officer of the police force or by the chief executive of the relevant Police and Crime Commissioner.

Subject to these Rules, the procedure at a hearing shall be determined by the tribunal. The tribunal may proceed with the hearing in the absence of either party, whether represented or not, if it appears to be just and proper to do so and may adjourn it from time to time if it appears necessary to do so. Unless the tribunal determines otherwise, the evidence adduced by you must be given first. Witnesses giving evidence at the hearing may be subject to questioning and cross-questioning. Any question as to whether any evidence is admissible, or whether any question should or should not be put to a witness, shall be determined by the tribunal. A verbatim record of the evidence given at the hearing must be taken and the relevant Police and Crime Commissioner must keep such record for a period of at least two years from the date of the end of the hearing.

The hearing shall be held in private, however, the tribunal may allow a person to attend all or part of the hearing as an observer for the purposes of training. In certain circumstances as prescribed in the Rules, the complainant, an interested party, or a representative of the IOPC shall also be allowed to attend the hearing.

The tribunal must determine whether the ground or grounds of appeal on which you rely have been made out. The determination of the tribunal must be based on a simple majority but must not indicate whether it was taken unanimously or by a majority. The chair must prepare a written statement of the tribunal's determination of the appeal and of the reasons for the decision. As soon as reasonably practicable after the determination of the appeal the chair shall cause you, the respondent and the Police and Crime Commissioner to be given a copy of the written statement, but, in any event, you must be given written notice of the decision of the tribunal before the end of 3 working days beginning with the first working day after the day on which the appeal is determined.

Any request for an appeal must be forwarded to:

Police and Crime Commissioner for Merseyside.

Vetting of individuals is critical to manage risks to the Force, and to ensure the integrity of everyone who works for Merseyside Police. Vetting is completed in line with the Vetting Code of Practice and its associated National Guidelines, APP on Vetting 2021. Section 8.50.1 of APP on Vetting 2021 states that following the conclusion of a misconduct hearing or meeting where the officer, special constable or member of staff is not dismissed but has been issued with a written warning or a final written warning, a review of vetting clearance should be carried out. The review includes a consideration of the applicant's suitability to maintain the level of clearance held and to continue in the post they occupy.

I have been served with a copy of this notice:-

Signed: _____

Date: _____

I have been served with a copy of the R –v- Edwards notice:-

Signed: _____

Date: _____

CHIEF CONSTABLES MEMORANDUM

Regina –v- EDWARDS Disclosure of Disciplinary Convictions

I refer to Merseyside Police Special Order Dated 30th June 1993, regarding the above. The detail of the misconduct conviction recorded against you has already been served upon you.

You must reveal the **full details of the wording of the charge(s)** relating to these convictions to the Crown Prosecution Service in accordance with the instructions contained in Chapter 18 of the Disclosure Manual (see Merlin). Failure to reveal your disciplinary record and/or any criminal convictions recorded against you may render you liable to further disciplinary proceedings.

The earliest date of expunction from your personal record of these convictions is in line with the Police (Amendment) Regulations 2008. At the appropriate time the Personnel Department will arrange for the conviction to be expunged from your personal record. You should inform the Crown Prosecution Service accordingly, when this has been done.

If you have any queries regarding this matter, the staff in the Professional Standards Department will be pleased to assist you.
