

IN THE POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING

**PURSUANT TO THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED BY THE
POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024)**

IN THE MATTER OF:

FORMER PC SAM CALLWAY

DECISION OF THE PANEL

Deputy Assistant Commissioner Jon Savell (Chair), Simon Williams (Independent Panel Member) and Karen McArthur (Independent Panel Member).

A: INTRODUCTION

1. The misconduct hearing for FPC Callway was held in public on 9th March 2026 at Palestra House, London. A notice of hearing was published in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ("the 2020 Regulations").

B: THE ALLEGATIONS

2. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of FPC Callway ("the Former Officer") containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct, namely:

DISHONEST COMPLETION OR FALSIFICATION OF CRIME REPORTS 2024

a. In August 2024, a review of PC Callway's live investigations was carried out by A/PS Hampton, due to PC Callway being restricted and not permitted to have live investigations. The following discrepancies were found.

b. Connect [REDACTED] was found to have a false statement made by PC Callway when on the 4 July 2024 he stated that he had spoken to the victim and that she was going to attend Kentish Town Police station to report and provide evidence to progress the crime report. This was not the case as the victim had not had any contact with PC Callway, as established by PC Holt who had contacted the victim on the 4 August 2024.

c. Connect [REDACTED] was found to have a false statement with regards to attempted victim contact by PC Callway. PC Callway stated that he tried to call the victim on 25 and 26 May 2024 and was not able to get hold of them. As a result, he stated that he had sent a seven-day letter to the victims address for them to contact police. This was found to be false by PC Nasser who contacted the victim on the 3 August 2024, the victim again stating they had not had any contact or attempted contact from Police.

d. Connect [REDACTED] refers to a robbery allegation that was reported on 5 July 2024. On 13 July 2024 PC Callway updated this report stating he had spoken to the informant of the investigation, due to the victim not able to speak English, to obtain more information. No further updates were added by PC Callway. PC Orr contacted the informant on 5 August 2024 and introduced herself as the new OIC. She confirmed with the informant that no previous contact had been made with her by any officer.

e. A/PS Hampton examined Connect [REDACTED] after PC Callway claimed he had spoken to the victim on the phone who had declined to do a 124H (hate crime risk assessment) and stated that he did not wish to progress with the report. A/PS Hampton called the victim but ended up speaking to a different person and not the victim, even though he had called on the only number listed on the connect. This person had no idea about the investigation or the victim.

f. A/PS Hampton examined connect [REDACTED] detailing that PC Callway had written on the investigation that it was not possible to contact the victim although no detail was included as to whether a voicemail or any kind of update had been given. A/PS Hampton phoned the victim via the only contact details given and this went through to someone other than the victim. When A/PS Hampton asked if they knew the victim or reported it on behalf of someone else, they said that they had never heard of the victim nor reported a crime on their behalf.

g. Over-checks on PC Callway's email and folders including One Drive revealed no record of a seven-day letter having been saved under victim's name, and only one seven-day letter had been completed relating to an entirely unconnected victim, long before the date of the allegations concerned here. Checks were undertaken of PC Callway's work mobile phone calls, confirming no apparent telephone calls made on the relevant dates to the victims on the 4/7, 13/7 or 25 & 26 May contrary to PC Callway's assertions on those investigations.

h. PC Callway's failure to adhere to basic protocols surrounding the completion of investigation reports, and moreover his demonstrably dishonest entries constitute a critical breach of the Dishonesty & Integrity and Conduct standards of professional behaviour. Dishonesty in the performance of an officer's duties fundamentally undermines public confidence in policing and risks severely damaging the reputation of the police service.

MEDICAL LEAVE REQUEST 2023

a. PC Callway dishonestly justified a request for an early departure from duty on 8 August 2023 by telling his supervisor, PS Williams, that he had an appointment to see a specialist [REDACTED]. Enquiries of the clinic established that no appointment had been arranged for 8 August 2023, and that the only appointment [REDACTED] booked and attended by PC Callway took place on 4 September 2023.

b. Accordingly, it is clear that PC Callway lied to his supervisor as to the reason for leaving duty early on 8 August 2023.

c. PS Williams chased PC Callway repeatedly for proof of the 8 August 2023 appointment. After some delay, PC Callway provided an image of a letter apparently setting out the appointment for 8 August 2023. Further enquiry with the clinic established that the only appointment letter sent to PC Callway specified an appointment – the appointment which he actually attended – for 4 September 2023.

d. Accordingly, it is further clear that PC Callway dishonestly edited or forged the letter to display the date he was relying on rather than the true date.

e. Subsequently, despite the absence of any supporting material beyond the questioned letter and having failed to conduct any or any adequate enquiry to establish his assertions, PC Callway on three occasions provided to the Professional Standards Directorate MG14 responses to questions which maintained the assertion that the 8 August 2023 appointment was genuine, and he had attended this appointment on this day.

f. These assertions have been maintained in the face of clear evidence, including extracts from the surgery electronic records and witness statements from employees there, to the

contrary and are therefore untenable. Accordingly, PC Callway's dishonesty has been compounded by his continued insistence that the 8 August 2023 appointment took place, and by his reliance on a document that appears to have been doctored.

COMPASSIONATE LEAVE REQUEST 2024

a. On 12 September 2024, PC Callway emailed his line manager PS Martin Evans requesting annual leave for the 16 September 2024. PS Evans directed him to request leave through Operational Support and Events (OSE) as the official authorisation route.

b. On 17 September 2024, Inspector Barnes informed PS Evans of the two-day compassionate leave for the period of 16/09/2024 and 17/09/2024 which he had granted as PC Callway had reported that [REDACTED] had passed away on 16/09/2024.

c. During a meeting with PS Evans and A/Insp Natalie Quarendon on 3 October 2024, PC Callway requested a month of unpaid leave from the 7 October 2024 in order to look after [REDACTED] At that time, he confirmed that it was [REDACTED] who had passed away on 16/09/2024 and A/Insp Quarendon asked for a copy of [REDACTED] death certificate for HR purposes. Having said that his father could obtain a copy, at no point has PC Callway complied with the request, later stating that [REDACTED] did not work for the MPS and that he would not be producing her death certificate.

d. The request for provision of material evidencing the need for compassionate leave was reasonable and proportionate. PC Callway's refusal to entertain this request by a superior officer demonstrates a wilful disregard of the chain of command and a disobedience to a justifiable request, constituting moreover a lack of honesty and integrity. Furthermore, by his failure to provide the material requested and the vague and inconsistent account given for the requested leave, it is believed that PC Callway had not been truthful as to the reason for requesting leave. This constitutes a further act of dishonesty on his part.

In the circumstances, by the conduct outlined at (1), (2) and (3) above, you have breached the Honesty & Integrity standard of professional behaviour. Additionally, your conduct is not befitting of the office of police constable, would clearly undermine public confidence in and damage the reputation of policing, and thus breaches the Conduct standard of professional behaviour. These breaches amount to gross misconduct, being so serious as to justify dismissal. The Appropriate Authority will say these breaches merit only dismissal.

C: REPRESENTATION

3. The Appropriate Authority ("the AA") was represented by Giles Bedlow of Counsel. The Former Officer did not attend and was not represented, however PC Mick O'Grady, Federation Representative, did attend.
4. The Panel were assisted by Stacey Patel, Legally Qualified Advisor.

D: PRELIMINARY ISSUES

5. The Panel first considered whether or not to proceed in the absence of the Former Officer. The Panel had sight of an email from the case manager dated 13th February 2026 which stated:

I have received confirmation from the Federation representative that the officer will not be attending, is not engaging with the process, and has no further documentation to provide.

On this basis, the fed rep will also not be in attendance and has advised the officer that the hearing will proceed in absentia.

6. As there was no further information before the Panel at the hearing, it was satisfied that the Former Officer was aware of the hearing, had voluntarily absented himself, and therefore they were content to proceed in his absence in accordance with Regulation 37(3)(b).

E: REGULATION 30 NOTICE

7. On the first morning of the hearing, the Regulation 30 Notice, as set out above, was read out.
8. As the Former Officer has not provided a response to the allegations, the Panel proceeded to determine to the facts.

F: THE PANEL'S APPROACH

9. The Panel reminded itself it was: -
 - a. Required to consider the facts of the case and to make its findings of fact in relation to each of the allegations;
 - b. Determine whether those findings of fact constitute a breach of the relevant standards;
 - c. Determine whether the conduct found proven against the Former Officer amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
10. The Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof is on the Appropriate Authority throughout and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities, namely 'what is more likely than not'.
11. The Panel have approached its decision making by keeping in mind the purpose and character of police misconduct proceedings. The primary purpose being not to punish the officer but to protect public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service by holding officers accountable and making clear that improper behaviour will not be left unchecked. A secondary purpose is to be declaratory of high professional standards, and a final purpose is to protect the public and staff by preventing similar misconduct recurring in the future.
12. The Panel has also had regard to a framework of regulations and guidance, in particular the following:
 - a. The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (the "Regulations") including in particular the Standards of Professional Behaviour at schedule 2;
 - b. 2018 Home Office Guidance (the "HOG"), including in particular chapter 1, summarising the Standards;
 - c. The definition of misconduct given at Reg 3(1) of the Regulations: "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour";
 - d. The definition of gross misconduct given at reg 3(1) of the Regulations: "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified".
13. The Panel read and carefully considered every item of the other evidence before them. They considered the totality of the evidence and submissions made. They do not propose

to deal with each and every aspect of the evidence or submissions made, but they state their main conclusions.

G: EVIDENCE

14. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:

- a. Combined Hearing Bundle comprising of 237 pages.

15. No live witnesses were called.

H: THE BACKGROUND

16. On Saturday 3rd August 2024 A/PS Hampton found multiple false statements made by PC Callway with regards to victim contact and closing reports. This was at a time that PC Callway should not have been public facing due to restrictions regarding a separate ongoing gross misconduct Investigation.

17. It is alleged that on 8th August 2023, PC Callway asked to leave work early for a hospital appointment that did not exist and that he subsequently fraudulently edited a hospital letter to change the appointment date.

18. It is also alleged on 17th September 2024 that PC Callway dishonestly stated that [REDACTED] had passed away in order to obtain compassionate leave for days which annual leave had recently been refused.

I: EVIDENCE

19. The AA relied only on the documents in the bundle and no further evidence was considered by the Panel.

J: FINDINGS OF FACT

20. In making its findings of fact, the Panel had regard to all the documents contained in the hearing bundle. The fact that each document is not referred to does not mean that each document has not been carefully considered.

21. The panel heard advice from the Legally Qualified Advisor ("the LQA").

22. The Panel has had regard to the fact that the burden of proof in this case is on the Appropriate Authority and that the civil standard applies, namely proof on the balance of probabilities. In line with the principle derived from *Byrne v General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 2237 (Admin)*, the Panel recognised that there is only one standard of proof in civil and regulatory cases, namely whether the facts in issue more probably occurred than not. The seriousness of an allegation does not of itself require more cogent evidence. The inherent probability of the relevant conduct is a matter which can be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and in deciding whether the event/conduct occurred; this goes to the quality of evidence.

23. The Panel took into account the limited responses from the Former Officer providing some explanation regarding the events but noted it was not in the required Regulation 31 response format. The Panel also had regard to the Former Officer's non-attendance at this hearing. In doing so he had not availed himself of the opportunity of challenging the AA witnesses' evidence by way of cross examination. Similarly, by reason of his non-

attendance, he had not given evidence and had thereby avoided his evidence being challenged by questioning by Mr Bedlow, or by clarification questions being asked by the Panel. As such, the Panel has attached less weight to his version of events than would otherwise be the case had his evidence been subject to challenge and scrutiny by way of questioning.

MEDICAL LEAVE REQUEST 2023

24. The Panel noted that PS Williams stated that he spoke to the surgery on 01/09/23 who confirmed there never had been an appointment on 08/08/23. In addition, the Panel had sight of three witness statements, all from staff at [REDACTED] stating that there was no appointment on the 8th August 2023 and no letter was sent confirming that it was. All 3 state that there was only an appointment for the Former Officer on 01/09/23 [REDACTED]. Additionally the electronic records indicate that 4th September was the initial appointment.
25. The Officer gave a response to the allegations in an MG14 dated 18/02/24 where he reiterated, he did have an appointment on the 8th August and the letter was genuine. He stated that got dates mixed up and it was a follow up appointment on the 4th September, not the 9th September as previously stated.
26. There has been no challenge to the evidence from the Former Officer and he has chosen not to participate in proceedings, therefore the Panel preferred the evidence of [REDACTED] workers and electronic records and found on the balance of probabilities, the Officer did not have an appointment on the 8th August and later falsely doctored an appointment letter.

COMPASSIONATE LEAVE REQUEST 2024.

27. The Panel had sight of the witness statements from Insp Barnes and A/Insp Quarendon. Checks were made at the coroner's office and they were unable to confirm that the Former Officer's [REDACTED] had passed away, informing DPS that "*we have nobody with that name*".
28. DPS Yana Macquiera Lee asked for the death certificate 6 times and it still has not been produced to this day. The Officer still did not attend an interview and give an account regarding these allegations and while the Panel noted that the Officer was on sick leave at the time, it agreed with the Investigating Officer when she stated "*there is a difference between an illness rendering him unfit for duty and unfit to attend an interview*".
29. When asked with a Yes/No if he could send the certificate, the Officer replied: "*I can't send it Mick, and not happy that I have to justify something like that anyway.*"
30. The Panel also considered the Former Officer's Regulation 17 response where he stated:

"I refuse all the allegations and once again my line management are trying to force myself out of the job again abd [sic] accusing me og [sic] doing another wrong doing. They are nothing but bulllys.....[REDACTED] which has been brought on due to line management but no one seems to care about that.."

However, the Panel concluded that in the absence of any evidence confirming this, these amounted to mere assertions by the Former Officer and thus they could not place any weight on them.

31. On balance, the Panel found that Former Officer did lie to gain the leave as it was simply not coincidental that he applied for annual leave first and then subsequently asked for compassionate leave on the exact same dates. The request for evidence by DPS and line managers was a reasonable one to make and the Former Officer has not provided with any good reason for not doing so. The Panel therefore found this matter proved.

DISHONEST COMPLETION OR FALSIFICATION OF CRIME REPORTS 2024

32. The Panel had sight of 4 witness statements from Officers confirming that they had noted discrepancies on Connect, namely that complainants had not been spoken to as the system suggested they had, or they had no relevance to the content of the crime report. Each time, the reference on Connect was made by the Former Officer.

33. The Panel considered the Connect reports numbered [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. It noted that there was no evidence per se to suggest these were false, or rather that wrong information has been inputted. The Panel therefore considered the cross admissibility of evidence. Having already found as a fact that the Former Officer acted dishonestly in August (when requesting medical leave) and in September (when asking for compassionate leave) the Panel concluded that there was a propensity to commit dishonest conduct and therefore were satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the Former Officer created false accounts and entered these on Connect.

34. The Former Officer has never given an account of these allegations, simply stating that he is "*in no place to be dealing with DPS*". The Panel considered if there were [REDACTED] surrounding these allegations, however, in absence any explanation or medical evidence, they were unable to conclude that there were.

35. The Former Officer has never provided any challenge to these witness statements and therefore the Panel were satisfied, on balance, that the AA's evidence was correct and found this matter proved.

36. The Panel therefore find all of the Allegations proved in their entirety.

K: BREACH OF STANDARDS

37. Turning to the Regulation 30 Notice and the allegations found proved therein, the Panel determined to deal with all matters cumulatively.

38. The standard of Discreditable Conduct requires police officers to behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in the police service. The standard of Honesty and Integrity requires that police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

39. Considering first the issue of dishonesty and applying the 2-stage test in *Ivey v Genting Casino [2017] UKSC 67*, the Panel were satisfied that the Officer knew he was lying at the time he made false Connect reports and in asking for medical and compassionate leave and that this is dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. It also undermines confidence in the policing profession and therefore the Panel were satisfied that both the standards of Honest and Integrity and Discreditable conduct are breached.

L: DECISION ON MISCONDUCT

40. The Panel heard representations from both the AA as to whether the breaches amount to misconduct or gross misconduct.
41. When deliberating, the Panel has reminded itself of the need to protect public confidence in and the reputation of the police service, the need to maintain high professional standards and the need to protect the public and officers and staff by preventing similar misconduct in the future.
42. The Panel has carefully considered the circumstances of the case and the breaches found. The Panel was particularly concerned by the fact there was repeated dishonesty over a lengthy period of time and in relation to the crime reports, had a direct impact on victims. In addition, the Panel were also extremely concerned that some of these allegations took place whilst the Officer was already on restrictive duties pending misconduct investigations
43. For these reasons, the Panel was entirely satisfied that the misconduct was properly to be categorised as gross misconduct.

M: DECISION ON OUTCOME

44. Regulation 42 (14) procedure provides that when considering the question of disciplinary action, before any such question is determined, the panel:
 - a. Must have regard to the record of police service of the officer concerned.
 - b. May receive evidence from any witness whose evidence would, in their opinion, assist in determining the question; and
 - c. Must give the officer concerned, his police friend or lawyer, and the appropriate authority, an opportunity to make oral or written representations.
45. The Panel heard submissions from Mr Bedlow as to the appropriate outcome. The Panel also had sight of the Officer's service record.
46. The Panel has regard to the Outcomes Guidance and reminded itself that in reaching its decision on outcome, the Panel must have regard to the public interest, which includes the need to protect the public, to maintain confidence in the police service, and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour. References to paragraphs below are references to the Outcomes Guidance. The Panel approached its decision on outcome in three stages to determine the appropriate sanction:
 - Stage 1: Assess the seriousness of the misconduct.
 - Stage 2: Keep in mind the purpose of disciplinary action
 - Stage 3: Choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.
47. In assessing the seriousness of the conduct found proven, the panel have had regard to four issues, namely:
 - a. The Officer's culpability
 - b. The harm caused by the misconduct
 - c. The existence of any aggravating factors
 - d. The existence of any mitigating factors

Stage 1: Seriousness of the misconduct

Culpability

48. The Panel took account of paragraph 4.9 of the Outcomes Guidance which states that

“The more culpable or blameworthy the behaviour in question, the more serious the misconduct and the more severe the likely outcome”.

49. The Panel considered this was intentional and deliberate conduct. It is also a specific type of serious misconduct, namely dishonesty, and at paragraph 4.30 the guidance states that cases involving any form of dishonesty on duty will always be serious because of the importance of maintaining public trust and confidence in the police service.

50. With this in mind, the Panel determined that the Officer's culpability was high.

Harm

51. The Panel also considered this is a type of reputational harm and took into account paragraph 4.66

Harm will likely undermine public confidence in policing. Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual or group to undermine public confidence. Where an officer commits an act that would harm public confidence if the circumstances were known to the public, take this into account. Always take misconduct seriously that undermines discipline and good order within the police service, even if it does not result in harm to individual victims.

52. The Panel therefore concluded that harm was high

Aggravating Factors

53. The Panel have identified the following aggravating factors:

In addition, in aggravating factors, the Panel find the following:

- Regular, repeated behaviour over a period of time
- Premeditation, planning, targeting, or taking deliberate or predatory steps
- Malign intent, such as personal advantage
- Continuing the behaviour after the officer realised, or should have realised, that it was improper
- Significant deviation from instructions, whether an order, force, policy or national guidance
- Multiple proven allegations and/or breaches of the Standards of Professional

Mitigating Factors

54. The Panel have taken into account that the Former Officer was suffering [REDACTED] at the time however there is no evidence to show that affected the Former Officer's ability to cope with the circumstances in question. The Panel could not therefore count this as a mitigating factor.

55. The Panel also noted that there was no personal mitigation or character evidence provided from the Former Officer.

Stage 2: Keep in mind the purpose of disciplinary action

56. In considering the outcome, the Panel also bore in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime which is threefold:

- (a) To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service.
- (b) To uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.
- (c) To protect the public.

Stage 3: Choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

57. As the Former Officer has already resigned, there are only two potential outcomes, namely disciplinary and no disciplinary action. Therefore, the Panel reminded itself that:

(i) If it were to decide that the conduct did not justify the sanction of dismissal, no disciplinary action would be taken; and

(ii) Disciplinary action can only be the outcome if the Former Officer would have been dismissed if he had not ceased to be a member of the police force.

58. The Panel did not consider that no disciplinary action would be sufficient to uphold public confidence in and respect for the police service and would be insufficient to reflect the importance of upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct.

59. Given its findings that the Former Officer's culpability was high, and a high level of harm had been caused, the Panel determined that the Former Officer would have been dismissed if he had not ceased to be a member of the Police Service.

60. **Right of Appeal.** In accordance with Regulation 43(2), the Appropriate Authority shall provide the Officer with a copy of this report and a notice of the right of appeal. The Officer is reminded he has a right to appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal. ("PAT"). The PAT may increase or decrease any penalty or overturn this decision.