

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:

PS STEVEN FARMER

And

FORMER PC LIAM ALLARDYCE

DECISION OF THE PANEL

Former Commander Katie Lilburn (Chair), Ms Placida Ojinnaka (Independent Panel Member) and Ms Yvonne Walsh (Independent Panel Member).

A: INTRODUCTION

The misconduct hearing for PS Farmer and FPC Allardyce was held in public between 18 May 2026 and 21 May 2026 and then resuming on 2 July 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

The Panel was referred to Regulation 30 notices in respect of both Officers containing the allegations and that their conduct amounted to gross misconduct, namely:

-
- 1. On 5th October 2022 you were both on duty in uniform. You attended the scene of an incident on Newham Way, East Ham.*
 - 2. During your policing career, you received regular first aid training, which included assessing and providing first aid to those with suspected spinal injuries.*
 - 3. In the twelve months prior to 5th October 2022, you had attended at refresher first aid training which included dealing safely with casualties with suspected spinal injuries.*
 - 4. The refresher training included*
 - a) identifying road traffic collisions, unrestrained occupants and ejected occupants as risk factors for spinal injury;*
 - b) the following as red flag signs/ symptoms of spinal cord injury*

- i) Cervical and/or spinal pain;*
- ii) Loss of sensation;*
- iii) Loss of movement;*
- c) the need to conduct a primary survey of the casualty;*
- d) the need to undertake secondary survey with specific consideration to the signs and symptoms associated with spinal injury;*
- e) the instruction that, in cases of suspected spinal injuries,*
- i) only essential movement should be undertaken;*
- ii) officers should focus on gentle handling only of the casualty.*

5. On arrival at the scene of the incident, you were aware that

- a) there had been a police pursuit of a suspected stolen vehicle;*
- b) the suspect vehicle had left the road, crashed and come to rest in a wooded area;*
- c) a member of the public, who was suspected to have been one of the occupants of the stolen vehicle, had been found in some bushes some distance away, but nearby.*

FPC Allardyce

6. On approaching the member of the public, Mr A, you did not know whether he was believed to have exited the vehicle while it was still moving or if he had decamped from the stationary vehicle and started to run off.

7. Two colleagues were already with Mr A. They informed you that

- a) the suspect had said he was not actually paralysed,*
- b) an officer had tried to move the suspect, but he did not really move his legs;*
- c) he had then said that he was paralysed,*
- d) he was complaining of neck pain;*
- e) he kept changing his story.*

8. You then spoke to Mr A, who told you that

- a) he could not feel his legs;*
- b) he couldn't feel anything.*
- c) In response to your question how he had hurt his legs, he replied that he didn't know, before mentioning he could not even lift up his neck.*

9. In the circumstances of which you were aware (as set out above), you knew that Mr A should be treated as having a suspected spinal injury.

10. Alternatively, you ought to have realised Mr A should be treated as having a suspected spinal injury.

11. Although you knew, or ought to have known, that Mr A should be treated as having a suspected spinal injury:

- a) You did not undertake a primary survey of the casualty, Mr A.
- b) You did not undertake a secondary survey with specific consideration to the signs and symptoms associated with spinal injury.
- c) You did not verify whether or not a primary or secondary survey of the casualty had been carried out by officers dealing with him prior to your arrival, or the outcome of any such primary/secondary survey.
- d) You failed to conduct any risk assessment before attempting to move Mr A.

12. You then moved Mr A by rolling him and pulling his legs out from underneath him.

13. Mr A stated that he couldn't move, and did not feel it when you had moved his leg.

14. You encouraged Mr A to sit up, to which he replied that he could not, and could not move. You then accused Mr A of having moved.

15. You told Mr A that if he stayed there, he would have to wait about 7 hours for an ambulance.

16. Mr A then asked for your help in getting him up.

17. Given that you knew, or ought to have known, that Mr A should be treated as having a suspected spinal injury, you should not have agreed to this request.

18. Together with a colleague, you then tried to lift Mr A to his feet. It was immediately obviously to you that he took no weight at all on his legs.

19. You let Mr A fall back to the ground.

20. Mr A became distressed, stating repeatedly that he had no legs.

21. You said to Mr A, "you're a bit old in the tooth for this shit".

22. After further conversation with Mr A, he confirmed that he could not feel anything.

23. You then performed a pain compliance technique on Mr A, who reacted with pain, before telling you he could feel it in his shoulder. You then challenged Mr A, incorrectly asserting that he had screamed "you're on my leg".

24. Your response to Mr A saying he could not move his legs

included you laughing / smiling at his comments.

25. Based on the above

- a) You failed to treat Mr A in a manner appropriate for a person who had a suspected spinal injury.*
- b) You failed to follow the training you had received in treating people with suspected spinal injuries.*
- c) As set out in paragraphs 12, 18, 19 and/or 23 above, you applied force to and/or moved Mr A where it was unnecessary to do so, in circumstances in which you created an unnecessary and avoidable risk of significantly increasing the severity of any spinal injury he may have suffered. [It is not alleged that your actions actually did have such a consequence.]*
- d) Your language and conduct towards Mr A was disrespectful and discourteous.*

26. Accordingly, your conduct was in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour for:

- a) Duties and Responsibilities;*
- b) Authority, Respect and Courtesy;*
- c) Use of Force;*
- d) Discreditable Conduct.*

27. Your breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out above, considered cumulatively, are so serious so as to justify dismissal, and accordingly amount to gross misconduct.

PS Farmer

28. On approaching the member of the public, Mr A, he was lying on the ground. You did not know whether he was believed to have exited the vehicle while it was still moving, or if he had decamped from the stationary vehicle and started to run off.

29. PC Allardyce told you that Mr A was saying that he could not move, and that he may have fallen out of the vehicle.

30. Based on what you could see, and the information you had received, you knew that Mr A should be treated as having a suspected spinal injury.

31. Alternatively, you ought to have realised Mr A should be treated as having a suspected spinal injury.

32. You asked Mr A why he could not get up. He replied that he couldn't feel his legs, and told you he was trying to move them. His legs did not move. On further questioning, Mr A did not appear to know how he had got to where he was.

33. You then started to prod and/or pinch Mr A's legs, starting with his calf. In reply to asking him if he felt it, Mr A said, "Feel what? You are not touching me bro."

34. Mr A similarly denied feeling anything when you squeezed his knee.

35. It was only when you put pressure at the top of his leg/ waist area that Mr A said he could feel pain. You then said to Mr A "You can feel that mate, stop fucking with me".

36. You then accused Mr A, incorrectly, of being involved in a previous incident on Mumford Road, concluding with the comment "So don't fuck with me."

37. PC Crozier arrived to administer a breath test. You told PC Crozier that Mr A had moved in response to a pressure point in the lower calf. This was incorrect.

38. You subsequently said to Mr A, "I am no medical expert, but you ain't paralysed, it's probably just the cannabis".

39. You then said to your colleagues, while you were still in relatively close proximity to Mr A, that he was too fat to get away, and had eaten too many burgers, that this happens if you jump from a moving car, and that the other occupant was probably a bit slimmer.

40. You then started to check Mr A for visible signs of injury. Mr A told you that his memory was coming back, that he had jumped out of the car and dropped on his head while the car was moving.

41. This account further raised the risk that Mr A had suffered a significant spinal injury.

42. You then attempted to pull Mr A up, sideways, into a sitting position. Mr A made a strong exclamation of pain, at which point you lowered him back to the ground.

43. There was no good reason for you to try to move Mr A into a sitting position.

44. Based on the above

a) You failed to treat Mr A in a manner appropriate for a person who had a suspected spinal injury.

b) You failed to follow the training you had received in treating people with suspected spinal injuries.

c) As set out in paragraphs 33, 35 and/or 42 above, you applied force to and/or moved Mr A in circumstances where it was unnecessary to do so, and in which you created an unnecessary and

avoidable risk of significantly increasing the severity of any spinal injury he may have suffered. [It is not alleged that your actions actually did have such a consequence.]

d) Your language and conduct towards Mr A was disrespectful and discourteous.

45. Accordingly, your conduct was in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour for:

- a) Duties and Responsibilities;*
- b) Authority, Respect and Courtesy;*
- c) Use of Force;*
- d) Discreditable Conduct.*

46. Your breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out above, considered cumulatively, are so serious so as to justify dismissal, and accordingly amount to gross misconduct.

REPRESENTATION

1. The Appropriate Authority ("the AA") was represented by George Thomas KC of Counsel. PS Farmer was represented by Austin Stoton of Counsel. Former PC Allardye was represented by Guy Ladenburg of Counsel.
2. The investigation into misconduct was conducted by the Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC). The IOPC Investigating Officer, Ele Ataguba, attended the hearing.
3. The Panel would like to thank the representatives for their assistance throughout the case, including the provision of an opening note.
4. The Panel were assisted by Maurice Cohen, Legally Qualified Advisor.

PRELIMINARY ISSUES

5. For reasons previously determined, the injured party was granted anonymity for this hearing and was referenced to as Mr A throughout.
6. Mr Stoton on behalf of PS Farmer made an application for disclosure on two matters on the first morning of the hearing:-
7. Firstly, an up-to-date full disclosure on Mr A's criminal history and
8. Secondly, the decisions (and rationale) made in respect of 3 other officers who had been present at the scene of the original incident.
9. Mr Stoton submitted that the evidence requested was relevant and that it was proportionate to the same to be disclosed.

10. Mr Ladenburg took a neutral position in respect of the former category of disclosure but agreed that the latter disclosure was clearly relevant.
11. Mr Thomas (for the AA) opposed the disclosure application in respect of the former category of evidence, indicating that it was not relevant to the allegations. Following clarification sought from the Panel, he accepted that it was the AA's position that Former PC Allardyce honestly held the belief, that Mr A had been involved in an incident in the preceding week involving the theft of another high-value vehicle, being a Mitsubishi Outlander, in which a machete had been discovered, although that belief ultimately was discovered to be mistaken.
12. In respect of the second disclosure request, Mr Thomas agreed to disclose correspondence passing between the IOPC and AA which led to the IOPC making decisions in respect of the appropriate determination and course of action directed for each officer who had been present at the scene. Both representatives agreed that this disclosure was sufficient for their purposes and so the Panel did not have to turn their mind to any further disclosure matters relating to the other officers.
13. The Panel received advice from the LQA.
14. The Panel based upon the concession made by Mr Thomas in respect of Former PC Allardyce's belief, which he imparted in turn to PS Farmer at the time, was taken by the Panel as being the only relevant evidence, which impacted upon PS Farmer's actions on, attitude towards Mr A and the wording of the allegations that they were considering. The Panel did not consider that Mr A's actual offending history or suspected offending history beyond the mistaken but honestly held belief (either prior to the date of the allegations or subsequently) was relevant to the allegations being considered by them. In the circumstances, the Panel considered that the further disclosure requested by Mr Stoton was not necessary, relevant or fair to disclose and they therefore declined to order any further disclosure.
15. Later in the hearing, a further potential disclosure issue was raised but the Panel did not have to consider this substantively as the parties reached an agreed position in respect of the same.

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

16. On the first morning of the hearing the Regulation 30 Notice, as set out above, was read out.
17. PS Farmer accepted those aspects of the allegations which related to the language that he used to Mr A, and relied upon his response as set out in the Regulation 31 response. He accepted that his language and conduct towards Mr A was disrespectful and discourteous and, in that respect, admitted a breach of authority, respect and courtesy and discreditable conduct. However, he did not accept that this breach amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct. He denied that his conduct was a breach of duties and responsibilities and use of force.

18. Former PC Allardyce accepted that he failed to conduct a thorough risk assessment of Mr A and was insufficiently courteous in all the circumstances. He relied upon his responses in the regulation 31 notice. He accepted a breach of the professional standards in respect of duties and responsibilities and authority, respect and courtesy only; but did not accept a breach of the use of force or discreditable conduct. He did not accept that these breaches amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct.

THE PANEL'S APPROACH

19. 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 the allegation;
 - b. Determine whether those findings of fact found constitute a breach of the relevant standard;
 - c. Determine whether the conduct found proven against the Complainant amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct.
20. 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'.
21. 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 the Complainant and staff by preventing similar misconduct recurring in the future. The Panel has had regard to *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512; *Chief Constable of Dorset v PAT*, *Salter Interested Party* [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin) and *R (Williams) v PAT* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).
22. The Panel has also had regard to a framework of regulations and guidance, in particular the following:
- a. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 (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".
23. The Panel listened carefully to all of the oral evidence. They read and carefully considered every item of the other evidence, particularly the several clips of Body

Worn Video footage, 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.

EVIDENCE

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

- a. Regulation 30 Bundle comprising of 422 pages.
- b. Regulation 31 Responses.
- c. The AA's opening note.
- d. Training records of both officers.
- e. Body worn video (BWV) footage from PC Crozier; PC Johnston; PC Wisnioch; MSC Kenny and PC Dingham (for which transcripts were provided in the bundle).
- f. Expert medical report from Mr Jaykar Panchmatia and other medical records.
- g. Schedule of direct extracts from IOPC decision (in respect of all officers attending the incident).

G: THE BACKGROUND

25. On 5 October 2022, at around 03:43am, a member of the public called police and reported their Range Rover sport vehicle stolen from outside their home in Chelsea. The vehicle was being monitored by a tracking company who updated the police on its movement. PCs Crozier and Johnston located the vehicle on East Ham High St. The officers indicated for the vehicle to stop. It failed to do so and a pursuit started. The vehicle was recorded as travelling 110 mph on the A13. Support from the National Police Air Service (NPAS) was requested and actioned. The NPAS identified the vehicle heading eastbound on the A13 at 04:08am; at 4.08.58am it recorded the Range Rover travelling on the wrong side of the A13 against traffic. At 4.09.05am, the pursuit was terminated (due to danger to the public) but NPAS was authorised to continue tracking the vehicle. The vehicle eventually exited the A13 taking a slip road onto the residential section of Newham Way. Shortly afterwards, on the NPAS recording in slow motion at 04.11.09am and 04.11.11am, 2 people are seen leaving the vehicle, one after the other, while it is still in motion.

26. The first person was an unknown individual who was not identified during the investigation. The 2nd person is now known to be Mr A and the footage appears to show that he tumbled from the vehicle and came to arrest in an overgrown area.

27. PCs Crozier and Johnston arrived at the scene at 04:11:16am. They searched for the occupants of the vehicle. They were joined by PC Wisnioch, MSC Kelly and PC Virdee at 4.14.30 a.m. to assist searching for the occupants of the vehicle. At 4.19.47am PS Farmer (a Roads Policing Sergeant) arrived at the scene, followed shortly afterwards by two dog handlers being PC Dingham and Former PC Allardyce (arriving at 04:20:52am). Neither PS Farmer nor Former PC Allardyce activated their Body Worn Video. PS Farmer indicated that he thought that he double tapped his BWV but it appears not to have activated and FPC Allardyce

that he did not activate his BWV as he had not got his dog out of the van and was not involved in any operational policing at the time.

28. Cries for help were subsequently heard coming from an overgrown area. Mr A was discovered in the area and at various stages indicated to numerous officers that he could not feel his legs and/or body, but then conversely that he wanted to get up. Some officers indicated that Mr A should not be moved due to a risk of spinal injury. Both of these subject officers moved or assisted in moving Mr A at times. Both were sceptical of his claims to have suffered a significant spinal injury. Both used inappropriate language towards him. Former PC Allardyce at one juncture laughs with colleagues and smiles at the camera believing Mr A to be feigning injury. Former PC Allardyce incorrectly believed that he had recognised Mr A from a previous incident involving the theft of a Mitsubishi which had occurred a week earlier in which a machete was discovered in the vehicle. Former PC Allardyce relayed this belief to PS Farmer. It appears that both officers may have been adversely influenced in their dealings with Mr A from this misapprehension.
29. The conduct of other officers who were present at the scene were investigated by the IOPC, but this did not culminate in misconduct proceedings against them.
30. Following the incident, Mr A received medical treatment and it was determined that he had incurred a complete spinal cord injury and had no use of his lower extremities and significant reduced use of his upper extremities. He subsequently underwent rehabilitation.
31. The involvement of both subject officers in moving Mr A in the light of the fact that he indicated a belief that he had suffered spinal injuries was contrary/potentially contrary to their training.
32. An expert medical report was obtained from Mr Panchmatia, Consultant Trauma and Orthopaedic Spinal Surgeon who prepared a report dated 25 October 2023. Having regard to the evidence, he identified that Mr A could be seen to have an erection when lying on the ground at an early stage in the BWV footage. He indicates that this is one of the indicators that a complete spinal cord injury had already occurred and therefore any movement of Mr A on the part of the subject officers did not exacerbate his injury.
33. Despite the above, it was concluded that the subject officers had acted inappropriately and contrary to their training in moving Mr A and additionally that their behaviour towards him including swearing and failing to treat him with respect or consider that his spinal injury was genuine was such that it breached numerous of the professional standards of conduct and behaviour.

EVIDENCE

34. The Panel had the opportunity of viewing the BWV footage from various officers who had been present at the scene on numerous occasions.

35. The Panel heard evidence from both subject officers. It is not repeated here in full, but a general summary given.

Former PC Allardyce

36. In his evidence to the Panel, Former PC Allardyce initially made a full apology to Mr A for his actions, language and any offence caused by his behaviour. He in particular was apologetic about appearing callous and laughing at Mr A at a time when he had not appreciated that Mr A had incurred paralysis and life-changing injuries. He had retired from the MPS after 30 years' service and now resided in the UAE but has returned for this case in part due to his wish to apologise.

37. Former PC Allardyce indicated that he ought to have realised that Mr A might have sustained a spinal injury and treated him accordingly. It was possible that his actions could have caused harm although they had not in the circumstances. His treatment of Mr A was conducted through the prism of him believing that Mr A was feigning his injury, possibly in an attempt to escape or secure better treatment in a hospital setting rather than being taken into custody.

38. He was acting in the capacity as a dog handler at the scene. His dog was not required at the time. He explained that he was not the lead officer and other officers were on the scene before him. He described becoming involved in a proactive manner, as he saw it as an opportunity to form a rapport to gain wider intelligence around high value stolen vehicles and investigations into serious and organised crime. Former PC Allardyce described the incident as a fast moving, multifaceted and a complex situation. One of the perpetrators had fled and was outstanding. He described it as being a 'high risk' situation due to the speed and manner of driving of the stolen vehicle during the pursuit, which had led to the pursuit being terminated.

39. When Former PC Allardyce saw Mr A, he honestly believed that he recognised Mr A from another high-value vehicle theft the previous week in which a machete was found in the boot of the car; however he now knows that he was incorrect in this belief. Former PC Allardyce conveyed this belief to PS Farmer. Former PC Allardyce acknowledges that this wrongly held belief may also have influenced his attitude at the time.

40. When Mr A stated his name, Former PC Allardyce explained that he recognised it from intelligence briefings.

41. Former PC Allardyce and MSC Kenny had assisted in moving Mr A because Mr A had requested their help and it was an attempt to make him more comfortable and relieve his leg, which was in an odd position and he felt Mr A might have cramp. With hindsight, he accepts that he should have followed his training and not moved Mr A because of the potential of Mr A having sustained catastrophic injuries.

42. Once Former PC Allardyce and MSC Kenny got Mr A upright, he did not weight bear or stand unaided, so he was released back to the ground. Former PC

Allardyce admitted he would have moved and repositioned Mr A differently if he thought he had sustained a spinal injury.

43. Former PC Allardyce admitted that he was sceptical about the claims made by Mr A that he could not feel his legs. He admitted that he would not have moved Mr A if he believed he had sustained a serious injury. He explained that he thought Mr A was feigning the seriousness of his injury. This belief came from the alternative comments coming from Mr A about his legs and his prior policing experience that on occasion some prisoners feign injury for a variety of reasons. He gave some examples as why suspects feign injury in similar circumstances as trying to prevent being breath-tested after suspected drink drive incidents; to increase the possibility of bail; and to increase the opportunity of escape from an ambulance.
44. Former PC Allardyce indicated to Mr A that there might be a seven-hour wait for the ambulance. He said that he made this comment as he thought that there was an ambulance strike at the time; but this subsequently was proved to be incorrect. In oral evidence he explained that in his policing experience there were often significant delays in ambulances' attendance. He did not recall where the 'seven-hour' estimate came from.
45. Former PC Allardyce was shown the BWV footage of him laughing at Mr A; he apologised for this and said it was entirely wrong. His only explanation was that he laughed because he thought Mr A was acting.
46. At the end of cross-examination, Former PC Allardyce conceded that his actions had breached all 4 professional standards alleged. From the outset, he had accepted a breach of the standards of 'duties & responsibilities' and 'authority, respect & courtesy'. By the end of his cross examination, he also accepted a breach of 'use of force' as he had used unnecessary force in trying to assist Mr A to his feet and 'discreditable conduct' as he admitted that his conduct failed to meet the requisite standards.

Panel analysis of Former PC Allardyce

47. The Panel found Former PC Allardyce to be an open and credible witness. He was reflective and showed insight into his failings, admitting to all alleged breaches levelled at him by the end of his oral testimony.
48. His attendance and full engagement at proceedings was noted by the Panel, especially as he no longer resided in the UK.
49. The Panel found it reassuring that Former PC Allardyce conceded that his actions and behaviour were wrong and sought the opportunity to give an apology to Mr A.
50. The Panel found that Former PC Allardyce provided a candid account of events to the best of his recollection and belief.

Findings of Fact

Allegations 1-5

51. The first five allegations relate to contextual facts and are all agreed by Former PC Allardyce. These are not levelled as allegations.

Allegation 6

52. This is a statement of fact agreed by Former PC Allardyce, both in his Regulation 31 response and oral evidence. Again, this is not framed as a specific allegation.

Allegation 7

53. The five sub-sections of this point are all agreed by Former PC Allardyce. This relates to Former PC Allardyce receiving contradictory evidence from Mr A and colleagues about potential paralysis. Again, these are not framed as specific allegations.

Allegation 8

54. This is agreed by Former PC Allardyce in his Regulation 31 notice and paragraph 12 of his witness statement (relating to what Mr A told him about a lack of feeling in legs). Again, these are not framed as specific allegations.

Allegation 9

55. This allegation is denied by Former PC Allardyce. The Panel accept that Mr A was giving contradictory comments as to whether he could feel or move his legs. Mr A on multiple occasions asked to be helped up or to his feet. In these circumstances, the Panel does not find that Former PC Allardyce *knew* for sure that Mr A should be treated as having a suspected spinal injury. The Panel do not find this allegation proved.

Allegation 10

56. In the alternative, Former PC Allardyce accepts that he *ought to have realised* that Mr A should be treated as having a suspected spinal injury (as stated in his regulation 31 notice paragraph 14 and his evidence before the Panel). The Panel find this allegation proved on the basis of his admission and through the construction of facts heard on the balance of probabilities; and that this breaches standards of professional behaviour.

Allegation 11

57. The four sub-sections of this allegation relate to primary & secondary surveys and risk assessments. Former PC Allardyce accepts that he did not undertake

the actions specified in the subheadings in his Regulation 31 notice (paragraph 15). However, he provided a contextual explanation that he had no duty himself to undertake these activities as the responsibility fell to other officers who interacted with and moved Mr A before he became involved.

58. The Panel, however, find that Former PC Allardyce despite being a dog handler who was not required to become involved in that capacity on the day of the incident, that he nonetheless did accept responsibilities and become involved in the situation and assessment of Mr A in any event. In so doing, he assumed resultant risk. He chose to assist in moving Mr A, albeit at his request. Former PC Allardyce took on an unnecessary and avoidable risk through his actions. Having chosen to undertake these actions he had a responsibility to double check risks and apply previous training and undertake appropriate risk assessments. The Panel therefore find this allegation proved and consequently find this breaches standards of professional behaviour.

Allegation 12

59. Former PC Allardyce indicates that this action was undertaken by him but that it was justified as Mr A thought he had cramp in his legs. The AA also made it clear that they were not levelling this action as a specific breach of use of force. The MPS training manual stated that some movement of a suspected spinal injured patient can be justified in certain circumstances to make a casualty more comfortable. The Panel found that whilst the allegation is technically proved, that there is no resultant breach of the standards of professional behaviour.

Allegation 13

60. Former PC Allardyce accepts that Mr A said these comments to him. This is not framed as a specific allegation against the officer.

Allegation 14

61. This allegation is again accepted by Former PC Allardyce. In his Regulation 31 response he stated that he honestly believed that Mr A had moved but now accepts that he must have been mistaken about this movement, considering that the paralysis sustained by Mr A would have occurred by this point. In this respect, the Panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 15

62. This allegation is again accepted by Former PC Allardyce. He admitted that this time estimate was based upon his own experience rather than having received specific information on this length of delay. The Panel felt that some of the motivation for suggesting this length of delay was to encourage Mr A to get to his feet, if he was feigning injury. In light of the previous findings above, the Panel felt that this exaggerated time delay would have caused more stress to Mr A in all the circumstances. The Panel find this allegation proved and a resultant breach of standards.

Allegation 16

63. This is accepted by Former PC Allardyce. This is not framed as a specific allegation against the officer.

Allegation 17

64. This allegation was accepted by Former PC Allardyce. The Panel accept that the action in moving Mr A was consensual. Nonetheless as accepted in oral evidence, the action was unnecessary and Former PC Allardyce would not have moved Mr A if he acknowledged that Mr A had a suspected spinal injury. The Panel find this allegation proved and a resultant breach of standards.

Allegation 18

65. As above, this allegation is admitted by Former PC Allardyce. He accepts that the action in lifting Mr A was unnecessary and he would not have attempted this action if he acknowledged that Mr A had a suspected spinal injury. The Panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 19

66. The allegation is worded that Former PC Allardyce "let Mr A fall back to the ground". The Panel watched the BWV footage of this incident from PCs Wisnioch and Crozier on multiple occasions and looking at the officer's hand movements the Panel concluded that Former PC Allardyce did not let Mr A 'fall back' to the ground. Rather, Former PC Allardyce releases one hand's grip, but the other continues to retain a grip on Mr A until he is back on the ground. In these circumstances, the Panel finds this allegation is not proved.

Allegation 20

67. This allegation is admitted by Former PC Allardyce. This relates to words and behaviour of Mr A and is not levelled as a breach of standards by Former PC Allardyce.

Allegation 21

68. Former PC Allardyce admits making this comment and using a swear word. He accepted his language and approach were inappropriate. The context provided is that Former PC Allardyce felt Mr A was feigning injury and this comment was made in relation to that impression. The Panel find this allegation proved and a breach of standards.

Allegation 22

69. This relates to words and behaviour of Mr A and is not levelled as a breach of

standards by Former PC Allardyce.

Allegation 23

70. This allegation is admitted by Former PC Allardyce, in that he performed pain compliance techniques on Mr A. The Panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 24

71. This allegation is admitted by Former PC Allardyce, in that he laughed and smiled inappropriately when Mr A said he could not move his legs. The Panel find this allegation proved and a resultant breach of standards.

Allegation 25

72. In his evidence before the Panel Former PC Allardyce accepted (a)-(d) above and the Panel find these allegations found proved by way of admission.

Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

Allegation 26

73. Duties and Responsibilities - Admitted by Former PC Allardyce before the Panel and found proved by the Panel by way of admission.

74. Authority, Respect and Courtesy - Admitted by Former PC Allardyce before the Panel and found proved by the Panel by way of admission.

75. Use of force Admitted by Former PC Allardyce before the Panel and found proved by the Panel by way of admission.

76. Discreditable conduct - Admitted by Former PC Allardyce before the Panel and found proved by the Panel by way of admission.

Assessment of Seriousness.

77. The Panel carefully considered the circumstances of the case, and the breaches found proved to assess whether the breaches amount to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

78. Under the *College of Policing's Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings*, gross misconduct is defined as:

“A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.”

79. To assess the seriousness of the found conduct at this stage, the Panel had regard to the above guidance, with reference to the (i) officer's culpability for the

misconduct (ii) the harm caused by the misconduct and the existence of any aggravating or mitigating factors whilst acknowledging the full analysis of these four factors are to be considered at the second stage of 'outcome'.

80. The Panel considered the following:

Culpability

81. The Panel found that Former PC Allardyce was solely responsible for his own actions and had chosen to become involved at the scene. This was his individual responsibility. Nonetheless, the Panel accepted that Former PC Allardyce found himself in a scene which was very dynamic and fast moving. There was imperfect information. He had a mistaken but honestly held belief, that Mr A had been involved in a serious incident during the previous week involving the theft of a high value, Mitsubishi vehicle, in which a machete had been discovered. The surrounding risks to this incident were of relevant context.
82. The Panel find that Former PC Allardyce's actions were not conducted with deliberate intent, targeting or planning. He did not intend to cause any negative effect. He was working off incomplete and discrepant evidence in numerous respects including that Mr A on occasions indicated that he was paralysed and on other occasions that he was not.
83. Nonetheless, Former PC Allardyce did not check if any of his colleagues had undertaken a risk assessment. He worked off an assumption.
84. The Panel find that Former PC Allardyce has some blameworthiness for his own actions. He did not fully apply his training but there were extraneous circumstances as referred to above.
85. Taking all of the above into consideration, the Panel conclude that Former PC Allardyce's culpability in this case was low to medium.

Harm

86. Whilst the Panel acknowledge that though his actions were contrary to training and risked aggravating a serious spinal injury, having regard to the medical expert report before them, the Panel acknowledged that no actual further physical harm was caused by his actions as paralysis was complete prior to Former PC Allardyce moving Mr A.
87. The Panel considered the issue of reputational harm. Former PC Allardyce appeared to laugh at Mr A's speech and behaviour in front of his colleagues. Now knowing the seriousness of the injuries Mr A sustained, this laughter and joviality looks extremely cold-hearted and was a harrowing watch especially for the family of Mr A during the hearing. However, the Panel accept that Former PC Allardyce

did not realise the extent of Mr A's injuries at the time. With hindsight, he demonstrated significant remorse for his actions before the Panel and apologised to Mr A and his family.

88. The Panel find that Former PC Allardyce's behaviour was highly likely to damage public confidence in the Metropolitan Police Service. However, the Panel acknowledge that a fully informed member of the public in possession of all of the facts, including the contradictory accounts of Mr A's injuries and the incomplete intelligence picture of the dynamic incident, would not consider the harm caused by Former PC Allardyce's conduct to be at the upper end of a harm spectrum.

89. In light of the above, the Panel concludes that in respect of the potential physical risk of harm posed to Mr A (through moving him unnecessarily) was medium in nature. The assessment of reputational harm caused by Former PC Allardyce's behaviour, was assessed to be low to medium in nature.

Aggravating factors

90. The Panel noted that there were multiple proven breaches of the standards of professional behaviour. Nonetheless, these were conducted during the course of one incident, over a relatively short space of time, being minutes.

91. The Panel does not find that there are aggravating factors in this case.

Mitigating factors

92. The Panel note that the breaches found proved occurred during a single episode. Former PC Allardyce showed genuine remorse and insight into his personal failings in how he approached this incident and his failure to treat Mr A as a casualty of a potentially serious spinal injury. Former PC Allardyce made open admissions to many of the allegations at an early stage in the proceedings, coming to admit all key facts by the end of proceedings. He apologised to Mr A and his family at the outset of his evidence.

Misconduct

93. Taking all of the above factors into consideration, the Panel find that Former PC Allardyce's actions and conduct found proven **amount to misconduct only**. They are not so serious as to potentially justify dismissal.

94. In light of disciplinary proceedings capable of being brought against former officers (Regulation 42 (1)(b) of Schedule 1 of the 2020 Regulations) the Panel note that having made a finding that Former PC Allardyce's actions amount to

misconduct only, that it cannot take any further action as he is now a retired officer.

95. That therefore concludes these proceedings in respect of Former PC Allardyce.

2 July 2026

Former Commander Katie Lilburn