

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 (sic) 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 Allardyce 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 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 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 mounted 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).

THE BACKGROUND

25. On 5 October 2022, at around 03:43am, a member of the public called the 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 rest in an overgrown area.
27. PCs Crozier and Johnston arrived at the scene at 04:11:16am. They searched for the two 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. This report concerns the evidence in connection with PS Farmer only; FPC Allardyce is subject to a

separate report. This report does not repeat all the evidence in full, but a general summary is given.

PS Farmer

36. The Panel heard evidence from PS Farmer. He provided a summary of his 24-year policing experience, describing 16 years of working within Road Traffic Policing and attending hundreds of collisions which have involved serious injuries. He has had previous experience of dealing with casualties who have sustained spinal injuries. Albeit he had not had any specific spinal injury training, but he confirmed he was up to date with all mandatory Emergency Life Training that he was expected to do as part of his role.
37. He described arriving at a still developing scene, originating from the initial high-speed pursuit, which was terminated and then the helicopter providing commentary that there was "one out and running" from the stolen Range Rover. He articulated the risks that he was considering when attending the scene, which included whether the vehicle had crashed, how many occupants there were, whether there was stolen property, a need to secure the scene and any exhibits. It was described as fast moving and dynamic.
38. He estimated that there were about 10 other officers at the scene when he arrived. Whilst he did not receive a formal briefing from others, he was told by colleagues that a male suspect was in a bush (Mr A) and was being dealt with by local officers. This male was about 15/20 metres from the now abandoned stolen Range Rover. He noted when he walked past the Range Rover that there was no obvious damage.
39. PS Farmer explained that he was informed by Former PC Allardyce that Mr A was saying that he couldn't move his legs. He explained that he was also told that Mr A had given contradictory comments (i.e. *that he can't move and then he can move and he just doesn't want to move*). PS Farmer maintained that he did consider that this may be a medical issue.
40. Former PC Allardyce told him that Mr A was involved in the theft of a Mitsubishi the previous week when a machete had been found in the vehicle. PS Farmer recalled the incident, but relied upon Former PC Allardyce saying Mr A was involved (a now known to be mistaken fact).
41. PS Farmer was asked questions about his knowledge of conducting primary and secondary surveys, within Emergency Life Support training. He stated he was familiar with the content and was compliant with all his refresher training.
42. He said that as a Sergeant at this incident, he was concerned after a time that no primary survey had been conducted fully and as a consequence he undertook a primary and secondary survey. This included conducting a pain response, to see if there was a reaction and response in Mr A's leg.
43. He said that he thought he felt the upper body tense and his leg had moved away from the source of pressure but now accepts that he must be mistaken in this

belief due to the medical expert's report (that paralysis was complete by this time).

44. PS Farmer admitted swearing (such as saying "stop fucking with me") and accepts that the use of such language fell below standards. He explained that at the time he thought Mr A was involved in the previous week's incident with another stolen vehicle, so his state of mind was assessing the risks and threats. He said that he was replicating the type of language used by Mr A and did not think Mr A would be upset. He maintained that he would not ordinarily use that sort of language to members of the public.
45. PS Farmer also admitted making comments about the size and build of Mr A. He provided context to this remark, that a scent trail had been picked up by a police dog, which indicated that an outstanding suspect had gone through a very narrow gap in a fence line. It was apparent to him that the person who went through that gap, must have had a very slight build. The reference was that Mr A's build was not consistent with him being the person who had taken that escape route.
46. PS Farmer said that his honest belief whilst dealing with Mr A was that he was not paralysed and he was feigning injury. He said that he was sceptical of the legitimacy of Mr A's claims that he was paralysed.
47. He admitted that he attempted to move Mr A to a seated position. This was done after the primary and secondary surveys, where he saw no injuries and no obvious swelling. Mr A had asked him to assist sitting him up and that he did this to help him get comfortable, as he said something was digging in his back and it was also as an opportunity to check under Mr A for any wounds/weapons. When Mr A let out a cry, he said he lowered him back down as gently as he could.
48. In cross examination, PS Farmer acknowledged that with hindsight he could see that there were other options to check for any wounds/weapons under Mr A by being more aggressive in his search and placing his hands underneath Mr A's body.
49. PS Farmer maintained that whilst his belief was that Mr A was feigning injury, it did not detract from his actions in relation to dealing with casualties and related MPS training packages. He maintained that he treated Mr A as a suspect and a potential casualty in parallel.
50. He admitted that his language fell below standards and he apologised. He said that he could have spoken to Mr A with more empathy. He accepted breaches of the professional standards in respect of authority, respect and courtesy and discreditable conduct but did not accept the breaches constituted misconduct or gross misconduct.

PANEL ANALYSIS

51. The Panel found PS Farmer to be a credible, experienced officer with significant previous experience of dealing with casualties from road traffic incidents. The

Panel found his description of a fast moving, still unfolding, dynamic scene to be compelling.

52. The Panel found that PS Farmer possessed a good knowledge of Emergency Life Support training packages and there was corroborative evidence from the BWV of him undertaking surveys of Mr A as a casualty. The Panel found that PS Farmer provided an honest account of events to the best of his belief.
53. The Panel considered that PS Farmer's risk assessment of Mr A as a suspect was informed in part from Former PC Allardyce's mistaken belief about his involvement in the previous stolen Mitsubishi incident with the machete.
54. The Panel considered that the discourteous language used by PS Farmer was a significant backdrop to the allegations he faced. PS Farmer accepted that these comments were unprofessional and disrespectful. He did demonstrate remorse, and offered an apology to Mr A for this language. He was candid that it was possible that Mr A might have heard his remarks, albeit felt it was unlikely.
55. The Panel considered the application of force used by PS Farmer when he helped Mr A get to his feet, was at Mr A's request.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Allegations 1-5

56. The above statements of fact and agreed by PS Farmer.

Allegation 28

57. The above is a statement of fact and agreed by PS Farmer.

Allegation 29

58. PS Farmer in his regulation 31 notice accepted that Former PC Allardyce referred to Mr A stating that he could not move and that he thought he had "fallen out" [of the car]. However the evidence before the Panel included PS Farmer referring to the incomplete intelligence picture at the time. NPAS had relayed that one suspect alighted the Range Rover and was "out and running". It was unclear which suspect that person was. PS Farmer also noted that the abandoned stolen Range Rover showed no signs of being involved in a collision.
59. In respect of the comment being made by Former PC Allardyce this is a statement of fact and agreed by PS Farmer. In relation to the "fallen out" of the car comment the Panel note the additional context and ambiguity around how Mr A exited the vehicle. When Mr A said he had "fallen out" of the vehicle, is some time, later in their interactions.
60. Due to the ambiguity of the wording of this allegation, the Panel do not find that the

AA have proved this allegation on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 30

61. PS Farmer was inconclusive in respect of whether he accepted this allegation in his regulation 31 notice but before the Panel in his oral evidence, he agreed that he *knew* that he should be treating Mr A as having a suspected spinal injury. PS Farmer maintained that although he also considered him a suspect, this did not detract from also treating him as a casualty with a suspected spinal injury. The Panel found that PS Farmer did undertake appropriate steps on that basis. Whilst PS Farmer suspected, based on what he was told and observed himself, that Mr A was feigning an injury, he nonetheless undertook a primary and secondary examination of Mr A and, the Panel finds therefore that whilst allegation 30 is found proved, that there is no breach arising from it.

Allegation 31

62. In the light of its findings above, and noting that this allegation is worded in the alternative, the Panel does not find this allegation proved.

Allegations 32 – 34

63. The above are statements of fact and agreed by PS Farmer.

Allegation 35

64. PS Farmer agreed that he applied pressure to Mr A as a pain response technique, to assess whether there was any loss of circulation or responses. He accepted that he must have been mistaken in believing that Mr A reacted to that application of pressure but maintained he honestly believed there was. The Panel found no wrongdoing in this application of pressure, as a pain response technique.

65. He agreed that he used the stated language and that it was wrong and the Panel concurs with that conclusion and finds that that is the wrongdoing found proved within this allegation. The Panel finds this allegation proved to that extent.

Allegation 36

66. PS Farmer agrees with the wording of this allegation but states that he was told this by Former PC Allardyce, which gave him an honestly held but mistaken belief.

67. He agreed that he used the stated language and that it was wrong and the Panel concurs with that conclusion. The Panel finds this allegation proved to that extent.

Allegation 37

68. PS Farmer denies this allegation. He states that he had genuinely believed that Mr A had moved in response to him touching a pressure point in the lower calf.

The allegation states that this was incorrect. The Panel, whilst noting that since full paralysis had occurred at this juncture, that Mr A would not have been capable of moving in response to a pressure point test, nonetheless accept PS Farmer's evidence that he believed that this had occurred, based upon his reaction at the time and his credible evidence on this point given before the Panel.

69. In this context, the Panel do not find that this allegation amounts to any breach of the professional standards on the part of PS Farmer.

Allegation 38

70. PS Farmer accepts this allegation. He states however that the comment was made in context. He indicated that he had significant experience in the MPS. He had dealt with other serious casualties including those with paralysis; he had also seen suspects who had suffered temporary paralysis as a result of cannabis use and believed that he could smell cannabis on Mr A and noted the effects of cannabis on him. The Panel find this allegation proved by way of admission.

Allegation 39

71. PS Farmer accepts this allegation. He states however that the comment was made in context and out of earshot of Mr A. Nonetheless, the Panel finds that these comments were unprofessional and inappropriate and wrong in all of the circumstances. The Panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 40

72. The wording of this allegation is not framed as a specific allegation. It relates to what Mr A said aloud whilst PS Farmer was knelt over him and Mr A's words were captured on PC Wisnioch's BWV. Whilst it is clear that Mr A did provide this explanation in the presence of PS Farmer, it was made at 04:52am – which was towards the end of the interaction and had followed a number of other conflicting accounts.

Allegation 41

73. The Panel were cognisant that PS Farmer attempted to move Mr A after Mr A said he had jumped from a moving car and dropped on his head. The Panel felt that this increased the risks objectively around Mr A's having suffered a significant spinal injury. However, this needed to be balanced with the proceeding conflicting accounts that Mr A had given. In addition, PS Farmer also had believed that Mr A had responded positively to a pain response technique. So, in light of all these factors the Panel felt it was reasonable for PS Farmer to have had the honest but mistaken belief that Mr A was feigning his injuries. The decision to move Mr A, needs to be considered against this context. For these reasons, the Panel find this allegation not proven.

Allegation 42

74. PS Farmer accepts this allegation. He provided context as to why he attempted this physical manoeuvre with Mr A. The Panel found this allegation proved by way of admission.

Allegation 43

75. In respect of this allegation, in his regulation 31 notice, PS Farmer denied the allegation stating that in fact there was a justifiable reason for him placing Mr A into a seated position. The Panel note the information contained in the bundle and quoted by the IOPC in their report concerning this incident. An opinion was provided by Ms Sue Warner, who is an MPS Senior First Aid Adviser. She states, "The officers should not have moved the casualty but they were getting conflicting information from him and moved him when he asked them to-but they should ideally have kept him still..... Officers did move the casualty at one stage because he complained of discomfort-moved his leg around. They talked to him and monitored him and explained what was happening-the only additional thing they may have done would be to cover him with a foil blanket but the effect of that would have been negligible. When one officer checked the casualty's legs for injuries his trousers came down slightly and the officer pulled them back up to maintain dignity".
76. Mr Thomas acknowledged that there was potential reason for moving Mr A since he complained of pain in his back and was uncomfortable. Training indicates that officers should attempt to ensure that injured parties are in a comfortable position.
77. In addition to the above, PS Farmer was working under the misapprehension that Mr A had been involved in an incident in the previous week concerning the theft of a vehicle in which a machete was recovered. He gave evidence that he was concerned that Mr A may have been lying on a weapon/machete which may have impaled him and that he wanted to use this opportunity to undertake further secondary checks on Mr A. The Panel find that this gave further good reason for PS Farmer trying to move Mr A into a sitting position.
78. In the light of all of the above, the Panel conclude that PS Farmer's actions in moving Mr A into a sitting position were justified in all of the circumstances and find this allegation not proved.

Allegation 44

79. Sub-allegation a)
PS Farmer indicates that he did undertake appropriate actions relating to someone who had a suspected spinal injury. The Panel find that his actions in undertaking checks on Mr A's body, pressure points and attempting to make Mr A more comfortable were consistent with treating Mr A as a person with a suspected spinal injury. The Panel therefore find this allegation not proved.
80. Sub-allegation b)

The Panel had regard to the checklist and instructions for care of those with suspected spinal injuries (pg. 93-94) in considering this allegation. The Panel find that PS Farmer undertook most of the indicated actions stated in that plan. The Panel therefore find this allegation not proved.

81. Sub-allegation c)

It is alleged that through his actions that PS Farmer inappropriately applied force to Mr A and/or alternatively moved him in circumstances when it was unnecessary to do so and thereby creating an unnecessary and avoidable risk of significantly increasing the severity of any spinal injury he may have suffered. The Panel noting its findings above, find that PS Farmer moving Mr A in the stated manner was necessary for the reasons set out herein. The Panel do not find PS Farmer applied unnecessary force in so doing. The Panel find that his actions were reasonable and justifiable in all the circumstances. The Panel therefore find this allegation not proved.

82. Sub-allegation d)

PS Farmer accepts that his language and conduct towards Mr A was disrespectful and discourteous. He acknowledged this amounted to a breach of the professional standards of authority, respect and courtesy and discreditable conduct, but this did not reach a threshold of seriousness to amount to misconduct or gross misconduct.

PS Farmer stated that he treated Mr A in a similar way to that in which it he treated other suspects and did so in order to establish authority and form a bond and speak to suspects in a manner that they were used to. The Panel do not accept PS Farmer's submissions in this respect.

The Panel find that on numerous occasions, that PS Farmer's language and conduct towards Mr A was disrespectful and discourteous. The Panel find that PS Farmer was frustrated by the circumstances that he faced and mixed messages received from Mr A concerning his circumstances and injuries. There was no reason for his behaviour, language or conduct. He displayed a degree of antagonism towards Mr A. His attitude may have been influenced by his mistaken belief that Mr A had been involved in the incident involving the theft of a high value car during the previous week.

83. In the light of its finding and observations above and noting that PS Farmer held the rank of sergeant and a responsibility to set standards for others, the Panel found sub-allegation 44d proved.

Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

Allegation 45

84. Sub-allegation a) On the basis of the Panel's findings above, the Panel do not consider there to be a breach of the standard of 'Duties and Responsibilities'.

85. Sub-allegation b) The Panel consider that the language and conduct of PS

Farmer found proved above was disrespectful and discourteous, in all the circumstances. The Panel considered the proven allegations amount to a breach of the standard of Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

86. Sub-allegation c) On the basis of the Panel's findings above, the Panel did not find that PS Farmer's actions amounted to a breach of the standard in respect of Use of Force.
87. Sub-allegation d) The Panel consider that the proven allegations against PS Farmer, amounts to a breach of the standard of 'Discreditable conduct'.

ASSESSMENT OF SERIOUSNESS

88. 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.

89. 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."

90. 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'.

91. The Panel considered the following:

Culpability

92. The Panel find that PS Farmer was solely responsible for his own language and behaviour towards Mr A and at the scene of this incident. Furthermore, he held the position of sergeant placing him higher on the scale of responsibility. It was a post of authority, he should have known better and to have performed as a positive role model to those around him.
93. Taking all of the above into consideration, the Panel conclude that PS Farmer's culpability in this case was medium to high.

Harm

94. The Panel concluded that PS Farmer was not responsible for causing any harm to Mr A in moving him and the force used was justifiable. Therefore, they did not consider physical harm ultimately sustained by Mr A as a relevant factor in their assessment of seriousness.
95. The Panel considered the issue of reputational harm. PS Farmer used inappropriate language to Mr A on several occasions and displayed a lack of patience and also a degree of antagonism. At the hearing, he demonstrated remorse for his actions.
96. The Panel find that PS Farmer's behaviour was highly likely to damage public confidence in the Metropolitan Police Service. PS Farmer swore on numerous occasions. He mocked Mr A despite now acknowledging that there was a risk that he had suffered paralysis. In light of the above, the Panel concludes that in respect of the risk to the reputation of the MPS, this was assessed to be medium in nature.

Aggravating factors

97. 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 conducted over the course of a relatively short space of time, being minutes.
98. The Panel does not find that there are aggravating factors in this case.

Mitigating factors

99. The Panel note that the breaches found proved occurred during a single episode of a multi-factorial situation and the dynamic environment. PS Farmer made open admissions around his inappropriate language at an early stage in the proceedings. He apologised to Mr A and demonstrated genuine remorse and insight.

SERIOUSNESS ASSESSMENT

100. Taking all of the above factors into consideration, the Panel find that PS Farmer's actions and conduct found proven amount to misconduct only, meaning a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action.

OUTCOME

101. In considering outcome the Panel has taken account of the College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023). The Panel has borne in mind that the purpose of police misconduct proceedings is threefold:

- To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service.
- To uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.
- To protect the public.

The Panel heard submissions from Mr Thomas and Mr Stoton as to the appropriate outcome. The Panel also had sight of the Officer's character bundle and service record.

102. The Panel approached its decision on outcome in three stages to determine the appropriate sanction. It adopted the structured approach as set out in *Fuglers LLP & Ors v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin):

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.

103. The Panel has already addressed seriousness including consideration of culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating factors in paragraphs 92 – 99 above and adopts its previous findings.

104. The Panel considered the detailed submissions of both representatives. It considered the advice of the LQA. The Panel noted there were only two possible disciplinary outcomes of either (i) a Written Warning or (ii) a Final Written Warning in this case.

105. The Panel assessed the seriousness of the allegation found proved (namely the inappropriate language and conduct towards Mr A being disrespectful and discourteous). The Panel had regard to its previous assessment in respect of culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating features above and adopts the same in their entirety.

106. In addition to the above, the Panel further noted in respect of culpability that PS Farmer used this disrespectful and discourteous language and behaviour in the capacity of a police sergeant. He was a senior officer at this high-risk incident. In addition to his rank, he had also taken responsibility in a practical sense taking on the lead role for conducting a primary and secondary survey. He had significant experience and should have known better. He should have been leading by example. Instead, he acted in a

disrespectful and discourteous manner to a suspect who he acknowledged may have suffered a serious spinal injury. In the light of the factors identified above and highlighting these factors in particular, the Panel reiterates that culpability in this case is medium to high.

107. In respect of harm, the Panel notes that no direct physical harm was caused to Mr A by PS Farmer. Nonetheless, the Panel have found that PS Farmer's conduct found proved was highly likely to damage public confidence in the MPS. This is due to the combination of inappropriate language, repeatedly displaying a lack of patience and a degree of antagonism and mocking Mr A, a victim of significant spinal damage, which although not known to PS Farmer, was acknowledged by him to be a possibility. Noting the factors identified above, the Panel find harm in this case to be medium.
108. The panel have not found any aggravating features in this case.
109. In respect of mitigating factors, the panel noted that the misconduct occurred over a relatively brief period of time and constituted a single episode. PS Farmer made open and early admissions in respect of his inappropriate language and demonstrated genuine insight and remorse. He has not been the subject of any previous misconduct proceedings. He has a long service history. The Panel had been provided with a substantial bundle of character references indicating that PS Farmer is otherwise good, competent and proactive officer.
110. The Panel noted in relation to the question of sanction that it is not meant to be punitive and that the least restrictive sanction should be imposed. The Panel had regard to the College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings in addressing the issue of sanction.
111. The Panel considers the misconduct found proved to be serious and undoubtedly undermines the reputation of the police force.
112. The Panel considered the outcomes in ascending order of seriousness. The outcome should be the least severe that adequately deals with the issues identified, while protecting the public interest. PS Farmer has submitted a large number of positive character reference reports from a number of officers of multiple ranks and is clearly an accomplished officer who appears to be dedicated and hardworking. This has continued to be the case whilst these misconduct proceedings remained outstanding.
113. In respect of sanction the Panel noting PS Farmer's rank at the time of the incident; supervisory status and role model responsibilities and noting the nature of his misconduct, conducted in the knowledge that Mr A may have

suffered a serious spinal injury do not find that a written warning would adequately reflect the public interest and declaratory purpose of such sanctions in misconduct proceedings.

114. In the light of the totality of the factors identified above, the panel find that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of a Final Written Warning for a period of two years.

2 July 2026

Former Commander Katie Lilburn