

IN THE MATTER OF POLICE MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE  
(CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

BETWEEN

**THE COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS**

APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY

**AND**

**FORMER PC RICHARD FIELDHOUSE**

OFFICER CONCERNED

1. This hearing has been held on 18 March 2026 at Empress State Building, London. The Panel consisted of Commander Stephen Clayman (Chair), Mary Anne Poxton and Purnima Uppal as Independent Panel Members. Ms Dale Simon was the Legally Qualified Advisor to the Panel.
2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Ms Katherine Higgs. FPC Fieldhouse was not in attendance and was unrepresented.

**THE ALLEGATIONS**

3. The allegations facing FPC Fieldhouse are set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon him under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. These are:

It is alleged that the following conduct has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour, and the matter has been referred to a misconduct hearing:

- (1) PC RICHARD FIELDHOUSE, it is alleged that in or around February 2019, when applying for a role as a Police Constable at the Metropolitan Police Service, you deliberately omitted to disclose within your application and/or vetting form a previous finding against you of Gross Misconduct by the Hampshire Constabulary in 2005 and you failed to correct this position after

you attested as an officer of the Metropolitan Police Service within a reasonable time period.

- (2) It is alleged that this behaviour is dishonest and constitutes a breach of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour: a) Honesty and integrity b) Discreditable conduct
- (3) It is further alleged that this conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

### **PRELIMINARY ISSUES**

4. At the pre-hearing held on 27 January 2026 the Chair was informed by the AA that FPC Fieldhouse had disengaged with the disciplinary process, that he was no longer represented by the Police Federation and that he would not be attending the hearing. Following FPC Fieldhouse's non-attendance at the hearing Counsel for the AA made an application to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the officer. The Panel were informed that FPC Fieldhouse was aware of the hearing and had confirmed that he would not be attending. In light of the information presented to the Panel and having regard to the principles set out in the GMC v Adeogba [2016] 1 WLR 3867 the Panel decided to grant the application to proceed in the absence of FPC Fieldhouse.

### **CASE SUMMARY**

5. FPC Fieldhouse joined the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) as a police constable in 2019. On 15 December 2022 PS Daly completed a source and information intelligence form 5020A setting out that during a Unsatisfactory Performance Process meeting with FPC Fieldhouse, he had disclosed to her that he had been investigated for gross misconduct whilst serving as a police officer in the Hampshire Constabulary. FPC Fieldhouse disclosed to PS Daly that when he had been a serving police officer for around two years, he was subject to a gross misconduct investigation. He indicated that this related to his handling of a wanted suspect.

6. Hampshire Constabulary confirmed that FPC Fieldhouse resigned from the force in 2005 whilst under investigation for gross misconduct; he had been served notice of the investigation and had been interviewed prior to his resignation. The allegation related to breaching the professional standards of honesty and integrity. A hearing was held in his absence and gross misconduct was found.
7. Several years after leaving Hampshire Constabulary, FPC Fieldhouse applied to join Surrey Police, however as part of their referencing and vetting process, Hampshire disclosed that PC Fieldhouse's misconduct hearing was heard in his absence, and that Gross Misconduct was found in relation to falsifying his statement. Surrey Police contacted PC Fieldhouse and cancelled his assessment day, blocking and declining him from applying to them. When interviewed in relation to this matter, FPC Fieldhouse stated that his application was rejected by Surrey during the vetting process as a result of the ongoing investigation by Hampshire Constabulary.
8. PC Fieldhouse applied to join the MPS on 5 June 2019. Within his application form, he was asked whether he had previously had any disciplinary action taken against him by any employer, regulator or professional body. He answered no to that question. FPC Fieldhouse was interviewed on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2024 in relation to these matters. He denied any dishonesty.

## **EVIDENCE**

9. In advance of this hearing the Panel was supplied with the documents in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 which included a copy of the papers served on FPC Fieldhouse in accordance with Regulation 30. In determining the facts in this case, the Panel had regard to:
  - All documents and materials in the hearing bundle, the Regulation 30 notice whether they were explicitly referred to or not during the hearing.
  - The submissions made on behalf of the AA.
  - The legal advice provided by the LQA

## THE PANEL'S APPROACH

10. In considering the facts, the Panel was aware that the burden of proof is on the AA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. 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.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

### ALLEGATION

11. The Panel finds that on the basis of the investigation report, that FPC Fieldhouse was the subject of a gross misconduct investigation and finding by Hampshire Constabulary in May 2005. The dispute relates to whether FPC Fieldhouse disclosed this finding. The AA relies primarily on the incontrovertible contents of FPC Fieldhouse's application and vetting form to prove the disputed allegations of fact. This application form shows the previous employment history within the last three years at the time of PC Fieldhouse application to join the MPS, within this document there is only one job listed, this is for a driving job. FPC Fieldhouse also declared on this document that he had been employed by Hampshire constabulary, which he applied to join in January 2003, and that he was subsequently employed by them. It also details how PC Fieldhouse applied to join Surrey Police in April 2007, but this application was rejected.
12. The AA also relies on the incontrovertible contents of the vetting form completed by FPC Fieldhouse to join the MPS. This form starts with an '*instructions to candidate.*' This states that all of the information requested on this form is to the best of the applicant's knowledge and belief, and that deliberately withholding information or making any false, misleading or inaccurate statements will be taken as indication of unreliability and any clearance may be refused or, if already granted that person may face disciplinary proceedings. An email address of [Vetting.unit@met.police.uk](mailto:Vetting.unit@met.police.uk) was also provided should any candidates need help with their online application form. PC

Fieldhouse stated that he was the subject of a vetting procedure by Hampshire Constabulary, PC Fieldhouse said that he had completed the Hampshire vetting questionnaire in September 2003.

13. Section 5 of the form shows that FPC Fieldhouse answered “No” in response to the question:

*“Have you ever been admonished, offered formal advice, received words of advice, written warnings, or been found guilty of a discipline offence, or had action taken against you under any discipline code by any employer, regulatory or professional body?”*

14. At Section 6 of the vetting form FPC Fieldhouse states that he had previously been employed by Hampshire police from September 2003 - May 2005. The electronic vetting form is signed on 5 June 2019 the declaration states:

*“By e-mailing this form to the Metropolitan Police Service I acknowledge that by doing so I am declaring that the information I have given is true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.”*

15. During his interview, FPC Fieldhouse denied completing the application form and suggested that it must have been completed by someone in the vetting team. FPC Fieldhouse also produced what appeared to the investigating officer to be a printed email from the officer’s email address dated 2 February 2019. The email purports to have been sent to an email address [Redated][\[Redacted\]@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:[Redacted]@hotmail.co.uk). and discloses the disciplinary finding in 2005. The investigating officer notes, however, that the format of the form is different to the MPS vetting form and purports to be sent to a Hotmail address that was confirmed by the MPS as not used by MPS Vetting.

16. FPC Fieldhouse confirmed that he was aware that he was the subject of a gross misconduct investigation by Hampshire constabulary and that his application to Surrey Police had been rejected on the basis that he was being investigated.

## Panel Finding

17. In determining this allegations of fact, the Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof rests solely on the AA. The Panel accepted the incontrovertible contents of FPC Fieldhouse's completed MPS application and Vetting forms, which both clearly indicate that FPC Fieldhouse did not disclose the disciplinary against him. The Panel found that FPC Fieldhouse's assertions in interview, lacked plausibility. FPC Fieldhouse was clearly aware that he had been the subject of a disciplinary finding from Hampshire Constabulary, his application to Surrey Police had been rejected due the Hampshire investigation and subsequent finding; therefore, in the opinion of the Panel it was most likely that FPC Fieldhouse deliberately omitted to disclose this information when he applied to the MPS. The Panel therefore found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.
18. The Panel then determined whether FPC Fieldhouse had acted dishonestly when he deliberately omitted to disclose the disciplinary finding against him on his MPS application form and vetting form. The Panel applied the two-stage test provided in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos UK Limited* [2017] UKSC 67. The Panel first considered FPC Fieldhouse's actual state of knowledge and belief as to the facts when he omitted to disclose the disciplinary finding against him. For the reasons detailed above the Panel concluded that FPC Fieldhouse had deliberately omitted to disclose the disciplinary finding against him in order to secure employment with the MPS and that he tried to mislead the investigating officer by producing a falsified document. The Panel next considered whether FPC Fieldhouse's conduct in light of his knowledge or belief was dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people. The Panel concluded that FPC Fieldhouse's conduct would be considered dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people.

## **BREACH OF STANDARDS**

19. Having found that FPC Fieldhouse had acted dishonestly when he deliberately omitted to disclose the disciplinary finding against him within the MPS application and vetting forms. The Panel went on to consider whether FPC Fieldhouse's conduct breached the

professional standard of Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct as alleged by the AA. The standards provides:

#### Honesty and Integrity

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

#### Discreditable Conduct

“Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

Police officers report any action taken against them for a criminal offence, any conditions imposed on them by a court or the receipt of any penalty notice.”

20. The Panel having found that FPC Fieldhouse’s conduct was dishonest also concluded that such dishonest conduct clearly breached the standards of honesty and integrity and discreditable conduct.

### **MISCONDUCT/GROSS MISCONDUCT**

21. Having found that FPC Fieldhouse’s conduct breached the professional standard of honesty and integrity and discreditable conduct, the Panel carefully considered whether the breach amounted to gross misconduct, misconduct or neither. Misconduct is defined in the Regulations as meaning a breach of the standards of professional conduct that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross misconduct is defined as a breach of the standards of professional conduct that is so serious as to justify dismissal. The Panel reminded itself of the circumstances of this case, the breach of the standards found proved, 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.
22. In assessing the seriousness of FPC Fieldhouse’s conduct, the Panel had regard to the College of Policing Outcome Guidance. The Panel determined that FPC Fieldhouse was fully culpable for his actions, he deliberately omitted to disclose the disciplinary finding against him for personal financial gain, namely to gain employment with the MPS. The Panel therefore concluded that FPC Fieldhouse’s level of culpability was high. In respect

of harm the Panel determined that the risk of reputational harm to the MPS was significant in light of public concern arising for recent high profile cases involving officer's who had not been appropriately vetted prior to becoming police officers. The Panel also had regard to paragraph 4.32 of the guidance and determined that, whilst not operational dishonesty, the falsification of the vetting forms in this case was particularly serious and would undermine public confidence. The Panel therefore concluded that the level of harm was also high.

23. The Panel found the following aggravating factors in this case:

- His actions were deliberate and planned

24. The Panel found no mitigating factors in this case that were relevant to seriousness.

25. Therefore, the Panel concluded that FPC Fieldhouse's breach of the standards was serious enough to justify dismissal and as such amounted to gross misconduct.

## OUTCOME

26. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction, the Panel have had regard to FPC Fieldhouse's service record, the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf of Counsel for the AA and the legal advice received from the LQA. The Panel applied the three-stage procedure set out in the guidance. The Panel assessed the seriousness of the misconduct, keeping in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions and chose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

27. For the reasons detailed above the Panel found that the level of seriousness of FPC Fieldhouse's conduct was high and the criteria for this assessment remains as detailed earlier.

28. The Panel kept in mind at all times the threefold purpose of imposing sanctions, namely: (a) maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; (b) upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; (c)

protection of the public. Of these, the maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service is paramount.

29. The Panel had careful regard to the purpose of outcomes and that they are not intended primarily to be punitive. The Panel also had regard to the need for outcomes to be proportionate. Although the only sanction available to the Panel is dismissal without notice, as FPC Fieldhouse is no longer a serving officer; the Panel first considered whether a final written warning would have been an appropriate sanction if the officer had still been a serving officer.
30. Honesty is a fundamental requirement of any police officer. FPC Fieldhouse, had deliberately omitted to disclose information about his previous disciplinary investigation and finding for financial gain, and then tried to evade responsibility for his actions by producing falsified documentation. FPC Fieldhouse's conduct was a clear departure from the standards expected of police officers and also significantly undermines public confidence in police service given that officers should not falsify evidence.
31. In light of the above, the Panel determined that if FPC Fieldhouse had been a serving officer the imposition of a final written warning would not reflect or be sufficient to address the seriousness of FPC Fieldhouse's conduct. The Panel therefore concluded that the only appropriate sanction in this case, that would fulfil the threefold purpose of misconduct proceedings, is that had FPC Fieldhouse been a serving officer, he would have been **dismissed without notice**. He will also be placed on the College of Policing Barred List.