

**Accelerated Misconduct Hearing of Police Constable Christopher Goodey
P237659 held on 13th May 2025**

1. I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started. I am satisfied that all the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been served: matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.
2. I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Ms Nairn. PC Goodey has been assisted by his Federation Representative, PC O'Shea. PC Goodey has not provided a Regulation 54 response and has not attended.
3. The allegation against PC Goodey is as follows:

“

On 22nd October 2025, whilst off duty, you were involved in a road traffic collision with another vehicle. You provided a roadside breath test with a reading of 109 micrograms of alcohol per 100 millilitres of breath.

As a result, you were arrested on suspicion of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

Following your arrest, you were transported to Parkside Police Station in Cambridgeshire, where you were required to provide an evidential breath specimen. While in police custody, you provided a sample which recorded 97 micrograms of alcohol per 100 millilitres of breath. Both readings were in excess of the prescribed legal limit of 35 micrograms of alcohol per 100 millilitres of breath.

On 2nd April 2026, you appeared before Cambridgeshire Magistrates' Court, where you entered a guilty plea to driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

Upon conviction, the court imposed the following sentence:

- *A 26 month disqualification from driving*
- *150 hours unpaid work*
- *A victim surcharge of £85*

- Prosecution costs of £85

This conduct represents a serious breach of the standards expected and resulted in criminal conviction and court-imposed penalties.

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that your actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in the Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely:

i. Discreditable Conduct

In that you behaved in a manner likely to bring discredit upon the police service and undermine public confidence.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, your conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct, and your dismissal may be justified.

“

4. PC Goodey has not responded to the allegations.

Factual Background

5. At around 21:18 on 22nd October 2025, an off duty police officer from Cambridgeshire Police came across a two vehicle collision on London Road in Fenstanton, with both vehicles badly damaged and minor injuries sustained to two of the four parties.
6. Each vehicle involved had two people inside. A black Mercedes was driven by PC Goodey with a female passenger in front. The other car was a silver Volkswagen.
7. The Mercedes was facing the wrong way on the wrong side of the road to the direction from where it had been travelling. The VW driver stated that he had been travelling the correct way along a main road when the other car came towards him on the wrong side of the road, the other car swerved but not before clipping the rear of his vehicle and making his car spin.

8. Both drivers were breathalysed at the side of the road. PC Goodey blew 109 and was arrested for drink driving.
9. PC Goodey provided another sample of breath at the police station and blew 97.
10. PC Goodey was arrested and gave a no comment interview.
11. On 11th March 2026, PC Goodey was charged with drink driving, contrary to s.5(1)(a) Road Traffic Act 1988.
12. On 2nd April 2026, PC Goodey pled guilty at court and received a 26 month ban, 150 hours unpaid work, fines, surcharges and costs.

Misconduct and gross misconduct

13. I have to consider whether I am sufficiently satisfied to make a finding, on the balance of probabilities, of misconduct or gross misconduct. Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour and Gross Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified.
14. On the evidence presented, I am wholly satisfied that PC Goodey has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Schedule 2 to the *Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020* in relation to all allegations. In particular, I conclude that PC Goodey breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that:
 - i. **Discreditable conduct:** PC Goodey acted in a manner which discredited the police service and/or undermined the public confidence in it by drink driving, and in so doing, breaking the law. It is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves. PC Goodey did not act with self-control that is required by serving police officers.

15. Consequently, I find the matter of discreditable conduct proven at the severity of gross-misconduct.

Outcome Decision

16. Following the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes, I adopt a three-staged approach in order to determine the appropriate sanction.

17. The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the conduct. This is assessed by reference to:

- i. The officer's culpability;
- ii. The harm caused by the misconduct;
- iii. The existence of aggravating factors;
- iv. The existence of mitigating factors.

18. The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime. I remind myself that this has three elements:

- i. To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
- ii. To uphold high standards and deter misconduct; and
- iii. To protect the public.

19. I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers - it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

20. The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils the purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.

21. In doing so, I remind myself that each case must be considered and determined on its own merits. In adopting the three-staged approach outlined above, I bear in mind PC Goodey's record of service.

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

Culpability

22. In considering PC Goodey's culpability, I consider that this was intentional and deliberate behaviour get in and drive his car whilst drunk. This was particularly reckless given that he had a passenger. His driving was clearly of a poor standard, in that he drove on the wrong side of the road.

23. It is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves.

24. Accordingly, I find culpability at a high level.

Harm

25. As per 4.66 of the Guidance, "harm will likely undermine public confidence in policing. Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual or group to undermine public confidence. Where an officer commits an act that would harm public confidence if the circumstances were known to the public, take this into account". I consider that all of PC Goodey's actions would undermine confidence in the MPS. It is unacceptable for police officers to break the law.

26. I consider that there has been direct harm in that two people were injured as a result of his drink driving. The potential harm could have been exceptionally serious.

27. Accordingly, I consider the harm to be high level.

Aggravating factors

28. I do not consider that there are any additional aggravating factors in this matter.

Mitigating Factors

29. Personal mitigation is less relevant than in a criminal trial, and is dependent upon the extent to which the PC Goodey's misconduct threatens public confidence.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

30. I have reminded myself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case, and I am satisfied that all elements are engaged in my considerations.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

31. The gravity of PC Goodey's behaviour means that I do not consider any sanction less than dismissal without notice is justified. All three elements of the police misconduct regime are engaged in this case.

32. It is entirely unacceptable for police officers break the law. PC Goodey's actions were dangerous and reckless and undermines public trust and confidence in policing as well as our reputation. The public could have no confidence in PC Goodey to act with due respect to protect them in enforcing the law, given that he himself broke it.

33. A lesser outcome would not serve to mark the seriousness of his misconduct, deter others from similar misconduct and fulfil the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

34. Therefore, the only outcome I consider appropriate is dismissal without notice.

OUTCOME: Dismissal without notice and placed on the College of Policing Barred List

Andy Brittain

Commander

12th May 2026