

IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE ACT 1996

AND

THE POLICE CONDUCT REGULATIONS 2020

AS AMENDED BY

THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024

THE APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY (CHIEF CONSTABLE OF KENT)

V

PC 3087 WHITE

NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS AND OUTCOME:

Hearing:

Date – Monday 5 October – Wednesday 7 October 2026

Location – Police HQ, Maidstone, Kent.

Panel and representatives:

- Panel Chair: ACO Andrew Pritchard
- Independent panel member: Clare Harrington
- Independent panel member – Bhupinder Gill
- Legally Qualified Advisor – Harry Ireland

Allegations

See attached appendix.

Evidence

The officer did not attend nor did he provide a Regulation 31 response. He had failed to engage in the process and in an email to his Federation representative informed him that he would not attend the hearing, a matter confirmed by the representative at the hearing, who had no instructions to participate further. The Panel was satisfied, following the principles laid down in the cases of R v Hayward [2001] EWCA Crim 168, [2001] and R v Jones (Anthony) [2002] UKHL 5, that the officer knew of the date, time and venue of the hearing, that he was in possession of all the evidence before the Panel and thus aware of the case against him, that he had voluntarily absented himself from proceedings and, finally, that nothing would be achieved by adjourning the proceedings. The Panel thus decided to proceed in the officers' absence.

The second issue arising from this was the decision as to the witnesses to be called and the method of ensuring that the officer's case was put to them, ensuring that the officer received a fair hearing. It was decided that only witnesses that provided first hand evidence of the allegations would be necessary in the interests of justice to be called. Thereafter, the remaining witnesses' evidence would be admitted as hearsay as well as, in most cases, corroborative evidence. In deciding upon this route, the Panel were mindful of the decision in *Chief Constable of Hampshire v Police Appeals Tribunal* [2012] EWHC 746 (Admin), to which it was referred, and how important witnesses should be heard. The Panel agreed with the submissions on behalf of the Appropriate Authority (AA), that :

'PC White made no application to cross-examine those witnesses, because he has declined to engage with these proceedings (and therefore formally deny the allegations). In those circumstances, it is submitted that a distinction can be drawn with McLean, where the officer concerned was formally engaged with proceedings, denied the allegations, and sought to call his accuser for cross-examination. Provided the Panel is satisfied as to the cogency and credibility of the hearsay evidence before it, it is submitted that it can properly find the factual allegations proven.'

The Panel was reminded about relying on hearsay evidence and the potential weight to be given to this, particularly absent any corroborating evidence. This applied equally to the evidence advanced on behalf of the Appropriate Authority as well as that of the officer.

It was agreed with Counsel for the AA that when examining the witnesses called to give evidence, he would, in a neutral fashion, put to the witnesses the responses from the officer given in his interviews, so as to enable the PC White's case to be put and the witnesses evidence tested. The Panel subsequently considered the responses when reviewing PC White's accounts .

The Panel addressed their findings in the order of the allegations contained in the Regulation 30 Notice and the numbering below equates to those found within the Notice.

There were 14 allegations under paragraph 4 of the Notice which dealt with comments made by the officer.

4(a); these comments were admitted by the officer who explained their usage by him in a previous occupation as well as his daily life. PC A and PC Karmonaite both heard such comments and felt them to be inappropriate and, for the latter officer, showed a lack of respect.

The Panel found this allegation to be proven.

4(b); this was contained in a message to PC D and the officer said that this was a part of a conversation with the officer where matters of a sexual nature were discussed. The Panel noted that the officer concluded his comment with a laughing emoji which demonstrated his attitude towards the female being discussed. The Panel found this allegation proven.

4(c); the comment was made in the presence of PC's D, Burns, Harper and Shonk, albeit PC D's recollection as to the exact words slightly differs from that of the other 3 officers. The import of the words however is much the same in their effect. The officer denied this and, which is acknowledged by others including PC Beadle to whom the words were addressed, he was a friend of hers. PC Beadle whilst not quoting any words, referred to such a conversation and said that because she and PC White were friends, she did not find anything untoward in his

comments. The Panel noted how 4 officers reacted to such words and could not find any evidence to suggest why this would be fabricated and accordingly found the allegation proven.

4(d); this comment was heard by both PC Burns and PC Shonk and PC Burns stated that this had been said by PC White on 'several occasions.' PC White said that he did say something akin to this but was talking about dating as opposed to having sex with members of the class. Given that the two officers recall such words being said, the Panel accepted their evidence and found the allegation proven.

4(e); whilst the Panel accepted that this was said by PC White, and offended the officer, the Panel could not discern from this anything it reached the threshold of a breach of the Standards in the context provided by the Appropriate Authority. This was dismissed.

4(f); these comments were made in front of PC's B and D and despite PC White claiming his comment of the staff officer being 'fit' was a reference to physical fitness his associated comments as to his desires, made it plain it was a sexual reference, and a wholly inappropriate sexual reference targeted at her perceived sexual identity which both officers found it to be inappropriate. The allegation was found proven.

4(g); whilst this was heard by 2 officers there was limited evidence of context and no elaboration and thus this was found not proven in terms of any breach of Standards, albeit the Panel accepted that the words were used.

4(h); this remark was heard by a number of officers and was said in an open classroom. PC White claimed that in admitting he used such words, it was in the context of describing 'chat up lines' and not as alleged, directed at PC A. However the evidence of all the other officers is clear, and PC A described how shocked she was and left the room immediately, feeling horrible and uncomfortable. PC White added to her distress by later asking if PC A had enjoyed his 'joke' to which she responded by asking him how he thought her boyfriend would react should he be told of this. The Panel found the allegation proven.

4(i); this was found not proven. PC D told the Panel that she told the investigator that this remark would be the 'kind of thing' PC White would say as opposed to him actually having said it. This also assisted the Panel when finding, as with all witnesses they heard from, that PC D was an honest and credible witness.

4(j); this remark was made in front of a number of officers albeit it is only PC Jessup and PC Karmonaite who give direct evidence of the words used. PC White denied saying this and claimed it was PC King who had said this on an earlier occasion. As there was no evidence to suggest either mistake or fabrication on the part of the two witnesses and taking into account how the Panel viewed PC White's overall behaviour regarding his attitude towards the female officers on his course, the Panel found this allegation proven.

4(k); PC White said that he could not recall making such a comment, but the Panel accepted that it was said to PC D. The Panel in finding PC D a credible and honest witness could discern no reason for invention nor mistake and, again, such language was in keeping with PC White's overall attitude. It was an inappropriate, puerile comment made out of context and sexualised a matter that clearly did not demand such a reference to be made as a joke or otherwise. The allegation was proven.

4(l); in considering this allegation, which was corroborated by PC Cadwallader, the Panel noted from his statement, background evidence regarding PC White which was echoed by many in its summation of PC White. He said this:

I remember Max liked to talk about his life outside of Kent Police and this usually involved him talking about a woman. I found these conversations inappropriate as he would talk about his sexual conquests and sometimes, he made sexual jokes about the women he had met and what he had said or done to them, things that I didn't find funny and was disgusted with. I found myself in a difficult situation as although I didn't want to hear Max's stories, he was in my class so felt like I had to listen to him. After while though, I stated to separate myself from him due to the inappropriateness of what he would say. When I spoke to others in the class, they told me they were having to listen to similar conversations with Max that they didn't like either.

He then added:

I remember on female from my class in particular, PC D, who was open about the fact she already had a boyfriend who did not work for Kent Police. Max was clearly interested in her, and he made many comments to me about PC D saying things like, 'I don't care if she has a boyfriend, I will still take her, and she will be mine'. I also remember when we were doing out statement training and had to complete an MG11 including the back containing the individuals' personal details. Max asked PC D fill out her personal details on MG11 and stated that he could stalk her now.

This confirmed PC D's evidence as to PC White's interest in her as well as PC White's general attitude towards women, and assisted the Panel when considering the allegations against him as opposed to his denials or 'reinterpretation' of the words alleged. It was notable that when PC White's version was put to PC D, she insisted that her version was correct and that she could still visualise it.

The Panel found the allegation proven.

4(m); albeit only PC D gives evidence of this comment, PC White, once more, in accepting the words alleged, claimed that they were used in a conversation about 'chat up lines' as opposed to being directed at PC D. For the reasons stated above, the Panel found that PC D's evidence preferable especially as PC D told the Panel about her reticence in general regarding talking about sexual matters, and the Panel's views of her as a witness. The Panel noted in particular her observation about PC White's comments generally when she told the Panel that she found his comments made her feel uncomfortable especially when made during college time, where she felt it had a 'military feel' and therefore such matters of a sexual nature should not be discussed there. It is noted also that this allegation was one of three (4(k)-(m)), that occurred over a period of only 2 days, in keeping therefore with the Panels' findings that this type of conduct by PC White was a pattern over a period of time and was nothing unusual for him. The Panel found the allegation proven.

4(n); the Panel found that this was likely a repeat of the allegation at 4(j) and thus dismissed it.

5(a) and (b); the Panel considered these allegations together because given the vagueness of PC Waddington as to time, date and place, combined with the similarity in wording to that alleged in 5 (a) it must be referring to the same incident. If it did not, it added nothing to the allegation in 5(a). As the words as alleged were witnessed by two officers, Burns and Coutts and so concerned PC Burns that he immediately challenged PC White about his racist comment, the Panel could not accept PC White's claim that his comments were a more scientific analysis

without any racial overtones. It is not credible that two officers would mishear such words and one react in the way that he did. The Panel found the allegation proven.

5(c); the words alleged were heard by PC D with PC B giving evidence of the second comment. PC White stated that this was a part of a conversation regarding martial arts and denied making any racist remarks. Both PC B and D told the Panel how shocked they were at such remarks and left the room thereafter. Given their independent reactions and their overall credibility the Panel found the allegation proven.

6. The comment to PC Cadwallader is quoted above (4(l)) and, as will be noted below, is in keeping with PC White's attraction to PC D and thus the Panel found this proven. There is nothing to evidence it was anything other than an honest recollection on the part of PC Cadwallader.

7. PC A gave evidence in line with her statement and described PC White as 'touchy feely' and how he would grab her from behind and push himself up against her. This occurred about 10-15 times and she would make her feelings clear as to how unwelcome such touching was by her movements away from PC White. She also confirmed how PC White placed his arm around her shoulder with his arm draped over her shoulder, his hand waving from side to side touching her breast. The actions of PC White were deliberate and left her shocked, uncomfortable and 'a little scared of him.' She accepted that in her initial account that she did not regard the touching as sexual but she said that she was still processing what had happened to her and at the time was shocked and naïve. Having thought about it more and having had training on the law she realised that PC White's actions were sexual in nature.

PC Harper stated that she saw PC White draping his arm over PC A's shoulder twice on the same day but could not see exactly where his hand was. Nevertheless, she was so concerned as to what she had seen, that she commented upon it to PC King at the time. PC King stated that he had seen PC White approach PC A and place his hands around her waist, resting his head on her shoulders. PC Coutts saw PC White approach PC A from behind and hug her and heard PC A say to PC D 'that was a bit weird.'

PC White accepted he had hugged PC A from behind, just not in the manner she had described stating there was no bodily contact between his front and her back during the hug. PC White reiterated that throughout his time at KPC, the hugging of each other was regular and mutual. He denied having ever intentionally touched PC A's breast in the manner described. He did accept he had put his arm/hand around her shoulder on the odd occasion when walking back and forth to the Smoking Shelter.

The Panel as stated above found PC A to be both credible and honest and accepted her evidence that the actions of PC White went beyond friendliness and were sexual in nature, especially when considering the evidence in totality as to his behaviour, conduct and attitude towards the females on the course. If friendliness was the motivation, why would PC A be shocked and a little afraid of PC White? The Panel found this allegation proven on the basis that at a minimum this was an action by PC White that was unwanted sexual contact with PC A.

8. The alleged actions of PC White were witnessed by two officers. PC Waddington saw him hug a female he believed to be PC B from behind and PC Martin described it thus:

I have also seen Max putting his arms over PC B and hugging her from behind. He didn't ask her first, this was sudden and unexpected by her, and I am sure she did not want Max touching her in this way.

PC Beadle says that PC B accepted the arm around her shoulder but her evidence was given little weight as she was not regarded by the Panel as independent, having admitted in her statement that she was a friend of PC White and saw the allegations against him as some form of conspiracy, of which there was no credible evidence at all.

The Panel found PC B to be a very persuasive and impressive witness and the Panel found her reaction to PC White's touching to be telling – 'What the hell is wrong with you?' – which seems to have had the effect on PC White of no longer seeking to interact with her in any untoward manner. She said that given the hands position which was unnatural, it could only have been deliberate on the part of PC White. When it was put to PC B that there may have been collusion between the witnesses to influence her views as to the nature of the touching she gave what the Panel found to be a persuasive and powerful retort, namely. 'the only person who has influenced my opinion of PC White is PC White.' The Panel will deal with the possibility of collusion here, albeit it applies throughout the findings. PC B in particular told the Panel that there was a discussion between some of the witnesses such was their concern about PC White's conduct and it was following this that they reported the matter to the Professional Standards Department. Given the relative youth and inexperience of the cohort, with PC White seemingly a little older than they generally, the Panel found it unsurprising that it was only when these young officers realised that they had jointly suffered at the hands of PC White over a period of weeks, that they found the fortitude to approach the Professional Standards Department. There was nothing in the evidence which demonstrated a remarkable similarity to justify a finding of collusion nor any evidence (save for an aside within PC Beadle's statement) to find that the officers had such malice towards PC White that they conspired against him. Indeed, the opposite was true, in that all officers, (as witnessed within the text exchanges between PC White and PC D), had a great deal of sympathy for PC White following the death of his mother during the early weeks of their course. Therefore, the only rational conclusion to be drawn as to the motivation of the officers in complaining about PC White was his behaviour.

9. PC D in evidence told the Panel that PC White approached her from behind unannounced and placed his arms around her waist and squeezed her making contact from the middle of her back down to the middle of her legs with his groin making contact with her backside. She was very sure of this when asked. It made her feel uncomfortable, as she was not a 'touchy' person. PC Harper described it thus:

WHITE was in uniform and walked straight up behind PC D. It appeared like he was trying to surprise her. PC D's arms were down by her side and WHITE went in between these arms with both of his. In a hugging motion, he then wrapped both his arms around PC D, above her hips and around her stomach. The hug lasted for a few seconds and WHITE said something to PC D I did not hear.

PC Coutts corroborated such actions adding that PC D looked trapped and uncomfortable and this was supported by PC Burns.

PC White accepted that he had hugged PC D from behind, but said that only his chest had made contact with her back and had made no contact with her breast. It was a gesture of friendship with no sexual intent. The Panel found his assertion that it was only his chest that made contact with PC D unlikely.

The Panel noted the background evidence here as to PC White's attraction to PC D. PC White had, according to PC D, continually 'talked down' PC D's boyfriend with whom she was and is in a long-term relationship with a view she thought for her to get rid of him and allow PC White to

have a relationship with her (as corroborated in his remarks to PC Cadwallader and noted by PC Martin). This was denied by PC White. The evidence was such that whilst there may well have been a fledgling friendship between PC White and PC D, (especially as PC D was consoling him due to the loss of his mother), it was nothing more as far as PC D was concerned. PC White made much of their video call whilst PC D was on holiday with her boyfriend but the Panel accepted that this call was in relation to an essay that both had to prepare and nothing more. Also, PC D had no reason to be attracted to PC White as he claimed given that PC Shonk said this in his statement

Due to what I had heard, I had spoken to PC D on a couple of occasions and had found out that the comments made by WHITE had made her feel anxious and on occasion she had gone home crying

Also, PC D told the Panel that as a result of PC White's comments she had declined to attend a group night out because PC White would be in attendance. However as things turned out PC White changed his mind, did not attend and this enabled PC D to do so.

The Panel found the allegation proven.

10. In accepting the facts as told to the Panel by PC E, the Panel did not find sufficient evidence to conclude that this touching by PC White was improper. PC E fairly told the Panel that she felt uncomfortable about it because she had heard 'whispers' about PC White's conduct and therefore was unsure about him. This undoubtedly coloured her view of any actions on the part of PC White and the Panel could not be satisfied, without any further evidence, that the officer behaved improperly.

11. PC Coutts gave evidence in her statement as to the words used. PC White accepted that such a discussion took place but denied using the word 'it.' The Panel found that if such a word had not been used, why would PC Coutts feel the need to challenge him? The comment and topic were in keeping with what the Panel found to be PC White's general demeanour and conduct and therefore found the allegation proven.

In respect of the allegations found proven the Panel found that PC White breached the Standards of Behaviour relating to

Authority, respect and courtesy.

Discreditable Conduct.

Equality and Diversity.

The Panel in considering the level of such breaches found the following:

CULPABILITY

Pc White's conduct was intentional, deliberate, targeted and repeated. Harm to individuals by his conduct was reasonably foreseeable, inevitably causing distress by both words and deeds. His actions were sexually improper with a degree of harassment, persistence and involved a number of people. The Panel found that his actions amounted to a course of conduct involving discriminatory behaviour especially sexual harassment of female officers. He also displayed racist behaviour in his use of language. His conduct towards female officers was a form of abuse of them for his own gratification which was unwanted, unwelcome and abusive.

Therefore, culpability was high.

HARM

Given ongoing public concern about the behaviour of male police officers' behaviour towards women and girls, PC White's conduct would undermine further the public trust in the police, albeit this should be balanced by the Force's early intervention and thus the prevention of any escalation of such conduct.

The Panel also noted the psychological distress to the female officers who gave evidence as a result of PC White's words and conduct, whereby their reactions included shock, discomfort and in the case of PC A, a degree of fear.

Finally, the Panel found that such conduct could undermine good discipline within the Police particularly in a learning environment with junior officers.

AGGRAVATING FACTORS

There was a malign intent on PC White's part, namely sexual gratification.

The behaviour was repeated, regular and persistent over a relatively short period of time.

There were multiple breaches and victims.

His actions demonstrated unlawful discrimination.

His actions and words would contribute to the public's ongoing concerns as to the conduct of certain officers.

As a result of the above the Panel found that the breaches amount to Gross Misconduct.

SANCTION

The Panel began by reminding itself of the threefold purpose of the Misconduct regime, namely:

Firstly, to protect the public confidence in and the reputation of policing.

Secondly, to maintain the high professional standards by demonstrating to other officers that misconduct will not be tolerated.

Thirdly, to protect the public and/or officers and staff by preventing the officers from committing similar misconduct again.

The Panel also followed the guidance from the court in *Fuglers LLP v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin) and the *Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings*.

In determining the appropriate sanction, we took into account the following matters:

CULPABILITY

The factors are as recorded above.

High.

HARM

The factors are as recorded above.

High

AGGRAVATING FACTORS

(The following should be read in conjunction with the comments and observations recorded above. The Panel was cognisant of the need to avoid 'double counting'.)

MITIGATING FACTORS

The Panel took into account his very junior and limited service and the loss of his mother during this period. However as this was personal mitigation it played only a minor part in the decision as to sanction.

The Panel in determining the appropriate sanction considered the least serious outcome that was consistent with the aims of the regime and decided that he is dismissed with immediate effect without notice, and is to be placed on the Barred List.



ACO Andy Pritchard (Chair)

7th October 2026