

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:

FPC Beaumont

INTRODUCTION

Hearing dates: 13 – 14 July 2026

Heard by: Chair: ACO Andrew Pritchard, Ms Sarah Carter (Independent Panel Member) and Mr Adrian Lee (Independent Panel Member).

The Panel were assisted by Helen Fleck, Legally Qualified Advisor.

The Appropriate Authority (“the AA”) was represented by Mr Matthew Holdcroft of Counsel.

Federation Representative: Brett Wright

FPC Beaumont did not attend the hearing

The Panel would like to thank Mr Holdcroft for his assistance throughout the case, including the provision of an opening note.

The Panel would also like to thank PC A and PC Harris for their attendance and the evidence given during the hearing.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Application to proceed in absence

1. FPC Beaumont did not attend the hearing and was not represented. The AA therefore made an application under Regulation 37 for the hearing to proceed in his absence.
2. Mr Wright had attended the hearing and informed the Panel that he had received no instructions from FPC Beaumont and that he was aware of today’s hearing

and would not be attending. He told the Panel FPC Beaumont has secured new employment and did not wish to take time away from that for this hearing.

3. The Panel received and accepted the advice of the legally qualified advisor as follows:

R v. Hayward, Jones and Purvis [2001] QB 862, CA; R v. Jones (Anthony) [2003] 1 AC 1, HL derives from the criminal courts but the following principles apply and state that the Panel must have regard to all the circumstances of the case including, in particular:

- i. the nature and circumstances of the officer's behaviour in absenting himself from the hearing and in particular, whether his behaviour was deliberate, voluntary and such as plainly waived his right to appear;
- ii. whether an adjournment might result in the officer attending voluntarily
- iii. the likely length of such an adjournment;
- iv. whether the officer, though absent is, or wishes to be, legally represented at the hearing or has, by his conduct, waived his right to representation;
- v. whether an absent officer's legal representatives are able to receive instructions from him during the trial and the extent to which they are able to present his defence;
- vi. the extent of the disadvantage to the officer in not being able to give his account of events, having regard to the nature of the evidence against him;
- vii. the risk of the Panel reaching an improper conclusion about the absence of the defendant;
- viii. the seriousness of the misconduct,
- ix. the general public interest and the particular interest of victims and witnesses that a hearing should take place within a reasonable time of the events to which it relates;
- x. the effect of delay on the memories of witnesses;

Within the regulatory sphere the case of *General Medical Council v. Adeogba*; *General Medical Council v. Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162, [2016] 1 WLR 3867 also provides useful guidance and although relating to doctors' fitness to practice the following points are to be read over into police conduct regime:

- i. it is important to bear in mind that there is a difference between continuing a criminal trial in the absence of the defendant and the decision to continue a disciplinary hearing. This latter decision must also be guided by the context provided by the main objectives of the police conduct regulations, namely, protection of the public, maintenance of

public confidence in the police service, and the upholding of high professional standards.

- ii. In that regard, the fair, economical, expeditious and efficient disposal of allegations made against police officers and former police officers is of very real importance.
4. The Panel determined that FPC Beaumont had had sufficient notice of today's hearing and had voluntarily absented himself from the proceedings. There was no request for an adjournment or participation by alternative means and no indication that an adjournment would be likely to secure FPC Beaumont's attendance on any future date. Two witnesses have attended to give their evidence today and the Panel considered that it was in their interests as well as in the wider public interest to proceed with the hearing as scheduled. So doing would mean the Panel would not receive any oral account of events from FPC Beaumont however the Panel has the account he provided in interview and by way of a written statement and was satisfied that it could fairly and justly proceed in his absence.
 5. Mr Wright was released from further participation in the hearing.

FACTS

The Panel's approach

6. The Panel reminded itself it was:
 - i. Required to consider the facts of the case and to make its findings of fact in relation to the allegation;
 - ii. Determine whether those findings of fact found constitute a breach of the relevant standards;
 - iii. Determine whether the conduct found proven against the officer amount to misconduct or gross misconduct.
7. The Panel 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, any

victim or complainant and the public by preventing similar misconduct recurring in the future.

8. The Panel also had regard to a framework of regulations and guidance, in particular the following:
 - i. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 (the “Regulations”) including in particular the Standards of Professional Behaviour at schedule 2;
 - ii. 2018 Home Office Guidance (the “HOG”), including in particular chapter 1, summarising the Standards;
 - iii. The definition of misconduct given at Reg 2(1) of the Regulations: “a breach a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action”;
 - iv. The definition of gross misconduct given at reg 2(1) as amended by schedule 1 of the Regulations: “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious the that the officer concerned would have been dismissed if the officer had not ceased to be a member of a police force or a special constable ”.

9. In making its findings of fact, the Panel had regard to all the documents within the hearing bundle, including the exhibited photograph and screenshot of a WhatsApp message from FPC Beaumont to PC A. The fact that each document is not referred to does not mean that each document has not been carefully considered.

10. The LQA provided her advice in written format to the Panel after it had been sent to Mr Holdcroft who had confirmed he had no comments to make on the advice. The Panel has received no advice beyond that which is captured in this decision and appended as appendix 1.

11. The Panel has had regard to the fact that the burden of proof in this case is on the Appropriate Authority and that the civil standard applies, namely proof on the balance of probabilities. In line with the principle derived from *Byrne v General Medical Council*, 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. The inherent probability of the relevant conduct is a matter which can be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and in deciding whether the event/conduct occurred; this goes to the quality of evidence.

12. As to individual pieces of evidence, the Panel was mindful that it is entitled to draw proper inferences, that is to come to common sense conclusions based upon the evidence which it accepts as reliable; but it must not speculate. Similarly, it must not speculate about what other evidence there might have been.
13. The Panel did not take FPC Beaumont's absence as an indication of acceptance of the allegations nor of any misconduct, and has decided the case on the evidence before it.

Evidence

14. The Panel had been provided with the following material in advance of the hearing:
- i. Hearing Bundle comprising of 142 pages
 - ii. The AA's opening note.
15. The Panel heard oral evidence from PC A and PC Harris. The Panel is grateful to them for their attendance and the evidence given.
16. The Panel admitted the witness statements of other officers in written format contained within the bundle. Their content was plainly relevant but not the sole or decisive evidence in relation to any of the particulars of the allegation and its inclusion had not been objected to by FPC Beaumont. We therefore considered it was fair to admit this material.
17. In relation to PC A, the Panel considered that she was an open and honest witness. She answered all questions readily and in a manner which was consistent with the previous account provided. The Panel noted that she was able to give much of her evidence without needing to refer to her written statement but that, where any matters were not within her current recollection, she acknowledged this. The Panel also noted that her account was consistent with the perception of others present on the nights out that she seemed unhappy with FPC Beaumont.
18. PC A was frank in her evidence about matters which might have had the potential to undermine her account, including her consumption of alcohol and her level of certainty as to whether any touching by FPC had been deliberate or accidental. The Panel considered that in this case, far from undermining her credibility or

reliability, these concessions enabled the Panel to put significant reliance on her as a witness of truth.

19. Finally, both Mr Holdcroft and the Panel put questions to PC A to explore the plausibility of FPC Beaumont's account, she answered these directly but was clearly upset by his suggestion that nothing untoward had happened. The Panel observed that when answering these and when recollecting the detail of what she said had occurred she became understandably uncomfortable and distressed. The Panel considered that this emotional response was further supportive of her events representing a truthful and unpleasant recollection.
20. In relation to PC Harris the Panel again found him to be a straightforward and credible witness. He did not seek to embellish his evidence and was open with the Panel that he was very intoxicated for part of the evening but that he recalled PC A seeming unhappy with FPC Beaumont, describing her as "giving him evils" and that FPC Beaumont said to her "you know you liked it" or words to that effect. He remembered this because it was such a strange comment to make but did not ask any further questions about what had happened. There is, in the Panel's view, no likelihood in this case of collusion or fabrication.
21. PC Harris was specifically asked how he was clear in his memory of the comment made by PC Beaumont given his state of intoxication and the period of more than a year between the event and him providing a statement in regards to these events, PC Harris was clear in his evidence that at the time of the incident he was sobering up and the comment and reaction of PC A was such that it brought the matter into sharp focus for him.

Findings

Particulars 1 – 5

22. These are background facts which relate to the dates of published documents and to the former officer's starting date and training provided to him. The Panel found the particulars proved by reference to the published documents and to the information contained within the investigators report.

Particular 6:

On 2 February 2024, the Officer's team had a team night out in London. Early in the evening, Ms A had a conversation with colleagues about some of her bad experiences with online dating. The Officer overheard this conversation.

23. The fact of the night out was not disputed by FPC Beaumont in his interview and is supported by the evidence of PC Harris and the other officers within the bundle. In his interview FPC Beaumont stated he was aware of the conversation between PC A and other officers about her dating experiences. The Panel therefore accepted this and PC A's oral evidence that this conversation took place as alleged and that FPC Beaumont overheard it.

Particular 7

Later in the evening, shortly before 20:00, whilst at the Brazen Monkey Karaoke Bar the Officer approached Ms A who was sitting down. Ms A was wearing a top with a deep rounded neckline that displayed some of her cleavage.

24. The Panel accepted PC A's account in relation to this particular which is to a large extent accepted by FPC Beaumont inasmuch as in interview he recalled the group went to the Brazen Monkey and had an interaction with PC A about her dating life. He further accepted that he was sitting down and he was standing with one knee on the seat leaning over her.
25. FPC Beaumont was not asked about what PC A was wearing but the Panel can see no reason for PC A to have made up or to have been mistaken about this detail and in light of our overall assessment of her credibility, we accept that this is what she was wearing.

Particular 8

The Officer stood in front of Ms A and said words to the effect of, 'I can't understand why you are having issues with men.' Ms A asked what he meant and the Officer referred to her earlier conversation.

26. This particular is found proved. FPC Beaumont accepts having used words to this effect and in line with the Panel's finding as to PC A's credibility, we accepted her evidence on this point.

Particular 9

The Officer then:

- a. Looked from Ms A's face to her chest.*
- b. Looked at her chest for several seconds.*

c. Said, 'Well, look at you.' as he was looking at Ms A's breasts.

d. Nodded and smirked as he did so.

e. He caused Ms A to feel uncomfortable.

Ms A stood up, put her jacket on and held it closed and then walked away from the Officer.

27. This particular is found proved in its entirety. The Panel was mindful that the only witness who described this incident was PC A and that whilst FPC Beaumont accepted he may have looked momentarily and not deliberately at her chest, he did not carry out any of the rest of the actions described by PC A. The Panel considered that despite not witnessing the events, PC Harris and the other officers who have provided statements supported PC A's version of events. If, as FPC Beaumont asserted, he had not acted in the ways alleged, there would have been no reason for others to have noticed that PC A looked upset, uncomfortable or "pissed off" nor would there have been any need for PC Goodman to speak to FPC Beaumont at the tube station or for him to send a text message apologising the next day.

28. The Panel could identify no reason for PC A to falsify her evidence given the low level of prior interaction between her and FPC Beaumont. Nor was there any potential for her to be mistaken about what happened. At the time she was close to FCP Beaumont who was effectively leaning over her. We considered her evidence on this matter to be further supported by the fact that she wanted to give FCP Beaumont the benefit of the doubt and did not escalate what had happened until she had further concerns about his behaviour. For all of the above reasons we preferred the account given by PC A and found this particular proved.

Particular 10

The team left the Brazen Monkey and stood on the pavement. The Officer approached Ms A from behind, he:

a. Placed his hand on her back.

b. Ran his hand down her back.

c. Placed his hand on her bottom.

d. Cupped her bottom for several seconds.

29. The Panel again and for the reasons stated above accepted the account given by PC A and has found this charge proved. The Panel considered whether there was any prospect that this non-consensual touching was carried out by someone other than FCP Beaumont but as PC A stated she turned round and immediately confronted the person who had touched her, and that this person was FPC Beaumont, we concluded that it was more likely than not that it was he who had touched her as alleged in a – d. This particular is therefore found proved.

Particular 11

Ms A immediately challenged the Officer. She said, 'How would your girlfriend feel if she knew you had been out touching up other girls?' The Officer replied, 'What?' and Ms A said, 'Don't fucking do it again'.

30. The Panel found this particular proved. PC A's evidence was consistent and credible and she had no motive to lie about her reaction. It was an instant and understandable reaction to being touched in this way and should have made it abundantly clear to FPC Beaumont that his earlier actions were unwanted.

Particular 12

Later, when stood on the platform of Tottenham Court Road Underground Station the Officer approached Ms A from behind again. He placed his finger on the rear of her upper thigh just below her bottom. Ms A turned and faced the Officer. He was laughing. Ms A said, 'Do that again and I'll break your fingers.' The Officer laughed and said, 'What.'

31. This particular is found proved. The Panel again had only the account of PC A and the denial by FPC Beaumont but, for the reasons given above considered that it was more likely than not that PC A's account reflected what had occurred. In this aspect, her evidence was supported by that of PC Goodman who saw PC A challenge FPC Beaumont at the tube station and saw her red in the face and pointing her finger at FPC Beaumont. There would have been no reason for this to have taken place had FPC not acted in the way described by PC A.

Particular 13

At 21:45 the Officer sent Ms A a WhatsApp message that said, 'Heyy [Ms A] I am sorry If I said a comment that upset/annoyed you, I really didn't meant anything (EMOJi) said in that way. I hope you can forgive me for anything I said....I generally didn't mean to annoy or upset you.'

32. This particular is evidenced by the message itself and FPC Beaumont's acceptance in interview that he sent it and is therefore found proved.

Particular 14

On 7 March 2025, the Officer's team had a team night out in London.

33. This is another background fact which is not disputed by FPC Beaumont and is confirmed by the evidence of PC A and the other officers who were present. It is accordingly found proved.

Particular 15

The team visited an escape room, Escape Entertainment, at George Yard. Whilst the group were trying to find the entrance to the escape room the Officer urinated in a public place

34. The background facts to this particular are again not disputed and are supported by all officers present who gave statements. FPC Beaumont was asked in interview about urinating in public and accepted that he had done so. The Panel also had a photograph taken by PC Cooper which clearly shows FPC Beaumont standing in an alcove of a building with his legs apart, hand in front of his body and a stream of liquid running onto the pavement. It is obvious to the Panel that FPC Beaumont is urinating as indeed it would have been to any member of the public walking by. The Panel noted that the photograph shows it still to be light, and that whilst FPC Beaumont is not exposing himself, he was urinating in a location which was open and where he ran a high risk of being seen.
35. The Panel has heard no evidence of any medical conditions affecting FPC Beaumont and as he accepted in interview, he had other options available to him.

Particular 16

The team entered the escape room. They split into two groups. The Officer and Ms A were in the same group. Whilst their group were in 'the bank heist' the Officer approached Ms A from her left and brushed her upper left thigh. Ms A turned and looked at the Officer who then turned and walked away.

36. The background facts about attendance at an escape room and the groupings are again not in dispute. FPC Beaumont denied in interview that he touched PC A either deliberately or accidentally. PC A told the Panel that although the pressure used was lighter than on the previous occasion, that she was sure it was FPC Beaumont who had touched her but that she wasn't sure it was intentional. Given that PC A also told the Panel that there was no reason for FPC Beaumont

to be that close to her as he was not helping with the task she and another colleague were completing and there was ample space in the room and because of his actions on the previous occasions, the Panel found it more likely than not that this touching was intentional.

Particular 17

The team then went to Honest Burger. When they were eating the Officer raised his eye level and started at Ms A's chest. He continued to look at her for several seconds.

37. This particular is found proved. PC A told us that this occurred whilst the colleague she was sitting next to had bent towards the floor and that FPC Beaumont had leered at her again and it made her feel disgusted. We accepted her account based on our assessment of her credibility and lack of any discernible motive to fabricate or reason to be mistaken about what had occurred.

Particular 18

On 12 March 2025, the Officer and Ms A were crewed together. They went to Sittingbourne Police Station. The Officer picked up a mug from a desk and walked to Ms A showing it to her. The mug had a picture of a cucumber on it and the text "more popular than a cucumber in a women's prison". Ms A considered this to be a further offensive display of sexualised behaviour by the officer.

38. The Panel found this particular proved. PC A told us that she had noticed the mug already and thought it was a bit risky but that FPC Beaumont then brought it to her to show her. She described how she could take a joke but how in light of the previous incidents she was upset by this. The Panel accepted her evidence and found that it had the ring of truth about it. Whilst there is no suggestion that the mug was FPC Beaumont's the reference on the mug is plainly sexual and there can have been no other motivation for showing it to PC A than to ensure that she was also aware of the sexualised joke the mug referred to. It was also the trigger for her to escalate her concerns as she was upset and frustrated that FPC Beaumont's sexualised behaviour had crossed over into the workplace.

Breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

39. The Panel has carefully considered all of the allegations found proved and is satisfied that FPC Beaumont's actions breached the Standards of Professional

Behaviour as set out in the regulation 30 notice and Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 in the following ways:

Authority, Respect and Courtesy: Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

40. The Panel considered that on repeated occasions FPC Beaumont acted without self-control and failed to treat a female colleague with respect and courtesy. Not only did he touch PC A in a manner which was inherently sexual namely by touching her bottom and the top of her thighs, the Panel concluded that the comments he made whilst looking at her chest and afterwards to PC Harris, as well as the incident with the mug, showed his actions were sexually motivated.

41. In addition to the sexual nature of the allegations FPC Beaumont showed a further lack of respect and courtesy by laughing at PC A when challenged and carrying out further non-consensual sexual touching despite having been told by her and others, in no uncertain terms, that his behaviour was out of order.

42. The Panel also determined that by urinating in a public place, PC Beaumont showed a lack of respect and courtesy towards the public and his colleagues who witnessed this behaviour.

Equality and Diversity: Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.

43. The Panel considered that FPC Beaumont had also breached this standard. His actions were targeted and directed at a female colleague. The Panel observed that the effect on PC A has continued to this day and that his behaviour did violate her dignity and created a hostile, degrading humiliating or offensive atmosphere for PC A.

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.

44. The Panel reminded itself that in order to prove a breach of the Standard relating to Discreditable Conduct, it is not necessary to prove that actual discredit has been brought to the police service; it is sufficient if the officer's behaviour had the potential to do so.

45. The Panel is in no doubt that this standard has also been breached and that FPC Beaumont's actions would damage the reputation of the police service undermine public trust and confidence were the details known to them, both in

terms of his unwanted sexualised behaviour towards PC A and his decision to urinate in a public place.

FINDING ON MISCONDUCT / GROSS MISCONDUCT

46. The Panel's task at this stage was to decide whether FPC Beaumont's actions amounted to "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that the officer concerned would have been dismissed if the officer had not ceased to be a member of a police force or a special constable". In so doing we have considered the factors identified within the College of Policing Outcomes Guidance:

Culpability

47. The Panel considered that FPC Beaumont acted in a way which was

48. There are a number of paragraphs within the outcomes guidance which specifically apply here and point to a higher level of culpability:

4.10 Conduct that is intentional, deliberate, targeted or planned will generally be more culpable than conduct that has unintended consequences, although the consequences of an officer's actions will be relevant to the harm caused.

4.17 It is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves – here the Panel considered that the touching of the thighs and bottom of PC A did amount to a sexual assault albeit that there has been no criminal conviction.

4.40 Matters involving sexual impropriety

4.41 This includes cases involving bullying or harassment, either in the police service or towards members of the public. The Panel considered that the repeated nature of FPC Beaumont's actions amounted to harassment of PC A.

Harm

49. The Panel decided FPC Beaumont's actions caused actual harm to PC A in terms of the emotional harm and distress

50. The Panel also considered his actions would cause significant harm to wider public confidence and trust in the police force, especially in light of recent high-profile cases. The Panel recognised that this is not a case involving physical or sexual violence but nonetheless considered that FPC Beaumont's actions represented repeated lack of respect for a female colleague's personal boundaries, and that the multiple sexual touchings which were not consented to and which were carried out despite being warned about his behaviour would be concerning to all members of the public but especially women and girls.

Aggravating Factors

51. The Panel identified the following aggravating factors:

- i. Repeated misconduct over a significant period of time.
- ii. Deliberate and targeted action towards PC A
- iii. Scale or depth of local or national concern about a particular issue – here sexual impropriety towards women and girls.

52. The Panel identified no mitigating factors.

53. The Panel had no hesitation in concluding that FPC Beaumont's actions amounted to gross misconduct as they were so serious that, had he still been a serving police officer, dismissal would have been justified.

OUTCOME

54. The function of the Panel at this stage is to determine in accordance with regulation 42 as amended by Schedule 1 whether or not to impose disciplinary action. As FPC Beaumont is no longer a serving officer, this decision is a binary one with the only available outcomes being to decide that FPC Beaumont would have been dismissed had he not resigned or that he would not.

55. The Panel has considered FPC Beaumont's service record but has received no additional evidence at this stage. The Panel kept in mind the purpose of disciplinary action and the overall purpose of the police misconduct regime which is threefold:

- i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;

- ii. To uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct;
- iii. To protect the public.

56. In light of the Panel's findings at the facts, standards and misconduct / gross misconduct stages, the Panel considered that none of the other options which would have been available in respect of a serving officer would have been sufficient to address the level of misconduct involved. A final written warning would not restore public confidence in the police force given the high level of culpability and the harm caused. Reduction in rank would not have been an available option in light of FPC Beaumont's rank.

57. The Panel therefore determined to impose disciplinary action and confirm that FPC Beaumont would have been dismissed without notice had he still been a serving police officer. This will mean that FPC Beaumont will be automatically placed on the barred list.

Right of Appeal.

In accordance with Regulation 43(2), the Appropriate Authority shall provide the Officer with a copy of this report and a notice of the right of appeal. The Officer is reminded he has a right to appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal. ("PAT"). The PAT may increase or decrease any penalty or overturn this decision.



ACO Andy Pritchard

14th July 2026