
REGULATION 43 REPORT:

NOTIFICATION OF OUTCOME OF MISCONDUCT HEARING

POLICE CONSTABLE 976 THOMAS LEE-STOREY & FORMER POLICE CONSTABLE 4452 AMY JOWETT

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 24 September 2026 a misconduct hearing was convened to deal with allegations against Police Constable (PC) Thomas Lee-Storey and Former PC Amy Jowett which the Appropriate Authority (AA) assessed as amounting to gross misconduct.

1.2 The hearing was held in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (PCR 2020) as amended by Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024.

1.3 The hearing was held at Nottinghamshire Police Headquarters on 24, 25 and 30 September 2026.

1.4 The hearing Panel consisted of retired Deputy Chief Constable Julia Debenham, and two Independent Panel Members (IPM), Ms Beverley Graham and Mrs Julia Peters.

1.5 The Panel were supported throughout the hearing by Mr Callum Cowx, the appointed independent legal adviser or Legally Qualified Person (LQP).

1.6 The AA was represented by Mr Ian Mullarkey of counsel. Both officers were represented by Mr Ashraf Khan of counsel.

1.7 Prior to the hearing the Panel was provided with a bundle of documents and video recordings relevant to the case.

1.8 In response to an application made by the Appropriate Authority, the Chair directed that the identities of the members of the public that were involved in this incident would be protected through the use of ciphers. They would be referred to as Person A and Person B throughout the proceedings and any reporting of proceedings.

2. THE ALLEGATIONS

2.1 The breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPB) alleged were set out in a Regulation 30 (PCR 2020) Notice of Allegations for each officer as follows:

PC Lee-Storey

1. Facts

- 1.1. At all relevant times, you were a police constable with Nottinghamshire Police, having commenced employment on 15 January 2021.
- 1.2. At all relevant times, you were subject to Nottinghamshire Police's Domestic Abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance and in particular:
 - 1.2.1. Section 3.4. which states that It will be for the attending officers to establish whether calls for assistance amount to domestic abuse, or not, based on the current circumstances and the past behaviour of those involved. However, if a call fits the definition of domestic abuse, it must be recorded as a domestic abuse on NICHE (whether a crime or non-crime)
 - 1.2.2. Section 3.5 which provides guidance as to when a domestic abuse public protection notice (PPN) ought to be submitted and in particular that If you suspect domestic abuse ... then submit a DAPPN.
 - 1.2.3. Section 4.4. which states that positive action should be taken at all domestic abuse. Victims have a right to protection from domestic abuse and police officers have a responsibility to investigate and obtain sufficient evidence to prosecute an alleged offender and to safeguard the rights of victims and children / vulnerable persons
 - 1.2.4. Section 4.8 which states that In all domestic abuse cases, Investigating Officers should explore the history of domestic abuse, with such information supporting a prosecution file and proving that the offence is part of a pattern of domestic abuse rather than the isolated incident
- 1.3. On 29 October 2024, you were on duty, having commenced work at 1500 hours. You were crewed with PC 4452 Amy Jowett.
- 1.4. At approximately 2014 hours, Person A contacted Nottinghamshire Police via 999 and made threats that she was going to stab her grandmother, Person B (incident 0657_291024).
- 1.5. At approximately 2040 hours, Person B contacted Nottinghamshire Police via 999 and stated that she was getting threats from Person A (incident 0676_29102024).
- 1.6. You were assigned to attend upon Person B. You were advised that Person B was getting threats from Person A and that Person A keeps harassing her [Person B] in general.
- 1.7. You accessed Niche occurrence 24000520142 at approximately 2057 hours, which related to a previous public order offence reported by Person B, relating to Person A.
- 1.8. You attended Person B's home address at approximately 2108 hours. Person B advised you that Person A had threatened her when she stated that she's coming to cut me up and put me in the bin and/ or that Person A had called a fire brigade and ambulance to her address and/ or that Person A keeps calling her.
- 1.9. You failed to take any positive action following the report by Person B which could amount to allegations of criminal offences.
- 1.10. You failed to safeguard Person B as you failed to provide her with or signpost her to safeguarding advice.
- 1.11. You failed to complete a PPN with Person B.

- 1.12. PC Jowett updated force system SAFE with information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading as it stated that
 - 1.12.1. No offences were disclosed on this occasion
 - 1.12.2. Person B did not disclose that Person A had made any new threats
 - 1.12.3. Person A has been given appropriate safeguarding advice
- 1.13. You knew and/ or ought to have known that that PC Jowett had updated force systems with information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading.
- 1.14. You knew and/ or ought to have known that the case should not be closed.
- 1.15. On 30 October 2024, PC 1078 Mason attended on Person B to obtain a statement and complete a PPN. PC Mason confirmed the same with yourself, PS 4489 Parkin and Inspector Schooling.
- 1.16. You thereafter spoke with PS Parkin and provided information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading when you informed PS Parkin that
 - 1.16.1. No offences or threats had been disclosed to you by Person B; and/ or
 - 1.16.2. Suggested that Person B was being dishonest to PC Mason
- 1.17. You thereafter provided information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading when you informed Insp Schooling by email on 31 October 2024 that
 - 1.17.1. No offences or threats had been disclosed to you by Person B; and/ or
 - 1.17.2. Suggested that Person B was being dishonest to PC Mason

2. Particulars of Misconduct

- 2.1. Your conduct at paragraphs 1.9, 1.10, 1.11 and/ or 1.14 breached the standard of professional behaviour relating to duties and responsibilities and/ or orders and instructions as you
 - 2.1.1. failed to act diligently and/ or expeditiously
 - 2.1.2. failed to abide by Nottinghamshire Police's Domestic Abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance
- 2.2. Your conduct at paragraph 1.13 breached the standard of professional behaviour, namely honesty and integrity (integrity only) as you knew and/ or ought to have known that the update provided by your colleague was false and/ or deliberately misleading
- 2.3. Your conduct at paragraph 1.16.1 and/ or 1.17.1. breached the standard of professional behaviour, namely honesty and integrity as you provided your line manager with information which you knew and/ or ought to have known was dishonest and/ or deliberately misleading
- 2.4. Your conduct at paragraph 1.16.2 and/ or 1.17.2. breached the standard of professional behaviour relating to honesty and integrity and authority, respect and courtesy
 - 2.4.1. Was dishonest as you provided false and/ or deliberately misleading information to your line manager

- 2.4.2. Lacked integrity as you suggested that a member of the public had provided dishonest information
- 2.4.3. Lacked respect and courtesy for a member of the public.
- 2.5. Your conduct as a whole would undermine public confidence in the police service.

3. Your conduct if proved amounts to:

- 3.1. Your conduct was dishonest and/ or lacked integrity which are fundamental tenets for a police officer
- 3.2. You failed to safeguard a victim of domestic violence
- 3.3. Your conduct would undermine public confidence in the police service.

4. Standards of Professional Behaviour engaged:

- 4.1. Honesty and Integrity (Integrity only)
- 4.2. Authority, Respect and Courtesy
- 4.3. Duties and Responsibilities
- 4.4. Orders and Instructions

Former PC Jowett

1. Facts

- 1.1. At all relevant times, you were a police constable with Nottinghamshire Police, having commenced employment on 3 March 2023.
- 1.2. At all relevant times, you were subject to Nottinghamshire Police's Domestic Abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance and in particular:
 - 1.2.1. Section 3.4. which states that It will be for the attending officers to establish whether calls for assistance amount to domestic abuse, or not, based on the current circumstances and the past behaviour of those involved. However, if a call fits the definition of domestic abuse, it must be recorded as a domestic abuse on NICHE (whether a crime or non-crime)
 - 1.2.2. Section 3.5 which provides guidance as to when a domestic abuse public protection notice (PPN) ought to be submitted and in particular that If you suspect domestic abuse ... then submit a DAPPN.
 - 1.2.3. Section 4.4. which states that Positive action should be taken at all domestic abuse. Victims have a right to protection from domestic abuse and police officers have a responsibility to investigate and obtain sufficient evidence to prosecute an alleged offender and to safeguard the rights of victims and children / vulnerable persons
 - 1.2.4. Section 4.8 which states that In all domestic abuse cases, Investigating Officers should explore the history of domestic abuse, with such information

supporting a prosecution file and proving that the offence is part of a pattern of domestic abuse rather than the isolated incident

1.3. On 29 October 2024, you were on duty, having commenced work at 1500 hours. You were crewed with PC 976 Thomas Lee-Storey.

1.4. At approximately 2014 hours, Person A contacted Nottinghamshire Police via 999 and made threats that she was going to stab her grandmother, Person B (incident 0657_291024).

1.5. At approximately 2040 hours, Person B contacted Nottinghamshire Police via 999 and stated that she was getting threats from Person A (incident 0676_29102024).

1.6. You were assigned to attend upon Person B. You were advised that Person B was getting threats from Person A and that Person A keeps harassing her [Person B] in general.

1.7. You accessed Niche occurrence 24000520142 at approximately 2057 hours.

1.8. You accessed Niche occurrence 24000647422 at approximately 2150 hours, which related to

1.9. You attended Person B's home address at approximately 2108 hours. Person B advised you that Person A had threatened her when she stated that she's coming to cut me up and put me in the bin and/ or that Person A had called a fire brigade and ambulance to her address and/ or that Person A keeps calling her.

1.10. You failed to take any positive action following the report by Person B which could amount to allegations of criminal offences.

1.11. You failed to safeguard Person B as you failed to provide her with or signpost her to safeguarding advice.

1.12. You failed to complete a PPN with Person B.

1.13. You thereafter updated force system SAFE with information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading including but not limited to that

1.13.1. No offences were disclosed on this occasion

1.13.2. Person B did not disclose that Person A had made any new threats

1.13.3. Person B has been given appropriate safeguarding advice

1.14. You knew and/ or ought to have known that the case should not be closed.

2. Particulars of Misconduct

2.1. Your conduct at paragraphs 1.10, 1.11, 1.12 and/ or 1.14 breached the standard of professional behaviour relating to duties and responsibilities and/ or orders and instructions as you

2.1.1. failed to act diligently and/ or expeditiously

2.1.2. failed to abide by Nottinghamshire Police's Domestic Abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance

2.2. Your conduct at paragraph 1.13 breached the standard of professional behaviour, namely honesty and integrity as you updated force systems with information which was not true.

2.3. Your conduct as a whole would undermine public confidence in the police service.

3. Your conduct if proved amounts to:

3.1. Your conduct was dishonest and/ or lacked integrity which are fundamental tenets for a police officer

3.2. You failed to safeguard a victim of domestic violence

3.3. Your conduct would undermine public confidence in the police service.

4. Standards of Professional Behaviour engaged:

4.1. Honesty and Integrity (Integrity only)

4.2. Authority, Respect and Courtesy

4.3. Duties and Responsibilities

4.4. Orders and Instructions

2.2 An error in the Regulation 30 Notices was identified and this was corrected by an amendment which was agreed by the parties. The alleged breach of Honesty and Integrity was not limited to the integrity limb. The amendment made clear that both officers were also accused of dishonesty, which was denied.

3. THE OFFICERS' RESPONSE

3.1 The officers had been interviewed and answered questions that were put to them about the alleged events. After being served with the Regulation 30 notices of allegations, they served their formal written response to that notice as required by Regulation 31 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

3.2 PC Lee-Storey had denied hearing the comment relating to a threat to cut the victim up. He was confused when he had arrived at the address and the incident was not as he was expecting. He accepted the facts as presented, but said that he had believed at the time that there were no new offences and had not considered harassment. He knew now that he was incorrect. PC Lee-Storey denied deliberately misleading his supervisors. He admitted that he had failed to abide by Nottinghamshire Police's Domestic Abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance.

3.3 Former PC Jowett stated that she also not heard the comment regarding the threat to cut the victim up. At the time, former PC Jowett was distracted by listening to the radio. Former PC Jowett stated that she was inexperienced and she was not sure whether there were any new offences. She followed PC Lee-Storey's advice when submitting the incident report. Former PC Jowett denied the fact that she

knowingly updated force systems with information that was untrue. Former PC Jowett admitted that she had failed to abide by Nottinghamshire Police's Domestic Abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance.

4. THE EVIDENCE

4.1 The Panel took into account the evidence in the bundle, particularly that to which it was referred by counsel, and to Body Worn Video (BWV) footage recorded by PC Lee-Storey and by former PC Jowett.

4.2 Oral evidence was given by Police Sergeant (PS) Thomas, (formerly Parkin), PC Lee-Storey and Former PC Jowett.

5. THE INCIDENT

5.1 The officers were sent to a Grade 1 incident. The dispatcher recognised that the incident was very confusing. The incident included reports by Person B of threats, harassment, hoax calls from Person A. It also includes that Person A has called the police to report that Person B's grandson is at the address kicking the door. Person B had not mentioned this when she called. The dispatcher wanted the officers to attend to find out what was going on.

5.2 There had been an earlier call by Person A to the police saying that she was going to stab Person B. This information was not relayed to the officers. On their way to the address, former PC Jowett reviewed the Place of Interest marker which showed that there had been previous threats from Person A to Person B. On arrival at the address both officers activated their body worn videos. The panel reviewed both officers' body worn video evidence together on a number of occasions.

5.3 On arrival at the address, PC Lee-Storey asked Person B whether anyone else was at the property. She told him that her husband was. No specific questions were asked in relation to the grandson until the officers have been inside the address for over 5 minutes. Person B initially tells the officers that she has had trouble with her granddaughter a few weeks ago, that it is being dealt with by the police. She had been told to phone the police if anything else happened. Person B disclosed that she had had the fire brigade at the property and that Person A had phoned an ambulance for granddad.

5.4 Person B showed PC Lee-Storey her phone and something that her daughter has sent her.

At around 2 minutes on PC Lee-Storey's body worn video, Pc Jowett appears to become distracted by radio communications regarding a grade one incident. The panel saw that her head was inclined to the side and she appears to be listening. At this point Person B is explaining that the council are coming to secure the property. At around 2.26 minutes, Person B speaks about "*her thing finishes on the 17th December She is coming to cut me up and put me in a bin...but I have to report it every time...I can't take no more*"

5.5 Neither officer responds with any question to this reported threat or to acknowledge it. Because of the lack of questioning, it is not clear whether that threat was a new threat or whether it was part of the ongoing matters that were being dealt with. There was no further mention of this threat throughout the interaction. PC Lee-Storey appears confused on the body worn video and his following question is to ask for clarity on Person A's name. PC Lee-Storey goes on to summarise what he believes has happened – he says “Ok, so Person A has called an ambulance and fire?”

5.6 Person B goes on to explain that there had been a number of hoax calls to Fire, Ambulance and Police. Person B does say that Person A has only just phoned and keeps ringing. She shows PC Lee-Storey her phone and says she has written it down. It is not clear to the panel what days those phone calls were made but it is clear that some would have been on that evening. Further questioning by the officers would have established this.

5.7 Around 4 and a half minutes into their attendance, PC Lee-Storey tells Person B that there were no offences on this occasion. He believes the hoax calls will be managed by the respective emergency services. Around 5 and a half minutes into the incident, former PC Jowett asks about Person B's grandson and whether he had been there tonight. Person B says that he not been there.

5.8 For the next few minutes, until they leave at around 11 mins in total, the officers speak with Person B around the background to the issues with Person A. They obtain more information around the history and her current whereabouts. She informs them that a number of security measures to her property are being implemented by the Council. PC Lee-Storey provided an element of reassurance around continuing to call the police if she has concerns.

5.9 Throughout the interaction, and even as the officers were leaving, Person B continues to provide information to them about the ongoing issues. She does say at one point that she should not have to keep repeating herself. Having told Person B earlier in the conversation that they would contact PC Molly (Mason) and the Youth Offending Team, the officers left the property.

5.10 The officers had a discussion in the car about the incident. They went back to Cotgrave police station. Former PC Jowett updated the incident with the result which was agreed between them and PC Lee-Storey sent an email to the Youth Offending team.

There was no email or update provided for the officer, PC Mason, who was dealing with the ongoing matters.

6. FINDINGS

6.1 Before beginning its deliberations, counsel for the AA and for the officers made closing submissions. These need not be repeated here as they were captured on the audio recording but were carefully considered by the Panel.

6.2 The Panel also received legal advice from the LQP on how it must approach its task. This advice was agreed with counsel before it was given to the Panel. The Panel had regard to the legal advice when deliberating on the allegations.

Factual Findings (Stage 1)

The panel considered its findings against the allegation, as laid down in the Regulation 30 notices for each officer.

6.3 In relation to PC Lee-Storey, the panel's findings of fact are outlined in bold below :

1. Facts

1.1. At all relevant times, you were a police constable with Nottinghamshire Police, having commenced employment on 15 January 2021.

1.2. At all relevant times, you were subject to Nottinghamshire Police's Domestic Abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance and in particular:

1.2.1. Section 3.4. which states that It will be for the attending officers to establish whether calls for assistance amount to domestic abuse, or not, based on the current circumstances and the past behaviour of those involved. However, if a call fits the definition of domestic abuse, it must be recorded as a domestic abuse on NICHE (whether a crime or non-crime)

1.2.2. Section 3.5 which provides guidance as to when a domestic abuse public protection notice (PPN) ought to be submitted and in particular that If you suspect domestic abuse ... then submit a DAPPN.

1.2.3. Section 4.4. which states that Positive action should be taken at all domestic abuse. Victims have a right to protection from domestic abuse and police officers have a responsibility to investigate and obtain sufficient evidence to prosecute an alleged offender and to safeguard the rights of victims and children / vulnerable persons

1.2.4. Section 4.8 which states that In all domestic abuse cases, Investigating Officers should explore the history of domestic abuse, with such information supporting a prosecution file and proving that the offence is part of a pattern of domestic abuse rather than the isolated incident

1.3. On 29 October 2024, you were on duty, having commenced work at 1500 hours. You were crewed with PC 4452 Amy Jowett.

1.4. At approximately 2014 hours, Person A contacted Nottinghamshire Police via 999 and made threats that she was going to stab her grandmother, Person B (incident 0657_291024). **FACTS 1.1 to 1.4 were agreed.**

1.5. At approximately 2040 hours, Person B contacted Nottinghamshire Police via 999 and stated that she was getting threats from Person A (incident 0676_29102024]. **Not Proved. Pc Lee-Storey has no knowledge. The panel accepted that he could not have knowledge of the exact call.**

1.6. You were assigned to attend upon Person B. You were advised that Person B was getting threats from Person A and that Person A keeps harassing her [Person B] in general.

Pc Lee-Storey accepted that he was assigned to attend Person B who was getting threats from Person A. Pc Lee-Storey stated that he was focussed on the suggestion that the grandson of Person B was trying to kick the door down.

The panel found that the nature of the incident was unclear when the officers were dispatched to it. The dispatcher told the officers that it was confusing. There was reference to threats from the granddaughter, Person A, but no reference to threats to kill.

The panel found the facts at 1.6 proven, but accepts the additional caveats that were provided by the officer in his response.

1.7. You accessed Niche occurrence 24000520142 at approximately 2057 hours, which related to a previous public order offence reported by Person B, relating to Person A. **This was denied. PC Lee-Storey was driving the police car at that time. This was not proven.**

1.8. You attended Person B's home address at approximately 2108 hours. Person B advised you that Person A had threatened her when she stated that she's coming to cut me up and put me in the bin and/ or that Person A had called a fire brigade and ambulance to her address and/ or that Person A keeps calling her. **The panel's findings are as below:**

- **The Threats**

The panel agreed that Person B had told PC Lee-Storey that a threat was made to her from Person A.

The officer's case as presented in evidence was that he did not hear Person B stating that her granddaughter had made threats to cut her up and put her in the bin.

The officer stated in evidence that he was focussed on his understanding of the Grade 1 call. He was focussed on the possibility of the grandson kicking the door in or of him being in the area. He repeatedly said that he was confused and did not hear the comment about the threat.

On the arrival at the address, no questions were asked about the whereabouts of the grandson or whether he had been at the address, kicking the door in. In fact he was not discussed for over 5 minutes.

The BWV of former PC Jowett clearly shows PC Lee-Storey looking directly at Person B at the time that she made the comment about the threats to cut her up. Whilst not repeated, the comments were clear and the officer and Person B were very close together. PC Lee-Storey did not respond to these comments. He asks no further questions in relation to them and does give the appearance of being confused. In evidence, PC Lee-Storey said he would have asked more questions if he had heard them.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel finds that the officer did not hear or process the reported threat that Person B told him about. He did look confused, he had no reaction to the comment but goes on to clarify the name of Person B's granddaughter. The panel can understand why there was confusion in relation to names. PC Lee-Storey then goes on to summarise what he believed are the issues which relate to the hoax calls to the emergency services. The panel accepted on the balance of probabilities that the officer missed the comment.

- The fire and ambulance service

In relation to the issues associated with the fire and ambulance being called, this is proved and is not disputed by the officer.

- "Person A keeps calling her"

In relation to the matters around Person A calling Person B, it is clear from the Body Worn Video that Person B told PC Lee-Storey that Person A had been calling her. She told him that Person A had told her that she had sent an ambulance, she told him that she didn't speak to Person A but just listened.

She told him twice that she had written everything down. She showed him calls from an Unknown number on her phone.

The panel found that this fact is proved.

1.9. You failed to take any positive action following the report by Person B which could amount to allegations of criminal offences.

The panel accepted that there were clear allegations of criminal offences reported by Person B to the officer.

In evidence and under cross-examination PC Lee-Storey agreed that he should have taken further action. Having had the opportunity to review the Body Worn Video, he agreed that a number of potential offences were being disclosed.

On reviewing the body worn video, the panel has noted that PC Lee-Storey had decided, within around 4mins 30 of activating his body worn video, that there were no offences for him to investigate.

PC Lee-Storey did not consider any harassment offences and did not take any positive action.

The panel finds this fact proved

1.10. You failed to safeguard Person B as you failed to provide her with or signpost her to safeguarding advice. **This is admitted by the officer and the panel finds it proved.**

1.11. You failed to complete a PPN with Person B. **This is admitted and is proved.**

1.12. PC Jowett updated force system SAFE with information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading as it stated that

1.12.1. No offences were disclosed on this occasion

1.12.2. Person B did not disclose that Person A had made any new threats

1.12.3. Person A has been given appropriate safeguarding advice

The officer's case is that he did not update SAFE, even though he did discuss it with former PC Jowett. The panel finds this fact not proved, but linked facts are at 1.13/1.14 below.

1.13. You knew and/ or ought to have known that that PC Jowett had updated force systems with information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading.

In giving evidence, both officers agreed that they had a conversation about the content of the report and agreed the content before it was submitted. PC Lee-Storey knew what updates were being submitted.

In relation to the updates on SAFE to say

- **no offences were disclosed on this occasion – the panel found this is a factually inaccurate as offences had been disclosed. The panel found that PC Lee-Storey failed to correctly identify that there were new offences. His questioning of Person B was woefully inadequate and he did not approach the incident with an investigative mindset. He appeared at times confused on the body worn video. Whilst he said that he was confused by what confronted him, the panel finds that a competent officer ought to have readily been able to respond to the situation. On the balance of probabilities , the panel did not find this deliberately misleading.**
- **Person B did not disclose that Person A had made any new threats – the panel found this is factually a false statement. The panel found that PC Lee-Storey did not hear or process the comments made in relation to the threat about being cut up and put in the bin. The panel finds that the statement that there were no new threats is not deliberately misleading.**
- **Person B has been given appropriate safeguarding advice. The panel accepted that the officer understood that there were existing safeguarding measures that were in progress. The officer did provide some reassurance and advice. Whilst he could have gone further, the panel found that the advice was reasonable in the circumstances. This is not proved.**

1.14. You knew and/ or ought to have known that the case should not be closed.

PC Lee-Storey denied this allegation.

The panel found that new offences had been disclosed to the officer but that the officer had not recognised this. The officer had provided a short update email to the Youth Offending Team. The officer had not updated PC Mason who was dealing with the ongoing matters, but said he believed former PC Jowett was doing so.

The panel found that the officer ought to have known that the case should not be closed. However, owing to his lack of competence and understanding, the panel did not find that he knew that it should not be closed.

1.15. On 30 October 2024, PC 1078 Mason attended on Person B to obtain a statement and complete a PPN. PC Mason confirmed the same with yourself, PS 4489 Parkin (now Thomas) and Inspector Schooling.

1.16. You thereafter spoke with PS Parkin and provided information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading when you informed PS Parkin that

1.16.1. No offences or threats had been disclosed to you by Person B; and/ or **PC Lee-Storey admitted that he had informed PS Parkin that there were no new threats or offences.**

The panel found that PC Lee-Storey did not hear or process the threat that was made. The panel found that PC Lee-Storey had not recognised the further offences that were disclosed. He denied deliberately misleading her as he wrongly believed that there were no new offences

The panel found that the officer's indignant response to PC Mason's email tends to support his belief that no new offences or threats had been made. The panel found this not proven.

1.16.2. Suggested that Person B was being dishonest to PC Mason

PS Parkin, in her statement, said that PC Lee-Storey had accused Person B of being untruthful in a verbal conversation. He wanted the matter to be addressed as he felt he was being accused of something that hadn't happened. He had said that the victim was being untruthful as she hadn't said anything like this.

The panel finds that PC Lee-Storey honestly believed that no such threat had been reported.

The panel finds this not proven.

1.17. You thereafter provided information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading when you informed Insp Schooling by email on 31 October 2024 that

1.17.1. No offences or threats had been disclosed to you by Person B;
PC Lee-Storey admitted that he had informed Insp Schooling that there were no new threats or offences.

The panel found that PC Lee-Storey did not hear or process the threat that was made. The panel found that PC Lee-Storey had not recognised the further

offences that were disclosed. He denied deliberately misleading her as he wrongly believed that there were no new offences

The panel found that the officer's indignant response to PC Mason's email tends to support his belief that no new offences or threats had been made.

The panel found this not proven.

1.17.2. Suggested that Person B was being dishonest to PC Mason

In an email to Insp Schooling, PC Lee-Storey has explained that he believes that PC Mason has "taken grandmother's word for it." The panel found that he had a genuinely held belief that his version of events was correct. The fact that he believed that Person B had provided incorrect information does not mean that he was saying that the member of the public was dishonest.

PC Lee-Storey gave evidence that he was advised by PS Parkin (Thomas) not to review his body worn video. PS Parkin (Thomas) was inconclusive when questioned on this matter. On balance, the panel accepted PC Lee-Storey's account.

The panel noted that PC Lee-Storey was fully aware that the incident was captured on body worn video. The panel found it less likely that he would deliberately lie when he knows that the incident has been recorded . The panel does not find that he deliberately misled Insp Schooling.

The Standards of Professional behaviour – PC Lee-Storey

6.4 The Panel went on to determine whether the proven factual allegations amounted to breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

Honesty and Integrity – not breached

The panel found 1.13 not proved.

The panel found 1.16.1 and 1.17.1 not proved

The panel found 1.16.2 and 1.17.2 not proved

In an email to Insp Schooling, PC Lee-Storey explained that he believed that PC Mason has "taken grandmother's word for it." The panel found that he had a genuinely held belief that his version of events was correct. The fact that he believed that Person B had provided incorrect information does not mean that he was saying that the member of the public was dishonest.

The panel found there has been no breach of the standard of Honesty and Integrity

Authority Respect and courtesy – not breached

The panel found that PC Lee-Storey had an honest belief that new offences and allegations of threats had not been made. The fact that he believed that Person B had provided incorrect information to PC Mason does not mean that he was saying that the member of the public was dishonest.

Duties and responsibilities – breached

The panel found 1.9, 1.10, 1.11 and 1.14 (partially) proven.

The panel found that PC Lee-Storey's dealing with this incident was wholly inadequate.

He failed to introduce himself to Person B, failed to investigate what was before him. He was faced with a victim who was upset and who was providing information in an unstructured way. PC Lee-Storey failed to take charge of the situation and to establish what had occurred.

Having completed almost no investigation, PC Lee-Storey made a very early decision that there were no offences. Had he reassured the victim, asked relevant questions, undertaken any further research, checked his understanding with the victim properly, then he may have identified the threats and offences that were apparent. This would be usual practice for officers attending such an incident. PC Lee -Storey failed to understand that this was a report of ongoing harassment. He wrongly assessed the hoax calls to be a matter for other agencies and not the police.

PC Lee-Storey failed to follow the Nottinghamshire Police Domestic abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance.

PC Lee-Storey clearly failed to act diligently and expeditiously.

Orders and Instructions – breached

Panel finds this Standard of professional breached for the reasons above.

Misconduct, Gross Misconduct or Neither – PC Lee-Storey

6.5. The panel found breaches relating to Duties and Responsibilities and Orders and Instructions.

In assessing seriousness, the panel is minded that Misconduct is a breach of the standards of professional Behaviour to serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross Misconduct is misconduct that is so serious to justify dismissal.

The panel has considered the seriousness relating to

- The vulnerability of the victim who was in need of police support
- The potential high risk nature of the threat which was part of an ongoing issue that had been graded as requiring an emergency response
- The total lack of investigation undertaken at the scene which led to missing the offences that were being disclosed
- The lack of positive action at the scene
- The lack of onward signposting for further safeguarding

These failures are so serious taken together and would have such an impact on public confidence that they amount to **Gross Misconduct**.

6.6 In relation to former PC Jowett, the panel's findings of fact are outlined in bold below. :

1. Facts

1.1. At all relevant times, you were a police constable with Nottinghamshire Police, having commenced employment on 3 March 2023.

1.2. At all relevant times, you were subject to Nottinghamshire Police's Domestic Abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance and in particular:

1.2.1. Section 3.4. which states that *It will be for the attending officers to establish whether calls for assistance amount to domestic abuse, or not, based on the current circumstances and the past behaviour of those involved. However, if a call fits the definition of domestic abuse, it must be recorded as a domestic abuse on NICHE (whether a crime or non-crime)*

- 1.2.2. Section 3.5 which provides guidance as to when a domestic abuse public protection notice (PPN) ought to be submitted and in particular that *If you suspect domestic abuse ... then submit a DAPPN.*
- 1.2.3. Section 4.4. which states that *Positive action should be taken at all domestic abuse. Victims have a right to protection from domestic abuse and police officers have a responsibility to investigate and obtain sufficient evidence to prosecute an alleged offender and to safeguard the rights of victims and children / vulnerable persons*
- 1.2.4. Section 4.8 which states that *In all domestic abuse cases, Investigating Officers should explore the history of domestic abuse, with such information supporting a prosecution file and proving that the offence is part of a pattern of domestic abuse rather than the isolated incident*
- 1.3. On 29 October 2024, you were on duty, having commenced work at 1500 hours. You were crewed with PC 976 Thomas Lee-Storey.
- 1.4. At approximately 2014 hours, Person A contacted Nottinghamshire Police via 999 and made threats that she was going to stab her grandmother, Person B (incident 0657_291024).
- 1.5. At approximately 2040 hours, Person B contacted Nottinghamshire Police via 999 and stated that she was getting threats from Person A (incident 0676_29102024]. **Facts 1.1-1.5 inclusive are agreed.**
- 1.6. You were assigned to attend upon Person B. You were advised that Person B was getting threats from Person A and that Person A *keeps harassing her* [Person B] *in general.* **This is proved. Former PC Jowett has described her understanding of the incident that she was being sent to as a grade 1.**

En route, Former PC Jowett reviewed the Place Of Interest marker which gave further background relating to Person A and threats towards Person B.

- 1.7. You accessed Niche occurrence 24000520142 at approximately 2057 hours. **Admitted and proved**
- 1.8. You accessed Niche occurrence 24000647422 at approximately 2150 hours, which related to **Admitted and proved**
- 1.9. You attended Person B's home address at approximately 2108 hours. Person B advised you that Person A had threatened her when she stated that she's coming to cut me up and put me in the bin and/ or that Person A had called a fire brigade and ambulance to her address and/ or that Person A keeps calling her.

The Threats

The panel agreed that Person B told PC Jowett that a threat was made to her from Person A.

The officer's case as presented in evidence was that she did not hear these comments. She was distracted by a radio communication. The officer explained that she has a hearing impairment and as a result, leans in to her radio in order to listen. At around 2 minutes into PC Lee-Storey's body worn video, it can be seen that PC Jowett is apparently listening to a call. She has her head inclined. The comment is made at 2 mins 26 seconds. The panel accepted PC Jowett's explanation that she did not hear this threat. The panel found this not proved.

The fire and ambulance service

In relation to the issues associated with the fire and ambulance being called, this is proved and is not disputed by the officer.

"Person A keeps calling her"

In relation to the matters around Person A calling Person B, it is clear from the Body Worn Video that Person B told both officers that Person A had been calling her. She told them that Person A had told her that she had sent an ambulance, she told them that she didn't speak to Person A but just listened. She told them twice that she had written everything down. Whilst in PC Jowett's presence, Person B showed PC Lee-Storey calls from an Unknown number on her phone. The panel found that this fact is proved.

- 1.10. You failed to take any positive action following the report by Person B which could amount to allegations of criminal offences. **Admitted and proved**
- 1.11. You failed to safeguard Person B as you failed to provide her with or signpost her to safeguarding advice. **Admitted and proved**
- 1.12. You failed to complete a PPN with Person B. **Admitted and proved**
- 1.13. You thereafter updated force system SAFE with information which was false and/ or deliberately misleading including but not limited to that
- 1.13.1. No offences were disclosed on this occasion
- 1.13.2. Person B did not disclose that Person A had made any new threats
- 1.13.3. Person B has been given appropriate safeguarding advice

In giving evidence, both officers agreed that they had a conversation about the content of the report and agreed the content before it was submitted. Former PC Jowett completed the SAFE update.

In relation to the updates on SAFE:

- no offences were disclosed on this occasion – the panel found this is a factually inaccurate as offences had been disclosed. The panel found that former PC Jowett failed to correctly identify that there were new offences. Her questioning of Person B was woefully inadequate and she did not approach the incident with an investigative mindset. Former PC Jowett's evidence was that when she updated the incident, she asked PC Lee-Storey for his advice which she followed. They collectively failed to recognise that new offences had been disclosed. The panel accepted her account. On the balance of probabilities, the panel did not find this update to be deliberately misleading.**
- Person B did not disclose that Person A had made any new threats – the panel has found this is factually a false statement. The panel found that former PC Jowett did not hear the new threats as she was**

distracted by radio transmissions. The panel found that the statement that there were no new threats is not deliberately misleading.

- **Person B has been given appropriate safeguarding advice. The panel accepted that the officer understood that there were existing substantial safeguarding measures that were in progress. Whilst further advice could have been provided, the panel agrees that safeguarding advice had been provided. This is not proved.**

The panel did not find that the updates provided on SAFE were deliberately misleading.

1.14. You knew and/ or ought to have known that the case should not be closed.

Former PC Jowett denied this allegation.

The panel found that new offences had been disclosed to the officer but that the officer had not recognised this. Whilst PC Lee-Storey had updated the Youth Offending Team, neither officer had updated PC Mason who was dealing with the ongoing matters.

The panel found that the officer ought to have known that the case should not be closed. However, owing to her lack of competence and understanding, the panel did not find that she knew that that it should not be closed.

6.7 The Standards of Professional behaviour – former PC Jowett

Honesty and Integrity

The conduct at 1.13 is not proved.

The panel finds there has been no breach of this standard.

Authority Respect and courtesy

The panel finds no specific allegation relating to this standard for former PC Jowett and so finds no breach of this standard of professional behaviour.

Duties and responsibilities

The panel has found 1.10, 1.11, 1.12 and 1.14 (partially) proven.

The panel found that former PC Jowett's dealing with this incident was wholly inadequate.

She failed to introduce herself to Person B, failed to investigate what was before her. She was faced with a victim who was upset and who was providing information in an unstructured way. Former PC Jowett failed to take charge of the situation and to establish what had occurred.

Former PC Jowett allowed herself to be led by PC Lee-Storey's early decision that there were no offences. Former PC Jowett had had the benefit of reviewing the Place Of Interest marker before attending the premises and she should have known that there were serious concerns about issues relating to Person A. Had she reassured the victim, asked relevant questions, undertaken any further research, checked her understanding with the victim properly, then she may have identified the threats and offences that were apparent. This would be usual practice for officers attending such an incident.

Former PC Jowett failed to understand that this was a report of ongoing harassment. She wrongly accepted PC Lee-Storey's assessment that the hoax calls were a matter for other agencies and not the police.

PC Jowett failed to follow the Nottinghamshire Police Domestic abuse Procedure and Practice Guidance.

PC Jowett clearly failed to act diligently and expeditiously.

The panel finds the breach of this standard is proved.

Orders and Instructions – breached for the same reasons as Duties and responsibilities

Misconduct, Gross Misconduct or Neither – former PC Jowett

Turning to seriousness, The panel found breaches relating to Duties and Responsibilities and Orders and Instructions.

In assessing seriousness, the panel was minded that Misconduct is a breach of the standards of professional Behaviour to serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross Misconduct is misconduct that is so serious to justify dismissal.

The panel considered the seriousness relating to

- The vulnerability of the victim who was in need of police support
- The potential high risk nature of the threat which was part of an ongoing issue that had been graded as requiring an emergency response
- The total lack of investigation undertaken at the scene which led to missing the offences that were being disclosed
- The lack of positive action at the scene
- The lack of onward signposting for further safeguarding

These failures are so serious taken together and would have such an impact on public confidence that they amount to **Gross Misconduct**.

7 PANEL DETERMINATION OF OUTCOME AND REASONS

7.1 Having made its determination on the facts of the case and on finding misconduct, the hearing moved on to the determination of outcome.

7.2 Mr Mullarkey made submissions on outcome for the AA. He submitted that the level of gross misconduct in this case was so serious that the only suitable outcome was dismissal without notice.

7.3 Mr Khan submitted that the facts of this case were not so serious and that the appropriate sanction was a final written warning.

7.4 The LQP provided the Panel with written legal advice on how it should decide outcome, following the 3-stage approach laid down in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes. The hearing was then adjourned for the Panel to deliberate.

7.5 The Panel reminded itself that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect, therefore it should be no more than is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings. It reminded itself that it must consider less severe outcomes first before considering more severe outcomes, always choosing the least severe outcome which deals adequately with the issues identified, whilst protecting the public interest. The Panel understood that if an outcome is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings, it must impose it even where this would lead to difficulties for the individual officer or former officer.

7.6 The Panel followed the three-stage approach as follows:

Stage 1: Assess Seriousness.

Stage 2: Remind itself of the purpose of the Police Misconduct regime.

Stage 3: Determine the sanction most appropriate to the purpose.

Seriousness

7.7 The Panel accepted that any case of gross misconduct which comes before a police misconduct hearing is to be considered a serious matter. But the Panel was reminded that its function is to decide *how* serious the gross misconduct was in this case.

7.8 The Panel assessed the level of seriousness by following the four-step approach as laid down in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes.

Step 1: Assess Culpability.

Step 2: Assess Harm.

Step 3: Consider Aggravating Factors.

Step 4: Consider Mitigating Factors.

Culpability

7.9 Culpability was determined by considering the non-exhaustive list of culpability sub-factors in the Guidance on Outcomes and any others it deemed to be relevant.

7.10 The Panel was satisfied that both officers (as Ms Jowett was at the time) were of sufficient service, had received the necessary training and had the relevant experience to have dealt with this incident in the appropriate way. Neither officer had provided a competent service. They failed to take the most basic of investigative steps such as questioning the complainant in order to ascertain what had happened and the true nature of her complaint, if in doubt they should have sought advice from a supervisor but they failed to do so, and they failed to record any information from the complainant. As a result of their failures, they submitted a wholly inaccurate report of the incident on a police information system. However, the officers' actions were not deliberate, and they did not intend to submit a false or inaccurate report.

7.11 This was a case of two officers failing to do their duty because of ineptitude and not malice. They should have recognised that Person B was vulnerable and at risk and taken the appropriate steps, but their failures were not planned and they were not aware that their handling of the incident fell far below what was expected of them.

7.12 The Panel found PC Lee-Storey's failure to be all the more concerning given he had completed an experiential attachment to the Domestic Abuse team not long before this incident. Former PC Jowett had also completed an attachment to the Rape and Serious Sexual Offences unit which although not focused on domestic

abuse would have provided her with experience of investigating more serious, sensitive and complex criminal matters than she would ordinarily be exposed to as a response officer. .

7.13 The Panel chose to adopt a scale of **low**, **medium** or **high** when considering and articulating its findings on culpability. Having assessed all of the relevant factors it determined that culpability for both PC Lee-Storey and former PC Jowett was **medium**.

Harm

7.14 The Panel referred itself to the harm factors suggested in the Guidance.

7.15 The Panel decided that in this instance there was little immediate risk of physical harm to Person B because Person A's freedom at that time was restricted due to her residing in some form of secure accommodation. She was though exposed to some risk of psychological harm from further threatening calls from Person A because the officers failed to take positive action. The Panel also found that Person B's trust and confidence in the police was adversely affected by the officers' poor conduct and that this amounted to harm.

7.16 The Panel then carefully considered the question of reputational harm to Nottinghamshire Police and the Police Service as a whole. It concluded that the well informed, rational and objective member of the public would be shocked at how badly these officers handled this situation which involved a woman in obvious distress. This would therefore create significant reputational harm.

7.17 Having considered the above factors, the Panel decided that harm or potential harm was best described as **medium to high**.

Seriousness Starting Point.

7.18 Having assessed culpability and harm, the Panel decided that the seriousness starting point was **medium to high**.

Aggravating Factors

7.19 The Panel considered whether there were any aggravating factors which might justify an uplift in seriousness. The Panel found the only aggravating factor was a significant deviation from force policy and instructions, but this did not merit an uplift in seriousness.

Mitigating Factors

7.20 The Panel that the officers' blameworthy conduct amounted to a single instance. Their early admissions were acknowledged as a mitigating factor, but they were given limited credit for these because the BWV evidence against them was compelling and irrefutable.

7.21 These mitigating factors were insufficient to merit a downward adjustment to the level of seriousness.

Overall Assessment of Seriousness

7.22 Having considered aggravating and mitigation factors the Panel's assessment of seriousness remained as **medium to high**.

The Purpose

7.23 Having assessed seriousness as **medium to high**, the Panel reminded itself of the purpose of the police misconduct regime before deciding on the appropriate sanction. The threefold purpose is as follows:

- Maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the Police Service.
- Upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct.
- Protecting the public.

Deciding Outcome

7.24 As required by the Guidance on Outcomes, the Panel moved to the third stage of the sanction process by considering the least serious outcome available to it that would meet the threefold purpose of the misconduct regime.

7.25 The least serious sanction available was a Final Written Warning (if Ms Jowett was still a serving police officer) and the Panel considered if this would satisfy the purpose of the police misconduct regime. The Panel decided that this would meet the purpose of the misconduct regime on the proven facts of this case and taking into account evidence of remediation by PC Lee-Storey and former PC Jowett which was contained in various character references provided in support of the officers.

7.26 The Panel did though consider the gross misconduct in this case to be so serious that the operative period should be the maximum permitted by the PCR which is 5 years.

7.27 Therefore the outcome in PC Lee-Storey's case is a Final Written Warning which will remain in force for 5-years from the date of its award.

7.28 If former Jowett was still serving officer, then she too would have received a 5-year Final Written Warning. However, because she is no longer a police officer, no disciplinary action may be imposed on her.

Personal Mitigation

7.29 The Panel considered the personal mitigation advanced by the officer and former officer, which was in the form of positive character evidence and their otherwise unblemished records of service. The Panel recognised that personal mitigation may be given only limited weight in police misconduct proceedings and in

this case it was insufficient to justify a reduction in the operative period of the Final Written Warning. This was because the Panel decided it was essential to demonstrate that the seriousness of the gross misconduct in this instance only just fell short of the threshold for dismissal without notice.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Julia Debenham', written in a cursive style.

Julia Debenham - Chair
Ms Beverley Graham - IPM
Mrs Julia Peters - IPM

6th October 2026