
IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020
Concerning: PC 430 Iain Solomon

THE PANEL'S FINDINGS

1. The misconduct hearing was conducted on 15th and 16th June 2026 at Lysander House, Bedfordshire, in accordance with Regulation 41 of the 2020 Regulations.
 2. The task of the Panel:
 - a) Determine whether the allegations are proven on the balance of probabilities (the civil standard)
 - b) Determine if any proven conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPB) relating to;
 - Honesty and Integrity
 - Duties and Responsibilities
 - Discreditable Conduct
 - Authority, Respect and Courtesy
 - c) If so, then determine if the proven conduct amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct, or neither.
 - d) Decide on outcome
 3. The allegations are set out in detail in the Regulation 30 notice and arise out of the Officer's attendance at an incident on the evening of 21 September 2024.
 4. The Panel has read the bundle of evidence and seen all material provided by the Appropriate Authority, including the Officer's Regulation 31 response. The Panel has also been provided with, and fully considered, a bundle of character evidence submitted on behalf of the Officer.
 5. At a pre-hearing on 23rd March 2026, it was determined that no witnesses were required to give evidence at the hearing, as events were captured on the body-worn video footage of PC Solomon and PC Taylor. That footage was played at the hearing, together with the footage captured by the wife of the suspect using her mobile phone.
 6. The Panel also heard evidence from the Officer directly. In assessing the Officer's evidence, the Panel took account both of the fact that the Officer is of previous good character and the positive character references which describe a conscientious and hard-working officer.
-

The allegations made by the Appropriate Authority.

Allegation 1: When dealing with the dispute you were called to on the night of 21 September 2024 you were dishonest to the Complainant and provided inaccurate reports to control in that you:

- a. Claimed to the complainant that you had seen footage that negated an assault, that the complainant had launched himself down the stairs and that the suspect made no contact with him when you had not seen such footage and had been told by the suspect that he made contact with the complainant; and**
- b. Reported the above to the Force Control Room together with stating that there were no injuries when you had been told about injuries and did not investigate them.**

7. The Panel approached this allegation by considering each part in turn. As to allegation 1a, this comprises the following elements:
 - a. That the Officer told the complainant that he had seen footage that
 - i. negated an assault;
 - ii. the Complainant had launched himself down the stairs; and
 - iii. that the suspect had made no contact with him.
 - b. The Officer was dishonest when he said these things to the complainant, because
 - i. The Officer had not seen such footage he described; and
 - ii. the suspect had told the Officer that he made contact with the complainant.
8. The Officer, both within his prepared statement in response to the regulation 17 notice and his regulation 31 response, admits each of the elements contained within allegation 1a, save for the allegation that he was dishonest to the complainant. The Officer repeated that within his oral evidence to the Panel.
9. Within his prepared statement, the Officer explained that this statement to the complainant was “clumsy, poorly worded and did not accurately reflect what [he] intended to relay to [the complainant].”
10. Within his regulation 31 response, the Officer said that he was confused between what he had heard and what he had seen, resulting in him inadvertently saying the wrong thing, which he accepted he had got “terribly wrong.”
11. During his oral evidence before the Panel, the Officer said he was muddled between what he had seen and heard and inadvertently said the wrong thing. This

was both to the complainant and to other colleagues in attendance. The Officer confirmed that the sequence of his interactions with the complainant and suspect had been:

- a. An initial meeting with the complainant, with PC Linsell in attendance, followed by;
- b. A meeting with the suspect, with PC Linsell in attendance, followed by;
- c. A second meeting with the complainant, with PCs Linsell, Cheadle, and Taylor all in attendance.

12. The Panel carefully viewed the body-worn video footage of the Officer in order to understand the interaction between the Officer and the suspect. During this interaction, the suspect explained that he had attended at the complainant's home address, that he was asked to leave the property by the complainant, and that he did so. The suspect confirmed there was no physical contact between the parties during their initial interaction.

13. The suspect went on to say that the complainant then attended at his home address. The suspect asked the complainant to leave and gestured a pushing motion using both hands. The suspect shortly thereafter repeated the pushing gesture with his hands and said, "I pushed him back because I was feeling threatened." The Officer specifically asked whether he connected with the complainant, the suspect explicitly confirmed that there had been contact. The Panel concluded that by the Officer's response of, "technically you've committed an assault," the Officer had fully understood the suspect's words to be an admission of a push. Since the complainant and suspect stated directly to the Officer that there had been contact in the form of a push whilst the complainant was at the top of the steps, the Panel was of the view that there was no credible basis for the Officer becoming confused about whether there had been contact.

14. Thereafter, the suspect asked the Officer if he was able to remove someone from his property, and the Officer replied, "that is a defence to the allegation." The Panel concluded that the Officer had understood the information given to him by the suspect and had formed the view that the suspect defended his actions. The Officer said, "you're not getting arrested so don't worry about that" and went on to say that he was "going to *try* and get this off as a breach of the peace which means nothing happens."

15. The Officer asked the suspect and his wife whether there was any video footage, and both replied, "only audio." It was therefore made clear to the Officer that there was no visual footage of the incident. This must have been plain to the Officer when this was twice played to the Officer. On viewing, the Officer is heard to laugh

and comment, “Cool. Brilliant. Perfect... Love it” adding, “well done for restraining yourself.”

16. Thereafter, the Officer spoke with the suspect’s daughter and expressed opinions of “your dad is brilliant; he’s done absolutely nothing wrong... your neighbours seem like they’ve been drunk, had a little bit too much to drink, and are, how can I put this - idiots. So, your mum and dad are brilliant.”
17. The body-worn video footage of PC Taylor shows the interaction which followed between the Officer and complainant. On entry to the complainant’s home, the Officer said to the complainant, “I’ve got video footage of what’s actually happened; so, would you like to change your story at all?” The Officer goes on, “You launched yourself down the stairs” and “there is no assault.” The Officer repeats the claim that he has video footage. The complainant replied, “he pushed me down the stairs.”
18. The complainant thereafter remained insistent that he had been pushed and that the Officer was “trying to de-escalate this.” The complainant added “I know he pushed me down” to which the Officer replied, “and I know he didn’t.” Toward the conclusion of the interaction the Officer said, “he put his hand out but there has been no contact.”
19. The Panel considered whether the Officer was confused between what he had heard and seen when he conveyed this to the complainant. The Panel was not persuaded by the Officer’s evidence that at the time he spoke with the complainant, he honestly believed that there had been no push and that the video footage showed this to be the case for these reasons:
 - a. The Officer had responded to an incident in which it was alleged that a neighbour had assaulted another.
 - b. The Officer had specifically asked the suspect whether he made contact with the complainant.
 - c. The Officer heard the suspect admit to pushing the complainant, as he acknowledged this by referring to this as an assault.
 - d. The Officer was expressly told there was no visual footage of the incident and twice saw the mobile footage which captured the audio.
 - e. The Officer told the suspect that he had raised a defence, enforcing his understanding that the suspect *had* pushed the complainant.
 - f. This information must have been fresh in his mind when he immediately thereafter attended the complainant’s home to speak with him.

20. The Panel considered the Officer's oral evidence in the context of his good character and weighed this carefully against the evidence contained within the footage. Most tellingly, the Officer's comment to the suspect that he was going to try to get this off as a breach of the peace illustrates the Officer's thought process. In conclusion, the Panel agreed with the observation made by the complainant that the Officer was trying to de-escalate the incident.
21. The Panel approached allegation 1b as it had in determining the facts in allegation 1a. The first part of allegation 1b mirrors that contained in allegation 1a. The Officer admitted that he gave inaccurate information to the Force Control Room ("FCR"); that is set out within the incident log (at p44-45 of the bundle).
22. The Panel concluded that the Officer's actions in giving this information to the FCR was dishonest for the same reasons as set out above. In addition, the Panel considered the witness statement of PC Taylor, which sets out that an Officer (now known to be this officer) repeated his assertion that he had seen video footage of the complainant throwing himself down the stairs.
23. The second part of allegation 1b contains the following further elements:
- a. The Officer's statement to the FCR that there were no injuries, despite having been told that there were injuries; and
 - b. That he did not investigate the injuries.
24. The Officer gave evidence about his knowledge of any injuries. When questioned whether he had made enquiries of the complainant as to knowledge of any injuries, the Officer replied, and repeated, that he had asked whether the complainant required medical treatment or an ambulance on his initial attendance. The Officer did not directly deny asking the complainant whether he had any injuries, saying he had not seen any injury. The Officer did agree that he had been told (either by the FCR or by PC Taylor) that the complainant had dislocated his shoulder in the fall but asked no further questions of the complainant. In the body-worn footage of PC Cheadle, PC Cheadle and PC Taylor are seen speaking with PC Linsell and PC Solomon. The injuries were explained as a dislocated shoulder and ABH level injuries to the hand.
25. In his oral evidence, the Officer confirmed PC Taylor had told him that the complainant had "potentially ABH recorded injuries to his hands" though was not made aware of the photographs taken by this Officer. The Panel noted that the discussion with PC Taylor took place before the Officer returned to speak to the complainant.

26. The Panel considered that simple questioning of whether the complainant had any injury and asking to see any such injuries would have amounted to a basic investigation of injuries. There are many injuries which would not require medical attention and the Panel concluded that asking whether the complainant required medical attention did not amount to an investigation of injury. The Officer was adamant in oral evidence that he had a clear view of the complainant's arms during their two interactions and that he had no visible injuries. The Panel considered that this assertion was undermined by the photographs of the complainant's injuries produced by PC Taylor at pages 72-73 of the bundle.

27. The panel found allegation 1 proven in its entirety. The Panel determined that the conduct in allegation 1 breached the SPB of Honesty and Integrity, Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct.

Allegation 2: Your interactions with [the complainant] were confrontational and unprofessional.

28. The Officer, within his prepared statement, regulation 31 response and oral evidence, said that he was firm, and was required to be due to the complainant's level of intoxication and aggression.

29. The Panel found the complainant to be coherent when viewing his interaction with the Officer on the footage. Whilst the complainant was challenging the Officer's explanation in a lucid way, the Panel did not find him to be aggressive; noting that he remained seated throughout the interaction.

30. The Officer's manner and use of words was confrontational and unprofessional, in which he said:

- a. Immediately on entry to the property, "We've done a little bit of investigation; I've got video footage of what actually happened so would you like to change your story at all?"
- b. "He told you to get off the property, you didn't. You launched yourself down the stairs. I've got video footage of it"
- c. "And I know that he didn't" in response to the complainant saying "I know that he pushed me down"
- d. When the Complainant said, "you need to understand what justice is" responding by "you need to understand what evidence is."
- e. He has put his hand out but there has been **no contact** [emphasised by the Officer].

31. The Panel found that the Officer's use of words was confrontational, immediately upon entry to the property and throughout continued to argue with the complainant, rather than listen to what the complainant said and reflect on his approach. The false relaying of information can be described as nothing other than unprofessional.
32. The Panel found allegation 2 proved. The Panel determined the conduct breached the SPB of Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

Allegation 3: You failed to adequately investigate the matter in that:

- a. You failed to record a crime in line with reporting standards**
- b. You failed to carry out an effective investigation including:**
- i. Prematurely reaching a view that you would dispose of the matter through community engagement before adequately investigating the matter;**
 - ii. Failing to investigate the complainant's injuries;**
 - iii. Failing to take sufficient account of the strengths and weaknesses of the available video evidence;**
 - iv. You accepted the suspect's explanation of self-defence when this is a matter for a prosecutor to consider when applying the Full Code Test, or for determination at trial.**

Failing to record a crime

33. The Panel has considered the Home Office Crime Recording Rules and guidance included within the bundle and notes:

"An incident will be recorded as a crime if, on the balance of probability: (a) the circumstances of the victims' report amount to a crime and (b) there is no credible evidence to the contrary immediately available."

34. The Officer admitted in his evidence that he failed to record a crime in line with recording standards. The Officer was aware that the complainant had alleged that he was pushed by the suspect; and that the suspect admitted pushing the complainant. In cross examination, the Officer agreed that he had heard enough from PC Taylor about the complainant's injuries to record an assault.
35. As to the availability of credible evidence to the contrary, the Officer said during his evidence that he believed there was credible evidence to the contrary at the time he made his decision but admitted that he had "got that wrong." The Panel determined that the mobile footage which captured only the audio of the relevant

part of the incident could not possibly be described as credible evidence to the contrary.

Prematurely reaching a view

36. It is plain that the Officer prematurely reached a view that he would dispose of the matter through community engagement before adequately investigating the matter. The Officer told the suspect “I’m going to try and get rid of this as a breach of the peace” before he had even listened to the audio footage.

37. Prematurely reaching a view then informed the Officer’s interactions with the complainant, demonstrated by the Officer’s use of language upon returning to the complainant’s home.

Failing to investigate the complainant’s injuries

38. The Panel’s findings are reflected when assessing allegation 1b.

Failing to take account of the strengths and weaknesses of the video evidence

39. The Officer denied failing to take account of the strengths and weaknesses of the video evidence, dismissing the complainant’s account due to intoxication, and describing his complaint about neighbours as ridiculous. The Panel found this wording to be illuminating as it indicates a justification for favouring the suspect’s account without properly balancing the strengths and weaknesses of the available evidence, including audio and video footage.

40. The Panel had no hesitation in concluding that the Officer’s motivation to resolve the incident as a breach of the peace led to him failing to properly reflect on the available evidence, including audio and video footage.

Accepting the suspect’s explanation of self-defence

41. The Officer, within his regulation 31 response, denies that he would have sought advice from a prosecutor. There is no reference to the case being determined at trial. The Officer admits in both his prepared statement and regulation 31 response that he accepted the suspect was acting in self-defence; this was advanced as his justification for attempting to resolve the incident as he did. The Panel concludes that the Officer was too quick to accept the suspect’s account, which regrettably influenced his subsequent actions.

42. The Panel finds allegation 3 proved in its entirety. The Panel determined the conduct breached the SPB of Duties and Responsibilities.

The Panel's assessment of seriousness

43. The Panel were reminded that the allegations are for the Appropriate Authority to prove and the standard of proof is the civil standard, which is the balance of probabilities, meaning the Panel are required to decide whether the allegations are 'more likely than not' to have occurred as laid out.

44. The panel found all allegations proven on the balance of probabilities.

45. The Panel found that the proven conduct breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

- Honesty and Integrity
- Duties and Responsibilities
- Discreditable Conduct
- Authority, Respect and Courtesy

46. The Panel was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that these breaches of the standards of professional behaviour amounted to **gross misconduct** for the following reasons:

- a. The proven conduct contained within allegation 1 amounted to operational dishonesty. This involved expressly and deliberately misleading both the complainant and Force Control Room, intending to curtail a crime investigation.
- b. The Officer was the most experienced Officer at the scene; and
- c. The Officer's conduct amounted to a failure to properly investigate the incident.

The Panel's determination on outcome.

47. Regulation 42 (3) provides that:

(3) The disciplinary action available at a misconduct hearing is

(b) where the person conducting or chairing the misconduct proceedings decides the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to gross misconduct, in accordance with regulation 41(15)

(i) a final written warning;

(ii) reduction in rank;

(iii) dismissal without notice.

48. The Panel keeps in mind the purpose of imposing disciplinary action is three-fold:

- To protect the public confidence in and the reputation of policing;
- To demonstrate to other officers that misconduct of a certain kind will not be tolerated; and
- To protect the public and officers by preventing further similar conduct from the Officer.

49. The Panel has approached the question of what disciplinary action to impose with regard to the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes.

Culpability

50. The Panel has determined that the Officer deliberately misled both the complainant and Force Control Room. The conduct cannot be said to be spontaneous; whilst it was confined to conduct over a single incident, the Officer repeated his misleading statements to colleagues at the scene.

51. The conduct amounted to operational dishonesty; As Lord Justice Kay in *Salter v Chief Constable of Dorset [2012] EWCA Civ 1047, para 21*, made clear: “it is obvious that the operational dishonesty.. of a single officer tarnishes the reputation of his Force and undermines public confidence in it.” The Officer could and should have reasonably foreseen this risk of harm.

52. The Panel concluded that the Officer’s culpability was **high**.

Harm

53. The Panel concluded that the conduct engaged reputational harm; the strongest evidence of this being contained within the complainant’s witness statement, in which he stated, “I do not feel confident in Bedfordshire Constabulary with any further situation, and I am worried to call again as I felt villainised when I was the victim of this incident.”

54. That reputational harm extends to the wider public, which is entitled to trust and have confidence that its police officers will act honestly in its dealings with members of the public. This has to be considered seriously in reflecting the national concern surrounding misconduct of police officers and operational dishonesty. The public is entitled to expect that officers will investigate allegations of crime diligently.

55. The Panel concluded that harm was **high**.

Aggravating factors

56. The Panel found that there was a significant deviation from national guidance, namely the National Crime Recording Standards and associated rules, as considered by the Panel in reaching its findings.
57. The Officer was the most experienced at the scene and was expected to act as a role model toward his less experienced colleagues.
58. The conduct amounted to multiple breaches of the standards of professional behaviour.

Mitigating factors

59. The Panel observed that the conduct appeared to be out of character and isolated, having regard to the Officer's character references.
60. The Panel took into account the Officer's difficult personal circumstances at the time of the incident, set out in full within his regulation 31 response at paragraphs 16-30 (not referred to in full here due to the personal information relating to third parties). As the Officer stated in his Regulation 31 response, his circumstances included the imminent loss of his accommodation. The Panel acknowledges that this caused a degree of pressure, and also noted the Officer was working increased hours during the relevant period.
61. The Panel has read the Officer's character bundle which pages 29-30 outline the Officer's further personal challenges, which I do not recite here.

Personal Mitigation

62. We are mindful of the limits to the weight we should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings, and that the reputation and interests of the police service, and the protection of the public, is more important than those of the individual officer.
63. Nevertheless, the Panel has had due regard to the character evidence submitted by the Officer.
64. The Panel do acknowledge the Officer's contribution to policing outlined in his record of service, which we have read and considered.

Outcome

65. The Panel, in line with guidance, carefully considered the least severe outcome it could impose, which in the circumstances was a final written warning.
66. The Panel considered that a final written warning would not meet the purpose of misconduct proceedings and concluded that dismissal without notice is the only appropriate action in this case.
67. The Officer is therefore dismissed without notice and this full finding and outcome will be made available within 5 working days, including right of appeal details.

ACC Vaughan Lukey (Chair)

Mr Bill Couves (IPM)

Mr Clive Manning (IPM)

Ms Caroline Sellars (LQP)