

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing – Outcome

Officer: PC 3699 Robert Masson

Case Reference: CM/9/26

Date of Hearing: 12th June 2026

Chair: Chief Constable Amanda Blakeman KPM

Following the application from the officer's counsel to adjourn prior to any outcome, I have balanced the officer's personal interest against my overriding duty to the public and I find that it is in the public interest for a swift resolution of these proceedings. The officer has been aware of this misconduct process since February 2026. Given the finding of Gross Misconduct additional mitigation would have limited impact on the statutory presumption of dismissal.

I have already determined that the conduct of PC Masson amounts to Gross Misconduct.

In reaching my decision on outcome, I have applied the structured approach set out in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes, namely:

1. Assessing the seriousness of the misconduct;
2. Keeping in mind the purpose of misconduct proceedings;
3. Selecting the outcome which most appropriately fulfils that purpose.

Assessment of Seriousness

Culpability

I find that PC Masson's culpability is high. His conduct was deliberate, repeated and sustained over a prolonged period of time. The practice of key-jamming was not a one-off lapse, but a conscious course of conduct undertaken on multiple occasions, sometimes for many hours in a working day.

I am satisfied that he knew, or ought reasonably to have known, that this conduct was wrong. The deliberate maintenance of a misleading impression of active working demonstrates a clear departure from the standards expected of a police officer.

While the Officer has suggested that his motivation was to remain responsive, I do not accept that this explains the scale, duration, or repetition of the conduct. I find that his actions involved a knowing and intentional misrepresentation of his activity.

Harm

I find that the harm in this case is principally reputational, but nonetheless significant.

The College of Policing Guidance makes clear that even in the absence of direct harm, the potential impact on public confidence is central to the assessment.

Dishonesty by a police officer is inherently damaging. The public are entitled to expect that officers will act with honesty and integrity at all times. Conduct of this nature, if known, would undermine trust and confidence in policing.

Aggravating Factors

I identify the following aggravating features:

- The conduct was repeated, regular and sustained over a lengthy period;
- It involved a pattern of deliberate behaviour, not an isolated lapse;
- It created and maintained a misleading impression of work being undertaken;
- The behaviour was not self-reported and came to light only through audit;
- The conduct took place in circumstances where the Officer was trusted to work with a degree of autonomy;
- There is limited evidence of genuine insight or reflection into the impact of his actions.

I also note that submissions suggests that those supervising the Officer were unaware of the conduct, which underscores the deceptive nature of the behaviour.

Mitigating Factors

I have considered the mitigation advanced on behalf of PC Masson:

- His admission to key-jamming at an early stage;
- His previous good service and lack of prior misconduct findings;
- Positive evidence regarding his work ethic and productivity in other respects;
- His personal mitigation, including length of service.

However, I attach limited weight to these factors. The Guidance makes clear that personal mitigation carries less weight where misconduct involves dishonesty, given the overriding need to maintain public confidence.

I have also considered and taken legal advice on the submissions that the matter should be adjourned for further enquiries. I am not persuaded that such further material would materially alter my assessment of seriousness. The key facts are admitted and supported by objective evidence, and I am satisfied that I am able to proceed to outcome on the information before me.

Outcome Consideration

I have considered the full range of available outcomes, including a Final Written Warning.

However, I do not consider that any lesser outcome would adequately reflect the seriousness of the conduct or meet the overarching objectives of misconduct proceedings, namely maintaining public confidence, upholding standards, and protecting the public.

The College of Policing Guidance makes clear that where conduct involves serious dishonesty and risks undermining public trust, dismissal is likely to follow, particularly where the behaviour impacts the standing and reputation of the profession as a whole.

In this case, I find that a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would not merely be concerned by this conduct but would be appalled by it. The repeated creation of a false impression of working strikes at the heart of the trust placed in police officers.

Determination (Outcome)

Having carefully considered all the evidence, the submissions made, and the applicable guidance, I am satisfied that the conduct of PC Masson is fundamentally incompatible with continued service in the police.

The seriousness of the misconduct, the high level of culpability, the impact on public confidence, and the lack of sufficient mitigating factors lead me to the clear conclusion that the only appropriate and proportionate outcome is dismissal.

The outcome of this Accelerated Misconduct Hearing is that PC Robert Masson is dismissed without notice and will be placed on the College of Policing Barred List.

Chief Constable Amanda Blakeman KPM

12th June 2026