

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing – Finding

Officer: Former PC 3304 Thomas Coppack

Case Reference: CM/31/23

Date of Hearing: 17th August 2026

Chair: Chief Constable Amanda Blakeman

Background

This matter was referred to an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 following the determination of the Appropriate Authority that the special conditions were met:

- There is sufficient evidence, in the form of written statements and documents, to establish on the balance of probabilities that the conduct constitutes Gross Misconduct.
- It is in the public interest for the officer to cease to be a police officer without delay.

The hearing considered the evidence contained within the misconduct bundle and the opening submissions from the Appropriate Authority. A brief Regulation 54 Response was received from the former officer, and it is noted that the officer had resigned prior to the hearing and his last day of service was 11th August 2026. Within the former officer's response, he denied that his conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

The officer's representative confirmed that the officer had the opportunity to receive legal advice and be legally represented at the hearing.

The matter arises from Former PC Coppack's conviction following a four-day trial at Mold Crown Court. On 9th July 2026, he was found guilty of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm, contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. On 13th August 2026, he was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment suspended for 18 months.

Allegation

It is alleged that Former PC Coppack breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely:

- **Discreditable Conduct;** namely that his conviction for Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm and the underlying conduct brought discredit upon the police service and undermined public confidence in policing.

Legal Advice

On this matter I have not required any specific legal advice.

Findings

On the balance of probabilities, I find the allegation proven.

The starting point is that Former PC Coppack was convicted following a contested criminal trial. A criminal conviction provides conclusive proof that the conduct occurred. I therefore do not need to revisit the facts determined by the Crown Court.

I am satisfied that Former PC Coppack caused actual bodily harm, and that his conduct resulted in a criminal conviction for a serious offence of violence.

The Standards of Professional Behaviour require police officers to behave in a manner, whether on or off duty, which does not bring discredit upon the police service or undermine public confidence in policing. Police officers are entrusted with significant powers and responsibilities and are expected to demonstrate the highest standards of behaviour in both their professional and private lives.

I find that a police officer who is convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm engaged in conduct that plainly damages the reputation of the police service and is capable of undermining public confidence in policing. Members of the public are entitled to expect police officers to uphold the law and protect others from harm. Conduct of this nature is fundamentally inconsistent with those expectations.

Accordingly, I find that Former PC Coppack breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct.

Assessment of Seriousness

In assessing seriousness, I have had regard to the Home Office Statutory Guidance and the Code of Ethics.

Paragraph 2.15 of the Guidance makes clear that discredit can be brought upon the police service by the act itself or where public confidence in policing is undermined, or is perceived to be undermined. It further provides that where a police officer has been convicted of a criminal offence, that conviction alone may justify disciplinary action. In all cases it must be clearly articulated how the conduct discredits the police service.

Police officers must at all times maintain the highest standards of behaviour and consider how their actions may be regarded by members of the public. The test is not confined to media attention but requires consideration of all the circumstances.

In this case I find the following factors particularly significant:

- The conduct resulted in a criminal conviction for a serious offence of violence.
- The conviction followed a contested Crown Court trial, demonstrating that the allegations were fully tested before a jury.

- The matter attracted media reporting, thereby increasing the potential damage to public confidence in North Wales Police and policing more broadly.
- The offending was deliberate criminal conduct and demonstrates a significant departure from the behaviour expected of a police officer.

The public rightly expects police officers to protect people, prevent violence and uphold the law. An officer who is convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm falls far below those expectations. In my judgment, a reasonable and informed member of the public would conclude that such conduct seriously damages confidence in both the individual officer and the wider police service.

Determination

Drawing all of these matters together, I find that Former PC Coppack's conduct represents a serious breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct.

I am satisfied that his criminal conduct, culminating in a conviction for Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm, has brought discredit upon the police service and has undermined public confidence in policing. The conduct is fundamentally incompatible with the role of a police officer and with the values and standards expected by the public.

For those reasons, on the balance of probabilities, I find that the conduct amounts to Gross Misconduct.

Chief Constable Amanda Blakeman KPM
17th August 2026