

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing – Outcome

Officer: Former PC 3304 Thomas Coppack

Case Reference: CM/31/23

Date of Hearing: 17th August 2026

Chair: Chief Constable Amanda Blakeman

I have already determined that the conduct of Former PC Coppack 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:

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

I have carefully considered the circumstances of the case, the submissions made on behalf of the Appropriate Authority, the former officer's representations, and the record of service provided to me.

The purpose of police misconduct proceedings is to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service, uphold high standards of policing and protect the public. These considerations must take precedence over the personal consequences for the individual officer.

Assessment of Seriousness

Culpability

I find that Former PC Coppack's culpability is exceptionally high.

Former PC Coppack was convicted following a Crown Court trial of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. The conviction establishes beyond doubt that the criminal conduct occurred.

The College of Policing Guidance makes clear that it is unacceptable for police officers, who are entrusted with enforcing the law, to break the law themselves. It further identifies violent crime as particularly serious offending that is likely to terminate an officer's career because it represents a fundamental breach of public trust and inevitably brings the profession into disrepute.

I also attach significant weight to the fact that this case involves violence against a woman. The College of Policing Guidance is unequivocal that violence against women and girls perpetrated by a police officer, whether on or off duty, will always attract a high degree of culpability and is likely to result in a severe outcome.

Police officers occupy positions of trust. Members of the public are entitled to expect that police officers will demonstrate self-control, integrity and respect for others at all times.

Harm

I find that the harm arising from this misconduct is substantial.

There is direct harm to the victim arising from the assault which resulted in a criminal conviction for actual bodily harm.

There is also significant reputational harm to North Wales Police and policing more broadly. The College of Policing Guidance makes clear that harm includes damage to public confidence and the standing of the profession, whether or not that harm can be precisely measured.

This former officer's conduct is fundamentally at odds with the values of modern policing and with the public expectation that police officers will protect vulnerable people and tackle violence against women and girls. I note from the hearing that the case and sentence received media attention, further increasing the potential impact on public confidence.

A reasonable and informed member of the public would rightly expect the police service to take robust action in circumstances where one of its officers has been convicted of a violent offence of this nature.

Aggravating Factors

I identify the following aggravating factors:

- The conduct resulted in a criminal conviction following a contested Crown Court trial.
- The offending involved violence and resulted in actual bodily harm to the victim.
- The conduct falls squarely within the category of violence against women and girls, an area of significant national and policing concern.
- The misconduct has caused significant reputational damage to public confidence in policing.
- The case attracted media reporting, increasing the visibility of the misconduct and its impact upon public trust.

Mitigating Factors

I have considered the mitigation available to Former PC Coppack.

I note from his record of service that he first joined North Wales Police as a member of police staff in 2012 and became a police officer in 2017. I further note that he has no previous disciplinary findings recorded against him.

I have also taken into account that he resigned prior to this hearing.

However, I attach limited weight to these matters. The College of Policing Guidance and relevant case law makes clear that personal mitigation carries significantly less weight where serious misconduct has been proven because the overriding consideration is the maintenance of public confidence and the reputation of the police service.

I find no exceptional feature capable of reducing the seriousness of the conduct or justifying a lesser outcome.

Outcome Consideration

I have considered the full range of available outcomes.

In the case of a former officer, where gross misconduct is found proven in accelerated misconduct proceedings, the relevant question is whether the officer would have been dismissed had they remained a serving officer.

I have considered whether a lesser outcome could properly maintain public confidence, uphold professional standards and protect the reputation of policing.

I have concluded that it could not.

Conduct of this nature is fundamentally incompatible with the standards expected of a police officer. To impose any lesser outcome would, in my view, seriously undermine public confidence in the police service and fail to demonstrate the standards rightly expected of those who hold the office of constable.

I am satisfied that a reasonable and informed member of the public would expect dismissal in these circumstances.

Determination (Outcome)

Having carefully considered all of the evidence, the submissions made, the officer's record of service, the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes and the wider public interest, I am satisfied that the misconduct is fundamentally incompatible with continued service as a police officer.

The seriousness of the misconduct, the exceptionally high level of culpability, the harm caused, the aggravating features present and the limited mitigation available lead me to the clear conclusion that dismissal is the only appropriate and proportionate outcome.

Accordingly, the outcome of this Accelerated Misconduct Hearing is that Former PC Thomas Coppack would have been dismissed without notice had he still been serving as a police officer and his name shall be placed on the College of Policing Barred List.

Chief Constable Amanda Blakeman KPM
17th August 2026