

IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING
PURSUANT TO THE POLICE CONDUCT REGULATIONS 2020 AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE
(CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024

BETWEEN:

HAMPSHIRE AND ISLE OF WIGHT CONSTABULARY

“Appropriate Authority (AA)”

and

FORMER CHIEF CONSTABLE SCOTT CHILTON

“Officer (FCC Chilton)”

REGULATION 43 REPORT: DETERMINATION OF THE PANEL

Dates of Hearing:	5 – 8 October 2026
Location:	In person, Holiday Inn, Eastleigh
Chair:	HMI Michelle Skeer
Independent Panel members:	Amelia Riviere and Leonard Wassell (collectively the “Panel”)
Legally Qualified Person (LQP):	Ruth Curtis
Counsel for Appropriate Authority:	John Beggs KC
Counsel for the former Officer:	James Berry KC
Legal representative for AA:	Chris Wilkinson, Weightmans LLP
Legal representative for former Officer:	Deborah Ross, 3D Solicitors

1. Introduction and Regulatory framework

- 1.1. This is a record of the decision of a Police Misconduct Panel held under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the police (conduct) (amendment) regulations 2024. All references to the Regulations are to these regulations unless specified otherwise.
- 1.2. The writing of this report was delegated by the Chair to the LQP in accordance with 43 (1B) of the Regulations. The LQP was involved in producing this report but did not form part of the decision making.

- 1.3. There may be slight differences between this written document as compared to the reasons given orally by the Chair during the hearing. If that is the case, this written document should be regarded as the definitive version.
- 1.4. The proceedings were conducted under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, the matter in question having occurred and come to the attention of the relevant Appropriate Authority after February 2020.
- 1.5. The first tranche of the 2024 Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations applied, principally affecting the composition of the Panel. The AA in this case would ordinarily be the Police and Crime Commissioner ("PCC") for Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary ("HIOWC") but since the PCC, Donna Jones, is a direct witness to material events (and is scheduled to give evidence in this case), the PCC very properly delegated the role of AA to her Deputy, Alex Rennie.
- 1.6. The second tranche of amendments came into force on 28th May 2025, in the form of the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025. The conduct in question here was already the subject of an investigation before the date of 28th May 2025. Therefore Part 3 of the 2025 amendments (affecting outcome options) did not apply.
- 1.7. Where proceedings concern a former officer, and the Regulation 30 Notice is served after 28th May 2025, the Schedule to the new regulations applies. The Schedule introduces the presumption of an accelerated hearing for a former officer. In this particular case however, a full hearing took place, and the Special Conditions did therefore not apply.
- 1.8. The relevant Home Office Guidance ('HOG') is the February 2020 version.
- 1.9. The relevant Guidance on Outcomes is the March 2023 version.

2. The Allegations: Parties respective positions

- 2.1. The Appropriate Authority served a Regulation 30 Notice on FCC Chilton on 8 January 2026. There were four Charges against FCC Chilton:

Charge 1

Being the applicant for the post of, and during your tenure as, Chief Constable for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Constabulary ("HIOWC") you failed to disclose to your Police and Crime Commissioner (Donna Jones) ("the PCC") or anyone else your previous sexual relationship with Officer A during the application process to become Chief Constable of HIOWC and thereafter. Furthermore, you repetitively and dishonestly denied the said sexual relationship to, amongst others, your PCC, her Chief Executive (Kate Gunson) and your Deputy Chief Constable ("DCC") (Sam de Reya). Such conduct was contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour scheduled to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Charge 2

Being the Chief Constable for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Constabulary ("HIOWC") you had sexual relations with Officer A, a subordinate police officer in the same Western Area as yourself, including whilst you were on duty, being conduct contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour scheduled to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Charge 3

Being the Chief Constable for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Constabulary ("HIOWC"), you abused your position for a sexual purpose by having a sexual relationship with Officer B, a subordinate working for the chief officer group, for the period of approximately April 2023 to October 2024. Such conduct was contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour scheduled to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Charge 4

Being the Chief Constable for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Constabulary ("HIOWC"), you failed to declare to your Police and Crime Commissioner ("the PCC") (Donna Jones) or anyone else your sexual relationship with Officer B. Furthermore, when the said relationship came to light, you behaved inappropriately towards Officer B. Such conduct was contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour scheduled to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

- 2.2. FCC Chilton denied all the charges against him. He denied Charges 1 and 2 as he denied any relationship with Officer A. He admitted a relationship with Officer B but denied any abuse of position and denied a failure to declare the relationship and further denied that he behaved inappropriately towards Officer B.
- 2.3. Each Charge had a number of factual particulars which were alleged against FCC Chilton, and which comprised the particulars of each Charge. FCC Chilton admitted to some of these particulars but denied others.
- 2.4. The Appropriate Authority alleges that the conduct within the Charges was a breach of the following Standards of Professional Conduct set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, in respect of:
 - 2.4.1. Honesty and Integrity - Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.
 - 2.4.2. Orders and Instructions - Police officers only give and carry out lawful orders and instructions. Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders.
 - 2.4.3. Authority, Respect and Courtesy - Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy. Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals

- 2.4.4. Discreditable Conduct - Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.
- 2.5. The Appropriate Authority's position was that the breaches, if proved were so serious as to amount to gross misconduct.
- 2.6. FCC Chilton denied gross misconduct. He denied any breaches of the Standards in respect of Charge 1 and 2. He admitted a breach of Integrity in that Charge 3 was a breach of the HIOWC policy and that this would also amount to a breach of Discreditable Conduct which he said was at the level of misconduct. For charge 4, FCC Chilton admitted a breach of integrity not disclosing the relationship to the PCC, he further admitted a breach of orders and instructions by not following the HIOWC policy and Discreditable Conduct relating to these breaches. He accepted these are breaches which amount to Misconduct.

3. The Misconduct Hearing

- 3.1. The proceedings relate to former Chief Constable Scott Chilton. This Officer resigned and his last day of service was 7 April 2025. He was therefore a former Officer at the time of the hearing and is referred to in this document as 'FCC Chilton' or the Officer.
- 3.2. In advance of the hearing a number of applications were presented to the Chair, full reasons were provided to all parties at the time and a summary of the determinations of the Chair is as follows:
 - 3.2.1. The AA made an application for Officer A and B to be granted anonymity and for reporting restrictions to be put in place. This application was not opposed by FCC Chilton's Counsel. Following an opportunity for media representations, the Chair determined to grant the applications giving anonymity to Officers A and B and further that these officers would not be identified in any reporting of these proceedings.
 - 3.2.2. The AA made an application for Officer A, Officer B and Person C to be granted special measures during the hearing. The Chair determined that these witnesses could be granted special measures in order to provide their best evidence to the Panel.
 - 3.2.3. Mr Berry on behalf of FCC Chilton made 3 applications to dismiss elements of Charge 2:
 - 3.2.3.1. the 'sex on duty' aspect of Charge 2 on account of insufficient particularity given the lack of specific dates.
 - 3.2.3.2. the 'sex on duty' aspect of Charge 2 on account of insufficient evidence as Officer A had not mentioned this in her evidence at the time.
 - 3.2.3.3. the 'sexual relations' aspect of Charge 2 on account of both insufficient particularity and lack of evidence.The Chair denied all 3 applications.

- 3.2.4. At the start of the hearing the AA made a further application for Person C to be afforded anonymity. The Chair determined on the evidence presented to grant this application with the same reporting restrictions for Officer A and Officer B. These measures were put in place to ensure that Person C could not be identified.
- 3.3. A public notice giving details of the hearing was published on the HIOWC website two weeks before the commencement of the hearing. An incorrect notice was mistakenly uploaded by the AA (which purported to restrict the hearing with blanket restrictions). Upon the media making representations the mistake was identified and the Chair directed that the notice be withdrawn and replaced immediately with the correct notice. Nineteen members of the media requested to attend the proceedings either in person or remotely.
- 3.4. At the start of the hearing Mr Berry informed the Chair that FCC Chilton was not going to be present on account of 'medical issues'. These were not elaborated upon. He informed the Chair that FCC Chilton was not requesting an adjournment and had instructed Mr Berry and his legal representative to withdraw from the hearing. FCC Chilton's defence team promptly left the hearing. The Chair was grateful to Mr Berry for stating this position in session and was thankful for the assistance he had provided in the lead up to the hearing.
- 3.5. The Chair determined that FCC Chilton had received appropriate and fair opportunity to attend the hearing but had voluntarily absented himself. Further, he had requested that his legal team withdraw and not represent him during the hearing. The Chair determined under 37(3)b of the Regulations and in accordance with paragraph 11.106 of HOG to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the Officer.

4. Evidence considered

- 4.1. As a result of FCC Chilton not attending and withdrawing his legal team, the AA's evidence would not be challenged. The Chair took into consideration the welfare concerns of the witnesses and the fairness of the proceedings and determined that it was not necessary or in the interests of justice for the witnesses to attend. The witnesses were stood down. This was subject to a direction that the AA seek a further statement from Officer A in respect of the questions which would have been put to her by the AA in evidence in chief had she been required to attend.
- 4.2. The Panel received an additional statement from Officer A the following day which was sent to all parties including FCC Chilton's legal representatives who sent a letter in response dated 6 October 2026.
- 4.3. Prior to the hearing the Panel had thoroughly read and considered the whole bundle of evidence presented in this case. The bundle of evidence included witness statements, with signed declarations of truth, from the following witnesses: Karen Scipio, Phil Scrase, Kate Gunson, Donna Jones, Sam de Reya, Sophie Palmer, Anne

Attwell, Iain Clancy, Wayne Jackson, Hazel Minshull, Karen Williams, Zoe Wakefield, Alexander Cropp, Roger Trencher.

- 4.4. FCC Chilton had submitted a detailed Regulation 31 response which was signed, a statement dated 19 August 2025, and a witness statement dated 7 April 2026. The Panel also had the benefit of his interview transcript from his IOPC interview on 20 August 2025 and a bundle of character references provided.
- 4.5. The Appropriate Authority Counsel, Mr Beggs, provided a comprehensive Opening Note, which was served in advance of the hearing, as well as opening the case in full during the hearing. The Panel members were grateful for the timeliness of this opening note and the detail provided.

5. The Panels Approach

- 5.1. These proceedings were held to determine whether the conduct of the FCC Chilton breached any Standards of Professional Behaviour, whether such conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct as set out in 3(1) of the Regulations and whether disciplinary action should be imposed.
- 5.2. The Panel considered the four-stepped approach as set out in Regulations and determined to consider step 1 – 3 before hearing additional submissions on outcome for step 4:

Step 1 - Firstly, ascertain the facts, bearing in mind what was and what was not in dispute.

Step 2 - Determine, on the basis of those facts, whether any Standards of Professional Behaviour had been breached.

Step 3 - Then to decide whether the conduct as a whole amounted to Misconduct, Gross Misconduct or indeed neither.

Step 4 - As appropriate, to decide what the outcome should be.

- 5.3. In making its decisions the Panel was mindful of the fact that the burden of proof rested with the Appropriate Authority. The standard of proof applied by the Panel was the civil standard of balance of probabilities. The balance of probabilities is a single unvarying standard.
- 5.4. The inherent probability or improbability of an event remains a matter to be considered when weighing the probabilities and deciding whether, on balance, the event occurred. The Panel understood that the seriousness of the allegations and/or the seriousness of the consequences for the Officer do not require a different standard of proof.

- 5.5. The Panel had regard to the whole of the evidence and formed its own judgement about the witness evidence (including the Officer), and which evidence was reliable and which was not. Witness evidence should be considered and tested by reference to objective facts, supporting information and in particular contemporaneous documents. It is open to the Panel not to rule out the whole of a witness's evidence based on credibility; credibility can be divisible. *Khan v The General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 374 (Admin)*
- 5.6. The Officer was entitled to a 'Good Character Direction', having no misconduct history. Whilst good character is not a defence to the allegations denied, the evidence of good character counts in the Officer's favour in two ways:
- 5.6.1. First, the Officer's good character supports his credibility and is therefore something the Panel should consider when deciding whether they believe the Officer's evidence (the 'credibility limb'); and
- 5.6.2. Secondly, the Officer's good character may mean that he is less likely to have committed the allegations cited (the 'propensity limb').

It is for the Panel to decide what weight to give to the evidence of good character, allowing for everything they have heard about the officer.

- 5.7. The Panel understood it must not speculate. If the Panel was satisfied by the evidence, that it was more likely than not that the conduct occurred as alleged, then the allegation will be found proved. As to individual pieces of evidence the panel are entitled to draw proper inferences, that is to come to common sense conclusions based upon the evidence which it accepted as reliable.
- 5.8. The Panel has to reach a conclusion on each particular of the charges separately, but it is entitled, in determining whether or not each particular is proved, to have regard to relevant evidence relating to other particulars. If evidence is accepted on one matter, the Panel should consider how that acceptance affects its consideration of other evidence.
- 5.9. The Panel have approached their decision making by keeping in mind the purpose of misconduct proceedings. The primary purpose being not to punish the Officer but to protect the public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service by holding police officers accountable and making clear that improper behaviour will not be left unchecked ("Primary Purpose").
- 5.10. In determining dishonesty, the Panel must use the accepted test for dishonesty, as set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting [2017] 3 WLR 1212*.

"When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of his belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it

is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest."

- 5.11. The Panel must also address a breach of integrity. It is open to the Panel to find that the Officer did not act with integrity even if they do not find any dishonesty. A lack of integrity may be less specific, less deliberate or less serious than dishonesty. In the case of *Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police v Police Misconduct Panel and White (2017) EWHC 923 (Admin)* Mrs Justice McGowan said:

"...A lapse of integrity is very serious but can fall short of the quality of a lapse of honesty. Integrity in this context is not used in the sense of freedom from moral corruption rather in the sense of a failing to act in the right way, not behaving as the totally correct police officer would, in some way falling short of the whole. It is explained for police officers as "doing the right thing".

- 5.12. Further it is clear that society expects professional people to live up to higher standards given their privileged and trusted role in society (*Wingate v SRA 2018 1 WLR 3969*)
- 5.13. When considering whether the conduct in question is discreditable the Panel should consider how a member of the public would view the behaviour and whether it would discredit the force, it is not necessary to prove that actual discredit has been brought to the police service.
- 5.14. The Panel heard submissions from the AA and was given full legal advice from the LQP in session.

6. Facts Decision: Charge 1

- 6.1. The particulars for Charge 1 were set out under different thematic headings. The Panel grouped and retained 9 headings when looking at the evidence and making their determination on the disputed facts. The facts admitted and the facts disputed are detailed under each heading for ease of comprehension of the particulars in dispute.

Charge 1 – Breach of Policies

- 6.2. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:
1. *You attested as a police constable with HIOWC in 1992.*
 2. *In September 2008 HIOWC published "24106 - Relationships at work" ("the HIOWC Policy").*

3. *The HIOWC Policy addressed, inter alia, workplace relationships, the risks of such relationships creating actual or apparent conflicts of interest and the duties of disclosure in respect of such relationships.*

8. *In March 2019 the NPCC and College of Policing published guidance entitled “Appropriate personal relationships and behaviours in the workplace” (“the College guidance”). The College guidance addressed, inter alia, workplace relationships, the risks of such relationships creating actual or apparent conflicts of interest and the duties of disclosure in respect of such relationships.*

9. *You knew or ought reasonably to have known about the College guidance.*

10. *On or about 14 September 2022, whilst Chief Constable of Dorset Police, you applied to become the Chief Constable of HIOWC. The first bullet point of Section 7 of your written application declares as follows: “If it is found that I have provided false or misleading information during the recruitment process I understand that any offer of employment may be withdrawn or appropriate actions taken under the Police Complaints and Misconduct Regulations”. You ticked that bullet point as having been understood.*

- 6.3. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 1 – Particulars 4 and 5

4. *You knew or ought reasonably to have known about the HIOWC Policy.*

5. *Further and in any event, you knew or ought reasonably to have known that a covert workplace relationship between officers of dissonant rank ought to be reported to their line manager, confidentially, for reasons consistent with the HIOWC policy, namely, to avoid actual or apparent conflicts of interest in the workplace.*

- 6.4. The policy came into force in 2008 when FCC Chilton would have been a superintendent working within HIOWC. During this period, he would have been a line manager for numerous staff members and therefore would have had a requirement to actively uphold this policy within his team. The policy dealt with workplace relationships, the risks of such relationships creating actual or apparent conflicts of interest and the duties of disclosure in respect of such relationships

- 6.5. The Panel noted that the effect of paragraphs 3.2.1 to 3.2.6 and 3.3.1 of HIOWC 2008 Relationships at Work Policy, was to impose an obligation upon an officer in a workplace relationship to report the relationship to their supervisor so that effective control / mitigation measures could be considered and put in place. The Panel accepted that this is to ensure that *“close personal relationships do not have an adverse effect on the service provided by [HIOWC] or other members of staff as they may result in conflicts of interest and affect the delivery and integrity of the service provided. This procedure is intended to prevent this situation from arising or others perceiving such risks”*.

- 6.6. There has been a nationwide focus within policing concerned with preventing conflicts through relationships at work.
- 6.7. The Panel does not accept that FCC Chilton would not have known about workplace relationship policies given his extensive period as an experienced officer. They took into account that FCC Chilton had stated himself that his DCC was responsible for internal operations within HIOWC. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton was the DCC within Dorset for a period prior to taking up his position as Chief Constable within Dorset (and later HIOWC) and concluded that he would have had operational knowledge of the impact of covert relationships within teams and the importance of managing these.

Charge 1 – Particular 6

6. Over the period of approximately 2008-2012, whilst you were a detective chief inspector and / or superintendent in Western Area, you had a sexual relationship with subordinate Officer A whilst she was a sergeant on the same Western Area as you.

- 6.8. FCC Chilton's Regulation 31 response stated that he did not have a sexual relationship with Officer A at any time. The Panel had regard to the 'good character direction' that the Officer's good character supports his credibility and considered FCC Chilton's credibility in respect of this Charge against the evidence.
- 6.9. The Panel noted the evidence of Officer A in her witness statement. She stated that she had an affair with FCC Chilton which lasted a few months around the end of 2011 beginning of 2012. She states that her mother was diagnosed with a terminal illness in 2012. She states that she was a sergeant in Romsey and FCC Chilton was a superintendent in Southampton.
- 6.10. The Panel found there were numerous other accounts of the affair between Officer A and FCC Chilton.
- 6.11. In 2012, Officer A told her friend and colleague Karen Manners, that she was having an affair with FCC Chilton. Karen Manners is a retired DCC and her witness statement states that she recalls Officer A visiting her in Warwickshire in 2012 and telling her of the affair. She was able to disclose details of the sexual interactions which were provided to her by Officer A, which gave credence to the recollection. The Panel considered this to be a contemporaneous account of the affair provided by Officer A to Karen Manners.
- 6.12. Person C gives evidence that in early 2012 she recalls FCC Chilton attending the Romsey Police station. She states that Officer A was a sergeant and that FCC Chilton was a superintendent. She gives evidence that there was an 'active rumour mill' at Romsey police station and it was widely known that Officer A was 'having an affair with a married man'. She states that a colleague confirmed to her that it was FCC Chilton. The Panel noted that there were some irregularities within the dates

provided by Person C in their witness statement and that reference is made to matters which are hearsay which reduced the weight they attached to this statement.

- 6.13. Around 2021 or 2022, Wayne Jackson recalls that Roger Wood was animated about information regarding Officer A who had joined their team as a Detective Inspector. Wayne Jackson recalls in his witness statement that Roger Wood reported to him, that he had been speaking with Officer A who told him that she had been contacted by a reporter or journalist relating to her time as a staff officer. Roger Wood said that Officer A had assumed the journalist's inquiry was about relationships she had had and mentioned that one of these involved a chief constable from a neighbouring force, formerly of HIOWC. FCC Chilton was Chief Constable of Dorset Police between 14 August 2021 and 21 February 2023. Wayne Jackson states that he formed the impression that Roger Wood was speaking of FCC Chilton.
- 6.14. In November 2022, Roger Wood made comments to Kate Gunson about FCC Chilton having an affair with Officer A. Kate Gunson recalls Roger Wood saying, *"I am pleased [SC] got the job, he had a fling with my friend Officer A and seems like a good bloke"*.
- 6.15. In November 2023, FCC Chilton asked Kate Gunson whether she had heard any comments about him. The Panel was of the view that FCC Chilton was trying to illicit information to establish the extent of knowledge within the senior leadership team. Kate Gunson told FCC Chilton that Roger Wood was implying that FCC Chilton had had an affair with Officer A, which FCC Chilton described as *"rubbish"*.
- 6.16. In early 2024, Wayne Jackson informed FCC Chilton of the aforementioned press enquiry. Wayne Jackson recalls speaking with FCC Chilton and the conversation turned to Roger Wood's gross misconduct proceedings, which FCC Chilton described as *"a bit of a mess"*, mentioning *"mudslinging"*. It was at this point that Jackson shared with FCC Chilton the conversation he had had with Roger Wood in Portsmouth, described in paragraph 6.12 above. Wayne Jackson did not name the chief constable said to have been having the affair with Officer A, but FCC Chilton responded that it was not true and that he hardly knew Officer A and did not have an affair with her. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton had assumed the comment was about him and his reaction demonstrated a knowledge of the affair as well as a defensive response.
- 6.17. Officer A's evidence was supported by her unsolicited comments that she made to Roger Wood in a private conversation (where she didn't know she was being recorded) in 2024. The audio comments corroborate Officer A's statement. They refer to the fact it was a sexual relationship and that it was alleged to have occurred around the time her mum died.

1:04: Officer A relating her conversation with SC "he said when you and I were shagging it was 12 years ago, I said it doesn't matter you were still in a relationship";

1:34: *"but he's giving it all oh I can't do – I said well don't give me that shit because actually my mum was dying in hospital and you were fucking shagging me so actually you wanna – you wanna go there";*
 3:02: *"Actually all I have done is said what is Roger do – you know we were having a shag, end of";*
 3:15: *"... and that was years ago, years ago!";*
 3:19: *"has he ever declare – and that's what I'll – and that's what I'll bring up next..."*.

- 6.18. In February 2025, Officer A was visited by Karen Scipio, Head of Occupational Health, Wellbeing and Inclusion for HIOWC. Ms Scipio informed Officer A of the intelligence gathered involving FCC Chilton. She describes Officer A's first response being *"that was years ago"*. Upon disclosure of the intelligence of an audio recording, Officer A initially did not think the matter referred to her but then said that it was Roger Wood, *"He's the only person I've told"*. Officer A then described her relationship with Roger Wood who was a long-term friend and who had stayed with her when he separated from his wife. It was in that context that Officer A confirmed her relationship with FCC Chilton to Ms Scipio. Officer A's disclosure to Karen Scipio was also consistent with her witness statement.
- 6.19. The Panel noted there was no embellishment on the information Officer A provided either in 2012 to Karen Manners, or to Karen Scipio or later in her witness statement. There was a consistency to Officer A's account and the Panel accepted that this added to the reliability of the evidence before it.
- 6.20. The Panel further noted that Roger Wood's disclosure of what he had been told by Officer A is consistent with Officer A's witness statement and the account to Karen Scipio and Karen Manners.
- 6.21. The Panel were of the view that Officer A was a credible and consistent witness and that there was clearly a sexual relationship between FCC Chilton and Officer A between 2008 – 2012. There were multiple reports of a relationship from the contemporaneous account of person C in 2012, Karen Manners in 2012 and Roger Wood in 2022 which were all made prior to any misconduct investigation into FCC Chilton.
- 6.22. The Panel noted FCC Chilton's denial of the sexual relationship, but was of the view that in addition to the above evidence supporting Officer A's account there was also evidence which undermined his credibility. It noted
 - 6.22.1. In a conversation with the DCC he stated that he only met Officer A *'a couple of times in the work environment'*. This was at odds with the evidence of Officer A and the evidence of Roger Wood.
 - 6.22.2. In his meeting with the PCC on 13 November 2024, he stated that *'she [Officer A] would message him randomly often commenting on football results or sending pictures of her dogs. He said she had been doing this on and off for years...he stated that he had only met this officer 2 or 3 times many years ago'*.

The Panel found it improbable Officer A was sending messages over a period of 'years' with no reciprocal contact.

- 6.22.3. In December 2023 FCC Chilton made a verbal disclosure to DCC Sam de Reya about Officer A stating that he had received a text which inferred that they had been in a relationship which FCC Chilton denied. DCC de Reya advised FCC Chilton to stop contact and log anything further. The Panel noted FCC Chilton didn't take this advice as he maintained contact with Officer A despite his DCC's advice and raised further concerns in January 2024. On the third disclosure to the DCC by FCC Chilton she again advised him to stop contact and block Officer A's number. FCC Chilton stated he didn't want any action taken against Officer A and continued contact. The Panel found this extraordinary considering the nature of the allegations being made against him.
- 6.22.4. FCC Chilton had made efforts to frustrate or stop the Roger Wood hearing. He questioned the DCC on *"the necessity and proportionality of running the investigation [into Roger Wood] as Roger Wood had retired"*. FCC Chilton also stated to the DCC that "he could step in and make decisions on the case." This comment by FCC Chilton bothered the DCC to such an extent that she personally reviewed the case and sought advice from the NPCC Lead for Professional Standards. This was similar in theme to the WhatsApp messages between Officer A and Roger Wood whereby Roger Wood stated *"Scott Chilton said to you [Officer A] to tell me not to look for another job and laughed with you about the case. He said if I didn't do anything on duty time then there was no case"*. To the DCC's credit she maintained the integrity of the investigation into Roger Wood and the Panel noted that a separate impartial panel had concluded that Roger Woods conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct. The investigation was clearly proper and required to uphold the Primary Purpose.
- 6.23. The Panel could not find any evidence which supported FCC Chilton's assertions and the weight of the evidence which contradicted his denials was substantial. The Panel had regard to Mr Beggs submission in his opening note:
- "The Crown Court Compendium at paragraph 10.1(2) provides a helpful summary of the common law description of circumstantial evidence (emphasis added): "A circumstantial case is one which depends for its cogency on the unlikelihood of coincidence: circumstantial evidence "works by cumulatively, in geometrical progression, eliminating other possibilities" (DPP v Kilbourne 1973] AC 729 at p.758 per Lord Simon)."*
- 6.24. The Panel was of the opinion that FCC Chilton was not credible in respect of his evidence. It was implausible that four other people were talking about their alleged relationship if FCC Chilton had only met Officer A, a couple of times. The corroboration and circumstantial evidence from the numerous witnesses over the period of time from 2012 to 2024 was very compelling evidence relative to FCC Chilton's account. The Panel concluded that FCC Chilton was lying when he denied the existence of the sexual relationship with Officer A.

- 6.25. The Panel considered that there was no evidence before it as to why Officer A would make up the allegation. It concluded that it was more likely than not to have occurred as alleged and therefore on the balance of probabilities this particular was found proven.

Charge 1 - Particular 7

7. *In breach of the HIOWC policy and in breach of the duty set out in paragraph 5 herein, you did not declare that relationship at the time*

- 6.26. The Panel were clear that a sexual relationship would have fallen within the definition of a 'close personal relationship' as set out in the HIOWC policy. The fact that there was no line management relationship between Officer A and FCC Chilton at the time was irrelevant as that policy clearly demonstrates that the requirement is to prevent a conflict of interest arising or other staff perceiving there to be a conflict of interest which could lead to an actual risk of one. The Panel noted that the policy stated at 3.2.3 that *"if there is no direct reporting relationship ... between the members of staff involved in the relationship, the relationship may still impact on other members of staff and the service provided by"*. The relationship was in breach of the HIOWC policy and was not declared as required.

Charge 1 - The Recruitment Process

- 6.27. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

14. *On 23 February 2023 you took up the post of Chief Constable of HIOWC.*

- 6.28. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton:

Charge 1 – Particulars 11, 12 13 and 15

11. *As part of the process to become Chief Constable of HIOWC, there was "chemistry conversation" between you and the PCC to ascertain general suitability for the role. This was an opportunity for you to disclose your relationship with Officer A. You did not do so. Your said failure lacked honesty and integrity.*

12. *As part of the process to become Chief Constable of HIOWC you were, on 4 November 2022, interviewed by the PCC and her panel:*

a. *The PCC asked you if there was anything that you needed to disclose to the panel or anything that the panel needed to be aware of;*

b. *You replied that there was nothing the panel needed to be aware of.*

13. *Your answer in sub-paragraph (b) of the foregoing paragraph was dishonest and lacking in integrity in that you had had a workplace relationship with Officer A which you ought to have disclosed to your prospective PCC.*

15. *Thereafter you failed to make any appropriate disclosures to your PCC or PSD concerning Officer A under the College guidance or the HIOWC Policy.*

- 6.29. In her witness statement, the PCC stated that on 4 Nov 2022 the penultimate question that she asked FCC Chilton, was whether there was anything else to 'disclose' or anything that the interview Panel needed to be aware of. She states that FCC Chilton reply was '*there was nothing that I needed to be aware of*'. FCC Chilton denies that this question was put to him conversely stating that he was asked at the end of the interview whether there was anything he wanted to say. The Panel was of the view that there was much similarity between the accounts. Even if FCC Chilton's account was correct the proposition of 'anything he wanted to say' would have been within the context of him being interviewed by a panel for the position of Chief Constable and a reasonable impression of this was that it referred to whether there was anything he needed to disclose or make the panel aware of. The Panel considered this to be a standard question in such appointments and preferred the PCC's evidence on this point.
- 6.30. The Panel had found that FCC Chilton had engaged in a sexual relationship with Officer A. It was clear that FCC Chilton ought to have disclosed the relationship with Officer A during the 'chemistry conversation' and this interview. He would have known of his duty to disclose any transgressions given the seniority of his role and the fact that he was interviewing for the most senior position within a constabulary which would involve setting and upholding standards of policing across HIOWC. It was factually evident that he did not make any disclosure during the chemistry conversations, the interview or later to the PCC or PSD concerning Officer A in accordance with the HIOWC policy. The Panel had regard to the case authorities *Wingate v SRA 2018* and *Chief Constable of Thames Valley Police v Police misconduct panel and White (2017)* as referred to by the LQP. It was clear to the Panel that FCC Chilton ought to have disclosed the relationship, doing so would have been the 'right thing to do'. As FCC Chilton did not do so, he had demonstrated a lack of integrity.
- 6.31. The Panel considered the test for dishonesty as set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting*. The Panel sought to ascertain the actual state of FCC's knowledge or belief and observed that FCC Chilton's evidence was that he had not had a sexual relationship with Officer A and that this was purportedly his belief at the time of the recruitment process; he did not believe he had engaged in a relationship with Officer A and therefore did not have anything to disclose. The Panel rejected that this was a genuinely held belief as they had found that FCC Chilton had engaged in a sexual relationship with Officer A over a period of months, which was known about by other staff within the HIOWC. FCC Chilton therefore had the full knowledge of his affair at this time.
- 6.32. The Panel considered that an ordinary decent person, knowing he had engaged in an affair with Officer A would have concluded that FCC Chilton was acting dishonestly by not disclosing the relationship during the recruitment process. The Panel found that FCC Chilton was dishonest.

Charge 1 - False denials to Chief Executive and the PCC

6.33. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

16. *On 15 November 2023 whilst you and your PCC's Chief Executive were at the APCC/NPCC partnership summit:*

- a. *You asked the Chief Executive whether DCI Roger Wood had ever made any comments about you;*
- b. *The Chief Executive replied that DCI Roger Wood had implied that you had had a sexual relationship with a female officer (Officer A);*
- c. *You replied that this was "rubbish".*

6.34. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton:

17. *Your reply in subparagraph [16](c) of the foregoing paragraph was dishonest and lacking in integrity.*

6.35. On the 15 November 2023 FCC Chilton stated to the Chief Executive, Kate Gunson that the comments by Roger Wood implying that FCC Chilton had a relationship with Officer A were 'rubbish'. FCC Chilton admits that he said this to Kate Gunson.

6.36. Given the Panel's findings that the relationship had occurred and its findings on the state of FCC Chilton's knowledge (as set out in paragraph 6.31) The Panel was satisfied that saying the rumours of the relationship were 'rubbish' was a dishonest response and lacked integrity.

Charge 1 – First false disclosures to your DCC

6.37. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

18. *In December 2023:*

- a. *You disclosed to your DCC that a serving female detective inspector had recently texted you suggesting that your previous relationship with her had been something more than just professional;*
- c. *Your purported reason for making the disclosure was in case information you claimed to be false was used against you;*
- e. *You emphasised to your DCC that there had never been any sort of romantic or sexual relationship with the female inspector.*

6.38. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 1 – Particulars 18 and 19

18. *In December 2023:*

- b. *You did not disclose the name of the detective inspector to your DCC, though you were referring to Officer A who was by now an inspector;*
- d. *The true reason for the disclosure was to elicit whether the DCC knew anything and / or to pre-emptively set up your defence in relation to Officer A;*

19. *In the foregoing paragraph [18]:*

- a. *Your conduct in subparagraph [18](d) lacked integrity;*
- b. *Your assertion in subparagraph [18](e) was dishonest and lacking in integrity.*

6.39. The Panel considered the statement of the DCC and noted that in December 2023 she makes reference to a ‘female’ serving Detective Inspector, and that it is only sometime in early 2024 that she makes reference to knowing the name of Officer A, which is after the third disclosure from FCC Chilton as the DCC contacts Officer A’s line manager regarding her welfare.

6.40. FCC Chilton states in his regulation 31 response that he verbally informed his DCC about the name of Officer A, and that he did not include the name in his written memo dated 5 January 2024. The Panel had regard to the memo and noted that it did not refer to the name of Officer A and therefore concluded that FCC Chilton must be correct and that he verbally informed the DCC of the name of Officer A at some point. It was clear from the DCC’s evidence that at some point she was made aware of the name of Officer A, but it was not clear whether this was in December 2023 or not. The Panel did not find particular 18b proved.

6.41. The Panel considered particular 18d and noted the evidence before it for the purpose of the disclosure. FCC Chilton denies that the true reason for the disclosure was to ‘*elicit whether the DCC knew anything and / or to pre-emptively set up your defence in relation to Officer A*’. The Panel observed that there was little evidence before it on this point and therefore found 18d not proved.

6.42. As the Panel had not found particular 18d proven, particular 19a, which related to the behaviour at 18d was not proven.

6.43. The Panel considered particular 19b whether FCC Chilton had lacked in honesty and integrity when saying that there was no romantic or sexual relationship to his DCC. The Panel considered FCC Chilton’s belief at the time when he made this statement and noted its findings in paragraph 6.31, that he would have been fully aware of the nature of his relationship with Officer A. The Panel considered that ordinary decent people would consider this rebuttal of the relationship was dishonest. The Panel had regard to the case authorities and noted that he was lacking in integrity.

Charge 1 – Further false disclosures to your DCC

6.44. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

20. *In early January 2024:*
 - a. *You spoke with your DCC again about communication from the female DI (whom you had still not identified to your DCC);*
 - b. *You told your DCC that you were concerned that a false allegation would be made against you by DCI Roger Wood (who was facing an imminent gross misconduct hearing in respect of allegations of sexual impropriety in the workplace);*
 - c. *Your DCC advised you to make a written disclosure to her so that she could record it and share with PSD should any allegations emerge.*
21. *By memorandum dated 5 January 2024 to your DCC you set out your purported connection to Officer A in which, inter alia, you:*
 - a. *Emphatically denied any kind of sexual relationship with Officer A;*
 - b. *Portrayed yourself in a favourable light vis a vis Officer A;*
23. *During the period June to November 2024 you raised Officer A with your DCC on about three further occasions, on each occasion reiterating that any suggestion of a relationship between you and Officer A was untrue.*

6.45. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 1 - Particulars 21, 22 and 24

21. *By memorandum dated 5 January 2024 to your DCC you set out your purported connection to Officer A in which, inter alia, you:*
 - c. *Sought subtly to discredit Officer A.*
22. *Your said written account to your DCC concerning your relationship with Officer A was:*
 - a. *dishonest and lacking in integrity.*
 - b. *another pre-emptive attempt to mitigate and / or “see off” what you perceived to be troubles ahead concerning your relationship with Officer A;*
 - c. *intended to undermine or denigrate Officer A.*
24. *Your assertions in the foregoing paragraph [23] were dishonest and lacking in integrity.*

6.46. The Panel noted the Memo dated 5 January 2024 from FCC Chilton to the DCC. FCC Chilton denies that he sought to subtly discredit Officer A and that he was stating the relevant facts as he perceived them to be.

6.47. After forensically reviewing the Memo, the Panel noted that FCC Chilton mentions that Officer A suffered from [REDACTED] was ‘in an emotional state’, was ‘struggling’ and ‘feeling low about her mother’. Given that the Panel had found that

there was a relationship, these elements of information appeared to be with the intention to introduce a question on the reliability of Officer A. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton stated in the Memo that he *'felt aggrieved and annoyed that she [Officer A] would raise such a matter with me as Chief Constable'*. The Panel were of the view that this was the start of a deliberate course of conduct by FCC Chilton to discredit Officer A and to assert a narrative that any allegations against him which may come forward were false. It also suggested that FCC Chilton thought of himself (being chief constable) as being above any criticism for his conduct. The Panel found particulars 21c and 22 b and c proved.

- 6.48. The Panel considered its finding in paragraph 6.31 that FCC Chilton would have been fully aware of the nature of his relationship with Officer A. The Panel considered that ordinary decent people would consider these rebuttals of the relationship to the DCC as dishonest. The Panel had regard to the case authorities and noted that FCC Chilton had fallen short of what was expected of him and therefore was lacking in integrity.

Charge 1 – False disclosures and denials to the PCC

- 6.49. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

- 27. *By 12 November 2024:*
 - a. *you knew or suspected that your sexual relationship with Officer A was likely to come to wider public knowledge;*
 - b. *you contacted your PCC and sought a meeting with her the following day.*
- 28. *On 13 November 2024 you went to the home address of your PCC:*
 - a. *You spent about 3 ½ hours with your PCC;*
 - b. *You gave your PCC an account of a non-sexual relationship with Officer A more than 10 years earlier;*
 - c. *You portrayed yourself in a favourable light vis a vis Officer A;*

- 6.50. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 1 – Particulars 25 and 26

- 25. *Ahead of the renewal of your Developed Vetting in November 2024, you advised your PCC that she would be required to provide a line manager's reference. At this point, despite knowing of the utmost importance of total candour in the DV process, you failed to disclose to your PCC the fact of the sexual relationship with Officer A.*
- 26. *Your failure in the foregoing paragraph [25] was dishonest and lacking in integrity.*

- 6.51. The Panel noted that in respect of particular 25, that in November 2024, the PCC gave evidence that during the Developed Vetting renewal process *"No affairs or any*

concerns about any relationships, personal or otherwise were disclosed to me” by FCC Chilton.

- 6.52. As the Panel had found that FCC Chilton had engaged in a sexual relationship with Officer A, it was clear that he had failed to disclose the relationship. The Panel further noted that at this point of the Developed Vetting, FCC Chilton had had a further relationship with Officer B by this date (which he subsequently admitted) that he also failed to disclose to his PCC during the Developed Vetting renewal. FCC Chilton had not been candid with the PCC during this Developed Vetting process and had acted dishonestly and without integrity.

Charge 1 – Particulars 28, 29 and 30

28. *On 13 November 2024 you went to the home address of your PCC:
d. You sought subtly to discredit Officer A in the eyes of your PCC.*
29. *The account in the foregoing paragraph [28] to your PCC in respect of your relationship with Officer A was dishonest and lacking in integrity.*
30. *Your said meeting dated 13 November 2024 with the PCC was a pre-emptive attempt to mitigate and / or see off what you perceived to be troubles ahead concerning your relationship with Officer A.*
- 6.53. The Panel had regard to both the first and the second witness statements of the PCC and what she alleges FCC Chilton said to her at the meeting on 13 November 2024. It noted that FCC Chilton is said to have informed the PCC that Officer A was ‘*off sick and had been for some time*’ and was suspected to have issues with [REDACTED]. The Panel were of the view, in line with its thoughts at paragraph 6.47 above that this was a continued effort by FCC Chilton to discredit Officer A and undermine her credibility ahead of any allegations being made public. The Panel found particular 28d and 30 proved.
- 6.54. The Panel found that this response was lacking in integrity and was dishonest by the standards of ordinary people.

Charge 1 – False Denials on 12 February 2025

- 6.55. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:
31. *By email dated 6 February 2025 from Donna Cannon to Jason Beer KC (who was presenting a gross misconduct case against former DCI Roger Wood starting on 17 February 2025) various allegations were made against HLOWC personnel, including that you had had a sexual relationship with Officer A.*
32. *The DCC was briefed on the said Cannon email on 10 February 2025. By 12 November 2024:*
- a. *you knew or suspected that your sexual relationship with Officer A was likely to come to wider public knowledge;*
- b. *you contacted your PCC and sought a meeting with her the following day.*

34. On 12 February 2025, at about 13:00 hours, in Costa Coffee in Winnall:
- a. Your PCC, in company with her Chief Executive, met with you;
 - b. You asserted to your PCC and her Chief Executive that the allegation that you had had a sexual relationship with Officer A was false.

6.56. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 1 – Particulars 33 and 35

33. Early on 12 February 2025, the DCC advised you of Cannon's allegation concerning your sexual relationship with Officer A. You inappropriately replied that the allegation could not go to the IOPC.
35. Your assertion in subparagraph [34](b) of the foregoing paragraph was dishonest and lacking in integrity.

6.57. The Panel had regard to the witness statement of the DCC and the events which led up to this early meeting on the 12th between the DCC and FCC Chilton. It noted that as a result of the misconduct hearing against Roger Wood, a third party, Donna Cannon had sent an email making various allegations of against a number of HIOWC personnel. FCC Chilton was mentioned in this email as having a sexual relationship with Officer A. The DCC details that she was briefed on the email on 10 February 2025. The DCC informed Kate Gunson as chief executive to the PCC on 11 February 2025 and wrote an email following up that conversation. The DCC drafted an IOPC referral regarding the allegations against HIOWC staff (in her capacity as HIOWC, Appropriate Authority).

6.58. The following day the DCC met with FCC Chilton to inform him of the allegations. She states in her witness statement that FCC Chilton was "shocked" and stated, "the allegation could not go to the IOPC". FCC Chilton says in his Regulation 31 response that if he did use those words, "it was by way of exasperation rather than instruction". The Panel were of the view that the DCC's detail in her witness statement was supported by the various emails and documents which were mentioned therein. The Panel had no reason as to why the DCC would make up FCC Chilton's response. It considered that by FCC Chilton's own admission he may have used the words but with a different tonal meaning.

6.59. The Panel considered the credibility of FCC Chilton and the credibility of the DCC. It noted that the DCC had acted with integrity during her conversations with FCC Chilton, for example advising him to make a formal disclosure as per the memo dated 5 January 2024 and to stop all contact with Officer A. The DCC had been meticulous in her record keeping and although the Panel had found in favour of FCC Chilton in respect of particular 18b above, overall, the Panel were of the view that the DCC was a reliable and credible witness. The Panel considered the credibility of FCC Chilton and noted that it had found on multiple occasions that he had been dishonest and had shown he lacked integrity in respect of this covert relationship

with Officer A. It therefore preferred the evidence of the DCC that FCC Chilton had inappropriately said that the allegation could not go to the IOPC.

- 6.60. After the meeting with the DCC, FCC Chilton had a meeting with the PCC and Kate Gunson. FCC Chilton denies that he acted dishonestly and was lacking integrity when he told them that the allegation was 'false'. As the Panel had found that FCC Chilton had engaged in an affair with Officer A and would have known this at the time he sat down with the PCC and Kate Gunson, it was clear to the Panel that he did lack integrity and that his actions would be considered dishonest by ordinary people's standards.

Charge 1 – Inappropriate behaviour at the meeting on 12 February 2025

- 6.61. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

36. *Later on 12 February 2025:*

- a. *You convened a meeting at HIOWC HQ with (amongst others) your PCC and her Chief Executive, your DCC, Roger Trencher, the Force Solicitor for HIOWC and ACO Ben Pratt;*
- b. *The meeting discussed inter alia whether the recent allegation concerning your alleged sexual relationship with Officer A should be referred to the Independent Office of Police Conduct ("IOPC");*
- d. *You knew or ought reasonably to have known that the honest and transparent approach would have been to refer the allegation to the IOPC for independent investigation;*

38. *On 26 February 2025 a recordable conduct matter concerning your alleged sexual relationship with Officer A was referred to the IOPC by the PCC.*

- 6.62. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 1 – Particulars 36c, 36e, 36f and 37

36. *Later on the 12 February 2025:*

- c. *At the meeting by your domineering conduct you inappropriately sought to influence the PCC into not referring the allegation to the IOPC;*
- e. *knew or ought reasonably to have known that you should not have been present in the meeting and / or should not have sought to influence the PCC's decision making;*
- f. *As a result of your said conduct, the PCC decided at the meeting not to refer the matter to the IOPC.*

37. *Your conduct in subparagraphs (a) to (e) of the foregoing paragraph was dishonest and / or lacked integrity.*

- 6.63. Later, on the 12 February 2025 FCC Chilton called the PCC, Kate Gunson, the DCC, Roger Trencher and ACO Ben Pratt to a meeting. FCC Chilton asserts that the

purpose of this meeting was to discuss the impact of the DCI Wood hearing which was due to start on 17 February 2025. He denies that he was domineering during this meeting. The Panel noted the evidence of the PCC, the DCC, Roger Trencher, Kate Gunson and Ben Pratt.

- 6.64. The DCC states in her witness statement that the meeting was to discuss the allegations against FCC Chilton. She states that she felt uncomfortable attending the meeting due to a potential conflict of interest and that FCC Chilton dismissed her concerns and directed her to attend. She states FCC Chilton was domineering at the meeting became verbally aggressive saying *“This is about the Chief Constable and the Force’s reputation’, ‘I’m getting fucked off about this cloak and dagger’, ‘it feels like a load of shite’, ‘it’s the reputation of the PSD and mine’ and ‘I am losing confidence in the support of my team’*”. The DCC commented that it was FCC Chilton’s reaction during this meeting that led her to believe that he was *‘trying to prevent a referral to the IOPC’*. The Panel also noted that the DCC stated that the next day FCC Chilton apologised to her for his behaviour at the meeting, stating he was *‘agitated and upset’*.
- 6.65. The Panel noted that the witness statement of Roger Trencher corroborated the evidence of the DCC stating that his recollection was that the meeting was to discuss a referral to the IOPC. He also states that he felt conflicted and emailed FCC Chilton before the meeting to say he wouldn’t be attending but that he was told he had to attend. In respect of how FCC Chilton was during the meeting he stated *“I remember that SC [FCC Chilton] was very agitated, moving in an agitated way, and appeared vexed. He was using some choice language, saying that he was aware of the allegations against him, and that they were absolute nonsense and that there had not been any inappropriate conduct. I formed the view that SC’s [FCC Chilton’s] agitation was because he was aware of what would happen if the referral was made, and an investigation was carried out. I was a little surprised that the PCC appeared to be going along with it”*
- 6.66. The Panel noted the witness statement of Kate Gunson who stated that the meeting was to discuss media concerns ahead of the Roger Wood misconduct hearing. She also corroborated the account of the DCC and Roger Trencher when commenting on FCC Chilton’s behaviour in this meeting as she stated that FCC Chilton was *“angry and desperate – he swore and made derogatory remarks about Donna Cannon. He asked Roger Trencher to find out about getting a court order to stop Roger Wood from speaking about Officer A to the press”*. She further commented that *“Scott [FCC Chilton] was making it clear to everyone at the meeting that he was the chief constable and they (Roger Trencher, Ben Pratt and Sam De Reya) worked for him”*.
- 6.67. The Panel noted the witness statement of the PCC who corroborated Kate Gunson’s understanding that the meeting had been put in to discuss media concerns ahead of the Roger Wood misconduct hearing. The PCC states that FCC Chilton was *‘not happy’*.

- 6.68. The Panel considered the evidence in the round. It was of the view that both the DCC and Roger Trencher believed that the meeting was to discuss the IOPC referral, this was supported by the fact that both commented on how uncomfortable they felt being at this meeting with FCC Chilton present and that they felt conflicted. It is not disputed by anyone that the IOPC referral was discussed at the meeting, however both the DCC and Roger Trencher had raised their concerns on the conflict **before** the meeting which gives credence to the fact that they knew this meeting was to discuss the IOPC referral, and not that it was something that simply 'came up' during the meeting. The Panel noted that in her first witness statement the PCC stated that she was at a conference in Winchester and due to be there all day but that she left early to meet with FCC Chilton at the Costa in Winnell. The PCC stated that she attended the meeting because she wanted to *'support Scott and was concerned about the Chief Constables (and by association, the force's) reputation being damaged'*. The Panel believed that it would make more sense that a meeting to discuss the upcoming Roger Wood hearing would have been scheduled in advance with all relevant parties and not on a day where the PCC was due to be at a conference. The Panel had regard to Roger Trencher's evidence that the meeting had been scheduled that day and concluded that it was more likely than not that the meeting was convened to discuss the allegations from Donna Cannon and not to discuss the media impact of the upcoming Roger Wood hearing.
- 6.69. The Panel accepted that all witnesses (save for the PCC) had commented on FCC Chilton's behaviour being aggressive in the meeting and the Panel determined that his behaviour had been domineering. The Panel noted that Roger Trencher commented that *"The meeting was very odd and was one of the most unprofessional meetings I have ever been in"* and *"as it seemed the meeting was only for the purpose of everyone being told to back off"*. The Panel concluded that as the meeting had been convened by FCC Chilton to discuss the allegations from Donna Cannon, it was more likely than not that FCC Chilton's behaviour was an attempt to influence the PCC into not referring the allegation.
- 6.70. FCC Chilton accepts that he should have left the meeting when his own alleged misconduct was being discussed. As the Panel had found that the meeting was convened by FCC Chilton to discuss exactly these matters his admissions make it clear that he knew he shouldn't have been in attendance as he was conflicted. The Panel also had regard to the evidence of the DCC and Roger Trencher who both informed FCC Chilton at the time of this conflict. The Panel accepted that FCC Chilton's presence at the meeting was inappropriate and was an abuse of his position.
- 6.71. The PCC states that she called Rachel Watson from the IOPC for advice and the advice was that Donna Cannon was not an affected party and therefore could not make a complaint and so no referral was required at that point. The Panel accepted that evidence and found allegation 36f not proved.
- 6.72. The Panel considered whether FCC Chilton's conduct at the meeting on 12 February was dishonest and lacked integrity. The Panel determined that FCC Chilton's

behaviour was not dishonest as he had not lied or been misleading but he was demonstrably inappropriate. As it had found that FCC Chilton knew that he shouldn't have been in the meeting as he was conflicted it was clear to the Panel that he had acted without integrity. He further had shown a lack of respect to his colleagues by not listening to the advice of the DCC and Roger Trencher.

Charge 1 – Further denials

6.73. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

- 39. *On 3 March 2025:*
 - a. *The PCC (in company with her Chief Executive) advised you of the said IOPC referral concerning Officer A;*
 - b. *You replied asserting that the allegation was untrue and malicious.*
- 41. *On 20 March 2025 the Daily Echo was making inquiries of HIOWC about the IOPC investigation into the Officer A matter. Your DCC advised you of this.*
- 42. *On or before 21 March 2025 you asked your PCC to amend her "if asked" media statement concerning the Officer A investigation so as to include the line: "The Chief Constable remains in post and has my full support to continue reducing crime, increasing detection rates and making communities safer across Hampshire and Isle of Wight".*
- 43. *Your PCC agreed to do so and her revised statement, supporting you, was issued.*

6.74. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 1 – Particular 40

- 40. *Your reply in subparagraph [39](b) to the foregoing paragraph was dishonest and lacking in integrity.*

6.75. The Panel noted FCC Chilton's denial. He stated that *"there was no relationship. The allegation was malicious because it was untrue, apparently made to assist DCI Wood in his defence of misconduct proceedings and apparently made by Donna Cannon, a vexatious complainant, as part of a list of allegations about matters that she apparently had no personal knowledge of. There was no dishonesty or lack of integrity."*

6.76. The Panel had regard to its finding at paragraph 6.31 above and found that FCC Chilton had acted dishonestly and with a lack of integrity.

Charge 1 – Particular 44

- 44. *You continued to deny and / or failed to disclose the sexual relationship with Officer A up until your retirement on 7 April 2025.*

- 6.77. FCC Chilton admits that he continued to deny the relationship with Officer A. The Panel found this particular proved.

Charge 1 Outcome

Being the applicant for the post of, and during your tenure as, Chief Constable for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Constabulary ("HIOWC") you failed to disclose to your Police and Crime Commissioner (Donna Jones) ("the PCC") or anyone else your previous sexual relationship with Officer A during the application process to become Chief Constable of HIOWC and thereafter. Furthermore, you repetitively and dishonestly denied the said sexual relationship to, amongst others, your PCC, her Chief Executive (Kate Gunson) and your Deputy Chief Constable ("DCC") (Sam de Reya). Such conduct was contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour scheduled to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

- 6.78. The Panel found charge 1 proved.
- 6.79. There was overwhelming evidence that FCC Chilton had engaged in a sexual relationship with Officer A. The Panel found Officer A to be a consistent witness. Her accounts of the sexual relationship were not embellished or exaggerated and were supported by the more contemporaneous accounts that she provided to friends and colleagues.
- 6.80. The evidence from multiple witnesses spanned from prior to 2012 when Officer A confided in a colleague and friend that she was having a sexual relationship with FCC Chilton who was a superintendent at that time. In late 2022 Roger Wood informed Kate Gunson that 'I am pleased Scott Chilton got the job, he had a fling with my friend Officer A and seems like a good bloke', and further in 2022 when Wayne Jackson spoke to Roger Wood about a press inquiry with Officer A about a Chief Constable in a neighbouring force having a relationship with a staff officer.
- 6.81. The Panel could see no reason whatsoever that could rationalise why on three different occasions, three separate witnesses would invent such accounts. There was knowledge of this relationship circulating before the investigation into Roger Wood commenced. The Panel considered that it was more likely than not that these were multiple accounts of the sexual relationship between Officer A and FCC Chilton.
- 6.82. The Panel found FCC Chilton to have been deliberately dishonest on multiple occasions by not disclosing the sexual relationship. His dishonesty persisted through his application process to become Chief Constable of HIOWC and extended beyond throughout the IOPC investigation, and the preparations for this misconduct hearing.
- 6.83. FCC Chilton failed to mention the relationship during a chemistry conversation with the PCC or during the interview with the appointments panel in November 2022. He

dishonestly denied the relationship to Kate Gunson a year later in November 2023 stating it was 'rubbish'. In December 2023 he dishonestly denied that the relationship with Officer A was sexual and a month later he again dishonestly denied the relationship and sought to discredit Officer A, as by this point the misconduct hearing of Roger Wood was imminent and it had become known that Roger Wood was going to make allegations involving other officers. This was FCC Chilton attempts to control the narrative and subvert any potential investigation involving his misconduct.

- 6.84. His lies and denials to the DCC continued throughout June to Nov 2024. At the renewal of his Developed Vetting in November 2024, he failed to disclose the relationship with Officer A to the PCC and later that month, at an extended meeting at the home of the PCC he again denied and sought to discredit Officer A. This was his continued attempts to subvert any potential investigation into his alleged misconduct.
- 6.85. Prior to the Roger Wood hearing information was provided by a third party which implicated FCC Chilton and Officer A, and he inappropriately sought to influence the DCC by saying that the allegation could not go to the IOPC. Later he met with the PCC and Kate Gunson and dishonestly denied the relationship.
- 6.86. On 12 February 2025 FCC Chilton inappropriately convened a meeting between the PCC, Kate Gunson, DCC, Roger Trencher and ACO Ben Pratt whereby he was domineering and abusive towards his colleagues, failing to listen to the senior staff who correctly raised a conflict of interest, by FCC Chilton calling and attending the meeting.
- 6.87. On 3 March 2025 FCC Chilton made a further dishonest denial to the PCC and Kate Gunson stating that the allegation was untrue and malicious. Finally, around 20 March 2025 FCC Chilton sought to control the narrative of the press inquiries regarding the alleged conduct by influencing the PCC to change her 'If asked' statement'. He continued to dishonestly deny the relationship. FCC Chilton's conduct showed a persistent dishonesty and lack of integrity.
- 6.88. The conduct was against the HIOWC policies and as Chief Constable it was clear that he ought to have known that his relationship was required to be declared in order to uphold public confidence and standards of policing.
- 6.89. Turning to the particulars, the panel found all disputed facts proved save for 18b, 18d, 19a and 36f, none of which impacted on the overall findings of the Charge 1.

7. Facts Decision: Charge 2

- 7.1. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

- 1. *You attested as a police constable with HIOWC in 1992.*

- 7.2. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 2 – Particular 2

2. *Over the period of approximately 2008-2012, whilst you were a detective chief inspector and / or superintendent in Western Area, you had a sexual relationship with Officer A whilst she was a sergeant on the Western Area, during some of which time you mentored her.*
- 7.3. The Panel noted it had found there was a sexual relationship between Officer A and FCC Chilton (see paragraph 6.24 above). The difference between this allegation and Charge 1 paragraph 6 is that FCC Chilton is stated to have mentored Officer A whilst they were having a relationship.
- 7.4. It noted in FCC Chilton's interview that he said *"in early 2012 I was asked by the then chief inspector Paul Bartolomeo to meet with Officer A for career advice, at the time I was a superintendent. Officer A was not in my line management structure and worked in a different policing area. This was standard practice at the time. I recall the meeting uh I recall meeting with Officer A on approximately two occasions for the purpose of these discussions"*.
- 7.5. The Panel noted there was no reference to FCC Chilton mentoring Officer at the time of their relationship in Officer A's statement. It further noted that Karen Scipio does not mention this in her statement of what Officer A informed her.
- 7.6. The Panel considered the evidence in the round and determined that Officer A and FCC Chilton met through the legitimate mentoring relationship which was put in place by Paul Bartolomeo. It would be fair to infer that during this mentorship (whether during the meet ups or during text conversations) the evidence demonstrated that they engaged in a sexual relationship. The Panel therefore found this particular proved.

Charge 2 – Particular 3

3. *On unknown dates during this period, you had sexual relations with Officer A whilst you were on duty.*
- 7.7. FCC Chilton denies that there was any sex on duty as he denies the sexual relationship with Officer A.
- 7.8. The Panel had regard to the additional witness statement of Officer A which was obtained on 6 October 2026.
- 7.9. Officer A states in her statement that FCC Chilton *"was on duty at the time as Force Silver, the duty superintendent for the force, I knew he was on duty as he told me*

and he was wearing his uniform which consisted of a white shirt and crown epaulettes and black trousers. Having attended my address, Scott and I had sex...” She further states that this occurred on ‘numerous occasions’.

- 7.10. The Panel had regard to the comments to Roger Wood in a WhatsApp exchange between Roger Wood and Officer A who were friends. Officer A was unaware that Roger Wood was recording the exchange. Her responses were unsolicited and spontaneous. The Panel attached weight to these responses, which implied acceptance of the comments made by Roger Wood that FCC Chilton and Officer A had indeed had sex whilst he was on duty.
- 7.11. In particular the Panel noted the following exchanges (Panel’s emphasis added in bold):

21 January 2024:

*Roger Wood: Thank you. It’s just agonising that Scott Chilton earl of terracotta can **shag on duty**, say I’ve done nowt wrong and have a giggle about it but does nothing to intervene in the madness. I was a good cop*

Officer A: I know darling. And you are amazing my work isn’t done yet x

Roger Wood: Thank god for mates like you I don’t know how I would have got through it.

7 March 2024:

Officer A: he said he wanted to change the force as people like me had suffered ... I replied not just me my friend is being treated badly and he’s done no more than him and I have done and that was over years! xxx

*Roger Wood: Well actually what he did was worse **cause he was on duty**. All I did was have sex with a consenting adult in our own time*

Officer A: I know. You’ve done nowt wrong xxx.

15 March 2024:

Roger Wood: I’m so angry today with th (sic) injustice of the whole situation. Scott Chilton said to you to tell me not to look for another job and laughed with you about the case. He said if I didn’t do anything on duty time then there was no case and he can pretend not to know the details but he knew enough to know that the suggestion I’ve exploited anyone is absolutely ridiculous ... why hasn’t he got the courage to tell ACU that they are biased and making it up as they go along

Officer A: Oh poppet. I do wish you hadn’t resigned tho . If I could make it right for you and turn the time back I would do darling.x

Roger Wood: Why did he laugh about it all and tell you to tell me not to look for another job? I don’t get it.

Officer A: He didn’t laff (as in ha ha) but I think like us all thought it was pathetic. I can’t say anymore as I don’t get it either. I don’t understand as how CC he hasn’t /can’t make this go away xxx

Roger Wood: both him and [redacted] both said the only issue in my case is whether I was on duty and what I do in my private life is my business. I wasn’t on duty I don’t understand why they are persecuting me.

Officer A: Neither do I ...

21 March 2024:

*Roger Wood: Can't sleep. Where's the justice? Scott Chilton has an affair with you for years. Regularly **sleeps with you on duty**, fails to declare you when he is made chief constable...*

Officer A: ...What had happened has happened ... I told you all that in confidence, but I do understand the injustice".

- 7.12. Officer A's statement is supported by her implied acceptance during this private exchange when Roger Wood asserts that she and FCC Chilton 'shagged on duty'.
- 7.13. The Panel reminded themselves that FCC Chilton had instructed his experienced legal representatives (both Counsel and solicitors) to withdraw from the hearing which meant there was no challenge or cross examination provided by FCC Chilton of this evidence. It noted the remarks of FCC Chilton's solicitors in their letter dated 6 October but noted that these were merely written submissions/opinions on the evidence of Officer A within her second witness statement. The Panel observed that if FCC Chilton wanted to dispute the evidence of Officer A or the inferences to be drawn from the WhatsApp evidence, then the proper process for doing this would have been to maintain his Counsel to represent him during the hearing. Officer A would have then attended to give evidence and would have been available to be cross examined on her evidence.
- 7.14. The Panel observed that Officer A had provided a declaration of truth with her second witness statement and as an officer she would understand the importance and consequences of not telling the truth on such a serious matter. The Panel had no evidence before it to not accept this statement as true.
- 7.15. The Panel understood that providing evidence of this kind (sex on duty) would have been very difficult and challenging for Officer A to come forward against a Chief Constable who was denying the said relationship and effectively calling Officer A, a liar. The Panel appreciated that the witness may have taken some time to muster the courage to do this.
- 7.16. The Panel were of the opinion that Officer A was a reliable and credible witness, she had provided multiple details of their relationship and the sex on duty. It also reminded itself of its finding at paragraph 6.23 in respect of circumstantial evidence. The WhatsApp messages taken with Officer A's statement carried great weight that there had indeed been instances of sex on duty. The Panel had found that FCC Chilton had lied about the sexual relationship and was therefore not a credible witness in respect of Officer A, it determined that he was also lying about there being no sex on duty.

Charge 2 – Outcome

Charge 2

Being the Chief Constable for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Constabulary (“HIOWC”) you had sexual relations with Officer A, a subordinate police officer in the same Western Area as yourself, including whilst you were on duty, being conduct contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour scheduled to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

- 7.17. The Panel found Charge 2 proved.
- 7.18. FCC Chilton’s acquaintance with Officer A came about from a mentoring relationship with her. Officer A gave clear evidence of an occasion when FCC Chilton had been on duty whilst he visited her home and engaged in sexual activities with her. She was clear that he was in uniform and that he was ‘Force Silver’ meaning that he was responsible for the operational response for any critical incidents which may have arisen within HIOWC at that time.
- 7.19. The Panel considered the evidence of FCC Chilton that there was no sex on duty and took into consideration his character references. However, the panel concluded that he was not a credible witness given the lies it had found proved in respect of Charge 1.
- 7.20. The Panel found Officer A to be a credible witness, and her account was supported by the spontaneous and unguarded responses she gave to her friend and colleague Roger Wood. The panel gave considerable weight to these messages which were during a private WhatsApp communication, where she was unaware was being recorded. Officer A had no idea they would be reproduced sometime later.

8. Facts Decision: Charge 3

- 8.1. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:
 - 1. *On 23 February 2023 you took up the post of Chief Constable of HIOWC.*
 - 2. *At all material times, Officer B was a subordinate ranking police officer working for the chief officer team at HIOWC.*
- 8.2. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 3 – Particular 3

- 3. *In or around April or May 2023 you started a covert sexual relationship with Officer B which continued for about 18 months until about October 2024.*

- 8.3. FCC Chilton states that the relationship lasted for a few months and was over by the start of 2024. In contrast Officer B states that the affair went on (on and off) for a period of 18 months between April 2023 and October 2024.
- 8.4. The Panel were of the view that Officer B was a reliable and credible witness, she had operated with integrity once the investigation into FCC Chilton came to light (in respect of Officer A) and had raised the affair with her line manager at the earliest opportunity. In contrast the Panel noted that FCC Chilton had not acted with integrity as he had repeatedly failed to disclose that he was in a relationship with Officer B on numerous occasions when he was asked about a covert relationship with Officer A. Further, FCC Chilton had only admitted the relationship once Officer B had provided a statement as part of the investigation. The Panel concluded that this impacted on his credibility in respect of this Charge.
- 8.5. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton's evidence on the relationship was inconsistent as he stated to the PCC, during the call on 26 March 2025 that it had '*happened three times*'.
- 8.6. The Panel also noted that FCC Chilton had stated in his prepared statement dated 19 August 2025 that "*She [Officer B] was not a direct line report, and I had no responsibility for her work or decisions connected to her career. We did not discuss work related matters when we met*". The Panel found this not to be supported by the WhatsApp evidence or the evidence from Hazel Minshull about FCC Chilton requesting Officer B to be his stand in staff officer.
- 8.7. The Panel noted that there was a high volume of messages, many of the WhatsApp exchanges between FCC Chilton and Officer B strayed into work matters, promotion processes, workplace personnel, find a job for Officer B, flattery of Officer B. The Panel felt that many of these message exchanges were inappropriate between a Chief Constable and a subordinate officer and therefore unprofessional.
- 8.8. As the Panel had found that as FCC Chilton had not been truthful and had been misleading in his statement (before the WhatsApp evidence was produced) this damaged his reliability and credibility as a whole in respect of this Charge and the matter of the relationship with Officer B.
- 8.9. The Panel therefore preferred the evidence of Officer B that the relationship persisted over a period of 18 months.

Charge 3 – Outcome

Charge 3

Being the Chief Constable for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Constabulary ("HIOWC") you abused your position for a sexual purpose by having a sexual relationship with Officer B, a subordinate working for the chief officer group, for the period of approximately April 2023 to October 2024. Such conduct was contrary to

the Standards of Professional Behaviour scheduled to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

- 8.10. The Panel found Charge 3 proved.
- 8.11. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton had made some admissions on Charge 3 in that he admitted that he had a sexual relationship with Officer B. The dispute related to whether there was an 'abuse of position' as per the Charge.
- 8.12. FCC Chilton stated that the '*relationship involved no abuse of FCC Chilton's position*'.
- 8.13. Officer B was a subordinate ranking officer working within the chief officer team. The Panel noted the private WhatsApp's between Officer B and FCC Chilton. FCC Chilton instigated the private messaging which began the inappropriate relationship and further instigated the visit to her home address where the sexual relationship (affair) started.
- 8.14. Officer B stated that their relationship was always intimate (apart from one occasion) and was always at her home address. The private WhatsApp messaging continued throughout the 'affair' as well as after the 'affair' had finished. The Panel found Officer B to be a reliable and credible witness, they accepted her evidence that the relationship spanned a period of around 18 months. FCC Chilton's evidence was not credible given his inconsistent evidence, his lack of integrity in disclosing the relationship with Officer B, his misleading assertions and his previously found lies regarding Officer A.
- 8.15. Officer B's evidence referred to her feeling like she had '*woman imposter syndrome*' and found FCC Chilton to be very '*empowering*'. The Panel noted that this relationship started within a couple of months of FCC Chilton assuming the appointment of Chief Constable. It was clear to the Panel that this relationship came about as a result of FCC Chilton's position and that as Officer B was a subordinate officer there was a clear abuse of his position. The power imbalance was evidenced by Officer B acquiescing to FCC Chilton's requests not to attend force events when his wife was in attendance. The Panel noted her evidence, '*we had conversations around me not attending work events that his wife was going to be present at and during those conversations, Scott Chilton did state that it wouldn't be appropriate for me to attend.*'
- 8.16. The Panel observed that Officer B states that the relationship was consensual she was '*not coerced into it*' and that she '*felt excited and happy*'. It noted that Officer B did not believe (at the time) that there was an abuse of position. The Panel further noted that she had stated in her statement that it was '*almost like what the doctor ordered*' which the Panel took to mean that she was low in herself and that the attention from FCC Chilton, as a Chief Constable was helping her and her self-esteem after her divorce.

- 8.17. The Panel noted the evidence of Hazell Minshull. She stated that she had *'worked with Officer B as a staff officer supporting Joint Operations Unit portfolio. In terms of Officer B covering Scott's staff officer, the normal procedure for when a staff officer is on leave is the next most available one would take over. So, Scott Chilton insisting on Officer B being the cover for his staff officer was not considered to be the norm, in terms of our working practices. This is based on the fact that no other Chief Officer has ever stipulated who they can have as cover. They would work with who they were given'*.
- 8.18. The Panel was of the view that as Chief Constable, the most senior position in the constabulary, FCC Chilton was provided with the opportunity to influence staffing decisions and members of staff. Although Officer B did not assert any abuse of position the Panel was of the view that there was evidence that he had used his position as Chief Constable to control the relationship, prevent her from attending force events, engineer her whereabouts as his staff officer. This was clearly an abuse of his position.

9. Facts Decision: Charge 4

- 9.1. The particulars for Charge 4 came under a number of themes which the Panel attributed the following headings:

- Breach of Policies
- Relationship with Officer B
- Disclosures and denials to PCC/DCC
- Denials between November 2024 and March 2025
- Inappropriate Treatment of Officer B

The Panel approached the particulars in respect of these headings when looking at the evidence and making their determination on the disputed facts. The facts admitted and the facts disputed are detailed under each thematic heading for ease of comprehension of the particulars in dispute.

Charge 4 - Breach of Policies

- 9.2. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:
1. *You attested as a police constable with HIOWC in 1992.*
 2. *In March 2019 the NPCC and College of Policing published guidance entitled "Appropriate personal relationships and behaviours in the workplace" ("the College guidance"). The College guidance addressed, inter alia, workplace relationships, the risks of such relationships creating actual or apparent conflicts of interest and the duties of disclosure in respect of such relationships.*
 3. *You knew or ought reasonably to have known about the College guidance.*

4. *Furthermore, in 2008 and 2024, HIOWC published “24106 – Relationships at work” and “37900 – Personal Relationships in the workplace”, respectively (“the HIOWC Policies”).*
 5. *The HIOWC Policies addressed, inter alia, workplace relationships, the risks of such relationships creating actual or apparent conflicts of interest and the duties of disclosure in respect of such relationships.*
- 9.3. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 4 – Particular 6

6. *You knew or ought reasonably to have known about the HIOWC Policies.*
- 9.4. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton denies that he knew the detail of the HIOWC policy but admitted that he ought to have. As the particular was phrased to say ‘knew or’ the Panel found this proved.

Charge 4 – Relationship with Officer B

- 9.5. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:
7. *On 23 February 2023 you took up the post of Chief Constable of HIOWC.*
 9. *In or around April 2023 you started a covert sexual relationship with Officer B which continued for about 18 months until about October 2024.*
- 9.6. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 4 – Particular 8

8. *At all material times, Officer B was a subordinate ranking police officer working for the chief officer team at HIOWC. As you knew, Officer B had vulnerabilities.*
- 9.7. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton admitted that Officer B was at all material times subordinate in rank to FCC Chilton (Inspector / Chief Constable). He further admitted that Officer B was at all material times a staff officer working for the Chief Officer Team, but comments that Officer B was staff officer to an ACC, not FCC Chilton. FCC Chilton did not consider Officer B to be vulnerable.
- 9.8. The Panel observed that Officer B does not state that she is vulnerable in her evidence however admits that her divorce was ‘*exceptionally hard*’ at times. There is evidence of an emotional vulnerability, which is supported by the statement of Hazel Minshull. Hazel Minshull said Officer B had been through a messy divorce and was on [REDACTED].

- 9.9. The Panel also had regard to the statement of Zoe Wakefield who Officer B confided in. She stated that *'When Officer B confided in me about Scott, she asked me to not tell anyone as she was worried about the impact it would have on her career if others found out'*
- 9.10. The Panel determined that Officer B was emotionally vulnerable at the time of the affair and as a subordinate, working in the chief officer's team she also would have been career vulnerable.

Charge 4 – Particular 10

10. *You asked Officer B to maintain the secrecy of this sexual relationship, and she agreed to do so*

- 9.11. FCC Chilton admits that he started a relationship with Officer B which both parties considered private. He denies that he asked Officer B to maintain the secrecy of the relationship and states that there was a shared understanding that it would be kept private.
- 9.12. The Panel noted that Officer B says FCC Chilton never put pressure on her to keep the relationship private however she goes on to state that *'they did have conversations about me not attending work events that his wife was going to be present at and during those conversations FCC Chilton did state that it wouldn't be appropriate for me to attend'*. She also states that she did not attend the Federation Ball or Families Day because of this conversation. This is corroborated by the evidence of Zoe Wakefield who states that:

Every year Hampshire Police Federation host a charity, reward and recognition dinner. For the event in October 2023, I asked Officer B if she would like to attend as my guest. Officer B declined because she knew Scott would be there and at this point, she confided in me that they had been having a sexual relationship. Officer B told me that it had been going on for a few months. At this point, Officer B was still working as a staff officer within the Chief Officer team so working very closely with Scott. I knew Scott was married and that he was bringing his wife Laura to the dinner. I was sat next to Scott and Laura during the dinner. This was the first time I had met Laura, and I found her to be absolutely lovely.

- 9.13. The Panel noted that Officer B stated that *"the decision not to go anywhere came from Scott Chilton as I would have taken the risk to enjoy somewhere nice together"*. The Panel determined that although both parties may have considered this relationship to be private, the power imbalance created a requirement for Officer B to maintain the secrecy. This requirement arose from both the discussions that FCC Chilton had with Officer B and the specific requests he made of her.

Charge 4 - Disclosures and denials to PCC/DCC

9.14. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

12. *By memorandum dated 5 January 2024 to your DCC you set out your purported connection to Officer A in which, inter alia, you:*
 - a. *Emphatically denied any kind of historic sexual relationship with Officer A;*
 - b. *Portrayed yourself in a favourable light vis a vis Officer A;*
13. *Despite making this purported disclosure in respect of possible historical allegations by Officer A, you failed to disclose to your DCC that you were at that time involved in a sexual relationship with Officer B, a subordinate officer who worked for the chief officer group.*
15. *Ahead of the renewal of your Developed Vetting in November 2024, you advised your PCC that she would be required to provide a line manager's reference. At this point, despite knowing of the utmost importance of total candour in the DV process, you failed to disclose to your PCC the fact of the sexual relationship with Officer B.*

9.15. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 4 – Particulars 11, 12c, 14 and 16

11. *At no stage prior to 26 March 2025 did you make any disclosures to your PCC or PSD concerning Officer B under the College guidance or the HIOWC Policies. This was notwithstanding a series of denials made by you concerning Officer A: see the particulars in charge 1 which reveal that you knew or ought reasonably to have known of the importance of disclosure in relation to covert workplace relationships.*
 12. *By memorandum dated 5 January 2024 to your DCC you set out your purported connection to Officer A in which, inter alia, you:*
 - c. *Sought subtly to discredit Officer A.*
 14. *Your said failure in the foregoing paragraph [13] was dishonest and lacking in integrity.*
 16. *Your said failure in the foregoing paragraph [15] was dishonest and lacking in integrity.*
- 9.16. FCC Chilton admits that he made no disclosures to the PCC or PSD about his relationship with Officer B and that he should have done so. He denies that the denials he made with respect to Officer A reveal that he knew or ought reasonably to have known of the importance of disclosure in relation to covert workplace relationships. FCC Chilton denies that his behaviour was dishonest or that it lacked integrity as he was not required to make a disclosure to the DCC. He further denies that he was dishonest when he failed to disclose the relationship with Office B in his Developed Vetting.

- 9.17. The Panel had regard to its previous findings at paragraph 6.1 to 6.7 above. It is clear from Policy 37900 which came into force in 2024 that it is the *'responsibility of all police officers to declare any conflicts of interests that have or could have reasonably be perceived to have arisen from a personal relationship with a work colleague'*. This was in place whilst FCC Chilton was engaging in a sexual relationship with Officer B.
- 9.18. The Panel noted its previous findings in respect of particular 12c which was the same as Charge 1 particular 21c which it had found proved.
- 9.19. The Panel further observed that FCC Chilton had approached the DCC in December 2023 in order to alert her to a potential risk arising from the allegations of Officer A (being that information may come about alleging that he'd had an inappropriate relationship with a subordinate police officer). Whilst the policy may not dictate that FCC Chilton was required to inform the DCC (as she was not his superior) it is reasonable to have expected FCC Chilton to have disclosed the relationship with Officer B, (also a subordinate officer) when he was discussing the alleged relationship with Officer A; the two were almost identical in premise. The Panel were of the view that this suggests a pattern of behaviour where FCC Chilton has a complete disregard for his own force policies.
- 9.20. Common sense would have dictated that as Chief Constable having a relationship with a subordinate required disclosure. In this instance FCC Chilton was given a number of opportunities to make an appropriate disclosure and was specifically questioned in this regard by the PCC. The Panel noted that in February 2025 the PCC in a meeting with FCC Chilton stated that she *'must have asked Scott 8 times, perhaps more, if the information in Donna Cannon's letter was true, if he had an affair with the person alleged. Scott's replies each time, were as I described in my first statement, consistent denials'*. She went on to say *"I also asked if there were any other affairs that I needed to know about, I told Scott this was his chance to put his cards on the table. Scott offered no other information"*. Whilst denying the relationship with Officer A (which the Panel have found to have been dishonest) FCC Chilton did not inform the PCC about his recent relationship with Officer B. The Panel found this incredulous and lacked integrity.
- 9.21. The Panel found that common sense and a moral duty to do the right thing would have made FCC Chilton disclose the relationship with Officer B, it would have been the appropriate course of action. FCC Chilton's conscious and deliberate behaviour to conceal the relationship with Officer B clearly lacked integrity.
- 9.22. FCC Chilton's denial that he was dishonest when not disclosing the relationship with Officer B in respect of the Developed Vetting in November 2024 is also refuted by the Panel. Not making the disclosure about Officer B undermined FCC Chilton's Developed Vetting. The Panel considered this to be particularly egregious given that this was a vetting matter at the highest levels, therefore creating a potential security risk and makes the office of the Chief Constable of HIOWC vulnerable to blackmail or subversion. The Panel had regard to the submission of Mr Beggs and his reference to the case of Goodwin v NGN 2011 EWHC 1437 where the judge stated that 'If a

person does not wish to disclose an existing relationship, for whatever reason, there is a real risk that that will lead to misunderstanding or deception’.

- 9.23. The Panel had regard to the *Ivey* test and considered what FCC Chilton’s actual knowledge or genuine belief was at the time he made the denials and failed to make the disclosures to the PCC. It noted that FCC Chilton would have been fully aware that he had engaged in a recent relationship with Officer B whilst he was discussing the historical matter of Officer A. The Panel considered the omission to make an appropriate disclosure regarding Officer B at this point to be dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people, it was deliberately deceitful.

Charge 4 – Denials between November 2024 and March 2025

- 9.24. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:
17. *On 12 November 2024 you:*
 - a. *knew or suspected that an alleged sexual relationship between you and Officer A (see charge 1) was likely to come to wider public knowledge;*
 - b. *contacted your PCC and sought a meeting with her the following day.*
 18. *On 13 November 2024 you went to the home address of your PCC:*
 - a. *You spent 3 ½ hours with your PCC;*
 - b. *You gave your PCC an account of an historical non-sexual relationship with Officer A;*
 - c. *At no stage did you disclose to your PCC that you had much more recently had a sexual relationship with Officer B.*
 20. *By email dated 6 February 2025 from Donna Cannon to Jason Beer KC (who was presenting a gross misconduct case against former DCI Roger Wood starting on 17 February 2025) various allegations were made against HIOWC personnel, including that you had had an historical sexual affair with Officer A.*
 21. *The DCC was briefed on the said Cannon email on 10 February 2025.*
 22. *Early on 12 February 2025, the DCC advised you of Cannon’s allegation concerning your sexual relationship with Officer A.*
 23. *On 12 February 2025 at about 13:00 hours in Costa Coffee in Winnall:*
 - a. *Your PCC, in company with her Chief Executive, met with you;*
 - b. *You asserted to your PCC and her Chief Executive that the allegation that you had had a sexual relationship with Officer A was false;*
 - c. *Despite the obvious context and purpose of this meeting, you failed to disclose to your PCC or her Chief Executive that you had had the much more recent sexual relationship with Officer B.*
 24. *On 26 February 2025 a recordable conduct matter concerning your alleged sexual relationship with Officer A was referred to the IOPC by your PCC.*
 25. *On 3 March 2025:*
 - a. *The PCC (in the company of her Chief Executive) advised you of the said IOPC referral concerning Officer A*
 - b. *You asserted that the allegation concerning Officer A was untrue and malicious;*

- c. *You failed to disclose that you had had the much more recent sexual relationship with Officer B.*

9.25. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 4 – Particular 19

19. Your conduct at the meeting with your PCC on 13 November 2024 lacked honesty and integrity in that despite the ostensible reason for the meeting being your concerns as to possible allegations emerging in respect of an alleged historic relationship between you and Officer A, you failed to disclose the fact of your much more recent sexual relationship with Officer B.

9.26. In respect of the meeting on 13 November 2024. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton denies that ‘*the ostensible reason for the meeting*’ was the allegations between himself and Officer A. He further denies that ‘*such a discussion in respect of Officer A should have prompted disclosure in respect of Officer B*’. FCC Chilton denies a lack of integrity and honesty.

9.27. The Panel noted the evidence of the PCC. FCC Chilton requested a meeting with the PCC just after she’d returned from leave and before she returned back to work. He attended her house for a period of 3.5 hours. The PCC gives no other evidence regarding what this extended meeting was relating to other than the information regarding Officer A.

9.28. The Panel were of the opinion that FCC Chilton was trying to shape and influence the PCC at this early stage in order to protect his own interests. He gave the appearance of being open and honest with his PCC, whilst deliberately concealing other information which was highly relevant to the matter being discussed. This was premeditated deception. The Panel determined that FCC Chilton conduct lacked honesty and integrity during this meeting.

Charge 4 - Inappropriate Treatment of Officer B and IOPC referral

9.29. The following facts were admitted by FCC Chilton in his tabulated Regulation 31 response:

- 26. *On 21 March 2025 at about 18:00 hours, you contacted Officer B via Facetime and spoke with her for about one hour during which you told Officer B:*
 - a. *about Officer A’s allegations and asserted that Officer A (whom you disparaged) was lying;*
- 28. *On 26 March 2025:*
 - a. *Officer B disclosed to the HIOWC Anti-Corruption Unit that she had had a sexual relationship with you;*
 - b. *The DCC briefed the PCC’s Chief Executive about the same;*

- c. *The PCC convened a Teams meeting with you at c.21:30 hours (as you were due to go on leave the next day, abroad) and put the allegation concerning Officer B to you;*
- d. *You admitted that you had had a sexual relationship with Officer B.*
- 29. *On 31 March 2025 your PCC referred the Officer B matter to the IOPC who determined to undertake an independent investigation.*
- 30. *On 7 April 2025 you retired from HIOWC, your said conduct having generated negative national media coverage and publicity.*
- 31. *On 19 August 2025 in a prepared statement provided to the IOPC you admitted the sexual relationship with Officer B.*

9.30. The Panel deliberated carefully on each particular of the allegation, as set out in the Regulation 30 Notice, which was disputed by FCC Chilton.

Charge 4 – Particulars 26b, 26c and 27

- 26. *On 21 March 2025 at about 18:00 hours, you contacted Officer B via Facetime and spoke with her for about one hour during which you told Officer B:*
 - b. *words to the effect of, “you’re not going to say anything”;*
 - c. *to “delete and double delete” all her messages and communications with you.*
 - 27. *Thereafter you bombarded Officer B with emotional voice calls and messages, in a bid to deter her from reporting your sexual relationship with her.*
- 9.31. FCC Chilton denies that he told Officer B to delete and double delete the messages or that he said to her not to ‘*say anything*’. The Panel noted that Officer B’s statement provides evidence that FCC Chilton did say these things to her. Her statement is corroborated by the handwritten notes of Officer Atwell and DC Palmer when they attended Officer B to take a statement.
- 9.32. The Panel assessed the credibility of Officer B. It noted that during her conversation with her line manager Iain Clancy, Officer B informed him that she was an honest person and if asked about the relationship she would tell them, ‘*100% the truth*’. This is supported by the fact that she admitted the affair before FCC Chilton did. Her conversation with Iain Clancy was a matter of hours after the investigation into FCC Chilton came to light, which gives weight to her credibility and integrity. The Panel considered its previous findings in respect of FCC Chilton’s credibility and integrity. It preferred the evidence of Officer B which was corroborated by the evidence of the ACU officers and Iain Clancy.
- 9.33. The Panel noted in Iain Clancy’s statement that on 26 March 2025 whilst he was with Officer B, in presence of the ACU officers, he stated that Officer B’s phone was getting a lot of notifications and that Officer B had informed him that ‘*Mr Chiltern [sic] was messaging her asking if they could speak*’. The Panel found that this was a concerted effort by FCC Chilton to subvert Officer B reporting the relationship.

- 9.34. It was clear from all his dishonest attempts that FCC Chilton had been trying to prevent the allegation from coming to light. Given his lack of transparency, his apparent attempts to stop the Roger Wood hearing and to cover his tracks at all points, the Panel concluded it was more likely than not that FCC Chilton had bombarded Officer B with calls and messages to deter her from reporting the relationship.
- 9.35. This was supported by the fact that FCC Chilton's admission was only as a result of a direct question from the PCC after Officer B had made a statement, at no point had he volunteered any information. After Officer B made her statement, the PCC and Kate Gunson contacted FCC Chilton on the evening of 26 March to ask him about the allegations of Officer B. It was not until this point that FCC Chilton admitted the relationship. The Panel had regard to the statement of Kate Gunson who stated that FCC Chilton informed the PCC *'it happened three times and she chased after me'*. The Panel were of the view that FCC Chilton was still trying to minimise the extent of the relationship, which had persisted for 18 months.

Charge 4 Outcome

Charge 4

Being the Chief Constable for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight Constabulary ("HIOWC") you failed to declare to your Police and Crime Commissioner ("the PCC") (Donna Jones) or anyone else your sexual relationship with Officer B. Furthermore, when the said relationship came to light, you behaved inappropriately towards Officer B. Such conduct was contrary to the Standards of Professional Behaviour scheduled to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

- 9.36. The Panel found Charge 4 proved.
- 9.37. FCC Chilton repeatedly failed to disclose his sexual relationship with Officer B until after the officer had made a formal disclosure to her line manager once the allegations regarding Officer A came to light. FCC Chilton dishonestly failed to disclose the sexual relationship during the Developed Vetting process in Nov 2024.
- 9.38. He lacked integrity when on multiple occasions when being asked about the alleged relationship with Officer A he failed to disclose the recent relationship with officer B. FCC Chilton failed to make the common-sense connection that his recent sexual relationship (affair) was highly relevant and directly connected to the conversation he was having about inappropriate covert relationships with subordinate staff members. The Panel finds it astonishing that any other conclusions could be reached, as it was so obvious that he should have recognised his duty and declared this relationship during all these interactions.
- 9.39. Once FCC Chilton realised the relationship with Officer A was going to come to light, he sought to exert pressure over Officer B to coerce her to keep the relationship with him quiet. FCC Chilton asked Officer B to delete and double delete their messages. Officer B then demonstrated great moral courage by immediately

disclosing the intimate relationship to her line manager after the referral to the IOPC. FCC Chilton was seen to be bombarding Officer B with calls and texts during her ACU interview. Officer B's account then resulted in the PCC contacting FCC Chilton and asking a direct question specifically about the relationship with Officer B. This was the first time FCC Chilton admitted the relationship.

10. Facts Decision Overall Outcome

- 10.1. The Panel had found all four Charges against FCC Chilton proved. The Panel concluded that all the disputed factual particulars for all the Charges had been found proved save for 18b, 18d, 19a and 36f.

11. Breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

- 11.1. The Panel determined on the basis of the facts found proven to decide whether the Standards had been breached.

Charge 1

Honesty and Integrity

- 11.2. The Panel had found FCC Chilton to be dishonest and lacking in integrity on multiple occasions by denying the sexual relationship with Officer A. Despite evidence to the contrary FCC Chilton continued to deny the existence of the relationship and failed to act with honesty and integrity. He lied through both act and omission between April 2023 to date, as he still denied the relationship.
- 11.3. FCC Chilton was given numerous opportunities to do the right thing and admit the relationship. He didn't declare it during the recruitment process, during Developed Vetting, during multiple confidential meetings with the PCC and DCC (with whom he had strong relationships).
- 11.4. The Panel concluded that FCC had shown a complete disregard throughout for his responsibilities to the public, the PCC, the officers and staff of HIOWC to act and be seen to act with honesty and integrity. His behaviour showed a total disregard to the office of Chief Constable with evidence demonstrating that he believed his staff served him, not the office.
- 11.5. He assiduously denied and sought to cover up the relationship with Officer A. Further, he attempted to manage the Roger Wood hearing and the PCC's press statement when the allegations came to light.
- 11.6. FCC Chilton's actions during the meeting on 12 February 2025 were unprofessional and domineering. This was again an attempt by FCC Chilton to control and influence the narrative and prevent any impact on himself. This meeting made the senior officers and staff involved to feel professionally conflicted. When this meeting moved to discuss whether the information regarding Officer A should be referred to

the IOPC, FCC Chilton demonstrated a complete lack of integrity by not removing himself from the discussion.

- 11.7. His efforts to control the narrative by discrediting Officer A to the DCC and PCC showed a continuous intent to subvert and diminish any negative impact on him. The memo dated 5 January 2024 was a deliberate effort to paint Officer A in a negative light, irrespective of the potential reputational impact that this may have on her, as a serving officer of rank.
- 11.8. The Panel found there were multiple breaches of Honesty and Integrity

Orders and Instructions

- 11.9. As the Panel had found that the policies and guidance clearly required professional candour and honesty in disclosing workplace relationships, FCC Chilton actions by denying the relationship, when he knew it was true, was in breach of these policies.

Discreditable Conduct

- 11.10. The Panel was clear that the reputational risk to HOIWC, as well as to national policing was significant by FCC Chilton's repeated dishonest behaviour and his persistent lack of integrity.

Charge 2

Honesty and Integrity

- 11.11. The Panel had found that FCC Chilton had engaged in sex whilst he was on duty. He was in a high ranked position at this time and operating as the 'Force Silver' which is a position of command for the County; if there was a serious incident, he would have been the officer responsible for coordinating the operational response. By having sex on duty, he put himself in a position where he may have been unable to respond and demonstrated a lack of integrity, i.e. 'doing the right thing'.

Authority Respect and Courtesy

- 11.12. The Panel considered that FCC Chilton had not acted with self-control or respect when entering into a covert sexual relationship with a subordinate officer. FCC Chilton was in a mentoring position with regard to Officer A and yet did not appreciate that he was abusing his position over her as a result of the power imbalance.

Discreditable conduct

- 11.13. The Panel was without doubt that a member of the public would find it wholly unacceptable that whilst on duty in a command position FCC Chilton was engaging

in sexual activity. As an officer of superintendent rank at the time, his actions brought the HIOWC Constabulary into disrepute.

Charge 3

Honesty and Integrity

- 11.14. The Panel was of the view that the policies clearly set out how relationships at work should be dealt with and the negative impact that covert relationships can have on the individuals, colleagues and the Constabulary as a whole. The policies give particular attention to the power imbalance when relationships involve senior officers and junior officers. FCC Chilton was the most senior officer within HIOWC and wilfully engaged in a covert workplace relationship knowing that he had a duty to declare it. He had clearly demonstrated a lack of integrity by not doing this and breached this standard.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

- 11.15. Within a few months of starting the position of Chief Constable at HIOWC FCC Chilton instigated private contact with Officer B on a WhatsApp message to develop a rapport and later invited himself to her home address to further the relationship. FCC Chilton actively chose to cross the line from a professional relationship and demonstrated a lack of self-control towards Officer B, his actions were driven by his own entitlement. As Chief Constable, FCC Chilton had a responsibility to set standards and to lead by those standards, his actions displayed that he could act how he wished and suggested that he believed that the rules didn't apply to him. He ought to have known that as Chief Constable he would have attracted interest and that other officers in his team may have been flattered by his attention, he took advantage of this demonstrating an abuse of his position.
- 11.16. The Panel had found proven that FCC Chilton had requested Officer B to remain away from key force events because his wife was in attendance. The statement of Zoe Wakefield demonstrated that she had invited Officer B as her guest to the Federation event in October 2023, but that Officer B declined as she knew that FCC Chilton and his wife was going to be in attendance. This shows that Officer B was changing her behaviour at FCC Chilton's behest. Further, FCC Chilton would insist for Officer B to cover as his staff officer when his own was unavailable. Officer B would not have been in a position to have any say in these directions demonstrating the imbalance of power between them.

- 11.17. These were multiple breaches of the standard of Authority, Respect and Courtesy

Discreditable conduct

- 11.18. As the most senior officer in the Constabulary, the impact on public confidence in conducting a covert relationship is significant. FCC Chilton undermined trust and the integrity of the privileged position of chief constable.

Charge 4

Honesty and Integrity

- 11.19. FCC Chilton lacked honesty and openness in his interactions with the PCC and DCC who were his closest working colleagues. The Panel found he was deliberately duplicitous by not disclosing the relationship with Officer B during the multiple opportunities when he was being asked to be open and honest about any relationship with Officer A.
- 11.20. FCC Chilton not only acted without integrity himself but was trying to influence Officer B to also show a lack of integrity and not admit the covert relationship that she had had with him. It was not lost on the Panel how morally courageous Officer B's actions were in the face of this pressure from FCC Chilton to not do the right thing.
- 11.21. FCC Chilton's conduct amounted to multiple breaches of integrity.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

- 11.22. FCC Chilton's conduct demonstrated a betrayal of trust towards his PCC and DCC and put them both at a disadvantage in being able to carry out their roles. He did not demonstrate authority, respect or courtesy towards the PCC or DCC or Officer B or indeed any of the staff within his office by failing to disclose the workplace relationship he was having.

Orders and Instructions

- 11.23. As the Panel had found that the policies and guidance clearly required professional candour and honesty in disclosing workplace relationships, FCC Chilton's actions in not disclosing the relationship was in breach of these policies.

Discreditable conduct

- 11.24. The Panel were of the view that FCC Chilton knew that he was under a duty to disclose his relationship with Officer B, yet he persistently failed to disclose the relationship. The Developed Vetting process enables the public to have confidence in people who are afforded privileged positions of power. FCC Chilton's failure to disclose the relationship with Officer B during this vetting caused significant risk of reputational harm to the process and to policing. This at a time when there was a particular sensitivity about the vetting of police officers.
- 11.25. Further, asking a fellow officer to delete evidence which could implicate his misconduct and to bombard her with contact in order to bully her into keeping quiet, would undermine public confidence in the force, its leadership as well as the public confidence in these misconduct proceedings.

12. Step 3: Gross Misconduct, Misconduct or neither

- 12.1. The Panel considered under Regulation 41(15) (b) of the 2020 Conduct Regulations whether the conduct as found amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
- 12.2. The Panel reminded itself, that under paragraph 2(1) of the Regulations, 'Misconduct' means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action, whilst 'Gross Misconduct' means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.
- 12.3. In reaching an assessment on the seriousness of the proven conduct the Panel has considered the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes which states consideration should be given to an officer's culpability, any harm caused, and the existence of any aggravating factors or mitigating factors.
- 12.4. The Panel's findings with regard to the factors in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes ("Outcomes Guidance") are as follows:

Culpability

- 12.5. The Panel concluded that FCC Chilton's behaviour was intentional, deliberate and planned. He was in the highest position of trust as the most senior officer in the Constabulary and ought to have known the foreseeable risk of harm by having a covert relationship. He repeatedly lied by act and omission about both his relationships with Officer A and Officer B and he knew that this was wrong. His conduct was a serious deliberate and sustained attempt to mislead the PCC and colleagues to subvert any negative impact on himself.
- 12.6. All police officers are in a position of trust however FCC Chilton was in the highest position of trust he would have been privy to confidential and sensitive information on colleagues, security and national policing matters. There was evidence that he was discussing issues which he shouldn't have been discussing with Officer B during WhatsApp message exchanges.
- 12.7. The panel noted the case of *Williams v PAT 2016* where it was stated that '*high rank and long service carry with them the responsibilities, which the panel clearly expressed; and the maintenance and of public confidence and respect in the police service may mean that a high-ranking officer must suffer a harder fall than would a junior officer in similar circumstance*'. There was an expectation on FCC Chilton to do the right thing and set the expectations for all officers below him. With authority and power comes responsibility.
- 12.8. FCC Chilton's rank and role meant that he was the public facing head of the HIOWC. His actions had a direct impact on public confidence in the police service in HIOWC and his actions were inappropriate and unacceptable.
- 12.9. The Panel concluded that culpability was high.

Harm

- 12.10. Although FCC Chilton's actions did not create harm to the officers at the time, the subsequent harm to both Officer's A and B was clear from the distress, anxiety and challenges they overcame in order to provide their evidence against such a senior ranking officer. Both officers are still serving. In particular Officer A had to present and provide evidence against the backdrop of FCC Chilton continually denying the relationship and thus calling Officer A, a liar.
- 12.11. There was also actual harm caused to wider colleagues as a result of FCC Chilton's deceit. During the meeting on 12 February 2025 FCC's behaviour clearly had a negative impact on Roger Trencher and the DCC. The DCC also articulates the ongoing difficulties between her and the FCC Chilton as issues around Officer A and Roger Wood came to light. The Panel appreciated that for all of these colleagues to participate in the investigation has undoubtedly caused distress and anxiety. The Panel recognises their moral courage.
- 12.12. The Panel were clear that there was reputational damage to the police. This is evidenced by the ongoing press coverage of this case. This is both at a local level in terms of the reputational damage to HIOWC but also given FCC Chilton's rank as Chief Constable, this impacts at a national level, calling into question the reputation and standing of the office of Chief Constable.
- 12.13. The public expects a Chief Constable to act with the utmost integrity and to lead his team by example. The Panel noted para 1.3 of the Code of Ethics, dealing with honesty and integrity, which states that "The more senior in rank, grade or role you are, the greater the potential for harm as a consequence of any misuse of your position or any failure to meet the standards required by the Code of Ethics." The Panel took FCC Chilton's senior rank into consideration of the harm he has caused in regard to each of the four charges that have been proven.
- 12.14. The Panel also observed that harm had resulted to HIOWC in the form of financial and reputational loss, as a result of FCC Chilton only making partial admissions to the charges against him (which had all been found proved) as this had resulted in a lengthier investigation and extended scheduled hearing.
- 12.15. FCC Chilton's press statement after not attending the hearing, but implying that the misconduct proceedings were protracted, not proportionate or necessary sought to cause reputational harm to HIOWC and the Office of PCC as it sought to impact on public confidence in the misconduct proceedings process.
- 12.16. Having regard to the foregoing matters, the Panel assesses the harm to be High.

Aggravating Factors

- 12.17. In considering aggravating factors the Panel was careful not to double count

- 12.18. The Panel noted that FCC Chilton's abuse of his position was for personal gain and ultimately his own sexual gratification.
- 12.19. FCC Chilton concealed his wrongdoing and attempted to blame others (by intimating that Officer A was lying and that Officer B was chasing him).
- 12.20. He demonstrated a propensity to act outside the rules and the Panel observed that both relationships were very similar in nature establishing a pattern of behaviour which was repeated over a period of time.
- 12.21. FCC was in a privileged leadership position in which he was expected to act as a role model and there are multiple proven allegations and/or breaches of the standards of behaviour.
- 12.22. The Panel found that he had demonstrated calculated and manipulative tactics to undermine the ongoing misconduct proceedings and to attempt to frustrate the investigation into him. His persistent lack of responsibility for his actions, their impact on the officers involved, colleagues and the wider policing community were considered by the Panel to be a significant aggravating factor.

Mitigating Factors

- 12.23. The Panel considered that there were some limited mitigating factors. It noted that FCC Chilton had made some admissions to the relationship with Officer B, however this was only after he was confronted by the PCC following Officer B's admissions when she acted with integrity on making her own disclosure. FCC Chilton's admissions even at this point in time, were still misleading, by suggesting the sexual relationship had only occurred on three occasions. The Panel gave these admissions little weight.

Severity Finding

- 12.24. Overall, the Panel considered the seriousness of each charge and found the seriousness of the conduct of FCC Chilton in respect of each charge was High. The Panel found that each Charge amounted to misconduct so serious that dismissal could be justified and was therefore gross misconduct both individually and collectively.

13. Step 4: Outcome

- 13.1. The Panel bore in mind the three stages to determine the appropriate outcome:
 - 13.1.1. assess the seriousness of the misconduct;
 - 13.1.2. keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions; and
 - 13.1.3. choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

- 13.2. The Panel in accordance with the case of *R (on the application of the Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police) v Police Conduct Panel (Roscoe – Interested Party)* Case no 698/2018 (Admin Court) looked again at the seriousness of the misconduct and took account of the culpability, harm, aggravating factors and mitigating factors following the guidance in chapter 4 of the Outcomes Guidance. It reminded itself to look at the least severe outcome that deals adequately with the issues identified, while protecting the public.
- 13.3. The Panel had regard to regulation 42(2)(a) and noted that FCC Chilton did not have any misconduct history.
- 13.4. The Panel considered its assessment of severity at the previous stage and revisited the culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating factors with regards to the considerations at this stage of proceedings.
- 13.5. The Panel reminded themselves of the purpose of imposing sanctions as set out in the College of Policing Guidance:
- 13.5.1. To uphold public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
 - 13.5.2. To uphold high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and
 - 13.5.3. To protect the Public.
- 13.6. It considered that, as per section 2.8 of the Guidance, any sanction imposed must be “... *no more than is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings*” and therefore less severe outcomes must be considered before more severe outcomes. It had regard to the legal advice of the LQP that it must work through the range of available disciplinary options as if the Officer was still serving and apply the appropriate outcome that deals with the seriousness and issues identified.

Culpability

- 13.7. The Panel acknowledged there were no submissions on behalf of FCC Chilton as he had chosen not to be in attendance and withdrawn his Counsel.
- 13.8. The Panel found FCC Chilton’s culpability to be high for the reasons it had previously set out above.

Harm

- 13.9. The Panel found that the harm caused was high. There were no submissions which altered this assessment.

Aggravating/Mitigating features

- 13.10. The Panel, after revisiting its assessment of seriousness concluded that there was no change to that assessment of aggravating and or mitigating factors, the seriousness of the allegations remained high.

Personal mitigation

- 13.11. The Panel had regard to the fact that FCC Chilton had no other previous misconduct issues.
- 13.12. The Panel had due regard to the Character Evidence provided on behalf of FCC Chilton but noted that this had little weight given the seriousness of the findings.
- 13.13. The Panel were not provided with a record of service but had regard to the *'Attachments of the personal statement of Scott Chilton'* which gave information on the considerable accomplishments and long-standing service of FCC Chilton.

Outcome

- 13.14. The Panel considered each breach in respect of each charge and reached a conclusion on each as to the seriousness and the appropriate outcome.
- 13.15. The Panel carefully considered each breach in Charge 1 individually and determined that a final written warning or reduction in rank would not appropriately uphold the primary purpose. The Panel determined that the only outcome which appropriately addressed the seriousness of each breach individually and collectively was that FCC Chilton would have been dismissed without notice.
- 13.16. The Panel carefully considered each breach in Charge 2 individually. The Panel determined that the only outcome which appropriately addressed the breach of Honesty and Integrity was that the Officer would have been dismissed without notice. In looking at the breach of Authority, Respect and Courtesy the Panel noted that at this stage FCC Chilton was not the Chief Constable. It considered that he was however still a superintendent which was a senior rank and that Officer A was a more junior officer. It had regard to the fact that FCC Chilton was mentoring her as the relationship began and this was an influential position of trust. The Panel determined that the abuse of this position for personal gain and sexual satisfaction would not be appropriately dealt with by a final written warning nor a reduction in rank. Public confidence would be seriously undermined. The breach of Discreditable Conduct could only be appropriately dealt with by an outcome of dismissal. The Panel concluded that all breaches under Charge 2 required a finding of dismissal without notice had FCC Chilton still been serving, to uphold the primary purpose of policing.
- 13.17. The Panel carefully considered each breach in Charge 3 individually and determined that a final written warning or reduction in rank would not appropriately uphold the

primary purpose nor would it give the right message to other serving officers about the seriousness of FCC Chilton's breaches. The Panel determined that the only outcome which appropriately addressed the seriousness of each breach both individually and collectively was that FCC Chilton would have been dismissed without notice.

13.18. The Panel carefully considered each breach in Charge 4 individually and determined that a final written warning or reduction in rank would not appropriately uphold the primary purpose. The Panel determined that the only outcome which appropriately addressed the seriousness of each breach individually and collectively was that FCC Chilton would have been dismissed without notice.

13.19. FCC Chilton's details will go on the barred list.

HMI Michelle Skeer - Panel Chair

Legally Qualified Person – Ruth Curtis

21 October 2026