IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

IN THE MATTER OF PC 8548 NATHAN GRIFFITHS

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing on 10 November 2026

by Chief Constable Jeremy Vaughan

Decision on Outcome

PC 8548 Nathan Griffiths has attended this Accelerated Misconduct Hearing today and he is legally represented by Ms Nicola Powell of Counsel. He is also supported by his Police Federation Representative, Police Sergeant Jonathan Rice. The Appropriate Authority is represented by Mr Jonathan Walters of Counsel.

The Allegations

The allegations against PC Griffiths are contained in the Regulation 51 Notice served on him. I have summarised the allegations as follows:

It is common ground that on 05/04/2024, whilst off duty, PC Griffiths attended on a social night out in Cardiff with a number of work colleagues who were also off duty. One of the persons present was a female police officer, who I will refer to as "PC A".

During the evening, the group attended a licensed premises known as "Boom Battle Bar". There is extensive CCTV coverage within the premises. Whilst at the premises, it is alleged that the following incidents took place:

Allegation 1

PC Griffiths inappropriately touched PC A's breast twice with his hand whilst walking past her. This incident is captured on the CCTV footage at 18:10:40 hours. The footage also shows PC

A's reaction which was to cover her chest area, where PC Griffiths had touched her, by pulling her dress and blazer jacket closer around her.

Allegation 2

PC Griffiths inappropriately touched PC A's bottom twice with his right hand. This incident is captured on the CCTV footage at 18:47:09 hours. PC A's reaction was to move away from PC Griffiths and to cover her bottom with her hand.

Allegation 3

PC Griffiths engaged in further inappropriate physical contact with PC A by taking hold of her arm as PC A moved to walk away from PC Griffiths. This incident is captured on the CCTV footage at 18:47:15 hours.

The Appropriate Authority contends that the conduct of PC Griffiths is in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to:

> **Standard 2: Authority, Respect and Courtesy,** namely that **"***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."*
>
> **Standard 9: Discreditable Conduct**, namely that: "*Police Officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the Police Service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty. Police Officers report any action taken against them for a criminal offence, any conditions imposed on them by a court or receipt of any penalty notice."*

The Appropriate Authority maintains that PC Griffiths' actions amount to gross misconduct, that is, the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour are so serious, as to justify dismissal.

As required by Regulation 54 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, PC Griffiths provided a written response to the allegations dated 4 September 2026 which is contained at pages 15 to 22 of the Hearing Bundle. A further written response dated 15 October 2026 has also been served following an amendment to the Regulation 51 Notice. Ms Powell requests that the further Regulation 54 written response, which is found at pages 114 to 120 of the Bundle, be read in conjunction with the initial written response, and I have done so.

In summary terms, PC Griffiths does accept that the CCTV footage shows brief contact with PC A's chest or breast area, but in his evidence today he was less clear. He does accept that the CCTV footage shows brief contact with PC A's bottom, but he does not accept that he grabbed her bottom.

PC Griffiths position is that:

> *"[He] does not accept, however, that any such touching as seen on the CCTV footage or in relation to any of the allegations is "objectively unprofessional and a wholly inappropriate way to touch a work colleague in this particular instance given the*
>
> *i. Type of relationship he had with PC A both on and off duty generally, and*
>
> *ii. Given their mutual conduct towards one another throughout the course of the particular night in question as evidenced by the CCTV footage".*

PC Griffiths denies that he has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy or Discreditable Conduct. PC Griffiths does not accept that the conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

Findings

I have had the benefit of hearing oral evidence from PC Griffiths, and I have listened carefully to what he said. I have viewed the CCTV video footage which I have been referred to by Mr Walters on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and the additional CCTV footage I have been referred to by Ms Powell on behalf of the PC Griffiths.

Having considered all the evidence, and the submissions made at this hearing today, I have found, on the balance of probabilities, that the allegations against PC Griffiths are proven. I have found that his actions breached of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct, as alleged. I am satisfied that PC Griffiths' conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

It is my view that PC Griffiths, in all likelihood, and based on the evidence I have heard here today and the content of the WhatsApp messages, that he has no clear recollection of the evening. I believe he was more intoxicated than he states in his evidence and that his description of events is less than credible.

The CCTV images clearly show PC Griffiths making contact with the breast area of officer A, and this is entirely corroborated with her visible reaction to the same. In that moment it is my view that Pc Griffiths decided for himself that it was permissible to touch this area of her body and had no regard whatsoever as to whether she consented to it or not.

In that moment, particularly but not exclusively, he grossly misconducted himself.

Outcome

Having found gross misconduct, I must impose disciplinary action on PC Griffiths. In this respect I have given due regard to the provisions of Regulation 62(1) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 which states as follows:

> ***"62.***—*(1) Where the person conducting the accelerated misconduct hearing finds that the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to gross misconduct, they must impose disciplinary action, which, subject to the provisions of this regulation, must be*
>
> *(a) dismissal without notice, or*
>
> *(b) if the person conducting the accelerated misconduct hearing is satisfied that there are <u>exceptional circumstances</u> which justify it —*
>
> *(i) a final written warning"*

In reaching my decision, I have also fully considered the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings which has formed the basis for my conclusion. I have tested the seriousness of the allegations and the purpose of imposing a sanction, which I have to consider in deciding an outcome. I have given due consideration to culpability, harm, any aggravating factors, and any mitigating factors as set out in the Guidance.

In assessing the seriousness of the conduct, I recognise the more culpable or blameworthy the behaviour in question, the more serious the misconduct and the more severe the likely outcome. All police officers hold a position of trust and responsibility, and PC Griffiths has abused that trust. Notwithstanding my comments on the likely level of self-induced intoxication of PC Griffiths, the conduct is intentional, deliberate and targeted. The behaviour involves intimidation and sexual impropriety. All of the factors significantly increase culpability. There can be no doubt that PC Griffiths' behaviour has an adverse impact on public confidence in policing.

The harm caused by the officer's actions is reputational harm and affects the police service and public confidence in the service as a whole. A factor of the greatest importance is the impact of the misconduct on the standing and reputation of the profession as a whole. I am satisfied that PC Griffiths has caused damage to that reputation. I am mindful that PC Griffiths actions caused actual harm to PC A.

Aggravating factors are those tending to worsen the circumstances of the case, in relation to either the officer's culpability or harm caused. I found that there are a number of significant aggravating factors present. The conduct was repeated, albeit over a short duration. The victim was vulnerable through the alcohol she had consumed. The behaviour is a significant deviation from instructions which includes orders, force policy and national guidance and conduct of this nature is a matter of particular local and national concern for policing and the communities which we serve. PC Griffiths' behaviour is reprehensible and totally unacceptable. His behaviour continued after he realised, or should have realised, that it was improper.

In terms of any mitigating factors which lower the level of culpability and harm, we have heard from Ms Powell that the nature of the relationship between PC Griffiths and PC A ought to be taken in to account when considering the seriousness of the conduct; namely he touched PC A because of his relationship with her and it should be treated differently from an allegation involving touching a member of the public. This has been presented as to amount to exceptional circumstances.

I have reminded myself of the threefold purpose of the outcomes in police misconduct proceedings which is to maintain public confidence in policing and the reputation of the police service; to uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct; and to protect the public.

I have considered the personal mitigation put forward on behalf of PC Griffiths. I have paid great attention to the character references which have been produced by PC Griffiths in his support. However, I recognise that due to the nature and purpose of disciplinary proceedings, the weight of personal mitigation will necessarily be limited, particularly where serious misconduct has been proven as it has been in this case.

I have specially considered whether there are any exceptional circumstances which would justify a final written warning. In doing so, I have considered the representations put forward by Mr Walters for the Appropriate Authority which is that there are no exceptional circumstances. I have had the benefit of hearing from PC Griffiths direct, and I have listened carefully to what he said and to the oral submissions made by Ms Powell at the hearing.

Exceptional circumstances are not defined in the Regulations and after deep consideration, I do not accept that the representations made on behalf of PC Griffiths amount to exceptional circumstances.

In all the circumstances, there is only one possible outcome which I am able to impose, and I have absolutely no hesitation in doing so. Therefore, my decision on Outcome is that I am

satisfied that the misconduct is so serious that PC Griffiths will be immediately dismissed without notice. No other outcome is justified or appropriate.

PC Griffiths has repeatedly described the nature of his relationship with PC A, and that this gave him implied consent to carry out his actions. On viewing the CCTV footage this is clearly not the case. His behaviour is typical of how some men see their entitlement over women, and it something that those who uphold the law are trying to protect women from.

To act in this way falls so far below the standards I would expect of a police officer I have no hesitation in saying this is not the career for him.

There is no room in South Wales Police for this type of behaviour. The Standards of Professional Behaviour apply the moment you walk through the door. This type of behaviour whether on or off duty will not be tolerated in any way. Police officers should be trusted to the ends of the earth. The public rightly expect our officers to uphold the highest professional standards, and PC Griffiths has failed to do so.

The vast majority of the Police officers, staff and volunteers, who work for South Wales Police conduct themselves impeccably and work tirelessly to protect the public, those very few who choose to breach the standards expected of them undermine the public's trust in policing.

In accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 the Findings and Outcome from this hearing will be referred to the College of Policing in order for PC 8548 Griffiths to be placed on the Police Barred List.