
REGULATION 43 REPORT:

NOTIFICATION OF OUTCOME OF MISCONDUCT HEARING

CHIEF CONSTABLE NICHOLAS ADDERLEY

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 28 May 2024 a misconduct hearing was convened to deal with allegations against Chief Constable (CC) Nicholas Adderley which the Appropriate Authority (AA) assessed as amounting to gross misconduct.

1.2 The hearing was held in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (PCR 2020).

1.3 The hearing was audio recorded and was adjourned on 31 May 2024. The hearing resumed on 20 June 2024 and was concluded on 21 June 2024.

1.4 The hearing Panel consisted of a Legally Qualified Chair, Mr Callum Cowx, a Police Panel Member (PPM) His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary and His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Fire & Rescue Services, Mr Andy Cooke QPM DL, and an Independent Panel Member (IPM), Mr James Maund.

1.5 The AA was represented by Mr John Beggs Kings Counsel (KC). CC Adderley was represented by Mr Matthew Holdcroft of counsel.

1.6 Prior to the hearing the Panel was provided with a bundle of documents relevant to the case. Additional documents were introduced by both sides during the course of the hearing which were also taken into account.

2. LEGAL ISSUES

2.1 A number of legal issues arose during the course of the hearing. Principally, these were: an application to exclude the evidence of Mr Paul Fell and to strike out those allegations based on his evidence; a submission of no case to answer after the closing of the AA's case; and an application for the Chair and the rest of the Panel to recuse themselves.

2.2 After the hearing was adjourned on 31 May 2024, an application by the defence that CC Adderley's attendance be excused on 21 June 2024 was refused by the Chair because he failed to persuade the Chair that he had reasonable grounds for non-attendance in accordance with Regulation 37(2) of the PCR 2020.

3. THE ALLEGATIONS

3.1 The breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPB) alleged were set out in a Regulation 30 (PCR 2020) Notice of Allegations as follows:

Being the Chief Constable of Northamptonshire Police, you have misconducted yourself over a long period of time by exaggerating the extent of your rank and career in the Royal Navy and by asserting and / or implying that you served in the Falklands War.

Particulars

Naval service

1. *You were born on 20 September 1966.*
2. *The Falklands War started on 2 April 1982 and concluded on 14 June 1982 (when you were 15 years old).*
3. *You served with the Royal Navy between 22 October 1984 and 5 December 1986, being discharged as a (non-commissioned) Able-Seaman for “shore medical reasons”.*

Dishonest application to become Chief Constable of Northamptonshire Police

4. *When you applied to become the Chief Constable of Northamptonshire Police in 2018 you advanced two documents in support, namely:*
 - a. *An application form (“the application form”) for Chief Constable dated 2 June 2018 which you signed under the following declaration: “I declare that to the best of my knowledge and belief, all statements contained in this form are correct. I understand that should I conceal any material fact, I will, if engaged, be liable for the termination of my appointment. I agree to be subject to the appropriate level of vetting (see terms and conditions) should I be successful in being appointed”.*
 - b. *A Curriculum Vitae (“CV”) dated 2 June 2018 which you signed and included the following self-drafted declaration: “I declare that to the best of my knowledge and belief, all statements contained in this CV are correct. I understand that should I conceal any material fact, I will, if successful, be liable to the termination of my appointment”.*
5. *Furthermore, and in any event, you signed a separate declaration dated 31 July 2018 which included the following ingredients:*
 - a. *“I NICK ADDERLEY declare that all information previously given in support of my application to join Northamptonshire Police is correct”;*
 - b. *“I understand that by making this declaration knowing that this information is not correct I could be guilty of a criminal offence and/or subject to the Police (Conduct) Regulations, 2008”.*

Deceits in the CV

6. *In the first item on page 2 of your CV, under Key Skills, you stated: “Proven track record as a leader in two careers (Royal Navy – Police Service)”. As you knew, you were an Able-Seaman and never a “leader” in the Navy in any reasonable sense of the word.*
7. *In the fifth item on page 2 of your CV, under Key Skills, you stated: “Commended officer (Royal Navy) for services and tours of duty”. As you knew, you did not receive any commendations for your Royal Naval career.*
8. *In the second item under “Education of Note” on page 2 of the CV, you stated that you were with the Britannia Royal Naval College between February 1982 and February 1986. As you knew (and admitted in your IOPC interview on 26 October 2023), you applied for but were rejected by and never attended or were affiliated with the said College.*
9. *In the second item on page 3 of the CV, under Employment History, you list your Navy record as “02/81 to 02/92”. This dishonestly implied that you served with the Royal Navy for 11 years when, as you knew, you served for just over two years (22 October 1984 to 5 December 1986).*

Deceits in the application form

10. *In Part Three and section 3.1 of the application form described yourself as “a former Commander in the Royal Navy”. This was dishonest in that you were at all times an Able-Seaman and, in any event, never in a position of “command” in the Royal Navy.*
11. *In that same section of the application form you also asserted as follows: “During my time in the forces I took command of military personal (sic) during active service at times of great pressure and stress, and whilst implementing the Mission Command of intent, strategy, resources, contingency and inspiration, it was the soft skills of command which yielded the success for which my teams were recognised”. As you knew, you did not have any command function in the Royal Navy nor did you see active service.*
12. *On the same page of the application form you stated that you were “recognised for [your] service as a military negotiator during the Anti-Duvalier protests in Haiti (1986)”. You knew that this was not true, in that in fact all you had done was write an academic paper on the issue (as you admitted in your IOPC interview on 26 October 2023).*

Wearing medals to exaggerate your Naval Service

13. *The Royal British Legion states that the etiquette for wearing military medals is that medals awarded to “a deceased service/ex-service person may be worn on the right breast by a near relative”. This etiquette was known to you.*

14. *You have been photographed on many occasions since about 2009 or 2010 wearing military medals on the left side of your chest, alongside medals that you were awarded in connection with your police service, including:*

- a. *A South Atlantic medal with rosette which is presented to service personnel who served in the Falklands between 2 April 1982 and 14 June 1982;*
- b. *A General Service Medal.*

15. *Examples of such medal wearing are referenced in paragraph 17(b) hereinbelow.*

16. *By wearing medals in this fashion you conveyed the false impression that you had been decorated for your Royal Navy service and / or had served in the Falklands War. You knew both implications to be untrue.*

Failing to correct media articles that inaccurately described or portrayed your career in the Royal Navy

17. *You failed to correct inaccurate media coverage of which you were aware about your record with the Royal Navy including:*

- a. *A news article on the Police Oracle website dated 11 September 2020 which refers to you as a “Royal Navy veteran who served in the Falklands war”.*
- b. *Articles on the Northamptonshire Telegraph’s website dated 17 June 2020 and 14 December 2022 which featured you wearing a General Service Medal (GSM) and a South Atlantic Medal.*
- c. *Northamptonshire Police internal news articles dated 1 February 2023 and 12 July 2023 which stated that you had served in the Royal Navy for 10 years including in the Falklands War.*
- d. *An article in bluelinejobs dated 5 September 2018 in which you were described as a “Royal Navy veteran, who served in the Falklands War”.*

Other miscellaneous dishonest assertions about your past

18. *You have made other dishonest assertions about your Royal Navy career in other contexts, including:*

19. *In 2014 when you addressed a conference for the British Security Industry Association you said this, “I’m going to be totally honest with you, I have been in the police service now for 23 years, just coming up to 23 years and prior to that I was a senior leader within the Royal Navy...” You knew that you were not a senior leader in the Royal Navy since you had served as an Able-Seaman.*

20. *In a Developed Vetting questionnaire that you completed on 16 August 2016 you stated that you had served in the Royal Navy between “Oct 1984 to Sept 1987”. You knew that was untrue since you served with the Royal Navy between 22 October 1984 and 5 December 1986.*

21. *By email from you to Martin Scoble, Chief Executive of the Officer of Police and Crime Commissioner for Northamptonshire, dated 25 June 2018 (in which you were approving your upcoming biography for the Northamptonshire Police website) you asserted inter alia that: "As for my bio: 1. My RN service was 10 years (and a few months)". You knew that was untrue since you had served with the Royal Navy between 22 October 1984 and 5 December 1986.*
22. *In a Podcast entitled "Tango Juliet Foxtrot" dated June 2021 you stated inter alia that:*
- a. *"I joined the police in 1992, the February of 1992, and I actually joined the Cheshire Constabulary, sorry left the Royal Navy or I was about to leave the Royal Navy ...". In fact and as you knew, you left the Royal Navy in 1986 and joined Cheshire Constabulary in 1992;*
 - b. *"I was a late joiner because I was 28 years old when I joined the police." In fact, as you knew or ought reasonably to have known, you were 25 years old when you joined Cheshire Police in February 1992.*
23. *On 1 February 2023 by email from you timed at 12:02 hours you approved ("this is great, thank you") a press statement to be released about you and Northamptonshire Police which stated inter alia that "Chief Constable Nick Adderley, who served in the Royal Navy for 10 years including the Falklands War..." You knew that that assertion was untrue since you served with the Royal Navy between 22 October 1984 and 5 December 1986, the Falklands War occurred in 1982 and you had not served in the Falklands War.*
24. *In a Management Vetting questionnaire that you completed on 2 February 2023 you stated that you had served in the Royal Navy between "Oct 81 to Nov 91". You knew that was untrue since you served with the Royal Navy between 22 October 1984 and 5 December 1986.*
25. *During a telephone conversation with Paul Fell on 17 July 2023 you told Mr Fell the following:*
- a. *That you had joined the Royal Navy in early 1982: in fact, you joined on 22 October 1984;*
 - b. *That you had joined the Royal Navy aged 17: in fact, as of 22 October 1984 you were 18 years old;*
 - c. *That upon completion of your basic training you were deployed straight to the Falklands War, serving on HMS Hermes: in fact, you were not deployed by the Royal Navy to the Falkland Islands during the hostilities in 1982 at all since you were not a member of the Royal Navy until 22 October 1984;*
 - d. *That you had served in the Royal Navy for 10 years until 1992: in fact, your Royal Navy service was just over 2 years, between 22 October 1984 and 5 December 1986.*

Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

26. Your said conduct in paragraphs 4 to 25 above amounts to breaches of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

- a. *Honesty and Integrity, in that you were both dishonest and you acted without integrity;*
- b. *In the alternative to Honesty and Integrity, Duties and Responsibilities, to the extent only that any of the said untruthful assertions or innuendos were caused by a lack of diligence on your part;*
- c. *In addition to Honesty and Integrity and Duties and Responsibilities, Discreditable Conduct, in that your said conduct is likely to bring discredit upon the police service and undermine confidence in it.*

27. Your said conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

3.2 The Regulation 30 Notice was drafted in such a way that the particulars of alleged misconduct were merged with factual narrative. For clarity, the Panel identified the following paragraphs of the Regulation 30 Notice as those containing the substantive allegations of misconduct.

3.3 Paragraph 4a and 4b. Two false declarations of truth by CC Adderley relating to the information he supplied in his application form (alternatively his "Supporting Statement") and Curriculum Vitae ("CV") (both dated 2 June 2018).

3.4 Paragraph 5. One false declaration of truth relating to his application for Chief Constable (dated 31 July 2018).

3.5 Paragraphs 6 to 9, four separate deceits in his CV.

3.6 Paragraphs 10 to 12, three separate deceits in his Supporting Statement.

3.7 Paragraph 13 to 16, combined as single allegation of multiple instances of wearing both the South Atlantic Medal ("the SAM") and the General Service Medal with Northern Ireland Clasp ("the GSM(NI)"), knowing the British Legion Protocol regarding the wearing of a deceased relative's service medals, and thereby conveying the false impression that he had been decorated for his Royal Navy service and/or that he had served in the Falklands War, and knowing both implications to be untrue.

3.8 Paragraph 17, a multiple incident allegation of failing to correct inaccurate media coverage about his record with the Royal Navy, on six separate occasions. The AA made it clear prior to the hearing, and during it, that the allegation was not limited to failing to correct the articles, but that he was the source of the inaccurate information.

3.9 Paragraphs 19 to 25, seven separate allegations of making dishonest assertions about his Royal Navy career.

4. THE EVIDENCE

Undisputed Facts

4.2 The following facts were evidenced in the documents relied upon at the hearing and were not disputed by CC Adderley.

4.3 CC Adderley was born on 20 September 1966. He left school with six O' Levels in Maths, English Literature, Physics, Chemistry, Music and French. He did not obtain any qualifications at A Level.

4.4 CC Adderley joined the Royal Navy as a rating in the Operations Branch on 22 October 1984. He completed Phase 1 basic training at HMS Raleigh then completed Phase 2 training as a missile operator at HMS Cambridge. He joined his first ship, the aircraft carrier HMS Invincible, on 1 July 1985, in the rate of Acting Able Seaman (Missile) (AAB(M)).

4.5 A "joining letter" from CC Adderley's Divisional Officer (DO) in HMS Invincible, dated 2 May 1985, told the then AAB(M) Adderley to join the ship in Portsmouth on 4 July 1985 and informed him of the ship's programme after his arrival date. The ship was to be alongside (ie. in harbour) in Portsmouth for July and August 1985. Towards the end of 1985 the ship participated in a Mediterranean deployment and in early 1986 in a West Indies deployment. HMS Invincible was then scheduled to go into refit in Devonport in May 1986. The DO's letter also confirms that CC Adderley's older brother, Richard (alternatively Rick), was an AB(M) in HMS Invincible as he was in the same division CC Adderley was about to join.

4.6 CC Adderley was advanced (ie. promoted) to substantive AB(M) on 15 May 1986, with effect from 9 April 1986.

4.7 CC Adderley married his first wife on 22 March 1986.

4.8 The then AB(M) Adderley was drafted to HMS Cochrane, a shore assignment in the Royal Navy dockyard at Rosyth in Scotland, on 26 May 1986. According to his Service Record, during his time in HMS Cochrane, AB(M) Adderley spent a short period in the fishery protection vessel HMS Anglesey, from 18 August 1986 to 28 August 1986.

4.9 CC Adderley went on his final ("terminal") leave from the Royal Navy on 12 November 1986 and was discharged from the Royal Navy on 5 December 1986. His Service Record gives the reason for discharge as "*Shore - Medical Reasons*". A letter from Naval Records in HMS Centurion to Greater Manchester Police (GMP) dated 11 April 1990 provides the reason for his discharge as "*Unsuitability of Temperament*".

4.10 On leaving the Royal Navy, CC Adderley had a number of civilian jobs including a trainee manager, tyre fitter, sales representative, a public house manager and a heavy goods vehicle driver.

4.11 CC Adderley applied to join GMP in February 1990 but was rejected in favour of better candidates. CC Adderley was successful in a subsequent application to join Cheshire Constabulary and joined that force on 17 February 1992. In Cheshire he rose to the rank of Superintendent then transferred to GMP in 2010 on promotion to Chief Superintendent (Ch Supt). In GMP, as a Ch Supt, he was the police commander for the Tameside area and during that time two of his officers, PC Nicola Hughes and PC Fiona Bone, were murdered on duty.

4.12 In early 2016 he transferred to Staffordshire Police as Acting Chief Constable (ACC). He was appointed Chief Constable of Northamptonshire Police in 2018.

4.13 On 14 July 2023 a complaint about CC Adderley was lodged with the Office of the Police Fire and Crime Commissioner (OPFCC) by his second ex-wife. The complainant said that she had seen recent media coverage of CC Adderley which reported that he had served in the Royal Navy for 10 years and that he was a Falklands War veteran. CC Adderley did not serve in the Royal Navy for 10 years nor was he a Falklands War veteran.

4.14 The Falklands War began on 2 April 1982 and ended on 14 June 1982. CC Adderley was 15 years of age at the time of the conflict and was still at school.

4.15 It is also a historical fact that President Jean-Claude Duvalier was ousted from power as a result of a protest movement in Haiti from 23 May 1984 to 7 February 1986.

The Disputed Facts

4.16 Here follows a summary of the evidence the Panel found to be relevant to the issues it had to determine, beginning with the documentary evidence. CC Adderley's response to that evidence, from recorded interviews and written responses to the AA's allegations, was carefully considered.

4.17 CC Adderley declined to give evidence at the hearing.

The Application for Chief Constable

4.18 As part of the application process for the role he secured, CC Adderley was required to provide a CV [2–3] and a Supporting Statement [1].

4.19 In his CV, CC Adderley stated that he served in the Royal Navy from February 1981 to February 1992. He stated that he had a "*proven track record as a leader*" in the Royal Navy and had been a "*Commended officer (Royal Navy) for services and tours of duty*". In fact, CC Adderley did not advance beyond Able Seaman and was prematurely discharged from the Service after only 25 months.

4.20 In the same CV, under the heading "Education of Note", he first listed his master's degree from Cambridge University, which he did obtain. Then he listed the following:

02/82 – 02/86: Britannia Royal Naval College
University of Portsmouth, Royal Naval School of Engineering
- Officer Programme

4.21 CC Adderley did not attend Britannia Royal Naval College (BRNC) Dartmouth, nor did he attend the “Royal Naval School of Engineering”, or the Royal Naval Engineering College (RNEC) as it was in fact called. The RNEC was located within HMS Thunderer, Manadon, Plymouth, and not the University of Portsmouth as suggested by CC Adderley in his CV.

4.22 Under “Employment History” he wrote that he served in the Royal Navy from February 1981 to February 1992. The difference in the BRNC dates (02/82-02/86) under the education heading and the Royal Navy dates (02/81-02/92) under the employment heading seem to have been overlooked by the IOPC investigators. This was not explored in interview, but a plain reading of CC Adderley’s text shows he was claiming 11-years’ service in the Royal Navy and not 10-years. However, the IOPC focused their investigation on the 10-year period, and it was that which CC Adderley responded to.

4.23 CC Adderley was asked about the above inaccuracies in his CV when interviewed by the IOPC, and he provided a quite detailed response. He maintained this position in his response to the original Regulation 51 Notice of Allegations and in his response to the final Regulation 30 Notice of Allegations.

4.24 His defence to the inaccuracies in his CV was that his reference to 10-years’ service in the Royal Navy also included his time in the Sea Cadets, which he said he joined at 10 years of age. He said he merely lumped the two periods together and this equalled 10 years in total. He accepted he should have been clearer about this in his CV. In interview he said he left the Sea Cadets at age 17 which, if true, would have meant a break in continuity between the cadets and joining the Royal Navy.

4.25 CC Adderley produced no evidence to support his assertion that he was a Sea Cadet or was a Sea Cadet for the period claimed.

4.26 The Chair made the observation that the minimum age for joining the Sea Cadets at the time in question was 12 and not 10. That proposition was not contradicted by evidence from CC Adderley.

4.27 CC Adderley maintained that he was a leader amongst his peers. He said he was verbally commended in the navy for his leadership ability. He was made class leader in basic training. When serving in HMS Invincible, he said he was put in charge of a winch which was used to recover a Sea King helicopter that had made an emergency ditching into the sea.

4.28 He said he was also put in charge of a “seaboat” (ie. a rigid inflatable powered craft carried by his ship), and a team of other seamen and Midshipmen (ie. trainee officers). He said he led them in taking an Italian frigate under tow after that vessel had suffered a machinery breakdown in heavy seas. He said that following both incidents he was commended by his DO and the Captain of HMS Invincible.

4.29 In his Regulation 52 response, CC Adderley volunteered further information about the Italian vessel, and he named it as the *Orsa*, which was indeed an Italian frigate (within the knowledge of the Chair). During the course of the hearing, CC Adderley produced some of his own photographs which were intended to support his account regarding the Sea King incident and the *Orsa* incident. There are two photographs which appear to show a warship under tow. The Chair's experience as a bridge-watchkeeping officer in the Royal Navy enabled him to recognise the towed vessel in the photographs a French frigate and not an Italian frigate. This observation was made to counsel during the course of the hearing. CC Adderley, through counsel, did not disagree or demur.

4.30 As a further example of leadership, he said that when in HMS Cochrane he was given "*responsibility over the armoury and the general security of the site*". He also claimed that his advancement to substantive AB(M) was accelerated. CC Adderley did not produce any evidence of accelerated advancement, for example he made no reference to anything in his Service Record which supported that assertion. The Chair referred CC Adderley to an entry in his Service Record which appeared to show that he had failed his Sea Cat Operator's course. Sea Cat was a surface to air missile system. No evidence was produced by the defence to contradict this point.

4.31 In regard to describing himself as an "officer", CC Adderley acknowledged [92 – 93] that he should have used the word "rating", but intended no deception as he was using the word officer in the more general, "police officer" sense. In terms, his evidence in interview was that he simply meant he was a serving member of the Royal Navy, and he did not intend to convey the false impression that he was a commissioned officer.

4.32 As for the reference to BRNC and the "Royal Navy School of Engineering" under the heading "Education of Note", he said he simply put it in the wrong place. He said he included it as a reference to an unfulfilled aspiration, in that he did apply to enter Dartmouth, with the hope of pursuing a career as an Engineer Officer, but he was rejected. He said that on reflection he should have put this information in his Supporting Statement (as general background information). When pressed on this by the IOPC interviewer he insisted that he included it in his application because it was an "*interesting topic of conversation*".

4.33 CC Adderley began his Supporting Statement [1] with "*As a former Commander in the Royal Navy...*". CC Adderley was not an officer in the Royal Navy and so did not rise to the rank of Commander. In response to this alleged misrepresentation, he again said that he was using police language and not naval language. He insisted that he was not referring to the rank of Commander, but to the function of command. He then reverted to his assertion that he had commanded other sailors, staff and other personnel, including police and military, in HMS Cochrane [102 – 103].

4.34 He said that he could not have intended anyone to think he had had reached the rank of Commander, because it would have taken him at least 16-years to achieve that rank and why would someone on a Commander's salary leave the Royal Navy to become a Police Constable?

4.35 In his Supporting Statement, he said that during his time in the armed forces he took command of military personnel “*during active service at times of great pressure and stress...*”. He went on to explain what he meant by active service. He said his definition of active service included going to the assistance of the Italian frigate which had broken down in heavy seas. The Panel referred itself to the two photographs produced by CC Adderley in support of this part of his account, which show a French frigate (again not contested by CC Adderley) on a calm sea.

4.36 The final contentious assertion in CC Adderley’s Supporting Statement was his claim to having been recognised for his service as a military negotiator in Haiti in 1986 during the Anti-Duvalier protests. CC Adderley did not perform any such role and explained this inaccuracy in his IOPC interview. When asked to explain what he meant by this particular statement he said:

Erm and again this is from memory, the anti-Duvalier protests were going on and there was a, and the, my Divisional Officer at the time I was based on HMS Cochrane, they were talking, there was conversations around the military negotiation that was taking place, not just British, but how you would start it with civil unrest there and he said to me, why don’t you do an academic paper on it? And that’s what I started to do to try and understand what the prot’, what the first of all what the protest and I’m, I’m memory banks right at the bottom of it here now, what the protests were all about, how the military negotiation should take place and by whom, erm and I did that paper, I did a lot of research on it, I did a lot of I did a paper on it and I presented it to and again it was recognised for, and what happened to it I’ve got no idea but I was recognised by him for that work. [112].

4.37 CC Adderley referred to his paper as an “academic” paper and estimated it was about 10,000 words long [112]. It is a historical fact that the demonstrations took place prior to the end of Duvalier’s rule which ended in early February 1986. According to his Service Record, CC Adderley was still serving in HMS Invincible in February 1986. According to his DO’s joining letter, which he produced in support of his own case, HMS Invincible was on a West Indies deployment at the time Duvalier was deposed and CC Adderley did not join HMS Cochrane until 26 May 1986.

4.38 Both the CV and application form contained declarations that the contents of the same were correct to the best of CC Adderley’s knowledge and belief, which he signed on 2 June 2018. After being selected for the role, he signed a similar declaration of truth on 31 July 2018.

Media Articles

4.39 A number of media articles were relied upon by the AA which include incorrect information about CC Adderley’s service in the Royal Navy.

4.40 On 11 August 2011 the Manchester Evening News printed the following about CC Adderley:

“The former naval officer also promises to run a tight ship.” “...joining the Royal Navy at 16. Over 10 years the naval engineer rose up the ranks to lieutenant,

...serving on HMS Invincible, Hermes and Anglesey, during which he saw conflict in Haiti during the civil uprising of 1984.”

4.41 The same newspaper referred to CC Adderley as “*The former lieutenant with the Royal Navy...*” in an article published on 15 June 2013, following the murder of PC Bone and PC Hughes.

4.42 On 5 September 2018 the website Blue Line Jobs described CC Adderley as “*The Royal Navy veteran, who served in the Falklands war...*”.

4.43 On 11 September 2020 a Police Oracle article referred to CC Adderley joining Cheshire Constabulary in 1992 “*...after being in the Royal Navy for ten years during which time he served in the Falklands War.*”

4.44 On 1 February 2023 and 12 July 2023, articles on the Northamptonshire Police intranet referred to CC Adderley as having “*...served in the Royal Navy for 10 years including the Falklands War...*”.

4.45 CC Adderley’s case in regard to the above inaccurate reports is that he was not the originator of any of the false information.

4.46 When asked about his use of social media he referred to his use of Twitter. He said he was a very private person, and he did not like using social media but saw it as a necessary evil in his role [122]. He was asked about the inaccurate media reporting on his time in the Royal Navy. In reply he said that it was the result of some sort of characterisation of him which had built up over time, but he was not responsible for it. He pointed to the fact that none of the articles contained quotation marks which would have indicated the information came directly from him. He said he cannot bear to read media reports about himself and so has not corrected anything and nothing had been brought to his attention. He suggested that different media outlets had seized upon inaccurate information and reused it.

4.47 Having stated that he was not responsible for inaccurate reports about his naval service, that he does not read media reports about himself and has not corrected anything, the Panel noted the two Northamptonshire Police intranet articles of 1 February 2023 and 12 July 2023. The wording of the inaccurate passages is identical: “... [Chief Constable Adderley] *served in the Royal Navy for 10 years including the Falkland War...*”. Those same words were seen and approved by CC Adderley on 1 February 2023. Miss Zakia Choudhury drafted a quote on behalf of CC Adderley for a media article on an Armed Forces Covenant event. The quote was forwarded to CC Adderley who personally approved it, in an email at 12:02 1 February 2023, with the words “*Afternoon Zakia, thank you for putting the quote together, this is great, thank you.*” [39-41].

4.48 After his selection for the post of Chief Constable, and before his appointment, a biography (“bio”) was drafted for him. This was emailed to him at 14:41 on 25 June 2018, by the Chief Executive for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (as the appointment then was), Mr Martin Scoble. ACC Adderley (as he then was), replied at 17:16 the same day with “*As for my bio: 1. My RN service*

was 10 years (and a few months)". [43-44]. That bio, which included a reference to 10 years' service in the Royal Navy, was then published [332].

4.49 The Panel was also provided with a transcript of a video of a speech given by Ch Supt Adderley (as he then was), to the British Security Industry Association (BSIA) in 2014. In that speech, CC Adderley said to his audience "*I'm going to be totally honest with you, I have been in the police service now for 23 years, just coming up to 23 years and prior to that I was a senior leader within the Royal Navy...*". [177]. Again, CC Adderley did not rise above Able Seaman in his 2-year career.

4.50 On 16 June 2021 CC Adderley was interviewed for a podcast on British policing entitled "Tango Juliet Foxtrot". He said the following about himself:

I joined the police in 1992, the February of 1992, and I actually joined the Cheshire Constabulary, sorry left the Royal Navy or I was about to leave the Royal Navy and I actually applied for my home force at that time which was Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and in those days you could apply for as many forces as you like so I applied for GMP and Cheshire police at the same time and Cheshire police came along first and I was more than happy to join that Constabulary...I was a late joiner because I was 28 years old when I joined the police... [52-53].

4.51 In fact, CC Adderley was 25 when he joined Cheshire Constabulary and had been out of the Royal Navy for 5 years.

4.52 Documents before the Panel suggest that CC Adderley did not make simultaneous applications to join GMP and Cheshire Constabulary. As part of his application to join Cheshire Constabulary that force wrote a letter to GMP on 4 January 1991 asking why Mr Adderley (as he then was) had been rejected by GMP. GMP replied and said Mr Adderley applied to join that force in February 1990 but was rejected in favour of better candidates [364-365].

4.53 In his application to join Cheshire Constabulary, he gave his reason for leaving the Royal Navy as "*Left at the end of my contract, to spend more time with my family.*" CC Adderley left the Royal Navy prematurely and not at the end of his contract [363].

4.54 During the course of the hearing the AA produced extracts from two books on the tragic murder of PC Fiona Bone and PC Nicola Hughes in Manchester in 2013. CC Adderley contributed to both books.

4.55 The first, "*Lured to their Deaths*", written by Manchester Evening News journalist John Scheerhout, was published in 2013. Mr Scheerhout spoke to CC Adderley and included the following passage about his naval career and a comment he made about the murder:

"He has served as a lieutenant in the Royal Navy for 10 years. He had seen colleagues die in the Falklands conflict. But this was different, somehow

harder to take.”...“Cregan’s rules of engagement were not from any battlefield he had known.”

4.56 The second book, “*An Extraordinary Sacrifice: The Story of PC Nicola Hughes 16.10.1988 – 18.9.2012*”, published in 2015, was written by PC Hughes’ father, Mr Bryn Hughes. Mr Hughes also provided a character reference for CC Adderley.

4.57 The extract from this book includes what appears to be a direct quote from CC Adderley. The quote is continuous and is 19 lines long. It speaks mainly to the police response to the attack on the two officers. But at lines 9 to 13 NA makes reference to his naval service as follows:

“I had held a senior position in the armed forces and I had been in conflict situations, but this was like nothing else, because the rules of engagement were completely different.” [4 lines in the original text].

4.58 Mr Scheerhout was asked to attend the hearing to be questioned about the source of the above passages referring to CC Adderley but declined to attend. Mr Hughes provided a witness statement in which he insisted any reference to CC Adderley’s naval service did not come from CC Adderley but from another source. However, he could not recall what the source was. He did not wish to attend the hearing to provide further information as he said he did not wish to relive the tragic events referred to in his book.

The Medals

4.59 It was alleged CC Adderley wore the SAM and the GSM(NI) in order to exaggerate his naval service and to give the false impression that he had served in the Falklands War.

4.60 It was not in dispute that CC Adderley was never awarded the SAM or the GSM(NI) nor was it disputed that he wore them on his police tunic as medals and as medal ribbons.

4.61 The bundle of documents contains photographs of CC Adderley wearing the medals and the medal ribbons on the left breast of his tunic. The SAM worn by CC Adderley bears the rosette, which signifies that the recipient served in the actual conflict zone (that is within the 35° to 60° South latitude) during the period 2 April to 14 June 1982.

4.62 CC Adderley wore the medals and medal ribbons as part of a set of five medals. In addition to the SAM and the GSM(NI) he wore the Police Long Service and Good Conduct Medal (“LSGCM”), and the Queen Elizabeth II Golden and Diamond Jubilee Medals. The medals themselves were “court-mounted”, that is, they were connected together with a firm backing.

4.63 The AA produced evidence from the Royal British Legion (RBL) on medal etiquette [35-36]. RBL etiquette is that its members must wear their medals above the top pocket of a jacket. It does not specify on which side of the chest the medals must be worn, but it is common knowledge that medals are worn on the left breast by the recipient.

4.64 The RBL guidance also refers to the wearing of medals awarded to a deceased near relative and that these may only be worn on the right breast on formal occasions. The RBL guidance refers to medals and not medal ribbons. The RBL document points out that RBL guidance is based on the "*Guide to the Wearing of Orders, Decorations, Miniatures and Medals*" published by the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood. It follows therefore that the RBL's guidance on the wearing of medals originates from a higher source and reflects wider practice or convention.

4.65 The IOPC investigators questioned CC Adderley at length about the medals. In his first interview he said the SAM was awarded to his older brother, Richard Adderley, who was also an AB(M) in the Royal Navy. He said the GSM(NI) was awarded to his younger brother David Adderley who served in the British Army.

4.66 He said in interview that Richard served in the South Atlantic conflict. He said Richard served in HMS Hermes (which as matter of public record, was the Flagship for the Royal Navy Task Force) and was then transferred to a commandeered merchant vessel. CC Adderley said that his brother received the medal not long after he returned from the South Atlantic and that his brother told him this in an email sent to him shortly after the telephone conversation with Paul Fell on 17 July 2023. That conversation is described later in this decision.

4.67 CC Adderley said that Richard emigrated to Australia and gave him his SAM in 2008 or 2009. He said that Richard had conducted some research which suggested CC Adderley was entitled to wear the medal as a close relative. At the time of his IOPC interview, he said he had subsequently learned that the medal should be worn on the opposite side, to distinguish it from his own medals and had apologised for his mistake.

4.68 CC Adderley said he had never seen the medal at any time prior to being given it by Richard. He said he started wearing it in about 2009 or 2010.

4.69 Regarding the GSM(NI), CC Adderley said that his brother David was awarded the medal and was also awarded the Gulf War Medal. He was asked why he wore the GSM(NI) and not the Gulf War Medal and his answer was that David only offered him the GSM(NI). CC Adderley made the point, and repeated it later, that the GSM(NI) was an Army medal. As a matter of fact, the GSM(NI) was not restricted to Army personnel but was issued to personnel from all three services if they met the qualifying criteria (in the course of proceedings CC Adderley indicated this was correct).

4.70 He was asked how he came to receive and to wear David's GSM(NI). He said there was a conversation with David during which either he or David said it would be nice if he (CC Adderley) wore one of David's medals alongside Rick's

SAM. CC Adderley said he started wearing David's GSM(NI) in 2013 or 2014. He said the Gulf War Medal did not feature in the discussion about wearing one of David's medals.

4.71 In the same interview, he produced the SAM and the GSM(NI) he had worn on his uniform. The SAM was engraved on the rim, firstly with Rick Adderley's service number, then "ABM R ADDERLEY MV CEDARBANK. CC Adderley was asked if he knew the significance of the rosette on the SAM and he said he did not.

4.72 In interview CC Adderley was told that David was awarded a third operational medal, the NATO Former Yugoslavia Medal (The "NATO FYM"). CC Adderley insisted that he was unaware of David having the medal.

4.73 The IOPC put it to CC Adderley that the reason he did not wear the Gulf War Medal or the NATO FYM was because those conflicts occurred in the 1990s and were inconsistent with the "eleven years [in the navy] legend" created by CC Adderley. CC Adderley denied this accusation.

4.74 Evidence was obtained from the MOD Medal Office on 24 October 2023. In an email to Neil Collins, the IOPC Investigating Officer (IO), Trisha Sherwood provided the following information:

*Richard Louis Adderley – As at 12th October 23, has applied for a South Atlantic Medal. Mr Adderley has not been previously issued with this award, however, the team have assessed and Mr Richard Adderley does qualify for the award **without rosette**. Note - the rosette is only issued for deploying in the initial war fighting period 02 April 1982 – 14 June 1982. We have not despatched this as yet.*

*However, Mr Adderley would **not have qualified for the South Atlantic Medal, with or without rosette, prior to the change to the criteria of the South Atlantic Medal in 2015** as a result of an Independent Medal Review.*

Mr Adderley embarked on Naval Party 2130 to serve in the South Atlantic region from 03 July 1982 until 21 October 1982 and served onboard MV Cedarbank for over 30 days. The South Atlantic extension extended the original criteria end date to 21 October 1982 instead of 12 July 1982. Mr Adderley would previously not have been able to complete the required 30 days service between 03 July 1982 and 12 July 1982.

David Jonathan Adderley – awarded The Gulf Medal 1990-1991, NATO Medal with clasp Former Yugoslavia, General Service Medal 1962 with clasp Northern Ireland. [472] [Emphasis and highlighting added by Trisha Sherwood or the IOPC].

4.75 The information from Trisha Sherwood was disclosed to CC Adderley in interview. He said he was unaware of the fact his brother Rick had never been awarded the SAM, and that he only became eligible for a SAM without rosette after a medal review in 2015.

4.76 The SAM worn by CC Adderley was sent to the MOD Medal Office where it was examined by Mr Chris Hayward and Mr Martin Phipps, who between them have many years of experience examining British military medals. On examining the medal, both men found it to be a copy for the various reasons given by Mr Hayward in his letter to the IO, Mr Collins, on 25 January 2024 [353-355]. Unfortunately, the medal was inadvertently disposed of by the MOD Medal Office.

4.77 Richard Adderley produced two statements in support of CC Adderley. The first was in the form of an email sent to CC Adderley on 19 July 2023 [22-23]. The second was in the form of a witness statement recorded by the IOPC on 6 December 2023 [178-179].

4.78 In the email, Richard Adderley wrote:

The purpose of this email is to confirm that I served in the Royal Navy from 1980 until August of 1989 during which time I saw active service in the South Atlantic, for this I was awarded a medal.

At the time of service in the South Atlantic I was serving aboard an Aircraft Carrier and later seconded merchant vessel, the names of which I cannot say due to being bound by the Official Secrets Act.

Over 15 years ago I emigrated to Australia and prior to me leaving the UK I gave my younger brother, Nicholas ADDERLEY my South Atlantic Medal, giving him permission to wear it as he saw fit, upon his Police Uniform, as I no longer would be living in the UK.

Both Nick and I served together in the Royal Navy, and indeed, on the same ship.

I know how passionate Nick was about serving in the military and I thought it only right and proper that he should have it and wear it where he saw fit. I am also aware that you can pass your awards on to your family and also friends if you wish and for them to wear these awards.

You will observe that the medal has my name, rank and service number engraved upon the outer rim and is clearly mine.

4.79 In his witness statement, Richard Adderley said the following:

In 1980 I joined the Royal Navy. In 1982 I travelled to the Falkland Islands on a seconded merchant vessel, the MV Cedarbank.

I recall that when we arrived in Port Stanley there was an air raid warning red. This meant that we had to immediately go to Action Stations, meaning "man all weapons", as an air raid was imminent.

A couple of weeks later some lads in the mess hall presented me with a medal in a box. It was a South Atlantic medal with a rosette on the ribbon. It had my name and service number inscribed around the edge.

I was only 17. I did not question the legitimacy of the medal. There was no formal ceremony.

I left the Royal Navy in 1987. I can't recall when but sometime after leaving the navy I gave the medal to my brother Nick Adderley. He had already joined the police and I thought he might want to wear it on his uniform.

I do not recall talking to Nick about which side of his chest he should wear my medal on. I know that medals belonging to family members should be worn on the right side. However at the time of giving the medal to Nick I would have been unsure which side it should be worn.

In 2008 I emigrated to Australia. Earlier this year Nick contacted me and asked if the medal I gave him was legitimate. I said I thought that it was.

I was also contacted by a reporter from The Sun newspaper who wanted to ask me some questions about the medal. I didn't reply to the reporter.

In October 2023 I completed a written application from requesting a medal from the MOD.

4.80 Richard Adderley was born on 22 October 1963 which means he would have been almost 19 years old at the time he was in the South Atlantic and not 17 as claimed above.

4.81 There is an obvious inconsistency between the two statements provided by Richard Adderley. In his first statement of 19 July 2023, which was obtained by CC Adderley to support his narrative of the phone call with Paul Fell on 17 July 2023, Richard Adderley said that he first served in an aircraft carrier in the South Atlantic and was later seconded to a merchant vessel. In his subsequent statement made on 25 January 2024, some months after evidence was obtained from the MOD about his actual service in the South Atlantic, Richard Adderley made no mention of having first served in an aircraft carrier.

4.82 The MOD's records indicate he did not serve in the South Atlantic in either of the two Royal Navy aircraft carriers which took part in the conflict. The MOD's records show that he served in the South Atlantic from 3 July 1982 until 21 October 1982, which was after the end of hostilities.

4.83 In his second statement, he referred to his merchant vessel going to action stations on receiving an imminent air raid warning. If such an air raid warning was issued, it was after the end of hostilities with Argentina. Richard Adderley was silent as to what happened after going to action stations, but given the conflict had ended, it must follow that it was a false alarm or an exercise.

4.84 The evidence from the MOD that Richard Adderley was never issued a SAM, and only became eligible for one without rosette after the 2015 review was not challenged.

4.85 In oral evidence, Mr Hayward was asked by the Chair if he knew when the SAM was first issued. He did not know the answer, but he agreed with the suggestion that the process leading up to issue takes some time.

4.86 Richard Adderley said in his first statement that he “was aware” medals could be given to family and friends and that they were entitled to wear them if they wished. He did not elaborate on how he came to such an understanding. Richard Adderley and his brother CC Adderley come from a “forces family”. Their father served in the Royal Navy. They followed him into the service and their younger brother joined the Army.

Vetting

4.87 It was alleged that CC Adderley provided false information when filling in two vetting questionnaires. The first was completed on 16 August 2016 for Developed Vetting, when he gave the dates of his Royal Navy Service as October 1984 to September 1987. The second was completed on 2 February 2023 for Management Vetting when he gave the dates of his Royal Navy service as October 1981 to November 1991.

4.88 The IO asked CC Adderley to account for the above discrepancies. Unhelpfully, the IO did not break down his question into two parts and so CC Adderley provided a single response to both discrepancies. In short, he said he had rushed the applications and had “rounded up” the dates. In his response to the original Regulation 51 Notice of Allegations, CC Adderley referred to the Management Vetting questionnaire and attributed the discrepancy to carelessness. He had just returned to work after a short period of leave after his father’s death. He completed the form quickly and without real thought.

4.89 CC Adderley’s general response to factual inaccuracies in the vetting forms and his Chief Constable application, was that he been careless, showed a lack of diligence and a “lackadaisical” attitude.

Paul Fell

4.90 It was alleged that CC Adderley lied about his Royal Navy service in a telephone conversation with Paul Fell on 17 July 2023. The alleged lies were that he joined the navy in 1982 when he was 17, after completing basic training he was deployed straight to the Falklands serving in HMS Hermes, and upon return from the war he began his officer engineering training. Mr Fell produced a witness statement on 17 August 2023 in which he recounted the phone call he made to CC Adderley. Mr Fell’s purpose in making the call was to obtain some further clarity from CC Adderley about his naval service as he had to make a decision whether the complaint made by CC Adderley’s ex-wife should be referred to the IOPC for investigation.

4.91 From previous conversations with CC Adderley, Mr Fell was aware that he had served in the Royal Navy, and he had seen him wearing the SAM ribbon on his police tunic.

4.92 Mr Fell called CC Adderley on his mobile phone. CC Adderley was off duty but said he was able to talk. Mr Fell insisted that during the conversation CC Adderley told him that he joined the Royal Navy at age 17 in early 1982. He said CC Adderley told him that after completing his basic training he deployed straight away to the Falklands in HMS Hermes. He said that CC Adderley also said that he served in the Royal Navy for 10 years until 1992.

4.93 On 19 July 2023 CC Adderley sent an email to Mr Fell, who read it on 20 July 2023. In the email CC Adderley made reference to the telephone conversation between the two men on 17 July 2023. He began his email by stating that the sound quality was not great and that he had not heard Mr Fell that well. CC Adderley then went on to produce a narrative of the telephone conversation which was in stark contrast to that recalled and recorded by Mr Fell.

4.94 In essence, CC Adderley insisted that he had been talking about his brother Richard's naval service and not his own. He referred to his brother giving him permission to wear the SAM and that he, Richard, was 17 or 18 when he deployed to the Falklands. He then went on to write:

I will confess that I do not read about myself and trust the accuracy of the detail to those who write it. Lesson learned for me.

It is my belief that this picture has been built up over time through mis reporting and assumption, something that wouldn't and couldn't be correct due to timings.

I also note that my biography clearly states that I served in the Royal Navy but obviously makes no mention of any active service in the Falklands – I have never said that I served during the conflict.

Having trawled the web sites, I can find no mention of this being mentioned or referred to by myself. What I have found is a variation of dates, length of time served, roles and other bits of misinformation but these are not attributed to any comments I have made. I think this is confusion borne of Ricks service and mine.

In summary, I have never declared the medal was awarded to me – it is my medal given to me by my brother. I have permission and the right to wear it.

I have never stated that I served in the conflict and any reference to this in the media is incorrect and needs addressing.

My bio clearly states that I served in the Royal Navy, which is accurate.

The press articles are inaccurate (Covenant) and need re-writing.

4.95 CC Adderley produced his own handwritten note which he claimed was a contemporaneous record of what was said during the conversation. The note recounted how Paul Fell made the call, that Mr Fell told him his ex-wife had made a

complaint about him wearing the SAM. The note goes on to state that he told Paul Fell the medal was given to him by his brother Rick, and that Mr Fell asked him several questions about Rick's service, such as how old he was at the time of the conflict, what ship was he on and how much service did he have. The note records that CC Adderley answered the questions. In the final sentence of his note, he said the call was "broken".

Other Oral Evidence

4.96 Mr Neil Collins, the IOPC IO gave continuity evidence in regard to the SAM which he sent to the MOD Medal Office.

4.97 Mr Pallister of the IOPC gave evidence in regard to enquiries with Mr John Scheerhout and Mr Bryn Hughes, the authors of "*Lured to their Deaths*" and "*An extraordinary sacrifice*" respectively.

The LQC's Comments

4.98 At the close of the evidence in the case, when it was known that CC Adderley would not give evidence, the Chair, as agreed with counsel, read out a number of observations on comments or assertions made by CC Adderley, which appeared in the documentary evidence. These were the Chair's preliminary views on certain points of evidence relating to CC Adderley's Royal Navy service. The purpose of exposing those views was to allow CC Adderley to respond to them before the Panel retired finally to deliberate on the evidence. The views raised by the Chair are summarised below:

Point 1

The minimum age which Chief Constable Adderley could have joined the Sea Cadets would have been 12.

Point 2

In explaining why his Royal Navy service was given as 10-years in his CV, CC Adderley said that he had lumped together his naval service with his Sea Cadet service. The Chair pointed out that the Sea Cadets is a youth organisation and a charity. It is not part of the Royal Navy, and it is not part of the wider Naval Service.

Point 3

Royal Naval Engineering College was not at the University of Portsmouth. It was located at HMS Thunderer, Manadon, Plymouth.

Point 4

In regard to CC Adderley's assertion that he applied to go to Britannia Royal Naval College Dartmouth, his own CV suggests that he didn't meet the minimum academic requirements to enter Dartmouth. He does not have the

required English Language O-Level, and he did not have the required two A' Levels.

Point 5

In regard to being a leader amongst his peers, CC Adderley's Service Record shows that he did not become a substantive Able Seaman until 9 April 1986 or the 15 May 1986. At the time of the two events he relies upon as examples of his leadership, he would have been an Acting Able Seaman.

Point 6

CC Adderley asserted that his performance was recognised at an early stage in the Royal Navy and that in some way his advancement was accelerated. But his Service Record appears to show that he failed his Seacat missile course before joining his first ship.

Point 7

CC Adderley produced two examples of when he was commended for his leadership. The first was to do with the recovery of Sea King helicopter which had ditched in the sea. He said he was commended for being the "lead winch party". The Chair doubted that such an important task would have been given to such a junior member of the ship's company.

Point 8

The second leadership example was when he was in charge of a Seaboat and assisted in putting a disabled Italian frigate under tow. The Chair suggested to CC Adderley that such a task would not have been given to him.

Point 9

In relation to the towing incident, CC Adderley said that he was in charge of a team of other Seaman Operators and Midshipmen. The Chair said that an Acting Able Seaman or a substantive Able Seaman would not be put in charge of such a team. Midshipmen are trainee officers.

Point 10

CC Adderley said he was responsible for the armoury and base security at HMS Cochrane, Rosyth, Scotland. That assertion ran contrary to the Chair's experience of the duties and responsibilities given to such a junior rating.

4.99 No attempt was made to correct the above preliminary views of the Chair.

5. ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE AND DETERMINATION OF THE FACTS

5.1 The Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof rests with the AA and the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is to say, on the balance of probabilities. The Panel applied this standard when considering the facts of the case.

5.2 The Panel decided this was a case with considerable overlap between the allegations, which were of the same or similar kind. The Panel took particular care when determining the facts to analyse the evidence specific to each allegation before assessing all of the evidence in the round.

Evidence of untruthfulness going to general credibility

5.3 The Panel identified a number of examples of obvious untruthfulness by CC Adderley which indicated a propensity to lie when it suited him. However, recognising that lies by themselves may not always be determinative of guilt, the Panel kept an open mind when determining each of the allegations, taking care to first carefully weigh up the evidence specific to each allegation, before taking into account CC Adderley's general credibility where any doubt remained as to the facts.

5.4 In his application to join Cheshire Constabulary in 1990, when asked to provide his employment history and reasons for leaving each role, CC Adderley said in regard to the Royal Navy that he "*Left at the end of my contract, to spend more time with my family.*" That was an untrue statement, because the Panel found it was self-evident from his Service Record, and from a letter from HMS Centurion to GMP dated 11 April 1990, that he did not see out his contracted engagement but was in fact discharged prematurely as being unsuitable. CC Adderley will have known then that he was applying to enter a service which demanded the highest standards of honesty and integrity, and he should have been truthful about his reasons for leaving the Royal Navy. However, the Panel recognised that this untruth was perhaps driven by embarrassment and did not place significant weight on this one example.

5.5 But in 2014, as a Ch Supt, with almost 23 years' service in the police, he told a blatant untruth in a speech to the BSIA when he claimed that he had been a senior leader in the Royal Navy prior to joining the police [**Allegation at paragraph 19 of the Regulation 30 Notice**]. CC Adderley attempted to place his own definition on the word "leader" when interviewed by the IOPC, after referring to himself as having been a leader in the Royal Navy in his CV. But on no objective view could CC Adderley ever legitimately claim to have been a *senior* leader in the Royal Navy when he did not remain in the service long enough to secure promotion beyond the lowest rate of Able Seaman. Unlike his application to join Cheshire Constabulary, there was no mitigation to apply to such an obvious lie, given his age and rank at the time it was uttered. The Panel found this was evidence of a tendency to lie in order to enhance his public image.

5.6 The 2014 speech was not an isolated instance of lying in public. In the "Tango Juliet Foxtrot" interview of 16 June 2021, knowing it was for broadcast to the public, CC Adderley lied about seamlessly joining Cheshire Constabulary from the Royal Navy, when in fact he was discharged over 5 years before. In the same interview, he lied about being 28 when he joined the police instead of 25. [**Allegation at**

paragraph 22 of the Regulation 30 Notice]. In the same interview, he also lied about having applications in with Cheshire and GMP at the same time, and choosing Cheshire over GMP, when in fact he had been rejected by GMP some months before.

5.7 The Panel did not accept CC Adderley's defence of carelessness as the reason for such inaccuracies. One would not forget a 5-year gap after leaving the Royal Navy. One would not forget the age they were when they began their vocation and would certainly not be a whole 3 years out. One would also not forget they had been rejected from their first choice of police force. Taken together, these lies were obviously intended to prop up a false narrative already created by Nick Adderley who had, by the time of the interview, had reached the pinnacle of his career. He was not willing to admit failure of any kind, including his rejection by GMP and a failed career in the navy. The false age of entry to the police was given to support the fiction already in existence that he had served for 10 or 11 years in the Royal Navy.

Application for Chief Constable

5.8 The CV and Supporting Statement created by CC Adderley, and submitted in support of his application to become Chief Constable of Northamptonshire, contained numerous factual inaccuracies regarding his service in the Royal Navy. The AA's case was that those inaccuracies were known by CC Adderley to be falsehoods.

5.9 The Panel considered the general defence put forward by CC Adderley that when completing his application form and the vetting questionnaires he had been lazy, careless, showed a lack of diligence and a "lackadaisical" attitude. The Panel did not accept that a senior police officer, who had attained the rank of ACC, would do anything other than take the utmost care when applying for a promotion which would take him to the very peak of his career. Having already climbed to the rank of ACC he will have understood that to give himself the best chance of success in the selection process, his written application had to be an accurate reflection of his career history, attributes and competencies. The Panel found that the sort of sloppiness suggested by CC Adderley as the reason for the multiple glaring errors was wholly inconsistent with such an intelligent, experienced and ambitious senior police officer.

5.10 The CV document is littered with inaccurate information [**Allegations at paragraphs 6 – 9 of the Regulation 30 Notice**]. CC Adderley insisted he had no intention to deceive, but in essence what he described was simply poorly articulated.

5.11 On the face of it, he assertion that he served in the Royal Navy from February 1981 to February 1992, when in fact he only served from October 1984 to December 1986. His explanation for this apparent exaggeration was that he was referring to his combined time in the Sea Cadet and in the Royal Navy. This explanation fails scrutiny for a variety of reasons.

5.12 CC Adderley produced no supporting evidence of ever being in the Sea Cadets. If he ever was in the Sea Cadets, he produced no evidence of how long he was a member. The Panel judged that such evidence was obtainable if this part of

his account was true. The Panel gave him the benefit of the doubt and assumed he was a Sea Cadet for a period of time. But for the reasons given below, any time spent in the Sea Cadets did not provide a plausible explanation for the statement in his CV that he spent 11 years in the Royal Navy, or the suggestion made at other times that he was in the navy for 10 years.

5.13 Even without the Chair's personal experience as a former Sea Cadet, the Panel collectively understand the Sea Cadets to be a youth organisation and quite distinct from the armed forces. As a former cadet, CC Adderley must have known the distinction and would not have considered his time in the cadets as being equivalent to membership of the Armed Forces. But a cursory examination of his explanation revealed it to be false.

5.14 CC Adderley had not only to explain the 10- or 11-year claim, but he also had to explain his claim to having served from February 1981 to February 1992. Even if he joined the cadets at age 10 as claimed, he would then have joined on a day from 20 September 1976 to 21 September 1977 because he was born on 20 September 1966. Such a start date would then fall some 3 ½ to 4 ½ years before the date as it appears on his CV (ie. February 1981). If the 11 years began when he joined the Sea Cadets as he claimed, then his service in the Royal Navy would have ended in 1987 or 1988, not in February 1992 as it appears in his CV.

5.15 But more obviously of course, even if one accepts the highly implausible explanation of aggregating childhood membership of the cadets with adult service in the Royal Navy, his true service dates of 22 October 1984 to 5 December 1986 cannot be reconciled with the Royal Navy leaving date of February 1992 he gave in his CV.

5.16 The Panel also carefully considered CC Adderley's explanation for the entry in his CV about attending BRNC Dartmouth and the "Royal Naval School of Engineering". His explanation was that becoming an officer was his aspiration, but that he failed in gaining entry. He said he thought this aspiration was an "*interesting topic of conversation*", but he put it in the wrong place in his application, suggesting he should have put it in his Supporting Statement.

5.17 This explanation was plainly incapable of belief in the circumstances. The Panel had no hesitation in rejecting the suggestion that CC Adderley believed it was permissible to include an institution he had never attended under the education section of his CV. That section was very obviously for education he completed and qualifications he had obtained. He sandwiched the false Dartmouth/Engineering School chapter of his education story between the master's degree and the O' Levels he actually obtained. This was an obvious and intentional attempt to deceive the reader into believing he had attended Dartmouth and the "Royal Navy School of Engineering". The Panel also dismissed the suggestion that a failed attempt to become an officer in the Royal Navy, 26 years earlier, would ever be a suitable topic an aspiring Chief Constable would ever volunteer.

5.18 The Panel also found it unlikely that CC Adderley ever, in fact, applied to attend Dartmouth to become an Engineer Officer. The Chair observed in open hearing that CC Adderley did not meet the minimum academic requirements to

become an Engineer Officer in the Royal Navy because he did not possess any A' Levels, and this view was not challenged by CC Adderley. It seemed unlikely that a young man would submit an application for "officer entry" if he did not meet the minimum academic requirements. If CC Adderley did genuinely apply to Dartmouth, or at the very least was genuinely interested in becoming an Engineer Officer, he would surely have known or would surely not have forgotten the true name and the true location of the prestigious Royal Navy engineering college his heart was set on attending. The conclusion that CC Adderley never in fact applied to enter Dartmouth was not material to the Panel's finding on the Dartmouth entry in his CV, but it was a further example of dissembling which further undermined his overall credibility.

5.19 In his CV, CC Adderley described himself as an "officer", and a "commended" one at that. He insisted that he did not mean to deceive when describing himself as an officer. But the Panel was not persuaded by his explanation about using the term officer in a vague and non-military sense. CC Adderley began both his CV and his Supporting Statement with references to his time in the Royal Navy. They were self-evidently intended to impress the reader. As someone who had served in the Royal Navy, who came from what can be described as a "forces family", CC Adderley would not have misused the word officer when referring to his own time in the Royal Navy. He knew that the word would be taken to mean he had been a member of the Royal Navy's commissioned cohort and it was his intention to give that false impression.

5.20 His claim to having been commended was also untrue or grossly exaggerated. By his own account, this claim was linked to having a "*proven track record as a leader*" in the Royal Navy, which the Panel also found to be untrue. At the close of the evidence in the hearing, the Chair shared his own view that the leadership and commendation examples provided by CC Adderley were highly improbable. This was done to allow the defence an opportunity to correct the Chair's preliminary views, but no such attempt was made.

5.21 But the Chair's personal knowledge and experience was not essential to the Panel in its determination that the examples given by CC Adderley were implausible. It was possible to gain an objective picture of CC Adderley's naval service from his Service Record. He may have been appointed class leader during his brief basic training, but there was sufficient police and military/naval experience on the Panel to know that being appointed as a recruit class leader was not the high accolade claimed. The Panel did not accept that when drafting his application form CC Adderley genuinely had in mind such examples as evidence of leadership in the Royal Navy, because they were far removed from the very senior leadership role in the police he was seeking. The Panel found this example, and the others he provided, were manufactured on the spot in interview to explain the "leader" myth.

5.22 CC Adderley's Royal Navy Service Record was unremarkable. Having claimed in interview that he was identified for accelerated advancement to Able Seaman, the Panel was not taken to anything in his Service Record to support this. To the contrary, as a trainee specialising as a missile operator, his Service Record indicated that he in fact failed a Sea Cat missile operator course. Failing a career course, before going to his first job after basic training, was inconsistent with a claim to above average performance and accelerated advancement. He was also not

confirmed as a substantive Able Seaman until 15 May 1986, only 6-months before going on terminal leave and discharge from the navy for unsuitability. These facts were not indicative of an individual singled out for early promotion.

5.23 CC Adderley joined HMS Invincible in early July 1985 and left her in May 1986, soon after being confirmed as an AB(M). At the time of the two main leadership examples given by him in interview, both from his time in HMS Invincible, he was obviously very junior in rank and inexperienced. The Chair voiced his view in the hearing that CC Adderley's claim to having winched a helicopter out of the sea was dubious because such level of responsibility would not have been entrusted him. But the Panel as a whole, using common sense, was able to arrive at the same conclusion, that a sailor who had been on board his first ship for such a short period of time, who had yet to be confirmed in the lowest rank, would not be entrusted with such weighty responsibility.

5.24 The Panel reached the same finding when it came to his claim to having been in charge of an operation to rescue an Italian warship which had broken down. The Panel of course did not share the Chair's knowledge and experience of such matters, but CC Adderley's story was patently implausible. The suggestion that such a junior sailor would be given such an important task, in the perilous circumstances he claimed, was deemed to be highly improbable, as was his assertion that not only was he put in charge of other sailors but was also put in charge of a number of trainee officers. Even without direct experience, the Panel fully understood the distinction between trainee officers and very junior ratings and found CC Adderley's claim to having been in charge of trainee officers to be a complete paradox and untrue.

5.25 The Panel considered and similarly dismissed as a paradox the further example of leadership, which was CC Adderley's assertion that when serving in HMS Cochrane, he was given "*responsibility over the armoury and the general security of the site*". The Panel found that to give such a junior service person, soon to be discharged as temperamentally unsuitable, command of other personnel, charge of an armoury, and responsibility for the security of a naval dockyard, as wholly incredible.

5.26 Moving on to his Supporting Statement [**Allegations at paragraphs 10 – 12 of the Regulation 30 Notice**], CC Adderley began it with "*As a former Commander in the Royal Navy...*". The Panel did not accept CC Adderley's attempt to explain away a patently untrue statement. If his true meaning was the function of commanding others, as he claimed, and not a reference to the naval rank of Commander, then he can only have had in mind the examples of leadership already discussed above. But that explanation was not sustainable in the Panel's view because CC Adderley, as an ACC vying for promotion to the most senior position in a police force, would never have fallen back on such lowly examples from a failed previous career, even if they were true, which they were not.

5.27 The Panel did not accept his explanation for the Commander point. His statement was a clear reference to the Royal Navy and not to the police. There was no plausible reason why he would use the term "commander" in a police sense. There was also no plausible reason why he would describe himself as any sort of

commander during his short time in the navy, given that he barely reached the rate of Able Seaman before he was prematurely discharged. The word itself appears mid-sentence with a capital “C” and was obviously intended to convey the false impression that he was a commissioned officer in that rank.

5.28 The Panel also dismissed CC Adderley’s claim to seeing active service as pure fantasy. The ordinary meaning of the term is well understood to mean participation in military operations, which does not include routine exercises or deployments. When asked to give an example of being on active service, he repeated the Italian frigate anecdote. Even if the events he described were true, they would not amount to active service in the Panel’s judgement.

5.29 The final lie in his supporting statement was his claim to having been recognised for his service as a military negotiator in Haiti in 1986. Reverting back to CC Adderley’s general defence of sloppiness in his Chief Constable application, on no sensible view would any intelligent senior police officer ever demonstrate such poor written communication skills by transforming the writing of an academic paper on Haiti into being a military negotiator in that country and being recognised for the same. CC Adderley’s meaning was clear and unambiguous. He intended the reader to believe he had been a military negotiator in the same way he intended the reader to believe he had been a Commander in the Royal Navy.

5.30 The AA did not challenge CC Adderley’s insistence that he wrote a paper on the Haitian revolution of 1986. But the Panel found this was also untrue and was conjured up on the spot in his IOPC interview. This was evident as he did not have the time to produce an accurate chronology of this historical event. The Panel was informed that Jeanne-Claude Duvalier fell from power in early February 1986. CC Adderley said that he was based in HMS Cochrane when the anti-Duvalier protests were going on. Any such protests logically pre-dated Duvalier’s overthrow, at which time CC Adderley was still serving in HMS Invincible in the Caribbean and not in HMS Cochrane. He was not drafted to HMS Cochrane until some 3 or 4 months after Duvalier’s downfall. Therefore, the story behind the paper is fundamentally flawed.

5.31 It was also highly implausible that he produced a 10,000-word academic paper as claimed in the Panel’s judgement. At the time, he was only an Able Seaman, and a very junior one at that. He was in his last 5 months in the navy before being prematurely discharged as unsuitable. He was not undergoing any course of academic study. As an Able Seaman, he had no apparent career reason for producing such a work, and time for such academic work must have been very limited because he was employed on routine duties in the dockyard, and he was recently married. CC Adderley was also harking back to the pre-internet age, when he was living and working in a naval dockyard, shortly before the termination of his service, which makes his claim that he did the necessary detailed research then wrote the paper even more unlikely.

5.32 Because CC Adderley was knowingly untruthful in his CV and Supporting Statement, his three declarations of truth were also false **[Allegations at paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Regulation 30 Notice]**.

Media Articles

5.33 The Regulation 30 Notice contains allegations of failing to correct six specific news articles containing false information about himself [**Allegations at paragraph 17**]. Evidence of additional articles containing false information about him was also included in the hearing bundle.

5.34 The six relied upon were the Police Oracle Article dated 11 September 2020, the Northamptonshire Telegraph articles dated 17 June 2020 and 14 December 2022 (which show photographs of CC Adderley wearing the contentious medals and medal ribbons), the Northamptonshire Police internal articles dated 1 February 2023 and 12 July 2023 and the Blue Line Jobs article dated 5 September 2018.

5.35 The Panel carefully considered CC Adderley's defence to the suggestion that he was the originator of what was described by the IOPC and the AA as the "Royal Navy legend". In short, he blamed misreporting by the media. He asserted that at some point his naval service was exaggerated and distorted, this was then repeated by other journalists or authors, and he was simply unaware of the misreporting.

5.36 The Panel rejected CC Adderley's explanation because it was inconsistent with the evidence in a number of ways. The first of these was that elements of the false legend created by CC Adderley in his CV and Supporting Statement could be found in media articles, which he insisted he did not generate. The Panel not only found that he failed to correct untrue reports about his service, but it also found him to be the author of the same.

5.37 The first article which makes mention of CC Adderley's naval service was that in the Manchester Evening News on 11 August 2011 which read:

"The former naval officer also promises to run a tight ship." "...joining the Royal Navy at 16. Over 10 years the naval engineer rose up the ranks to lieutenant, serving on HMS Invincible, Hermes and Anglesey, during which he saw conflict in Haiti during the civil uprising of 1984."

5.38 That article contained details which went beyond the simple "10-years commissioned service" strapline. It contained specific information which the Panel decided must have come from CC Adderley himself rather than the local journalist, Mr Greer.

5.39 The information contained in the above article appeared elsewhere in the evidence and originated from CC Adderley. It was highly unlikely that the journalist would have known that CC Adderley served in HMS Invincible and HMS Anglesey. In the Panel's judgement, the appearance of HMS Hermes was also not coincidental, and it was the warship he would later falsely claim was linked to his brother Richard's SAM. The article referred to him not simply as an officer in the Royal Navy, but as an engineer and a Lieutenant. The reference to Haiti of course provides a direct link to the falsehood in CC Adderley's CV, written almost 7 years later. The Panel was satisfied the false information in the article came from CC Adderley.

5.40 This particular newspaper article did not form one of the Regulation 30 allegations, but it clearly formed part of the same factual matrix alongside those articles relied upon by the AA. Being the first in time, the 11 August 2011 article was an obvious datum point from which to assess the other articles and what CC Adderley had to say about them.

5.41 The Panel did not use its findings regarding the 11 August 2011 article as the sole basis for assessing those other articles containing references to CC Adderley's Royal Navy service. Other evidence fatally undermined his claim that he was not the source of the false information and that he paid no attention to reports about himself.

5.42 The first of these was the speech he gave to the BSIA in 2014. In it he told the audience that prior to joining the police he "...was a senior leader within the Royal Navy...". On any objective view CC Adderley was never a leader in the Royal Navy. He was certainly therefore never a *senior* leader. The only reasonable inference that could be drawn from such a comment was that the maker was claiming to have been an officer, and more senior than a junior officer. In that speech CC Adderley claimed something about his naval service which was blatantly untrue.

5.43 On 25 June 2018, CC Adderley approved the bio that had been prepared for him before taking up his position as Chief Constable [**Allegation at paragraph 21 of the Regulation 30 Notice**]. Not only did he approve it, but in his reply to the Chief Executive for the PCC of Northamptonshire he wrote "*As for my bio: 1. My RN service was 10 years (and a few months)*". By his own hand, CC Adderley uttered the very same lie which he later blamed the media for perpetuating.

5.44 Then on 1 February 2023, CC Adderley approved a quote, drafted on his behalf, which was published on the Northamptonshire Police intranet later that day [**Allegation at paragraphs 23 of the Regulation 30 Notice**]. The quote included a reference to him as follows: "*...served in the Royal Navy for 10 years including the Falkland War...*". CC Adderley emailed the person who sent the quote to him for approval and wrote: "*Afternoon Zakia, thank you for putting the quote together, this is great, thank you.*" The Panel was satisfied that CC Adderley checked the quote, saw the reference to 10-years' service and to serving in the Falklands War. He attested to the accuracy of the untrue content and authorised its publication.

5.45 The 2014 speech, approving his own bio in 2018 and approving the internal articles in 2023 clearly demonstrated that CC Adderley was the person solely responsible for creating and peddling a completely untrue legend. Taken together, this demonstrated his confident willingness to lie about his service in the Royal Navy.

5.46 Further clear evidence of his propensity to lie can be found elsewhere. As far back as his application to join Cheshire Constabulary in 1991, he gave his reason for leaving the Royal Navy as "*Left at the end of my contract, to spend more time with my family.*" CC Adderley did not leave the Royal Navy at the end of his contract. He was discharged for unsuitability.

5.47 In his 16 June 2021 interview for the podcast "Tango Juliet Foxtrot" he claimed a seamless transition from the Royal Navy to Cheshire Constabulary in

February 1992. But his Service Record showed that he left the navy more than 5-years before joining the police. In the same interview he suggested that he applied to join GMP and Cheshire at the same time, and that he joined Cheshire because they offered him a job first. That was also untrue because GMP in fact rejected him in 1990.

5.48 In the same podcast interview, he said that he joined the police as a late joiner at 28. Again, that was untrue. CC Adderley asserted this was nothing more than an innocent mistake. The Panel rejected that explanation because this was not a slip of mere months but a full 3-years. The Panel agreed with the AA's proposition that a significant life event, such as the date or age when a career police officer joined the service, would be recalled immediately. The Panel also agreed with the proposition put to him in interview that he lied about being 28 when he joined the police because that supported his false claim to service in the Royal Navy for 10 or 11-years.

5.49 For the above reasons the Panel discounted CC Adderley's defence that he was not the originator of any false reports about his naval service which appeared in the media. The Panel found that the inaccurate reports contained in all of the media articles produced in evidence at the hearing, and not just those particularised in the Regulation 30 Notice, were the work of CC Adderley alone. It was his intention to spread an untrue story of his life before the police which is why he failed to correct such reports.

5.50 But if further evidence was needed, it could be found in the two books about the murder of PC Fiona Bone and PC Nicola Hughes in Manchester in 2013. CC Adderley contributed to both books.

5.51 Out of all the evidence produced in this case, the Panel found that CC Adderley's conduct in relation to these two books was the most shocking because he attempted to turn the spotlight onto himself and his naval fantasy, rather than on his murdered colleagues.

5.52 In "*Lured to their Deaths*", John Scheerhout spoke to CC Adderley and included the passage about his naval career. Although not written in direct speech, the reference to CC Adderley's supposed naval service formed part of a wider conversation which the author indicated took place in the Ch Supt Adderley's office. The contentious words bear repeating:

"He has served as a lieutenant in the Royal Navy for 10 years. He had seen colleagues die in the Falklands conflict. But this was different, somehow harder to take."... "Cregan's rules of engagement were not from any battlefield he had known."

5.53 The untruth about serving as a Lieutenant and for 10-years appears. But what was added to this account, which did not appear in Mr Scheerhout's newspaper article of 15 June 2013, were the embellishments about seeing naval colleagues die and battlefield rules of engagement. The assertion that CC Adderley had seen colleagues die in the Falklands War was obviously untrue as was the assertion that he had any experience of battle or rules of engagement. The Panel found it highly

unlikely that a professional journalist, when writing a book about the murder of two police officers, would embellish CC Adderley's words and add further unnecessary reference to death. The Panel concluded that CC Adderley was the originator of the above remarks.

5.54 In an effort to deflect blame for the untrue newspaper reports, CC Adderley observed that none of the comments about himself were in direct quotes. But the words attributed to him in Mr Bryn Hughes book "*An Extraordinary Sacrifice*" did appear as a direct quote:

"I had held a senior position in the armed forces and I had been in conflict situations, but this was like nothing else, because the rules of engagement were completely different."

5.55 Mr Hughes did not wish to attend the hearing but produced a witness statement supporting CC Adderley. In that statement, Mr Hughes insisted that what appeared in his book was not a quote from CC Adderley. He insisted that CC Adderley did not tell him anything about his naval service. He said that he obtained that information from another source, but he could not recall what it was.

5.56 The Panel carefully considered how much weight could be given to Mr Hughes witness statement. The Panel noted that Mr Hughes had already provided a very supportive character reference for CC Adderley and there was a longstanding, close relationship between the two men going back to the terrible death of Mr Hughes' daughter. The Panel considered Mr Hughes' reason for not wishing to give evidence, which was that he did not wish to revisit the events of his daughter's death. The Panel insisted that it be made clear to Mr Hughes that if he attended to give evidence, the Panel's focus would solely be upon the source of CC Adderley's comments. Nevertheless, Mr Hughes, an available and competent witness, declined to give evidence.

5.57 The Panel carefully considered what Mr Hughes had to say about the origin of the remarks about CC Adderley's time in the Armed Forces and decided to give his version little weight, for the following reasons. There was evidently a long-standing bond of trust between the two men and the Panel concluded Mr Hughes' priority was loyalty to CC Adderley. What appears in the book is very clearly a direct quote, which is a continuous 19 lines long. Most of the quote is about the police response to the attack on the two officers, but at lines 9 to 13 the theme is interrupted by reference to CC Adderley's naval service. The Panel decided that the 19-line extract self-evidently came directly from CC Adderley as quoted speech.

The Medals

5.58 The focus of the AA's case was on the SAM. But as alleged in the Regulation 30 Notice, CC Adderley wore two medals which were not awarded to him. The second medal being the GSM(NI). The Panel had to decide whether he wore the medals in order to exaggerate his naval service and to give the false impression that

he had served in the Falklands War and Northern Ireland, or was it for the innocent reason he insisted upon. **[Paragraphs 13 – 16 of the Regulation 30 Notice]**.

5.59 It was not disputed that he wore the medals and the medal ribbons on his police tunic, and it was not disputed that he was never awarded the medals by the MOD. The GSM(NI) worn by CC Adderley was awarded to David Adderley, his younger brother, during his time in the army.

5.60 The medal, which was purported to be the SAM, and worn by CC Adderley, was given to him by his older brother Richard Adderley. The Panel was satisfied by the evidence of Mr Hayward, that the medal he examined was a copy. The Panel was satisfied that that medal was the same medal provided to the IOPC by CC Adderley. Unfortunately, the medal was lost of by the MOD Medal Office, but the Panel was satisfied, on the balance of probability, that the chain of evidential continuity was not broken. Although the personal details engraved on the medal were not recorded by Mr Hayward, he was able to say that the medal arrived in a police evidence bag that was marked in a way which suggested it came from Wakefield. The IO, Mr Collins, said his office is in Wakefield and he posted the medal to the MOD Medal Office in a police evidence bag.

5.61 But even without the expert opinion of Mr Hayward, the unchallenged evidence of Trisha Sherwood was that Richard Adderley had never been awarded a SAM and only became eligible for a SAM without rosette from 2015. Richard Adderley applied for a SAM on 12 October 2023, only 10 days after CC Adderley had been served with written notice that he was being investigated for alleged misconduct. Therefore, the SAM CC Adderley gave to the IOPC investigators cannot have been genuine.

5.62 It was suggested that CC Adderley did not know that the SAM was a copy. The Panel rejected that suggestion because it concluded that CC Adderley would surely have known that his brother Richard did not serve in the Falklands conflict. At the time of the Falklands War, CC Adderley was 15 and by his own account he was in the Sea Cadets. Furthermore, his father was ex-Royal Navy. The teenage Nick Adderley and his whole family would surely have had a keen interest in where Richard Adderley was serving at a time when the Royal Navy was engaged in a well reported war in the South Atlantic and was sadly losing ships and men. He would have known which ship or establishment his older brother was serving in and would therefore have known Richard was not involved in the conflict but arrived in the Falkland Islands shortly after it had ended.

5.63 If Richard Adderley came back from the Falkland Islands with a medal, believing it to be genuine, he would surely have shown it off to his family and to the young Nick Adderley in particular because of his interest in the navy.

5.64 It was also an undisputed fact that in 1985, Richard and Nick Adderley served in HMS Invincible together, and in the same division of seamen. The brothers would obviously have worn uniform in the time they served together, therefore CC Adderley's assertion that he had never seen the SAM before Richard gave to him years later was simply not credible. He never saw Richard wear the SAM because Richard was never awarded one.

5.65 When CC Adderley first wore the SAM, he knew it was not genuine. For that reason alone, his defence that he believed he was entitled to wear his brother's medal had to fail.

5.66 Richard Adderley was not a truthful witness. In his email to CC Adderley on 19 July he said that he first served in the South Atlantic in an aircraft carrier but was later seconded to a merchant vessel. That assertion was contradicted by the MOD whose records showed that he deployed to the South Atlantic in a merchant vessel. It is noteworthy that in his subsequent witness statement to the IOPC on 6 December 2023 he left out any mention of serving in an aircraft carrier. The Panel found it more likely than not that Richard Adderley's email of 19 July 2023 was "made to order" after CC Adderley's telephone conversation with Paul Fell on 17 July 2023, during which CC Adderley was said to have claimed that he served in the aircraft carrier HMS Hermes in the Falklands War. When asked to produce a formal witness statement, the former Queensland police officer changed his story.

5.67 Richard Adderley's reference to an air raid warning when he was in Port Stanley was, in the Panel's judgement, part of an attempt to prop up CC Adderley's efforts to retract the information provided to Paul Fell on 17 July 2023. Without further evidence on the point, and given the war had ended, what he described had to be a false alarm or an exercise. Its inclusion in Richard Adderley's statement was therefore designed to give the impression of being on active service.

5.68. To support his brother, Richard Adderley had to somehow account for the medal he gave to his brother, knowing it was not genuine. The Panel had no hesitation in rejecting his story about being presented with the medal only weeks after arriving in Port Stanley. Mr Hayward did not know when the SAM was first issued, but common-sense dictates that an operational award such as the SAM, and issued on behalf of the Crown, could not have been authorised, designed, approved and then issued in a matter of weeks. Because what Richard Adderley had in his possession was a copy of the SAM, it follows that it could not have been manufactured before the genuine article was issued.

5.69 Richard Adderley also asserted that he was only 17 when he was presented with the medal by his mates onboard MV Cedarbank. Yet he was in fact 18 or 19 at the time he was in the Falklands. It seemed very unlikely to the Panel, that as a former police officer, he would have been unable to include the correct age in a witness statement. The Panel concluded that this was an intentional error designed to give the impression of youthful naivety because Richard Adderley foresaw that his SAM would be revealed as a copy.

5.70 The Panel carefully considered CC Adderley's reasons for wearing the SAM and the GSM(NI), but when considered against a number of evidential strands, it did not stand up to scrutiny.

5.71 In simple terms, CC Adderley insisted that he genuinely believed he could wear his brothers' medals alongside his own and that Richard had done some research on the point and found it to be permissible. But in his witness statement of 6 December 2023, Richard Adderley said he had become aware of a protocol

allowing the wearing of medals by a relative on the right side of the chest, but he did not know that at the time he gave the medal to CC Adderley. The only logical conclusion to be drawn from this part of Richard Adderley's statement is that he did not do the research CC Adderley claimed he did at the time he gave him the medal. It follows that any discussion between the two brothers did not happen as CC Adderley said it did.

5.72 CC Adderley's reasons for wearing his brothers' medals is further undermined in precisely the way suggested by the IOPC in its interview with him. David Adderley was the recipient of two other operational awards besides the GSM(NI), namely the Gulf War Medal and the NATO FYM. In interview, CC Adderley said at the time the medals were gifted to him he had had some sort of discussion with his brothers along the lines of it being nice if he could wear one of David's medals alongside Rick's SAM. He said David did not offer him the Gulf War Medal and he was unaware of the NATO FYM. The IOPC put it to CC Adderley that the reason he wore the GSM(NI) only is that the other two medals, awarded for military operations in the 1990s, did not fit the naval legend created by him.

5.73 The Panel found the IOPC hypothesis to be the most credible. If a discussion had taken place between the three brothers about CC Adderley wearing his siblings' medals for the purpose of honouring their service and not to exaggerate his own, it seemed more likely that David Adderley would have given all three medals to his brother. Doing so would have been preferable to breaking up a set of medals in the Panel's judgement. The Panel was not convinced by CC Adderley's explanation and found it more likely there was an element of planning, in that he applied careful thought to which medals would match the myth he wished to create.

5.75 He repeatedly insisted that he had no intention to fool anyone, and as proof of this he repeatedly asserted the GSM(NI) was "an army medal", meaning it was only ever issued to army personnel. This was an attempt to plead the wearing of the medal was inconsistent with the false Royal Navy legend. However, during the proceedings, CC Adderley conceded the medal was issued to all three services.

5.76 On his behalf, it was argued that protocol regarding the wearing of relatives' medals applies only to members of the RBL, of which CC Adderley was not a member. But the Panel was satisfied that the RBL protocol reflects wider, long-standing convention. The RBL medal protocol document is clear about it following the guidance issued by Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood. The Panel found that the ordinary objective person, with little or no connection to the Armed Forces or other uniformed Services, would understand that medals are of great significance and personal value to the recipient, and would think it highly irregular to wear someone else's medals. The natural assumption being that in wearing them, the individual is making a false claim about entitlement, unless some clear indication is given to the contrary.

5.77 But CC Adderley and his brothers fall into a different category in the Panel's judgement, because they all served in the Armed Forces and must have had greater understanding and awareness of the significance of such awards and that they are personal to the wearer. The Panel found that any member or former member of the

uniformed services would find the act of combining one's own medals with someone else's as being highly irregular and an intentional deception.

5.78 By his own admission, CC Adderley remained a staunch supporter of the Armed Forces. It is more likely than not that he would have attended Remembrance Day services and parades or watched them on the television. It is more likely than not that he would have seen medals worn on the opposite side of the chest and would have come to understand the significance of such method of display, if he had not already learned of it when he was younger.

5.79 But the actual convention on wearing a relative's medals is more limited than what CC Adderley belatedly accepted. The convention or protocol allows the wearing of a deceased service person's or ex-service person's medals by a close relative. Of course, neither Richard nor David were deceased. The purpose of the protocol was clear to the Panel, which is to allow the deceased recipient's service to be honoured by a close relative after death. Richard and David Adderley were not prevented by death from doing so themselves. The practice of wearing another's medals is therefore strictly limited, and is only permitted when worn in such a way that makes it obvious they have not been earned by the wearer. CC Adderley gave no indication at all that the medals were not awarded to him by the Crown.

5.80 But CC Adderley's defence to the medal wearing was undermined further, because he did not confine himself to simply wearing the medals on formal occasions. On routine everyday occasions he wore the medal ribbons for the SAM and the GSM(NI) in combination with his own, on his tunic. The routine wearing of the medal ribbons was indicative of an intention to deceive others into thinking his service had been more impressive than it was.

5.81 The aforementioned evidence provided sufficient reasons for rejecting CC Adderley's defence of genuine ignorance or of not being bound by protocol. But as with his application to become Chief Constable and the media articles, the Panel could not put of mind other solid evidence of deception, such as the "Tango Juliet Foxtrot" podcast and his speech to the BSIA which together demonstrated the ease with which CC Adderley publicly lied to a wide audience, and it was this propensity which made his defence to the medal wearing even less credible.

Vetting

5.82 These allegations [at paragraphs 20 and 24 of the Regulation 30 Notice], were straightforward. Both contained errors regarding dates of CC Adderley's Royal Navy service. In his Developed Vetting (DV) he declared the dates as "Oct 1984 to Sept 1987", thereby extending his service 9-months. In his Management Vetting (MV) form he declared his service dates to be "Oct 81 to Nov 91", advancing his joining date by a full 3-years and delaying his leaving date by almost 5 years to give the false impression of having 10-years Royal Navy Service.

5.83 The MV form was completed on 2 February 2023. The Panel did not accept such an error was explainable by carelessness, because the importance of providing accurate information on vetting forms of any kind is surely common knowledge. This must be well understood by those with long service and higher rank, who will have

more experience of providing such information during their careers. At the time he completed this form CC Adderley had been in post as Chief Constable for over 4 years and would have been in no doubt about the requirement to be scrupulously accurate when completing it. But he had already nailed his colours to the mast almost 5 years earlier, in his CV, by making the false claim about the length of his Royal Navy service. The dates in the MV form did not exactly match those in his CV (“Oct 81 to Nov 91” instead of “2/81 – 2/92”), but the Panel found this was an intentional perpetuation of the same false claim and not a slip.

5.84 In his earlier DV form, the error was not so significant as in the MV form, but it was significant enough not to have been caused by innocent mistake. CC Adderley would surely have known the year and month in which his time in the navy ended. On the evidence, the Panel could not determine CC Adderley’s motive to a high degree of probability, but concluded he rounded up his service to almost 3 years to disguise the fact he was prematurely discharged.

Paul Fell

5.85 The Panel had to decide whose recollection of the telephone conversation between Paul Fell and CC Adderley was correct [**Allegation at paragraph 25 of the Regulation 30 Notice**].

5.86 The two accounts of what was said were quite different and the Panel concluded only one could be the true account. The Panel preferred Paul Fell’s account over that of CC Adderley for the following reasons.

5.87 CC Adderley said the call was hampered by poor reception, yet Paul Fell disagreed and said the quality of the call at his end was clear and unbroken. The conversation on both accounts was not momentary but involved an exchange of questions and answers. This tended to suggest the sound quality of the call was not poor at all because CC Adderley was aware of the reason why Mr Fell was making the call, which was the complaint by his ex-wife. It was evidently a serious matter which required CC Adderley’s careful attention. If the quality of the call was as bad as CC Adderley asserted, one would have expected him to point it out to Mr Fell and to have suggested making a call from a different location or from a landline, yet he carried on with the telephone conversation.

5.88 CC Adderley’s note records that Mr Fell asked him several questions. The sound quality cannot therefore have been as poor as claimed if he heard the questions asked. CC Adderley also recorded the reason given by Mr Fell for the call in the note.

5.89 Paul Fell also made a detailed note of what was said, on the same day. That note records what CC Adderley told him about serving in the Falklands War in HMS Hermes. Mr Fell was adamant that CC Adderley made no mention of his brother Rick at all.

5.90 The two notes of the conversation were inconsistent on the very significant point raised in CC Adderley’s defence, which was that he was referring to his brother Rick and not to himself. CC Adderley’s note simply did not ring true to the Panel

because it accurately recorded the non-contentious parts of the conversation when those which incriminated him were radically different to those recorded by Mr Fell. When deciding who to believe on this point, the Panel took account CC Adderley's propensity to lie, which was established elsewhere by the evidence, and therefore the Panel concluded his note of the conversation was false and created with a misconduct investigation in mind.

Adverse Inferences

5.91 Mr Beggs KC invited the Panel to draw adverse inferences against CC Adderley because of his refusal to give evidence to the Panel. Mr Holdcroft argued against the drawing of adverse inferences on the basis CC Adderley elected to remain silent at the hearing on legal advice. The Chair advised the Panel that legal advice to remain silent cannot by itself prevent adverse inferences from being drawn. Such advice is a very relevant factor when deciding if it is reasonable for an accused officer in misconduct proceedings to refuse to give evidence. In this instance it was contended that because the possibility of prosecution still hung over CC Adderley, he was in fear of self-incrimination. However, the Panel rejected that as reasonable justification for not drawing adverse inferences, because CC Adderley had already provided a fulsome account of his own, in IOPC interview and in his written responses to the allegations, which one could reasonably expect him to repeat before a jury.

5.92 Notwithstanding its decision that the drawing of adverse inferences was permissible in the circumstances, the Panel chose not to draw such inferences because the strength of the evidence against CC Adderley, on each allegation, was so overwhelming that adverse inferences from his silence at the hearing would add nothing of weight.

The Allegations

5.93 For the aforementioned reasons, the Panel found all of the allegations set out in the Regulation 30 Notice to be proved.

5.94 In his pronouncement of the Panel's findings on 21 June 2024, the Chair erroneously referred to the allegations as being set out at paragraphs 6 to 25 of the Regulation 30 Notice, under five different headings. But Mr Beggs KC was correct in stating that the allegations fell under six separate headings, and the allegations were in fact set out at paragraphs 4 to 25.

6. PANEL DECISION ON THE SPB & GROSS MISCONDUCT

The SPB

6.1 The Panel was satisfied that taken individually and collectively, the proven factual allegations breached both limbs of the SPB relating to Honesty and Integrity. The Panel directed itself on the correct test for dishonesty which was laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of Ivey v Genting Casinos [2018] AC 391.

6.2 By lying about his service in the Royal Navy, verbally and in writing, by allowing such lies to be published, and by wearing others' operational service medals intending to cause others to believe he had earned them, was certainly dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. It follows that such acts of dishonesty also amount to a serious lack of integrity.

6.3 The Panel also found that such dishonesty and lack of integrity by a police officer, especially a Chief Constable, must amount to Discreditable Conduct.

Level of Misconduct

6.4 The Panel found that such breaches must amount to misconduct so serious that dismissal could be justified and is therefore gross misconduct.

7. PANEL DETERMINATION OF OUTCOME AND REASONS

7.1 Having made its determination on the facts of the case and on finding gross misconduct, the hearing moved to deal with outcome.

7.2 Mr Beggs KC provided written submissions on outcome for the AA. In short, it was contended that dismissal without notice was the only rational outcome on the Panel's findings. Mr Holdcroft, on behalf of the absent CC Adderley, agreed with Mr Beggs KC.

7.3 Mr Holdcroft read out a statement on behalf of CC Adderley, which included an apology to service personnel and veterans for his wearing of the medals. However, the apology was not a full and frank apology for his wrongdoing. It was based on his own case, of mistaken belief in an entitlement to wear the medals, which the Panel had resoundingly rejected.

7.4 The Panel was also provided with numerous character references for CC Adderley.

7.5 The Panel adjourned to decide outcome, and in doing so it followed the 3-stage approach laid down in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes. The Panel reminded itself that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect, therefore it should be no more than is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings. It reminded itself that it must consider less severe outcomes first before considering more severe outcomes, always choosing the least severe outcome which deals adequately with the issues identified, whilst protecting the public interest. The Panel understood that if an outcome is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings, it must impose it even where this would lead to difficulties for the individual officer or former officer.

7.6 The Panel followed the three-stage approach as follows:

Stage 1: Assess Seriousness.

Stage 2: Remind itself of the purpose of the Police Misconduct regime.

Stage 3: Determine the sanction most appropriate to the purpose.

Seriousness

7.7 The Panel accepted that any case of gross misconduct which comes before a police misconduct hearing is to be considered a serious matter. But the Panel was reminded that its function is to decide *how* serious the gross misconduct was in this case.

7.8 The Panel assessed the level of seriousness by following the four-phase approach as laid down in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes.

Phase 1: Assess Culpability.

Phase 2: Assess Harm.

Phase 3: Consider Aggravating Factors.

Phase 4: Consider Mitigating Factors.

Culpability

7.9 Culpability was determined by considering the non-exhaustive list of culpability sub-factors in the Guidance on Outcomes and any others it deemed to be relevant.

7.10 The Panel was satisfied that CC Adderley intentionally and deliberately lied about and exaggerated his service in the Royal Navy for the purpose of personal aggrandisement.

7.11 As someone with personal experience of the Armed Forces, and from a “forces family”, CC Adderley possessed the insight to know what he was doing was reprehensible and would cause deep offence to service personnel, veterans or their relatives. He must also have foreseen the damage his behaviour would do to the reputation of the Police Service if discovered, yet he repeated his misconduct many times over a period of perhaps 15 years, embellishing a false legend as he went.

7.12 The false legend about serving in the Royal Navy as an officer, for 10 or 11 years as an officer, and having seen active service in the Falklands War, Northern Ireland and Haiti, was for the purpose of enhancing his public image. However, the Panel found that by lying about his Royal Navy service in his application form to become the Chief Constable of Northamptonshire, he did so for more than reasons of self-aggrandisement. He included lies in his application form for the purpose of securing promotion, with brought with it enhanced status, authority and financial gain. It mattered not that those who recruited him placed little or no weight on his past naval service: the fact he included it so prominently in his CV and Supporting Statement demonstrate his dishonest intent to influence the reader.

7.13 One of the most shocking examples of CC Adderley's deception was the way in which he turned requests to comment in two books about the murder of PC Fiona Bone and PC Nicola Hughes to his own advantage. The Panel felt its condemnation of this particular behaviour had to be announced, but it took care not to allow this particular example to influence its assessment of seriousness because it did not form part of the AA's allegations.

7.14 The way in which CC Adderley developed his false legend over time revealed a significant degree of planning. He went to the trouble of having his brothers' medals court mounted along with his own, and similarly had a combined medal ribbon bar made for himself. He must have planned what he was going to say to the BSIA and to the authors of the various media articles, and what he said about himself in his CV and Supporting statement must have taken considerable thought.

7.15 The Panel found that CC Adderley's conduct amounted to serious breaches of that trust and responsibility which were generally bestowed upon police officers, because of his senior leadership position in command of an entire county police force.

7.16 The Panel determined culpability by considering a spectrum of blameworthiness which it articulated as **low**, **medium** or **high**.

7.17 Having considered the above factors, the Panel decided that CC Adderley's culpability was best described as **high**.

Harm

7.18 The Panel referred itself to the harm factors suggested in the Guidance.

7.19 The Panel found that reputational harm to the Police Service was bound to be substantial and long-lasting, especially because of recent and ongoing public concerns about the police and failures in vetting processes.

7.20 For the above reason the Panel found that harm in this case was best described as **Very High**.

Seriousness Starting Point.

7.21 Having assessed culpability and harm, the Panel decided that the seriousness starting point was at the **High/Very High** level.

Aggravating Factors

7.22 There were multiple proven allegations against CC Adderley, his misconduct was regular and repeated, and it continued for a long time after he knew or should have known his behaviour was improper.

Mitigating Factors

7.23 The Panel found no mitigating factors to CC Adderley's misconduct. The Panel was not persuaded by his statement of apology, which did not acknowledge the true nature and extent of his wrongdoing. The Panel recognised his entitlement to advance a positive defence but could not give him any credit for genuine remorse or insight because his limited apology was based on mistake and not premeditated misconduct, which is what it was.

Overall Assessment of Seriousness

7.24 Having identified several aggravating factors and no mitigating factors, the Panel decided that its seriousness Starting Point had to be elevated from **High/Very High** to **Very High**.

The Purpose

7.25 Having assessed seriousness as **Very High**, the Panel reminded itself of the purpose of the police misconduct regime before deciding on the appropriate sanction. The threefold purpose is as follows:

- Maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the Police Service.
- Upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct.
- Protecting the public.

Deciding Outcome

7.26 As required by the Guidance on Outcomes, the Panel moved to the third stage of the sanction process by considering the least serious outcome available to it that would meet the threefold purpose of the misconduct regime.

7.27 The least serious sanction available was a Final Written Warning and the Panel considered if this would have been the sanction that satisfied the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

7.28 The Panel decided that a Final Written Warning would not meet the purpose of the misconduct regime on the proven facts of this case.

7.29 The Panel also concluded that Reduction in Rank, even to the rank of Police Constable, would not satisfy the purpose because the public would deeply disapprove of such behaviour if committed by any rank within the Police Service. This then left dismissal as the only outcome.

7.30 In this case, the Panel concluded that anything less than dismissal would seriously undermine public confidence in the police and would not act as a deterrent to others.

Personal Mitigation

7.31 The Panel took into account the many character references produced on CC Adderley's behalf. But it decided that those references, which spoke highly of his contribution to policing, could be given only negligible weight in such a very serious case of dishonesty and lack of integrity by a senior officer.

7.32 For the above reasons the Panel found that CC Adderley must be dismissed without notice.

7.33 CC Adderley will be placed on the Police Barred List.

Mr Callum Cowx – LQC

His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary and His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Fire & Rescue Services, Andy Cooke QPM DL – PPM

Mr James Maund – IPM

2 July 2024