

Investigation Report

**Redacted report of
the independent investigation
into allegations against
former Dyfed-Powys Police
Chief Constable Terence Grange**

COMPLAINT

On 23 October 2007, IPCC Commissioner Mr Tom Davies received a written submission from Ms A detailing a number of allegations against the then Dyfed-Powys Police Chief Constable, Mr Terence Grange, and his wife. The allegation against Mrs Grange was not a matter for the IPCC and we advised Ms A accordingly.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In the document Ms A alleged that between November 2006 and 30 August 2007 she had a relationship with Mr Grange, where they would spend the best part of each week together in either London or Carmarthen.

Ms A alleged that she accompanied Mr Grange to official police functions and that she would stay with him at a hotel in London. She alleged that Mr Grange would stretch out his meetings in London to facilitate seeing her. Ms A also alleged that she shared evening dinners with Mr Grange which he claimed back from Dyfed-Powys Police as business expenses.

She made a more specific claim that on 14 August 2007 Mr Grange spent the afternoon in London with her rather than attend an official business meeting that he was in London for. She claimed that the Police Authority paid his rail fare.

Ms A also made reference to email correspondence between the two of them which she described as ranging from being politically insensitive to sexually explicit.

Ms A has refused to make any form of official complaint against Mr Grange and has refused to make a witness statement regarding her allegations. Ms A was able to provide an IPCC investigator with details of times, dates and locations of meetings and copies of the email correspondence. She provided the IPCC with copies of what she describes as "politically sensitive emails" from Mr Grange.

BRIEF PARTICULARS OF COMPLAINT/ALLEGATIONS BEING CONSIDERED

Criminal offences of Misconduct in Public Office and obtaining monies by deception

Although Mr Grange has now retired from his post as chief constable, and is therefore no longer subject to the police misconduct regulations, this report will also comment on the allegations made against him under the misconduct regulations, namely:

- Misuse of the force computer system.
- Use of the force computer system likely to bring discredit on the force.
- Expense claims in respect of Ms A.
- Failing to attend official business meetings to spend duty time with Ms A.

IPCC DECISION ON HOW CASE SHOULD BE PROGRESSED

The IPCC forwarded the written document from Ms A to Dyfed-Powys Police

Authority, which is the appropriate authority under the Police Reform Act for the chief constable.

The Police Authority referred the matter back to IPCC Commissioner Tom Davies as a mandatory conduct referral on 30 October 2007. He decided that an independent investigation would be undertaken by IPCC investigators.

OFFICER SUBJECT TO COMPLAINT

Ex-Chief Constable Terence Grange.

INVESTIGATING OFFICER

Wales and South West Senior Investigator Paul Davies.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

To investigate the Dyfed-Powys Police Authority referral into the conduct of Chief Constable Terence Grange as follows:

- That inappropriate use was made of the Dyfed-Powys Police computer system to send inappropriate emails to Ms A.
- That expense claims were made in respect of meals, accommodation and transport in relation to Ms A who accompanied the chief constable on a number of official business meetings.
- That the chief constable failed to attend official police business meetings in order to spend duty time with Ms A.

To consider and report on whether any criminal or disciplinary offence may have been committed by any police officer or member of police staff involved in the incident, and whether relevant local and national policies/guidelines were complied with.

To consider and report on whether there is any:

- Learning for any individual police officer or member of police staff; or
- Organisational learning for the police service including:
 - Whether any change in police policy or practice would help to prevent a recurrence of the event, incident or conduct investigated.
 - Whether the incident highlights any good practice that should be disseminated.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

At 9.50am on 8 November 2007 IPCC Senior Investigator Paul Davies and Deputy Senior Investigator Stuart Lancaster saw Chief Constable Grange in his office, and served him with a Regulation 9 Police Misconduct notice in respect of the allegations contained in Ms A's written allegations. The Notice detailed four main areas:

1. That he used the force computer system to send inappropriate emails to Ms A.
2. The inappropriate emails were likely to bring discredit to the police force.
3. That he made a number of official business expense claims for meals, accommodation and transport in respect of Ms A with whom he was undertaking a relationship and who accompanied him on a number of official police functions.
4. That he failed to attend official business meetings in order to spend duty time with Ms A, with whom it is alleged he was having a relationship.

The Regulation 9 Notice detailed that items 3 and 4 could lead to criminal liability.

At the same time the Notice was served, Mr Grange stated he had an affair with Ms A and expressed his intention to resign. Following formal caution he replied: "I don't believe I have spent any of my force funds on Miss A, I had an affair with her, its over."

Consideration was given to appropriate welfare support for Mr Grange and the deputy chief constable was fully briefed following the IPCC unannounced visit to see the chief constable.

On the same day, Mr Grange's laptop computer was seized by the IPCC in order to allow an examination of the hard drive. In addition, IPCC investigators obtained Mr Grange's Barclaycard receipts and his police force expense claims for the period in question, from November 2006 until August 2007. A download of the force computer server for email traffic between Mr Grange and Ms A was undertaken, and printouts from Mr Grange's on-line diary were obtained.

A preliminary investigation was undertaken by the IPCC to corroborate or disprove the allegations made by Ms A. It was quickly established that the allegations in respect of the computer misuse and inappropriate emails were substantiated.

It was also established when Mr Grange was in London to attend a VISOR National Implementation Project Board on 14 August 2007, he did not attend this meeting as alleged by Ms A.

A preliminary examination of his expense claims highlighted issues of concern.

On 14 March 2007 there was a restaurant receipt for a restaurant in London. This is a date Ms A claims she was in London with Mr Grange. The bill for two meals and drinks amounts to £50.10 which was paid by Mr Grange using his corporate Barclaycard. With the Barclaycard bill Mr Grange submitted a personal cheque for £25.60.

However, on his personal expenses claim for the same day he also claimed £24.50 for an evening meal. No receipt was submitted for this claim which is endorsed NV - non-vatable. It would therefore appear that the cost to the force for this meal is £24.50 for the original Barclaycard transaction (£50.10 - £25.60 cheque = £24.50) plus £24.50 expenses claim, a total cost of £49.00.

On 28 March 2007 there is a restaurant receipt for a restaurant in London - again this is a date Ms A claims she was in London with Mr Grange. The receipt states one meal and drinks and amounts to £36.80, which is paid by Mr Grange with his corporate Barclaycard. With the Barclaycard bill Mr Grange submitted a personal cheque for £15.80.

However, Mr Grange claimed £21 for an evening meal on his personal expense claim for the same day. Again, this is not receipted and is endorsed NV It would therefore appear that the cost to the force for this meal is £21 for the original Barclaycard transaction (£36.80 - £15.80 cheque = £21) plus £21 expense claim, a total cost of £42.

These matters were reported to Dyfed-Powys Police Authority on 15 November 2007.

On 19 November 2007 Mr Grange submitted notice of his intention to retire from his post and this was agreed by the emergency committee of the Police Authority.

As a result of the apparent irregularities in Mr Grange's expense claims, accountants from the Wales Audit office undertook a review of all his expense claims from November 2006 to August 2007. The Wales Audit Office has provided a report on the findings and has highlighted in **table 1** the following irregularities which required further investigation.

Table 1 provided by Wales Audit Office

| Date | Barclaycard statements | Expense Claim | Receipts and vouchers | Comments |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Tuesday 27 February 2007 | Restaurant – total bill £56.50 Barclaycard statement dated 18 March 2007 | TG submitted personal expense claim of £24.88 Narrative includes reference to total bill of £56.50 Expenses claim form dated 12 March 2007 | Receipt present with expense claim for restaurant. Biro annotations on receipt. Covers two persons and includes two glasses of red wine. | £56.50 has been paid by the force for meal In addition TG has claimed £24.88 |
| Wednesday 14 March 2007 | restaurant – total bill £50.10 Barclaycard statement dated 18 March 2007 | TG submitted personal expense | Receipt present with Barclaycard statement | £50.10 has been paid by force for meal TG submitted |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | Statement annotated with a reference to a cheque received for £25.60 | claim of £24.50 Expenses claim form dated 2 April 2007 | Biro annotations on receipt with items totalling £24.50 Covers two persons | a personal cheque for £25.60 TG then submitted claim for £24.50 |
| Wednesday 28 March 2007 | restaurant – total bill £36.80 Barclaycard statement dated 17 April 2007 Statement annotated with a reference to a cheque received for £15.80 | TG submitted personal expense claim of £21. Expenses claim form dated 2 nd April 2007 | Receipt present with Barclaycard statement. Covers two persons Cost of wine and service totalling £15.80 | £36.80 paid by force for meal TG submitted a personal cheque for £15.80 TG then submitted claim for £21 |
| Wednesday 18 April 2007 | restaurant – total bill £32.45 Barclaycard statement dated 17 May 2007 | No claim for evening meal made on expense claim form dated 4 May 2007 | Receipt present with Barclaycard statement Biro annotations on receipt totalling £22.95 Covers two persons | £32.45 paid by force for meal No expense claim for evening meal TG submitted cheque for £46.40 to cover cost of two meals Cheque processed by Finance |
| Date | Barclaycard statements | Expense Claim | Receipts and vouchers | Comments |
| Monday 23 April 2007 | restaurant – total bill £58.73 Barclaycard statement dated 17 May 2007 | No related expense claim submitted | Receipt present with Barclaycard statement Biro annotations on receipt totalling £21.28 Covers two persons | £58.73 paid by force for meal No expense claim submitted for evening meal TG submitted cheque for £46.40 to cover cost of two meals |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | Cheque processed by Finance |
| Monday 2 July 2007 | restaurant – total bill £47.96 Barclaycard statement dated 17 July 2007 | No related expense claim submitted on claim form dated 9 July 2007 Annotation on claim form stating cheque for £30 attached to cover expenses | Receipt present with Barclaycard statement Biro annotations on receipt totalling £26.90 Covers two persons | £47.96 paid by force for meal No expense claim submitted for evening meal TG claimed to have submitted cheque for £30.00 to cover cost of two meals Cheque not received by Finance |
| Thursday 5 July 2007 | restaurant – total bill £31.20 Barclaycard statement dated 17 July 2007 | No related expense claim submitted on claim form dated 9 July 2007 Annotation on claim form stating cheque for £30 attached to cover expenses | Receipt present with Barclaycard statement Biro annotations on receipt Covers two persons | £31.20 paid by force for meal No expense claim submitted for evening meal TG claimed to have submitted cheque for £30.00 to cover cost of two meals Cheque not received by Finance |

| Date | Barclaycard statements | Expense Claim | Receipts and vouchers | Comments |
|------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--|--|
| Thursday 21 July 2007 | Barclaycard statement of Mr X for a florists in Lichfield for £40 | No related expense claim | Compliments slip submitted by Mr X | It would appear that a wreath was purchased for the National Memorial Arboretum in Staffordshire. |
| Tuesday 14 August 2007 | | No expense claim submitted | Receipt from Finance Department apparently signed by Mr Y acknowledging receipt for £79 in respect of train travel | Initial train travel booked by member of staff for travel to London. Time of travel amended by Mr Grange on day of travel which incurred additional expenditure. Personal cheque for £79 submitted by Mr Grange on 31 August 2007 Cheque appears not to have been processed by Finance Despite receipt provided to Mr Grange |

Early consultation was also made by the IPCC with the Crown Prosecution Service, who were briefed on the provisional findings and offered advice and guidance for the investigation.

A number of witnesses have been seen in the course of the investigation and it has been established that on 10 November 2005 Mr Grange was issued with a Dyfed-Powys Police Barclaycard. Mr Grange signed for the card and for the Terms and Conditions for its use. The finance controller details how the card holder should submit each transaction receipt from the Barclaycard transaction to the finance department, who then match up the receipt to the relevant Barclaycard bill and process them for payment. The conditions for use of the corporate Barclaycard state that it must only be used in relation to official expenditure and excludes the purchase of alcohol.

In addition in her statements the finance controller describes how expenses incurred by officers in Dyfed-Powys Police are reimbursed; officers have to submit an expense claim form attaching original receipts and have this signed by a supervising officer. Police force policy details this.

Statements have also been obtained from the members of staff working closest to Mr Grange. His personal assistant describes how she would arrange appointments and book hotels and transport for Mr Grange. She claims that she had no knowledge of Ms A. In addition Mr Grange's staff officer and Mr Grange's driver describe having no knowledge of Ms A.

On 1 February 2008 Mr Grange was interviewed under caution, in the presence of his solicitor, by two IPCC investigators at the IPCC Wales and South West offices in Cardiff. Mr Grange was interviewed with regard to allegations of misconduct in a public office and offences against the Fraud Act 2006 in respect of his expense claims. Only the matters relating to potential criminal offences could be put to Mr Grange, who was no longer subject to the Police Misconduct Regulations.

During interview Mr Grange admitted to having an affair with Ms A between the end of November 2006 and August 2007. He conceded that she had accompanied him to three or four work functions. He also took her to dinner and paid for the meals using his corporate credit card. He stated that upon receipt of the Barclaycard credit card bill he separated her part of the bill from his and paid for it separately by means of a personal cheque. He also admitted that she had stayed with him overnight at hotels paid for by Dyfed-Powys Police, but he also stated that he checked that this did not incur any additional expense, and if there had been additional expense then he would have paid it.

The IPCC has made enquiries with a number of hotels in London, since Ms A has made claims she stayed overnight with Mr Grange at these locations. It has been established that no additional expenditure would be required in respect of a guest staying in the same room - the hotel's fees are based on two people sharing the room. In addition, any expenses incurred during the hotel stay such as telephone bills or mini bar items, was paid for during the checking out procedure using personal monies.

EXPENSE CLAIMS

The nature of these allegations is the claiming of meals, including alcoholic beverages, for two persons, when there was only entitlement for one person. The Dyfed-Powys Police corporate credit card agreement stipulates that the force credit card is not permitted to be used to purchase alcohol. Following examination of Mr Grange's expense claims the following anomalies have been highlighted.

Expense claim 1

On 27 February 2007 a receipt was submitted by Mr Grange for a restaurant bill for £56.50 on his force expense claim form. The meal would appear to be for two people and alcoholic beverages had been purchased. The total restaurant bill was paid for using Mr Grange's corporate Barclaycard. The Barclaycard statement was dated 18 March 2007. This is also a date when Ms A claims to be with Mr Grange in London.

There is an associated personal expense claim for £24.88 on his Dyfed-Powys Police expense claim form dated 12 March 2007. This form appears to have been signed, certified correct and approved by the Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) Barry Taylor.

During interview, Mr Grange conceded that the meal was for two people and that the second person present may have been Ms A. He also conceded that two glasses of red wine had been purchased. He agreed that the receipt for the meal was not attached to the Barclaycard bill, and had instead been attached to his personal expenses claim form. He also admitted that the writing on the restaurant receipt was his, as he said that he was trying to work out what he owed Dyfed-Powys Police. He then admitted submitting a personal expenses claim for £24.88 for the meal. He stated that he intended to pay for Ms A's part of the bill, and instead of paying the amount of £24.88 he mistakenly claimed it since he wasn't paying attention when he was completing the form.

This resulted in Mr Grange having his restaurant bill paid for by the force using his force credit card and also resulted in him receiving £24.88 for his personal expenses.

Expense claim 2

On 14 March 2007 there is a restaurant receipt for a restaurant in London. This is a date when Ms A claims to be with Mr Grange in London. The receipt is for two meals and amounts to £50.10, which was paid by Mr Grange using his corporate credit card. The receipt for the restaurant was attached to the Barclaycard statement. In addition, the statement, dated 18 March 2007, is annotated with reference to a personal cheque received for £25.60. It is believed that the finance department made this annotation.

However, on his personal expenses claim form for the same time period, dated 2 April 2007, Mr Grange has claimed £24.50 for an evening meal. No receipt was submitted for this claim and again it appears to have been certified correct by DCC Taylor.

During interview, Mr Grange agreed that he had written on the receipt in an attempt to split the bill and that he had paid for the meal using his corporate Barclaycard. He believed that he had been with Ms A on this occasion. He also agreed that he had

submitted a personal cheque for £25.60 to cover Ms A's part of the bill but had later mistakenly submitted a personal expense claim for £24.50 for the meal. He claimed that he had entered the relevant amount in the wrong text box on the claim form and had meant to submit it as a payment rather than a claim.

However, further enquires conducted by the IPCC within the finance department demonstrated that this is the incorrect usage of this form which is a *claim* form and not intended for recording the submission of personal expenses. The explanation provided by Mr Grange for these mistakes is unconvincing and lacks credibility.

It would therefore appear that the cost to the force for this meal was £24.50 for the original Barclaycard transaction ($£50.10 - £25.60 = £24.50$), plus the £24.50 expenses claim submitted by Mr Grange, which results in a total cost of £49.

Expense claim 3

On 28 March 2007 there is a restaurant receipt for a restaurant in London, which is attached to Mr Grange's Barclaycard statement. This is also a date when Ms A alleges that she was with him. The receipt states that a meal was consumed to the value of £36.80, which was paid by Mr Grange with his corporate credit card.

Mr Grange submitted a personal cheque for £15.80 with his Barclaycard bill which is dated 17 April 2007. This is annotated on the statement by a member of the finance department. However, on his personal expense claim for the same period, dated 2 April 2007, Mr Grange has claimed £21 for an evening meal. It has been certified correct by DCC Taylor.

During interview, Mr Grange conceded that the restaurant bill was for two people, although he was unable to confirm the identity of his companion. He agreed that he had submitted a personal cheque for £15.80 which he intended to cover part of the restaurant bill. However, he also submitted a personal claim for £21. He claimed to have submitted the claim in error by mistakenly entering the wrong figures into the wrong box on the claim form. He intended to highlight the fact that he had submitted a personal cheque rather than submit a claim. Again, this is an unconvincing explanation provided by Mr Grange.

In summary, it would appear that the cost to the force for this meal is £21 for the original Barclaycard transaction ($£36.80 - £15.80 = £21$) plus a £21 expense claim submitted by Mr Grange, which results in an overall cost of £42.

Expense claims 4 & 5

On 18 April 2007 there is an entry on Mr Grange's Barclaycard statement for £32.45 for a restaurant. The Barclaycard statement is dated 17 May 2007. There was a receipt attached to the statement for the restaurant supporting a meal for two persons, including the purchase of alcohol. There are items annotated on the receipt totalling £22.95 which appear to be ones not eligible for reimbursement from Dyfed-Powys Police. Mr Grange did not submit a personal expense claim for this meal.

On 23 April 2007 there is a restaurant receipt for £58.73 and £21.28 is marked on the receipt in pen, together with a bottle of white wine at £27.50. The meal was paid for using his corporate Barclaycard and is listed on the statement dated 17 May

2007. Mr Grange did not submit a personal expense claim for this meal.

During interview, Mr Grange conceded that the annotations on both of the above receipts were his. He claimed that he had submitted a personal cheque for £46.40, which he claimed covered the additional cost of an extra person at the two restaurants. There was no reference to this personal cheque on the Barclaycard bill or personal expense claim forms for the relevant time period in the paperwork seized by IPCC investigators. However, during the interview Mr Grange produced a copy of his personal expense claim form dated 4 May 2007, which included a note making reference to the personal cheque for the same amount. Both copies of the claim form had been signed by DCC Taylor.

As a result of the IPCC investigation it would appear that a personal cheque for £46.40 had been received and submitted to the finance department on 18 May 2007. This is verified by documentation from Dyfed-Powys Police. Therefore, since the force has processed the personal cheque no additional expenditure has been incurred by Mr Grange on this occasion.

Expense 6 & 7

The Barclaycard statement for Mr Grange dated 17 July 2007 includes a restaurant bill, including alcohol, for £47.96 for 2 July 2007. There is not an associated claim for this restaurant on his personal expense claim form for this time period, although there is a note from Mr Grange on the claim form stating that a cheque for £30 was attached to cover expenses for 2 and 5 July. The claim form has not been counter-signed.

The Barclaycard statement dated 17 July 2007 also contains an entry for a restaurant for £31.20 on 5 July 2007. The restaurant receipt had been marked, with the alcoholic beverage being circled. There is not an associated claim for this restaurant on Mr Grange's claim form, although as outlined above there is a note making reference to a cheque for £30. It is not clear who made this annotation.

During interview, Mr Grange conceded that the restaurant receipts were for two people, with the other person probably being Ms A. He agreed that the notes on the receipts were his workings out. He claimed to have submitted a personal cheque for £30 to cover the items that he was not entitled to claim at the two restaurants. However, it was put to Mr Grange that the finance department did not appear to have processed the cheque, despite a note on his personal expenses claim form making reference to a personal cheque for £30. Mr Grange was unable to explain why the finance department had not processed the cheque since he claimed to have attached the cheque to the expense claim form prior to submitting it. He could only assume that they had mislaid the cheque.

Therefore the cost to Dyfed-Powys Police on this occasion amounted to £30.

In relation to his expense claims Mr Grange has stated that he has made a number of mistakes, referring to making "a right pig's of them." He stated that he used the corporate Barclaycard instead of his personal credit card because it saved him from scrutinising restaurant receipts when the writing was too small and indistinct in order to work out what he owed. He acknowledged that he received the monies from

Dyfed-Powys Police by way of payment into his personal bank account.

Expense 8

On 21 July 2007 the Barclaycard statement for Mr X includes a transaction for a florist in Lichfield for £40. Following inquiries by IPCC investigators it would appear that this transaction refers to a wreath purchased on behalf of Dyfed-Powys Police for the National Memorial Arboretum in Staffordshire.

OTHER ISSUES

The IPCC investigation also examined Mr Grange's work commitments for the set time period between November 2006 and August 2007 in order to identify any meetings or official engagements that he failed to attend in order to spend duty time with Ms A. As a result two instances were highlighted when the chief constable failed to attend work commitments in London and these are outlined as follows.

VISOR National Implementation Project Board meeting

In her initial correspondence Ms A made reference to a specific date when Mr Grange failed to attend an official function in London and spent the afternoon with her instead. This was on the afternoon of 14 August 2007 when Mr Grange was scheduled to attend the VISOR National Implementation Project Board meeting. The meeting was due to commence at 2pm at Cleland House in London. Examination of Mr Grange's paper diary for 14 August 2007 revealed a paper note attached to the diary outlining train times between Bristol Parkway and London Paddington.

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 10.01 Bristol Parkway | 11:27 Paddington |
| 15:45 Paddington | 17:07 Bristol Parkway |

The original booking for the train travel was made by a member of his immediate staff. In addition, a statement was obtained from the individual who was the minute taker of the relevant meeting and the minutes obtained both of which corroborate his non-attendance.

During interview, Mr Grange disclosed that he realised that the original train booking for this date would not have enabled him to attend the entire meeting and so he changed the original booking on the morning of his intended travel. As a result he incurred an additional cost of £41 in addition to the original cost of the train tickets (£38).

Following questioning during interview Mr Grange stated that he did not attend the meeting despite travelling to London specifically for the meeting. He claimed to have met Ms A for lunch prior to the VISOR meeting which resulted in them having some personal issues to discuss. This resulted in him not attending the VISOR meeting. He also did not send apologies. It would therefore appear that Mr Grange should have attended the VISOR National Implementation Project Board meeting as part of his official duties but did not attend, and consequently incurred salary and rail costs.

Upon his return to Carmarthen he claimed to have told his PA, to mark it down as one day's annual leave. Following further investigation by the IPCC it would appear that Mr Grange does not retain a record of his annual leave.

Mr Grange claimed to have submitted a personal cheque for £79 in order to cover his travel costs. He then claimed to have given the relevant expense form to his PA to put through the system. However, following the receipt of the Regulation 9 notice he realised that this expense form had not been submitted, and consequently requested his PA to hand it over to the head of professional standards for Dyfed-Powys Police. Mr Grange was questioned why the expense form had not been counter-signed. He stated that he had handed it to his PA and he believed that she was trying to protect him by not submitting the claim form.

He further claimed that his cheque for £79 was cashed by the force on 4 September 2007. He had checked this because he was wary of the “complete falling out and threats” that he had received from Ms A since the conclusion of their relationship. He then made reference to an acknowledgement receipt which appeared to be signed by a member of the finance department. It was date stamped 30 August and was for £79.

IMPACT INI/CRISP Project Board / National IMPACT Forum

The other instance where Mr Grange failed to attend a meeting and spent duty time with Ms A was on 24 January 2007 when Mr Grange attended a meeting for the IMPACT INI/CRISP Project Board in the afternoon in London. The meeting was due to commence at 2pm with Mr Grange chairing the meeting. However there was an associated meeting on the morning of 24 January for the National IMPACT Forum which Mr Grange also did not attend.

It would appear that the chief constable travelled down from Llandudno, North Wales to London the night before his afternoon meeting. He stayed overnight in London.

As part of the investigation an IPCC investigator obtained a statement from the secretary for the IMPACT INI/CRISP Project Board and National IMPACT Forum meetings. In her statement she stated that she expected Mr Grange to attend both of the meetings and she endeavoured to arrange the meetings on the same day in order to facilitate the attendance of members who had long distances to travel including Mr Grange. She had also sent the minutes out to Mr Grange via email in the week preceding the meeting. Both the morning and afternoon meetings were noted in his paper diary.

During interview Mr Grange was unable to specifically account for his movements on the morning of the 24 January except for speculating that he may have attended the ACPO press office or had a meeting. In addition, he repeatedly stated that he never intended to attend the morning meeting as he had only attended the meeting twice previously since his attendance was required for specific issues and that he wasn't a regular attendee of the meeting. On this occasion he believed that he received the minutes for the meeting the day before and that his PA would have been the one to make the entry into his diary. He also believed that he would then have asked his PA to send his apologies on his behalf since he wasn't going to attend.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This advice file was submitted to the Crown Prosecution Service for consideration of

criminal liability on the part of Mr Terence Grange in respect of the matters outlined in this report.

On 14 April 2008 the Crown Prosecution Service determined that there was insufficient evidence to prosecute Mr Grange for the criminal offences under consideration.

Although Mr Grange has now retired from his post as chief constable, and is therefore no longer subject to the police misconduct regulations, this report will also comment on the allegations made against him under the misconduct regulations namely:

- Misuse of the force computer system.
- Use of the force computer system likely to bring discredit on the force.
- Expense claims in respect of Ms A.
- Failing to attend official business meetings to spend duty time with Ms A.

ALLEGATION 1

In respect of the allegation that the Chief Constable Grange used the force computer system to send inappropriate emails, this investigation has established that a large number of emails (102) have been discovered on the force computer server from Mr Grange's email address to Ms A's Hotmail account.

Although the server did not record the actual content of the email, the date, time, from whom, title and email capacity was recorded. These ranged from 'Re visits to Wales' to 'Irish sausages' and 'Hindu cows'.

It has also been established that when Ms A and Mr Grange started to communicate by email the force computer firewall automatically blocked Ms A's emails as they originated from a Hotmail account. It has been established that Mr Grange personally visited the force computer department and arranged for Ms A's emails to be allowed through the firewall.

The IPCC have obtained copies from Ms A of the emails that she refers to as 'politically sensitive' and others she refers to as 'sexually explicit'. A number of the emails referred to contain inappropriate comments and sexual innuendo.

This allegation is therefore substantiated.

ALLEGATION 2

In respect of the allegation that the inappropriate emails were likely to bring discredit on the force.

The emails in possession of the IPCC are inappropriate and could be extremely damaging to Mr Grange and the police service if they found their way into the public domain. Mr Grange has clearly breached force policy by use of the force computer system to send inappropriate emails and his actions and content of the emails would clearly bring the force into disrepute.

The allegation is therefore substantiated.

ALLEGATION 3

In respect of the allegation that Mr Grange made a number of official business expense claims for meals, accommodation and transport in respect of Ms A, she forwarded to the IPCC details of the meetings where she claims she met Mr Grange - some 68 days in a period between 30 November 2006 and 25 August 2007. During this period she claims she accompanied Mr Grange on official business trips.

However, this investigation has established that on the occasions Ms A claims that she stayed overnight with Mr Grange at London hotels, no additional cost for accommodation has been incurred by the force as the hotel charges relate to the room costs and not the number of guests sharing.

Mr Grange has accepted that Ms A accompanied him on official functions on three or four occasions.

This report has detailed the number of anomalies in Mr Grange's expense claims. Use has been made of an official police credit card both for personal use and the purchase of alcohol, both contrary to force policy. In respect of the occasions where Mr Grange has made additional expense claims, in effect claiming back monies which he had submitted personal cheques for, he has claimed that these were errors on his part and he had made a 'right pigs of them'; that he was 'filling the form out without paying attention'; that he placed entries 'in the wrong place and it's the wrong number'. On one occasion, Mr Grange claimed a cheque that he had submitted for £30 to cover a restaurant bill on 2 July 2007 where he dined with Ms A had been misplaced.

The explanations provided by Mr Grange for these anomalies are unconvincing and lack credibility. Whatever the truth of the matter, Mr Grange has made a financial benefit from double-claiming expenses. He has also misused his corporate Barclaycard.

This allegation is therefore substantiated.

ALLEGATION 4

In respect of the allegation that Mr Grange failed to attend official business meetings in order to spend duty time with Ms A.

This report has highlighted two occasions where Mr Grange was expected to attend official meetings; the first was on the afternoon of 14 August 2007 where Mr Grange was scheduled to attend the VISOR National Implementation Project Board Meeting. Mr Grange accepted that he had met with Ms A for lunch which resulted in them having some personal issues to discuss. This resulted in him not attending the meeting. It is claimed by Mr Grange that on his return to Carmarthen he subsequently told his PA to mark the day down as annual leave. However, no records of Mr Grange's annual leave exist.

The second occasion where Mr Grange failed to attend a meeting was on the morning of the 24 January 2007 where he failed to attend the National Impact Forum meeting, having travelled down from Llandudno, North Wales to London the previous evening. It is known that Mr Grange spent the evening with Ms A and did attend the separate IMPACT INI/CRISP Project Board in the afternoon in London which he chaired.

Mr Grange stated in interview that he was never supposed to attend the morning meeting; however, the secretary of the group has stated she was expecting Mr Grange to attend both meetings. Previous minutes also confirm his previous attendance at the National Impact Forum Meeting.

This allegation is therefore substantiated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This investigation has established a number of significant failings in respect of the systems and processes in place surrounding the use of the Dyfed Powys Police force credit card scheme, together with the failure to adhere to force policies by Mr Grange and his staff over expense claims that he made – specifically the investigation established:

- Use of the corporate Barclaycard for personal use.
- Use of the corporate Barclaycard for the purchase of alcohol.
- Payment of expense claims without corresponding receipts.
- Payment of expense claims without countersignature.
- Officer using corporate Barclaycard on behalf of another officer.
- No clear audit for when an officer submits a personal cheque to finance, who are unable to reconcile a cheque against a particular expenditure.
- The current system where officers simply forward receipts for purchases using their corporate Barclaycard to the finance department, with no corresponding documentation or Barclaycard bill lends itself to failure.

In addition the investigation was unable to reconcile any annual leave records for Mr Grange against claims that he retrospectively took annual leave to cover his meeting with Ms A. It would appear no such annual leave records exist.

It is therefore recommended that Dyfed-Powys Police Authority in line with its duties of public accountability examine the issues arising from this investigation and establish revised robust procedures for the use of the police force corporate credit card scheme, and the policies and procedures surrounding the claiming of expenses by the chief officer team, together with establishing transparent systems for the auditing of duty commitments and annual leave recording.

In addition, the investigation established misuse of the police force computer system by Mr Grange in sending and receiving inappropriate emails via the force computer system, as well as abusing his position as chief constable by facilitating through a junior member of staff for emails from Ms A to pass through the force computer firewalls. The implications for allowing such access is clearly a breach of security and could have allowed force systems to be contaminated by computer viruses with

serious consequences.

It is therefore recommended that Dyfed-Powys Police remind all staff, regardless of their rank or position, over the proper use of force computer systems and that robust procedures are implemented to prevent a similar incident occurring in the future, especially where a single senior officer can instruct subordinates to bypass force systems.