REX V. PAUL STREET AND JOSHUA WILLIAMS.

SENTENCING REMARKS

1. On Friday 26th June 2026, Paul Street, you were convicted of two counts of misconduct in public office. On the first day of your trial, 15th June 2026, you pleaded guilty to two offences concerning the unlawful disclosure of personal data, contrary to s.170 of the Data Protection Act 2018, and I must now sentence you in respect of those four offences.

2. On 23rd May 2025, Joshua Williams you pleaded guilty to one count of misconduct in public office (count 7 on the main indictment). The offence is in very similar terms to count 6 on the indictment as it concerned Paul Street. At the time you pleaded guilty there was to be a trial on a connected offence of perverting the course of justice, count 8. However, at your trial on 1st June 2026, that matter was not pursued by the prosecution and so you are to be sentenced for a single offence.

The background to the offences.

3. Paul Street, you joined Cambridgeshire Constabulary on 30th August 2005. By 2021 you were a police sergeant leading the Southern Neighbourhood Impact Team based at Cambourne Police Station. The Impact Team is described as a proactive policing team dealing with 'county lines' drug supply and organised crime groups. As a sergeant you had responsibility for a number of police constables.

4. Joshua Williams, you joined the Cambridgeshire Constabulary in 2011. By the autumn of 2020 you were part of the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Policing Team.

5. You knew each other having worked together and as members of the same police football team.

6. Street, you and the Impact team were perceived to obtain impressive results, particularly in tackling serious and organised crime. By the time of your own arrest you had been a police

officer for some 17 years. As you made clear when giving evidence at trial, you relished the role you had and, in my judgment you very much enjoyed the power that came with along with being a police sergeant. Some have described you as having a 'robust' style of policing. In some contexts 'robust' is a word used to cover what is, in reality, bullying. Whilst I expect we all accept there are many significant challenges in policing, it is how police work is undertaken that is most important. The public should expect to be able to trust police officers to act fairly in the execution of their powers to prevent, detect and solve crime – anything less does great harm to the public faith in police forces and individual police officers.

7. In November 2021, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire Constabulary Anti-Corruption Unit undertook an audit of mobile phones issued to Cambridgeshire police officers and staff. Examination of your phones Street, revealed conduct which merited further investigation. The analysis showed 'WhatsApp groups involving you and various members of your team. Messages on 'WhatsApp' passing between officers on the Impact Team took place on personal rather than work phones.

8. In 2018, Street you had a 'WhatsApp' group for the Impact Team. It consisted of you and 17 others. As the avatar for this group you chose a photo of yourself with your fingers to your lips. Messages passing within the group demonstrate the type of culture you Street sought to create: a culture of bragging and intolerance towards suspects. You displayed a zero tolerance attitude to anyone on the team who disagreed with your methods and sentiments. This chat was used for all sorts of communications including those that might more ordinarily take place over the police radio system. At times the language used was uncompromising, with others in the group very much adopting your sentiments about suspects. Many of the officers involved in those chats have been subject to separate investigation over misconduct.

9. On 14th January 2020, Street you created another 'WhatsApp' group, 'Inner Circle'. This was a more selective group and consisted of you and eight others. Whilst any group of fellow workers are likely to engage in banter, the tone and content of the messages within this group chat is at times astonishing. You shared highly negative and inappropriate comments about other officers and made clear that your comments were not to be divulged elsewhere.

10. Thankfully, one of those included in the messages was sufficiently troubled by what he saw to do something about it and reported it immediately. When he did so the issue was brought to the attention of, as he then was, Chief Inspector Skipworth. As I will set out later in these remarks, Superintendent Skipworth, as he became, was himself subject to disciplinary proceedings for misconduct.

11. Returning to the chronology, Chief Inspector Skipworth emailed you Street on 17th January 2020, expressing concern about a report of an inappropriate message and requesting in clear terms that the 'WhatsApp' group should be warned about standards of behaviour. He indicated that he would look at the matter in more detail. Within half an hour of that message you replied by email and apologised. You accepted responsibility for a photo that had been included in the 'WhatsApp' saying it had been sent in jest. You said: '*The whatsapp group is designed as a team private group and no offence would have been intended. I understand my behaviour has fallen below what is expected, and I apologise that you are put in this position'*. Rather tellingly you then instructed those in the group to clear their chat – not the group. Later you sent your 'Inner Circle' this message: *"Just a shame we have snakes as we are all such good mates."*

12. Chief Inspector Skipworth and Superintendent Sutherland met with you on 24th January 2020. Superintendent Sutherland expressed the view that the 'WhatsApp' messaging and photograph he had seen had been inappropriate, and could be very damaging reputationally. An action plan was drawn up to highlight the organisation's concerns about your behaviour. Superintendent Sutherland had intended to remove you from your position and to place you under a form of review during which you would be required to focus on ethics, respect and amongst other things, the dignity of detained persons.

13. In an email sent by you on 28th January 2020, to the Head of Local Policing you expressed your view that the whole incident had been blown out of proportion. Your response to criticism about the photo on the 'WhatsApp' and messages was somewhat mixed: you appeared to concede that your conduct had been unacceptable and could not happen again - you described it as 'silly', but you then sought to justify what you had done.

14. You were particularly forthright about the fact that Superintendent Sutherland had contemplated removing you from the Impact team and made it clear that you thought this disproportionate. You did say that you were sorry and that you appreciated you were a role model and that you would not make the same mistake again. Superintendent Sutherland reconsidered the matter, and a revised action plan was drawn up and agreed. This revised plan retained an emphasis on keeping you under review and requiring you to reflect on your attitude and conduct. Importantly for you was the decision you were to remain in post leading the impact team. You were required to undertake a piece of research and submit a report setting out your findings on the role of leadership and of being a role model in ensuring the right culture and working environment within a team. The action plan was to last for 6 months or for 3, if satisfactorily completed by then. In fact, the action plan was signed off as

complete in March 2020. It is now clear that you simply paid mere lip service to the action plan. For example, you boasted on 13th February 2020: *'I'm struggling not to go full on sarcastic with this essay'* and then *"I'm entitling it 'Daddy's take on being in charge'*" and indulged and joined in on mocking remarks about Supt Sutherland who had set the action plan.

15. It is in this context that your conduct Street, as covered in counts 3 and 4 on the indictment. and the count that concerns you Williams, needs to be seen.

Count 3: Paul Street.

16. On 14th April 2020, the Impact Team arrested a then 17-year-old male, Robiul Islam, in Cambridge. Mr Islam was observed by officers who formed the view that he was seeking to deal drugs They also formed the view it was likely he had inserted or plugged drugs in his anus. Those in the team started sending messages on the group 'WhatsApp'. They observed that Islam was claiming to be 18 when he wasn't. You posted: '*That works for me'* making clear you would rather deal with Islam him as an adult than with the additional protections afforded to those under 18 when detained. Minutes later you messaged: "*Think we can bully this fucker*".

17. Islam was detained for the purpose of a strip search and taken to Parkside police station in Cambridge. At 15.20 a strip search took place and was negative. Islam was arrested on suspicion of drug supply. Following his arrest, you regularly posted messages on the Impact 'WhatsApp' group chat. You referred to Islam as an: "*absolute gobshite*" and that you would like to smash his face in. You told the group that they need to *"bully this prick …… relentlessly…… get in his fat little head*". Others in the group responded with similar inappropriate messages. Islam was placed in a cell and closely monitored as it was still believed that he had drugs concealed in him. The custody record suggests that Islam was verbally confrontational and annoyed at being detained. Meanwhile on the group WhatsApp chat you continued to refer to the suspect using derogatory terms.

18. At 6.40pm on 14th April Islam was taken to hospital due to the risk of internal injury arising from the release of any secreted drugs. Whilst he was there, you sent a message: "*Smash his little head in*". After 7pm you put in motion a police search at Islam's home address. The search was authorised at 7.42pm and after this you recorded a video of yourself and sent that to a colleague, PC Tom Carden. The video showed you speaking to the camera. You say: "*Hello, tiny cock, we meet again. Well we know who you are now. We're gonna go to your*

mum's house and rip it apart. Fuck you". At the end of the video you make a gesture sticking your middle finger up at the camera. You said to PC Carden: *"Keep it to yourself but I've got Alex to play this to him when he's on his own…….. Not a peep to anyone else though as not sure all are trustworthy in our group*.". You messaged another officer, PC Alex Oliver: "*Mate I could genuinely see myself beating this prick up"* and "*Please hit him*".

19. Islam was returned to the police station from hospital at about 10pm. By then you had sent a copy of the video you had made to your partner, Fern Clark. You also sent another message on the group chat: "*We need to bully the fuck out of this prick*". You were clearly frustrated that the suspected secreted drugs had not yet come to light.

20. At 9.30am on 15th April, you and PC Kitson took over observations on Islam. Later in the morning Islam saw his solicitor and there was a formal police interview. He was returned to his cell. According to you Islam was verbally aggressive calling you and your colleague various name and making deeply provocative comments. You suggest in a subsequent witness statement that Islam approached you aggressively and in a threatening way causing you to fear you were about to be assaulted. Islam was physically restrained and handcuffed. The CCTV shows no lawful reason for this to be done. There is no note of this on the custody record but at 12:56pm that day you messaged the group stating, *"We broke him ……He's kicked off and been squashed…At the mention of another strippy…. He's rattled …. Nobody speak to him when you get down here*."

21. At around 1pm a further strip search was authorised on the basis that Islam had continued to decline food and drink and was agitated. Islam was able to speak to his solicitor at this stage after which the solicitor made representations that any search should not be carried out by you as Islam believed that you had a personal dislike for him and were not impartial or professional. That search was also negative.

22. Soon after that you were replaced on observation duties by other officers. At 2:40pm you message Fern Clark: "*Had a rumble with our drug dealer in the cell today. Little rat has proper pressed my buttons today".*

23. At some stage after 8pm Islam indicated to the new officers on shift that he was willing to produce items from his anus and extracted two wraps which were seized in evidence.

24. During this time there were various messages from you on the group and individual chats including: *"How's my shitty mate doing", "Don't let him sleep" "Just talk to each other and ignore him".* At 8:20pm PC Alex Oliver posted on the group chat that Islam had

produced packages. The messages that follow reveal your disappointment at it only being two wraps. You messaged Oliver telling him to: *"Smash… his…. Face…. In*".

25. The basis of count 3 is that you encouraged other officers to bully a 17-year-old detainee; encouraged the use and language of violence; used inflammatory language to colleagues and thereby normalising sentiments of violence towards a detainee; encouraged officers to ignore the suspect; prepared and shared a deeply inappropriate video to be shown to the 17-year-old detainee that you intended be played to a young suspect with the sole purpose of bullying the suspect and winding him up; shared abusive and inappropriate messages with your team and with your partner; and that you goaded a 17-year-old detainee until the point of reaction when you then "bundled" him on to the bed and handcuffed him.

26. You were in a position of trust towards this 17-year-old in detention and as a police sergeant required to set an example to officers you were leading. As I have set out these acts take place in the immediate aftermath of events which you do not fall to be sentenced for but which had led to you being put on an action plan. The consequence of those earlier events is that you were very clearly aware of the need to act as a police officer should and ensure nothing was done or said that would bring the police force into disrepute or erode public trust in the police.

Counts 6 and 7: Street and Williams.

27. On 19th August 2020, a female suspect was arrested for suspected involvement in drug dealing. Her mobile phone was seized, and she was asked to provide the passcode to her phone and did so. When she did so she specifically warned the arresting officers that she had personal, private intimate photos on the phone, because she wanted to ensure they were not shared. She trusted that the police would deal with her phone, and the personal material on it, properly. As there is in place a reporting restriction on her name, I will refer to this female as 'X'.

28. A few months later, on 1st October 2020, Williams, as part of your duties in the Huntingdon Neighbourhood Policing Team, you were tasked with the examination and download of the seized phone. Whilst undertaking that request you discovered those personal photographs and a video of a sexual nature. Those matters had nothing to do with the matters under investigation. You messaged Street on 1st October at 2:08pm:

> *Just doing a download for some bird that got nicked with some mandem in st Neots Turns out it's* [X's] *sister…*

She's bang at it!
Shame cos she's quite fit

The reference to 'X' was to a the sister of a friend of yours, and someone you had played football with. Street, you replied to those messages by writing:

No way! What drug?
Any nudes?

There are further messages passing between the two of you. At 2:15:56pm onwards the exchange is:

Williams: *There's also a video of her and being filmed sucking some dude*
Street: *This I have to see*
Williams: *She hides under a towel*
Street: *Horny*

At that point in the exchange Williams you send an image of the photo reel on the female suspect's phone with her in her underwear to Street.

Street: *Definitely* [X's] *sister?*
Williams: *Yeah. Found a chat with "brother" and there is a pic of him*
Street: You send two emojis
Williams: *The mandem got nicked.* There is then a reference to a name and two police operations.
Street: *She's in trouble then*
Williams: *Big time.*
Williams: *Although weighty Katie is the OIC so…*
Street: *Probably a caution then* and two laughing emojis

29. On 8th October 2020, Williams you provided a witness statement dealing with the download work you had undertaken. With the statement there were a number of screenshots of the contents of the phone. None of those were the naked images sent to Street: there was no policing purpose in that. X and her co-accused were charged with offences but those proceedings came to a premature end. Charges against X were dropped.

30. On 6th April 2021, Street you send to Williams another message on WhatsApp. The exchange is as follows:

> Street: *You still got that video of* [X's] *sister sucking that mandem off.*
> Williams: 3 laughing emojis followed by: *I doubt it mate sorry. You exhausted all other porn?*
> Street: *Nah just wanted to show the lads from footy* followed by two laughing emojis.

31. When X was interviewed she explained that when arrested she had provided her PIN to the police, she had made clear there were personal photos on the phone. Furthermore, she believed the video to be saved in a password protected app. She had no idea that personal images of her would be looked at let alone shared. She has expressed her distress that personal images were being shared between police officers and that this has totally undermined her trust in the police. X read her victim impact statement in court today and set out her concerns on the undermining of public trust in the police. She speaks about the stress and anxiety she has suffered and in particular her concerns for her own children and the profound impact on her of your actions.

Disclosure of personal data – counts 4 and 5.

32. These two counts cover disclosures of personal data that Street you made to your partner Fern Clark: the disclosure to her of confidential police information.

33. On 27th April 2020, Street, an image of a confidential police log displayed on a computer screen was sent to you. The image showed that a member of the public had made a complaint about you and that she had made complaints in the past, but none of them had been dealt with. The text on the image says that the member of the public, had been told by a PCSO that you had been suspended and demoted. Whilst the full contents of the police log cannot be seen, it clearly displays the home address of the complainant. You and DC Girdlestone, the person who sent this image to you, then talk about this member of the public and joke about there being a "*We hate Street Club*" which is "*oversubscribed*" and "*has a waiting list."* You then forwarded the image to Fern Clark, and with a crying/laughing emoji. There is then an exchange of messages between you and Fern Clark. You say to her it "*Made me giggle*" and "*Another one in the "we hate street" club*". Clark asked you if you were in trouble, to which you said of the member of the public who made the complaint: "*Nah, she's a scummy drug dealer*". When Fern Clark said, "*I'm not finding this as funny as*

you right now" you said to Fern Clark that you thought it would make her chuckle and she responded by telling you she did not want you to get in to trouble at work. Your response was to say "*Fret not*". You also say that you would like to know which PCSO has been 'chatting shit' about you and the comments: *"I feel a public hanging is due for someone"* and "*I can't wait to see this chick again*" and *"Sounds like she knows Big Daddy Street is getting close to catching her."*

34. On the same day DC Girdlestone sent you another image of a computer screen. This was an Athena Intelligence log and displayed details, including the name of a member of the public and how he had been found hiding behind a wall. It went on to say this member of the public stated that he had been hiding because he thought he had seen you, Street. The image was accompanied by a crying/laughing emoji The name of this person and their date of birth were visible. You then forwarded this image of the intelligence log to Fern Clark as another disclosure of confidential information to someone outside the police.

35. As with the previous disclosure, you then proceeded to have a conversation via 'WhatsApp' with Fern Clark about it. You said: "*I reckon they've got their own club*" and some emojis. Fern Clark replied, telling you this stuff stresses her out. You then respond: *"I'm giggling away reading this stuff*" ,"*Honestly don't be worried*", *"This is my job to rattle these people" "Incidentally* [name of the member of the public] *is also a drug dealer"*

Others involved.

36. Whilst I have to sentence the two of you, the details of the messaging and particular offences of misconduct in public office show a quite appalling attitude to the carrying out of a highly important and significant public duty - policing - by a significant number of officers as well as the two of you. As part of the material deployed in the course of the trial Agreed Facts were before the jury setting out details in respect of 11 other officers. PC Girdlestone and PC Dowd were subject to disciplinary proceedings for gross misconduct, which were found proven. PC Girdlestone was dismissed without notice. PC Dowd was given a Final Warning. PC Oliver and PC Scott were given 18-month written warnings. PC Carden and Superintendent Skipworth were subject to disciplinary proceedings for misconduct. They both resigned from the force before their hearings, meaning they did not proceed any further. PC Brookes, PC Upcott, PC Spalthoff, PS Smith, and PC Pinton were subject to reflective practices review processes, which they have each completed. They each accepted failures in 'Authority, Respect and Courtesy' in respect of derogatory language they used about members of the public during 'WhatsApp' conversations.

Progress of this case.

37. Williams you pleaded guilty to misconduct in public office about a year before the trials were to take place and so full credit will be given for your plea.

38. Street, you were convicted following trial. Before trial various submissions were made on your behalf that this prosecution should be stayed as an abuse of process. Claims as to police corruption were made and it was suggested that the conduct here did not amount to the commission of a criminal offence. Extensive written requests were submitted on your behalf for disclosure. A timetable was set for pre-trial arguments, including issues as to disclosure, to be resolved. The Court received lengthy and detailed requests for disclosure. One of those requests spanned some 39 pages. Lengthy skeleton submissions were provided on abuse of process and dismissal. Court time was set aside for those hearings to take place. A time estimate for trial was given of 5 weeks, and an estimate of 5 days for the Abuse of Process hearing. The allocation of court time explains some of the delay to the resolution of the trial for Williams. In October 2025, and then in December 2025, extensive court time was given over to those representing you to set out submissions as to any proper basis for abuse of process and disclosure. Evidence was called. In the course of those hearings all of the points that the Court was to be asked to rule on faded away. Whilst I entirely accept that any defendant is entitled to test the case against them, there was nothing in any of the points raised. In February of this year different leading trial counsel, Ms Demster KC, took on this case and provided a helpful note to the Court on 6th February 2026. It would appear that before this stage little if any real attention had been paid to the hard facts of this case and the reality of what the evidence showed as to your involvement. The approach before then appears to have been one seeking to blame everyone else for your own actions.

Personal circumstances.

39. Street you are now aged 41. You are of previous good character. I have a pre-sentence report dated 30th July 2026. I have read the report with care. The author of the report is clear in their assessment that you are someone who seeks to minimise your own culpability and responsibility for what you did. As you did in the course of the trial, you seek to put your own gloss on the messages you shared with others and to deflect blame. I suspect that the period since your trial concluded has brought home to you the extremely serious nature of your conduct and how conduct of this sort is viewed by the Courts.

40. I note that you have two boys aged 10 and 12 and have co-parenting responsibilities to them. Your incarceration has had, and will continue to have, an impact on them and on your former partner. I have read with care the letter from your former partner as to how they have all been impacted by the conclusion of this case and the added stresses imprisonment has caused.

41. Whilst your own letter refers to remorse and you set out that you are in a different position now to the time when the offences took place, those expressions of remorse and regret need to be seen in the context of the events at the time and how you have approached the allegations you faced up to the point of conviction. Whilst I have no doubt that you are very troubled by the impact of your incarceration on your family and your sons, I do not find until very late in the day any true understanding of the real impact of your offending on those most directly affected by it – X and Mr Islam. Whilst I note you have now expressed some regret and remorse for what you did, and I hope you will reflect more on the your own actions.

42. The other letters provided by your mother, brother and close friends paint a different side to you. The letters touch on issues of the physical health of family members and the additional stress they face as a consequence of this case and the impact of imprisonment as well as the good things you have done to assist others including mental health training and emotional support you have provided to others.

43. I take into account the period of time that has elapsed since the offences were committed and that there has been no other offending.

44. On your behalf Ms Dempster KC invites the Court to consider imposing a suspended sentence order in your case. She submits that the case can be dealt with by such a disposal in the light of the matters she has set out in her comprehensive written submissions and the points she has further highlighted this morning. She relies on the impact on others of your continued incarceration and the on-going disruption that would cause.

45. Williams, you are aged 38. I note in your case that you were convicted of 2 offences of unacceptable behaviour on the London Regional Railway Network contrary to various bylaws following an incident in 2016. An appeal against conviction was dismissed by Kingston Crown Court on 12th May 2017. You were fined and ordered to pay costs. You received a final warning in 2017 in relation this incident and that expired in 2019. There is also a pre-sentence report [PSR] in your case. In the report the remorse you feel is evident. You and your partner have two daughters aged 7 and 4. You now live on the Isle of Arran. The PSR sets out potential non-custodial options for sentence should I decide that the case could be met with a non-custodial sentence or indeed a suspended sentence order.

46. Mr Morris accepts on your behalf the impact of your actions towards X. I have seen and read with care letters that have been written by your wife, parents and your uncle. In his written submissions and as amplified in court, Mr Morris submits that the circumstances so far as you are concerned merit a suspended sentence order.

Sentencing provisions.

47. There are no offence specific guidelines for offences of misconduct in public office. I have before me the General Guideline from the Sentencing Council as well as a number of relevant authorities. In *R. v. Collins; R v. Lewis & Jaffer* [2022] EWCA Crim 742, the Court of Appeal reviewed sentences passed on three police officers for varying types of misconduct in public office and the principles set out in *Attorney General's Reference (No. 30 of 2010)(Mark Edward Bohannan)* [2010] EWCA Crim 226, [2011] 1 Cr. App. R. (S.) 106. At paragraph 9 of the judgment the President of the Queen's Bench Division (as it then was) stated:

> *In the fourth Bohannan principle, the court recognised the gravity of offending that has an impact on police operations. We would emphasise that misconduct that has an impact on the investigation and prosecution of crime must be regarded as serious. The criminal justice system plays a vital part in keeping the public safe and in ensuring that the rule of law is upheld. It is essential that the public should be able to trust the police to play their proper part in ensuring that those who commit crimes are brought to justice. Conversely, the rule of law means that those who are not guilty of crimes should have the opportunity to exculpate themselves. Misconduct that undermines public trust in the process of bringing those guilty of serious offences to justice, or the process of preventing innocent people from early exculpation, must be punished severely.*

48. I had sentenced two of those where sentence was being considered by the Court of Appeal. As I observed then, and do so again today, the public expects, and rightly so, the highest of standards from police officers. I am sure there will be many thousands of officers in police forces in this country and abroad utterly horrified by your actions and by the attitude you have each displayed here. It is both appalling and inexplicable.

49. I have also been referred to *Ali* [2023] EWCA Crim 1464 and *Longmate* [2024] EWCA Crim 443.

50. I note that the maximum sentence for an offence contrary to s.170 of the Data Protection Act 2018 is a fine.

51. The prosecution's sentencing note seeks to identify aggravating features of the offending in this case. Ms Dempster takes issue with some of those points. All offences of misconduct in public office involving police officers involve a breach of public trust. Damage to the public perception of the police is significant, as is public confidence in the integrity of individual police officers. The conduct here relating to images and the video footage on X's phone will be of great concern as it such as to discourage members of the public from providing police with access to their phones. Your conduct Street with regard to Mr Islam also very concerning in terms of public impact. Whilst it might be said he was nearly 18, that rather masks the appalling nature of your treatment of him: those accused of any crime deserve to be dealt with fairly and appropriately.

52. In terms of aggravating features I note the actions taken when aware of an investigation. On being made aware that Street had been arrested in December 2021, I note that Williams you encouraged others to delete material from their phones. Williams you cleared the entire chat history with Street. Also I note that the night before you were due to be interviewed in February 2023, you carried out a factory reset of your phone.

53. Turning to additional factors specific to your conduct Street I note:

    (i) you were in the position of 'Team Leader' and you created a toxic culture that was then adopted by junior officers under your command;

    (ii) you were on formal notice about the quality of your leadership following your conduct around the arrest of Samuel Kayode and use of WhatsApp. You instructed the team to delete the previous group chat and then started up another 'Inner Circle' group. Whilst I accept you were acquitted of assaulting Samuel Kayode and perverting the course of public justice in respect of statements prepared following the arrest, there is the undisputed conduct (taking and sharing image of Kayode, sending mocking messages about him etc) that illustrate a course of conduct before and during the indictment period;

    (iii) your attitude to the action plan and flagrant undermining of the senior leadership;

    (iv) that serious and unfounded allegations were made against officers including the suggestion that the phones had been tampered with and that the content of the phone and messages were not accepted. It was only in January this year that you accepted the contents of the phone as correct.

54. Whist not strictly an aggravating feature of the conduct on the specific offences, one cannot simply ignore the collateral impact of your conduct Street on other prosecutions. There has been a review of cases in which you were involved. 18 Crown Court cases have been discontinued, 5 of those cases were ones with defendants subject to Custody Time Limits. The contents of your personal phone demonstrated the conduct of other officers and has led to the review of a further 201 cases. From that review 44 Crown Court cases have been discontinued. 9 of those cases were ones were CTL cases. 5 cases in the Magistrates' Court have also been discontinued. I am told there will be a review of a further 14 cases in light of the conviction over conduct towards Mr Islam.

55. There has also been a clear risk to compliance with the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act (CPIA) caused by using 'WhatsApp' to capture relevant evidence and police conduct which might be capable of undermining/assisting in any case where disclosure needs consideration. I note the comments you made in evidence during the trial and to the probation officer which imply that the use of 'WhatsApp' was condoned by more senior officers. You would have known that whilst some use of 'WhatsApp' might conveniently bypass the use of police radios, it should never have been used to capture relevant evidence/material, material that should fall to be considered under the CPIA or to send wholly unacceptable and insulting messages.

56. One cannot also not ignore the example set to other officers and their complicity that has led to the dismissal or regulatory sanction of numerous officers. As the prosecution correctly identifies this, in itself, is a costly distraction from policing. The entire team was disbanded.

Sentence.

57. In my judgment the only appropriate sentences in this case are ones of immediate imprisonment. I take into account in both your cases your hitherto previous good character, but that is of little if any weight in cases such as this. I also take into account the impact on former police officers serving sentences of imprisonment particularly where those officers had involvement in drugs offences. Williams, in your case I accept that some remorse has been shown, and understand there will be others impacted by any sentence of immediate imprisonment I impose on you. I have made some reduction to the sentence to cater for this. In your case Street I take into account that you were the more senior police officer and as the identified aggravating factors demonstrate, were more significantly involved in the misconduct. In your case I also accept that there will be hardship caused to others as a result

of imprisonment and in particular the impact on your two sons and their mother and have made some reduction to the sentence that would otherwise apply.

58. In both of your cases I take into account the period of time that has elapsed since the offences were committed. The proceedings have taken quite some time. I have referred to some of the legal issues that have been aired before me and I am aware of wider investigations into the conduct. Having said that some allowance for delay is given.

59. In my judgment the sentences on counts 3 and 4 of the trial indictment so far as you Street are concerned are concurrent sentences of 4 years' imprisonment. On two counts of unlawful disclosure of personal data, I impose no separate penalty.

60. Williams, making allowance for your plea of guilty, a sentence of 16 months' imprisonment. The start point on the count you faced (and count 4 in relation to Street) would be one of 2 years' imprisonment and so, hence the 16 month term following a plea. I have considered whether the sentence in your case can or should be suspended. In my judgment in the light of the underlying conduct it cannot.

61. It is likely you will each serve up to 40% of the sentences in custody and then released on licence for the remainder of the term. You must comply with the terms of that licence. At any stage it may be withdrawn and your return to custody ordered. If the statutory surcharge applies to your cases, then the appropriate orders can be drawn up.

62. Application is made for each of you to pay something towards the costs of this prosecution. In your case Street, the sum sought is £5,000 and Williams for you £1,000. In the light of the detail of the finances that have been set out and the fact that I have imposed immediate sentences of imprisonment, I make no order as to costs.

His Honour Judge Mark Lucraft QC
Recorder of London,
Central Criminal Court,
London EC4M &EH
September 16th 2026.