

Commissioner for Standards
c/o The States' Greffier
The Royal Court House
St Peter Port
GY1 2NZ



2nd December 2024

Our Ref: Robert Prow Complaint

Dear Commissioner,

CONDUCT COMPLAINT: DEPUTY ROBERT PROW

We write in order to submit a formal complaint regarding the conduct of Deputy Robert Prow, who currently holds responsibility for, inter alia, overseeing police complaints against senior officers. Our concerns are rooted in a failure to uphold the standards of public office as defined by the Code of Conduct.

1. Lack of Accountability

On 18 July 2024, we submitted a serious complaint to the Committee *for* Home Affairs in respect of then-Chief Officer of Police, Ruari Hardy (enclosed).

Despite allowing adequate time for a response, no acknowledgment or reply was received. On 25 September 2024, a polite follow-up was sent (enclosed), but to date, we still have not received a response. We feel that this lack of accountability and responsiveness is not acceptable for someone holding public office, particularly in a role of oversight and responsibility. It is especially concerning that our complaint evidences dishonest and deceitful behaviour shown by the most senior member of law enforcement. That this did not result in an investigation, or an acknowledgment letter, four months on, demonstrates an alarming lack of concern and interest in respect of allegations of serious police misconduct.

2. Potential Bias and Impartiality Issues

Deputy Prow has consistently demonstrated strong bias in favour of police officers, undermining his impartiality in handling complaints against senior officers. This behaviour conflicts with the principle of *Objectivity*, which requires decision-makers to act impartially, fairly, and without prejudice. As the individual tasked with overseeing senior police complaints, Deputy Prow's impartiality is critical to maintaining public trust in the process. However, in light of Deputy Prow's conduct, we have lost confidence in his ability to remain impartial.

It is also our belief that Deputy Prow intentionally failed to respond, knowing that Mr Hardy was set to retire. We anticipate Deputy Prow justifying a refusal to investigate on the grounds of Mr Hardy's retirement (in the event that a response is finally forthcoming).

3. Breach of Nolan Principles

The conduct of Deputy Prow contravene multiples Nolan Principles of Public Life, specifically:

- *Accountability*: Failing to respond to a very serious complaint undermines his accountability to the public and the principles of transparency in Deputy Prow's role.

- *Openness*: The lack of communication and acknowledgment disregards the principle of openness and the expectation that public officials act with clarity and honesty in their dealings.
- *Objectivity*: Demonstrating bias in favour of police officers suggests decisions may not be made with fairness or objectivity, eroding public confidence in the integrity of Deputy Prow's oversight role.
- *Respect*: Refusing to acknowledge or respond to complaints and genuine worries of the public shows a lack of respect, care and concern for members of the public.

4. Conclusion

It is vital that public officials entrusted with oversight roles uphold the highest standards of behaviour to ensure public trust is maintained. Unfortunately, Deputy Prow has failed to meet with these standards. To allow this type of conduct to go unchallenged sends a message that bad behaviour of States Members is the norm. This erodes public confidence and trust in the States of Guernsey and in its ability to lead.

Given these concerns, we respectfully request a thorough investigation into Deputy Prow's conduct.

We look forward to your response and an outline of the next steps in addressing this complaint.

Yours faithfully,

