

PAN-ISLAND
COMMISSIONER
FOR STANDARDS



Report by the Jersey Commissioner for Standards on complaints
made by Stephan Beddoe, Simon Wilson, Sally MintyGravett and
Anita Rive against Deputy Philip Ozouf

R.127/2025

Summary

This report relates to an investigation into four complaints received on 21 February 2025 from Mr Stephan Beddoe, Mr Simon Wilson, Ms Sally Minty-Gravett, and Ms Anita Rive ("the Complainants") concerning the conduct of Deputy Philip Ozouf. As the allegations raised are substantively similar, I have addressed them collectively in this single report.

The complaints arise from an incident on Saturday 2 November 2024, in which Deputy Ozouf was stopped by a police officer and found to be driving at 31mph in a 15mph zone, without displaying a valid motor insurance disc. Subsequently, the Parish Hall in St Helier issued three separate notices summoning Deputy Ozouf to attend a Parish Hall Enquiry. He failed to attend on each occasion. As a result, the matter was referred to the Magistrate's Court, where, on 11 February 2025, Deputy Ozouf was fined £575.

The complainants allege that, in relation to the speeding offence and his failure to engage with the Parish Hall process, Deputy Ozouf breached Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Code of Conduct.

I wrote to Deputy Ozouf on 21 February 2025 requesting a written response to the complaints. After receiving no reply, I commenced an investigation on 13 March 2025. Continued lack of engagement further delayed the process until an interview with Deputy Ozouf was eventually conducted on 6 May 2025.

During the interview, Deputy Ozouf did not dispute the facts: he acknowledged that he was speeding, that the vehicle was not displaying a valid insurance disc, and that he failed to attend the Parish Hall Enquiry, resulting in the matter proceeding to Magistrate's court and a fine being imposed. Deputy Ozouf offered an unreserved apology to the court on 11 February 2025 and voluntarily made an apology to the States Assembly on 19 March 2025.

Elected representatives are expected to model lawful behaviour and demonstrate respect for due process. This obligation extends to timely and constructive engagement with the Commissioner for Standards. In my assessment, Deputy Ozouf's actions did not meet the standards of leadership, integrity, and accountability expected of those holding public office.

In response to the complaints, Deputy Ozouf referred to mitigating personal circumstances, including recent bereavements and the ongoing impact of a recent diagnosis of ADHD. He explained that these factors have contributed to difficulties in managing administrative responsibilities and responding to formal processes. While I am sympathetic to the challenges he has faced, elected Members remain accountable for fulfilling their duties in accordance with the Code of Conduct throughout their time in office.

Having considered all available evidence, I find that Deputy Ozouf breached Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Code of Conduct.

Introduction

1. This report relates to four similar complaints¹ received against Deputy Philip Ozouf. Deputy Ozouf was stopped by a police officer on Saturday 2 November 2024 and found to be speeding at 31mph in an area with a speed limit of 15mph, without displaying a current motor insurance tax disc. St Helier's Parish sent notices to attend the Parish Hall Enquiry on three occasions to which Deputy Ozouf did not attend. The matter ended up in the Magistrates Court on 11 February 2025, where Deputy Ozouf was made to pay a fine of £575. The complainants allege that Deputy Ozouf failed to adhere to Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Code of Conduct.
2. The Members' Code of Conduct Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5²:

2 Public duty

The primary duty of elected members is to act in the interests of the people of Jersey and of the States. In doing so, members have a duty to uphold the law in accordance with their oath of office and to act on all occasions in accordance with the public trust placed in them. Elected members have a general duty to act in what they believe to be the best interests of Jersey as a whole, and a special duty to be accessible to the people of the constituency for which they have been elected to serve and to represent their interests conscientiously. Elected members must give due priority to attendance at meetings of the States in accordance with the terms of their oath of office and should be present in the Chamber when the States are meeting unless they have very compelling reasons not to do so.

3 Personal conduct

Elected members should observe the following general principles of conduct for holders of public office –

Selflessness Holders of public office should take decisions solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family and friends, their business colleagues or any voluntary or charitable organization they are involved with.

Integrity Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organizations that might influence them in the performance of their official duties.

Objectivity In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

Accountability Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.

Openness Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest, or rules on freedom of information, data protection or confidentiality clearly demand.

Honesty Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.

Leadership Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example to maintain and strengthen the public's trust and confidence in the integrity of the States and its members in conducting public business.

¹ Documents 1-4

² [Members Code of Conduct](#)

4 Conflict between public and private interest

Elected members should base their conduct on a consideration of the public interest, avoid conflict between personal interest and the public interest and resolve any conflict between the 2, at once, and in favour of the public interest.

5 Maintaining the integrity of the States

Elected members should at all times conduct themselves in a manner which will tend to maintain and strengthen the public's trust and confidence in the integrity of the States of Jersey and shall endeavour, in the course of their public and private conduct, not to act in a manner which would bring the States, or its Members generally, into disrepute. Elected members should at all times treat other members of the States, officers, and members of the public with respect and courtesy and without malice, notwithstanding the disagreements on issues and policy which are a normal part of the political process.

Investigation

3. During the course of my investigation, I carried out the following:
 - Requested a written response to the four complaints from Deputy Ozouf
 - Interviewed Deputy Ozouf³
 - Requested confirmation from St Helier's Parish

Evidence

4. Deputy Ozouf does not dispute that he was speeding. Further, he does not dispute that he failed to attend the Parish Hall Enquiry on three occasions. Nor does he dispute that he had displayed an expired motor insurance disc.
5. Deputy Ozouf was fined in Jersey Magistrate's Court on 11 February 2025 for speeding and for failing to have a current motor insurance disc on display.
6. He apologised to the court for failing to attend the Parish Hall on 27 January 2025 and for failing to provide evidence of a current insurance disc within the time allocated and for any inconvenience he caused to the Court and St Helier's Parish authorities.⁴
7. Deputy Ozouf took the opportunity to publicly apologise for the matter in the States meeting on 19 March 2025⁵

³ Document 5

⁴ Document 6

⁵ Document 7

Engagement with the Office of the Commissioner for Standards

8. Deputy Ozouf failed to respond to my letters on 21 February 2025 requesting a written response to the four complaints.
9. On 13 March 2025, I received correspondence from Deputy Ozouf in which he apologised for his lack of response and stated that he would provide a formal and comprehensive reply.⁶ However, no such response was subsequently received.

“I must sincerely apologise for missing your earlier emails in February moreover, for not responding within the timeframe set out. I deeply regret this oversight”

“The delay was not intentional. I have been continuing to navigate back from an extraordinarily difficult personal period, which has significantly further affected my ability to manage even basic administrative matters.”

“I am now reviewing the complaint in full and will respond formally and comprehensively—ideally later today or over the weekend. Thank you for your patience and if possible for allowing me this short further time to respond.”
10. On 6 May 2025, I interviewed Deputy Ozouf. Deputy Ozouf stated that difficulties managing administrative tasks had contributed to his failure to attend the Parish Hall Enquiry and to his lack of engagement with the Commissioner’s Office. He indicated that he is currently dealing with a number of personal and administrative challenges and is seeking assistance to manage these more effectively. He stated that he had recently been diagnosed with ADHD and that this diagnosis compounded with personal losses over the past two years have been very challenging for him.
11. In relation to Deputy Ozouf’s assertion that he hadn’t received any letters from St Helier’s Parish, I was able to confirm with St Helier’s Parish that they had sent three notices to his correct address.

Findings of Fact

12. On the balance of probabilities, I have found the following facts:
 1. On 2 November 2024, Deputy Ozouf was stopped by the police for speeding.
 2. Deputy Ozouf did not attend three Parish Hall Enquiries in relation to his speeding offence.
 3. On 11 February 2025, Deputy Ozouf appeared in Jersey’s Magistrate’s Court and pleaded guilty to two motoring offences.
 4. Deputy Ozouf was fined £275 for driving 31mph in a 15mph zone and £300 for failing to show a valid motor insurance disc.
 5. Deputy Ozouf voluntarily issued a public apology in the Assembly on 19 March 2025.
 6. Deputy Ozouf did not engage with the Standards process in a timely manner.
13. Deputy Ozouf was afforded an opportunity to challenge any of the above findings before I finalised my report. I did not receive any challenges to my findings of fact.

⁶ Document 8

Analysis

14. While speeding is a relatively common offence, for someone in public office it carries wider implications. It signals a lapse in judgment, a failure to demonstrate respect for the law, and ultimately a breach of public trust. Furthermore, repeatedly failing to attend a Parish Hall Enquiry displays a disregard for accountability and a lack of respect for legal obligations.
15. The question before me is whether Deputy Ozouf's conduct breached Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Code of Conduct. I consider each in turn:

Paragraph 2 – Uphold the Law

17. Elected members are expected to uphold and respect the law. Speeding is a criminal offence. Failing to attend a Parish Hall Enquiry when summoned shows further disregard for the legal system. Public confidence in elected representatives depends on those in office modelling lawful behaviour and respect for due process.

Paragraph 3 – Adherence to the Seven Principles of Public Life

18. Members must observe the Seven Principles of Public Life. They are expected to lead by example, act with integrity, and be accountable for their conduct. By speeding and subsequently failing to attend the Parish Hall Enquiry, and subsequently failing to engage appropriately with my investigative process, Deputy Ozouf fell short of the standards of leadership, integrity, and accountability required of public office holders.

Paragraph 4 – Public versus Private Interest

19. Speeding is not in the public interest; it prioritises a private interest—whether convenience or haste—over the public's interest in road safety, legality, and responsible conduct. The failure to attend the Parish Hall Enquiry, on three occasions, reinforces the impression that private concerns were placed above the duty to engage properly with the legal process.
20. Elected members have a duty to comply with legal obligations regardless of personal circumstances. While Deputy Ozouf may have had what he believed to be valid reasons for non-attendance, repeated failure to appear could reasonably be perceived as prioritising private challenges over his public responsibilities.
21. Deputy Ozouf did not engage with this investigation in a timely manner. The Office of the Commissioner for Standards exists because democracy depends on accountability, and because Members have collectively agreed on the importance of an independent standards process. It is not in the public interest for any Member to disregard or disengage from that process. Respectful and timely engagement is essential to upholding the integrity of the standards system.

Paragraph 5 – Upholding Public Trust

22. The public rightly expects elected representatives to uphold high standards of personal and professional conduct. Even relatively minor offences can carry reputational consequences—particularly when compounded by a failure to follow legal procedures. Repeated non-attendance at the Parish Hall Enquiry suggests a disregard for due process and accountability. Such actions risk undermining confidence in the justice system and are inconsistent with the ethical standards expected of those in public life.
23. Deputy Ozouf did not engage with this investigation in a timely manner. While he may have personal reasons for his reluctance, this lack of engagement signals a failure to respect the accountability mechanisms that apply to all Members. It weakens the integrity of the standards process and risks eroding trust in the oversight framework that underpins ethical conduct in public service.

Observations

24. I recognise that Deputy Ozouf has faced personal difficulties over the past few years and that he has acknowledged challenges in completing administrative tasks, especially with ADHD. He has explained that these combined issues contributed to his failure to engage with both the Parish Hall Enquiry and with the Standards process. I have genuine empathy for these circumstances. However, as long as Deputy Ozouf remains an elected Member, he must fulfil his duties in accordance with the Code of Conduct to which he is bound.

Conclusion

25. I find that Deputy Ozouf breached Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Code of Conduct in relation to the speeding offence, his repeated failure to attend the Parish Hall Enquiry and his failure to engage with the Commissioner for Standards processes in a timely manner.
26. Given that Deputy Ozouf has already issued a public apology in the Assembly, a further apology may be unnecessary. Any decision regarding additional sanctions lies with the Privileges and Procedures Committee.

14 June 2025
Dr Melissa McCullough
Commissioner for Standards, Jersey