

**IN THE POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING  
PURSUANT TO THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED BY THE  
POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024**

**BETWEEN:**

**THE COMMISSION OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS**

**Appropriate Authority**

**-and-**

**PC MOHAMMED CHOUDHURY**

**Officer concerned**

---

**PANEL FINDINGS**

---

**Introduction**

1. The misconduct hearing for PC Mohammed Choudhury (PC Choudhury) was held in public on 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> March 2026 at Empress State Building. A notice of hearing was published in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (“the 2020 Regulations”). The Panel comprised of Commander Stephen Clayman (Chair), Amanda Harvey and Adam Williamson (Independent Panel Members). The Legally Qualified Person was Christine Nwaokolo.
2. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of PC Choudhury. It is alleged that the PC Choudhury’s conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPB) as follows:

Allegation 1 - PC Choudhury, you accessed the CONNECT system and carried out a search using your forename, surname and date of birth and then opened a case where you were shown as a defendant.

Allegation 2 - PC Choudhury, you failed to disclose 6 penalty points endorsed on your personal driving licence by Northamptonshire Magistrates Court on 18 September 2023 for driving without insurance.

Allegation 3 - PC Choudhury, you failed to disclose a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) for an endorsable offence namely using a vehicle whilst uninsured on Wednesday 2 October 2024.

3. If proved, the allegation amounts to gross misconduct for the following reasons:
  - a) The conduct would be a breach of the standards of professional behaviour: Honesty and Integrity and, Discreditable Conduct; and that,
  - b) The breach of the standards of professional behaviour is so serious as to justify dismissal.
  
4. In his prepared statement of 16 July 2025, in relation to allegation 1, PC Choudhury accepts that he looked himself up on CONNECT and viewed a case where he was the Defendant. PC Choudhury states that this was for a policing purpose. PC Choudhury accepts that he has breached the SPB for Discreditable Conduct, but does not accept that he breached the SPB for Honesty & Integrity.
  
5. In relation to allegation 2, PC Choudhury accepts the behaviour alleged except that he did not at any time ignore a conditional offer. PC Choudhury accepts that he has breached the SPB for Discreditable Conduct. PC Choudhury does not accept that he breached the SPB for Honesty & Integrity.
  
6. In relation to allegation 3, PC Choudhury accepts the behaviour alleged and that this breaches the SPB for Discreditable Conduct. PC Choudhury does not accept that he breached the SPB for Honesty & Integrity.
  
7. The burden of proof is on the AA to prove (it is not for PC Choudhury to disprove) on the balance of probabilities that the officer behaved in the manner alleged and in doing so he breached the relevant SPB. Further, the AA must satisfy the Panel to the same standard that the manner of the breach is of such a nature or degree that it amounts to Misconduct/Gross Misconduct.

8. The Panel reminded itself that it does not need to make a finding on every issue and need only make findings on those issues which it believes to be relevant and material to the allegations. The Panel, has however, resolved enough to reach a clear judgment in this case.
9. The Panel approached its task in the following stages:
  - i) Are any of the facts admitted?
  - ii) What facts have been proved by the AA on the balance of probabilities?
  - iii) Of the admitted or proved facts, has the AA satisfied the panel on the balance of probabilities that the relevant SPB has been breached?
  - iv) If so, has the AA satisfied the Panel on the balance of probabilities that it is Gross Misconduct, namely the breach is so serious as to justify dismissal?

### **The proceedings**

10. The AA has been represented by Poppy Cleary of Counsel. The Officer was represented by DS Elliot Hughes (Police Federation). The Panel carefully considered all the documentation and submissions put forward on behalf of the AA and PC Choudhury. The Panel is grateful for the assistance provided by Ms Cleary and DS Hughes.

### **The admitted facts**

11. On 25<sup>th</sup> February 2025 PC Choudhury, carried out a search of his name and date of birth using the CONNECT system. PC Choudhury viewed a case which showed him as the defendant.
12. On 18<sup>th</sup> September 2023 PC Choudhury received a conviction for driving without insurance. Northamptonshire Magistrates Court endorsed 6 penalty points on PC Choudhury's personal licence. PC Choudhury did not inform his employer.
13. On 2 October 2024, PC Choudhury received a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) for using a vehicle uninsured. PC Choudhury did not tell his employer about the FPN.
14. PC Choudhury accepts that his conduct breaches the SPB in respect of Discreditable Conduct.

### **Disputed facts**

15. PC Choudhury states that he viewed the case on CONNECT for a training purpose and the reason he did not inform his employer about the traffic convictions is because he was embarrassed.
16. The issues for the Panel to resolve are:
  - a. Whether PC Choudhury's CONNECT access was justified.
  - b. Whether PC Choudhury's conduct breaches the SPB in respect of Honesty and Integrity.

### **Stage 1: Finding of Facts**

17. The Panel considered that the only relevant disputed fact at this stage to be determined is whether PC Choudhury had a policing purpose when making the searches and accessing his record on the CONNECT computer system.
18. In considering the disputed fact, the Panel carefully considered amongst other evidence, written accounts of the witnesses, investigation reports, video and audio of interviews. Statements were submitted by PC Choudhury, PC Christian Robinson, Jeremy Dixon and PC Steven Lush. The Panel did not hear any oral evidence from the witnesses or PC Choudhury.

### **Allegation 1**

19. In relation to this allegation, DS Hughes, on behalf of the Officer, submitted that whilst PC Choudhury accepted that he had searched his name and date of birth on CONNECT, and viewed a case where he showed as the defendant, he did so for a policing purpose. When asked by the Panel to clarify what the policing purpose was, it was submitted that it was for a training need.

### **Analysis**

20. The documentary evidence clearly shows that PC Choudhury accessed the CONNECT system on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2025 searching his name and date of birth and viewing the record attached to these details. Further, PC Choudhury accepts that he did this.

21. The Panel notes that in PC Choudhury's statement dated 16 July 2025 at paragraph 18 it states, "*I believed that there was a policing purpose for my actions in doing this.*" PC Choudhury's statement does not give any further detail on this point.
22. The Panel notes that it was only after clarification questions posed by the Panel that PC Choudhury informed that the policing purpose was a training need and even at that point no detail was provided on what exactly this training need encompassed. However, DS Hughes told the Panel that the Officer had limited experience of the system as he had been on restricted duties in relation to another matter. Prior to the hearing, the Panel had no information or context to explain the reason PC Choudhury viewed the case on CONNECT.
23. Further, even if the Panel accepted that PC Choudhury had accessed CONNECT for a training purpose it has received no explanation from PC Choudhury as to why this required searching his own details, especially as it is in breach of MPS policy.
24. Given the limited information and context available, the Panel does not accept PC Choudhury's submission, preferring the AA's submission as set out in its opening note this being that "*there was no policing purpose that would justify the searches completed by PC Choudhury and therefore it is a breach of the MPS ICT Policy*".
25. The burden of proof rests with the AA. The Panel found that the evidence was sufficient to make a finding that PC Choudhury had no justified reason for using CONNECT on the balance of probabilities, and therefore finds this allegation is proven.

#### Allegation 2 and 3

26. The Panel sought clarification through DS Hughes that PC Choudhury was aware of the requirement to disclose the traffic offences to his line management. The Panel was also aided by the statement of PC Lush as to reminders sent to PC Choudhury to supply his driving licence for his annual check which was overdue. The Panel accepted the AA's position that he did this to avoid penalty points coming to notice.
27. In any event, PC Choudhury admits to failing to disclose his traffic convictions and therefore these allegations are proven.

## **Standards of professional behaviour (SPB)**

### **Stage 2: Do the facts as determined by the panel constitute a breach of the standards of professional behaviour?**

28. Having found the allegations proven, the Panel then went on to consider whether, by his conduct, PC Choudhury had breached the SPB. The Panel reminded itself that Schedule 2 of the 2020 Regulations stipulates that, with regards to:

Discreditable Conduct: Police officers will behave in a manner, which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

Honesty and Integrity: Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position

29. In respect of 'Discreditable Conduct' the Panel notes that PC Choudhury accepts that his conduct breaches this standard. PC Choudhury's decision to access CONNECT to search his details without a policing reason and to not disclose his traffic convictions shows a lack of integrity. Police officers are expected to use CONNECT in a safe and proper way and for its intended purpose. Further it is incumbent on officers to know that a breach of the law needs to be reported. By choosing not to do so, again shows a lack of integrity. The Panel considers that PC Choudhury's conduct discredits the police service and undermines the public confidence in it.

30. In respect of Honesty and Integrity the Panel applied the two-stage test as set out in *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67

- a. Subjective: Ascertain the defendant's actual knowledge or belief as to the facts.
- b. Objective: Determine if the conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary, decent people.

### **Allegation 1**

31. PC Choudhury has not provided the Panel with any context except to say that he was searching for his name and date of birth and viewing the record for a training need. PC Choudhury would have received training on using CONNECT correctly, operationally

and purposefully. It follows that if PC Choudhury believed that he was using the system to search his name for a good reason he would have alerted his manager or further, if he was unsure about doing so again, he should have discussed this with his manager. To get to his record PC Choudhury would have had to pass a screen reminding the user of using the system for the correct policing purpose.

32. Without a full and proper explanation of PC Choudhury's use of CONNECT in this context the Panel consider that PC Choudhury's conduct would be seen as dishonest by the standards of ordinary, decent people.
33. The Panel determines proven allegation 1 breaches the SPB for Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct.

#### Allegation 2 and 3

34. Given the similar nature of these allegations the Panel considered them together when determining whether they breach SBP – Honesty and Integrity.
35. The Panel notes that PC Choudhury admits to not telling his employer about the traffic convictions. In submissions, DS Hughes stated that PC Choudhury did not disclose this information because he was embarrassed. Whilst the Panel appreciates that disclosing this information may not be easy it does not justify why this important and mandatory step was not taken.
36. The Panel considers that the public would expect officers to set an example in behaving with honesty and integrity. Failing to disclose convictions is serious. The public would expect PC Choudhury to act with integrity – by following the rules in disclosing the convictions. PC Choudhury's failure to disclose the traffic convictions meant that he concealed this information despite having opportunities and time to rectify the situation.
37. The Panel determines on the balance of probabilities proven allegations 2 and 3 breach the SPB for Honesty and Integrity and Discreditable Conduct.

#### **Misconduct or Gross Misconduct**

#### **Findings on gross misconduct/ misconduct**

38. The Panel then went on to consider whether PC Choudhury's behaviour amounted to Misconduct or Gross Misconduct.
39. The Panel reminded itself that Regulation 2(1) of the 2020 Regulations defines Misconduct as being 'a breach of the SPB behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action' whilst Gross Misconduct is defined as 'a breach of the SPB that is so serious as to justify dismissal'.
40. Further, the purpose of the police misconduct regime is to:
- a. maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service.
  - b. uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.
  - c. and to protect the public.
41. Although the College of Policing – Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings is aimed at informing decisions at the outcome stage, the Panel drew assistance from some of the principles contained within the guidance when assessing the overall seriousness of the breach in determining the level of misconduct.
42. The Panel is mindful that assessing the seriousness of the conduct lies at the heart of the decision on outcome under Parts 4 and 5 of the Conduct Regulations. Whether conduct would, if proved, amount to misconduct or gross misconduct for the purposes of Regulation 14 of the Conduct Regulations is also a question of degree (ie, seriousness).
43. It is the Panel's assessment that PC Choudhury was highly culpable for his conduct in respect of all 3 of the allegations. PC Choudhury acted alone and with intention. PC Choudhury chose to use CONNECT to search his personal details and then chose to open the record associated to it. PC Choudhury chose to not tell his employer about the traffic convictions despite knowing that he had to. PC Choudhury's concealment was used to cover his actions which he knew were wrong and a breach of the SPB.
44. It is the Panel's assessment that PC Choudhury actions amounted to a high level of harm. Whilst PC Choudhury's conduct did not cause actual harm to anyone, his actions have caused harm to the profession as it undermines public confidence. Whilst PC

Choudhury's conduct does not amount to operational dishonesty, his actions were dishonest which is serious.

45. The Panel has noted that there were two opportunities that PC Choudhury could have informed his employer that he had traffic convictions. PC Lush emailed PC Choudhury on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2024 and 14<sup>th</sup> May 2024 regarding his annual licence check.
46. The Panel consider that PC Choudhury tried to conceal that his driving licence had been compromised because of the traffic convictions and he has not been honest about the reasons for searching his name and date of birth on CONNECT.
47. Police officers are expected to be honest and conduct themselves with integrity. This is particularly important where in current times the public confidence in policing is a national concern. The Panel therefore assess the seriousness of PC Choudhury's misconduct as high.
48. It is the Panel's determination that in respect of allegations 1, 2 and 3, PC Choudhury's breach of the SPB, on the balance of probabilities amounts to Gross Misconduct.

### **Stage 3: Outcome**

49. Having made a finding of Gross Misconduct the Panel went on to consider sanction. The Panel approached this by applying the three stages to determining the appropriate sanction:
  1. Assess the seriousness of the misconduct by considering factors such as Harm, Culpability as well as Aggravating and Mitigating factors.
  2. Keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions by considering the threefold purpose of imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings as laid down in 2.3 of the College of Policing guidance:
    - a) to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service
    - b) to uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
    - c) to protect the public

3. Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

When considering the third stage the Panel is mindful that under The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025 15(3)(i) and (ii) in that where a panel has determined Gross Misconduct there is a presumption that the outcome justified is Dismissal without Notice, unless the panel is satisfied that there are “exceptional circumstances” which justify a lower sanction.

50. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction, the Panel have had regard to PC Choudhury’s service record, the facts found proved, the submissions made by Ms Cleary on behalf of the AA and DS Hughes on behalf of PC Choudhury along with the legal advice received from the LQA.

Submissions

51. Ms Cleary submitted on behalf of the AA that PC Choudhury’s culpability and harm is high due to his deliberate actions to conceal his traffic convictions and using the CONNECT system inappropriately. Ms Cleary submitted that the aggravating factors are; repeated conduct, significant deviation from instructions, continuing behaviour, leadership responsibility and multiple proven allegation/breaches of SPB. Ms Cleary submitted that there were no mitigating factors and the information set out in PC Choudhury’s statement was personal mitigation and therefore should not bear much weight to the decision on outcome. Ms Cleary submitted that the appropriate sanction is Dismissal without Notice.

52. PC Choudhury submitted that the Panel should consider paragraph 4 to 14 of his statement dated 16<sup>th</sup> July 2025. No further submissions were made on behalf of PC Choudhury.

Findings

53. In the Panel’s assessment of seriousness, the Panel determined that in relation to Harm caused and Culpability, this was assessed as high. This is due to the Panel’s

determination that PC Choudhury actions were deliberate and intentional. Further, PC Choudhury was solely responsible for his actions.

54. PC Choudhury's actions were dishonest, whilst it did not involve operational dishonesty; honesty and integrity are fundamental requirements for any police officer, breaching this SPB is serious, as it undermines the public confidence and trust in the police service. Further by PC Choudhury failing to disclose his traffic convictions there was a risk that he could have continued to drive whilst disqualified in his duties as a police officer. Given the harm to the public confidence and trust in the police service the Panel determined the level of harm to be high.

55. The Panel also took into consideration the following aggravating factors:

- PC Choudhury's regular and repeated misconduct
- In respect of non-disclosure of the driving offences, PC Choudhury continuing a course of conduct despite knowing that he should have done so
- PC Choudhury's significant deviation from operational policy
- PC Choudhury accessing a police computer system for personal benefit

56. The Panel did not identify any mitigating circumstances.

57. Maintenance of public confidence in the police and the reputation of the police service is paramount. The public expect police officers to comply with SBP and be role models in society. The public would expect standards to be high and upheld, and that action is taken to recognise misconduct as well as deter others from committing breaches of the SPB. The Panel determines that PC Choudhury's behaviour has constituted a serious departure from the professional standards set by the Police service and the standards which the public can rightly expect from the police officers who serve them.

58. The Panel read PC Choudhury's statement of 16 July 2025 which sets out his personal circumstances and empathises with his situation. However, the Panel is unable to consider this as mitigation for the proven gross misconduct. The Panel is mindful that the main consideration when determining sanction is the seriousness of the misconduct found proven. In this case the misconduct is very serious, and personal mitigation does not justify a lesser sanction.

59. Based on the Panel's assessment of seriousness and taking into account the three-fold purpose of sanctions and taking into consideration, the amendments to the 2020 Regulations, the Panel does not find any exceptional circumstances that would justify a deviation from the guidance.

60. Therefore, the only appropriate and proportionate sanction for PC Choudhury is **dismissal without notice** and that he be placed on the College of Policing's barred list.

### **Publication of Outcome Report**

61. The Chair directed publication of the outcome decision, subject to the harm test, pursuant to Regulation 43(6) of the 2020 Regulations.

20<sup>th</sup> March 2026