

## Accelerated Misconduct Hearing: Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: - DC Pervaz Malik  
Warrant No: P219413  
Date of Hearing: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2026  
Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Honesty and Integrity,  
and Fitness for Duty

### Finding

I have had the benefit of receiving the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started. I am satisfied that the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been served. These are matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.

### Public Hearing

I directed that the hearing be held in **Public**, because the default position in misconduct proceedings is transparency and open justice. The matters alleged are serious and engage public confidence in the police service; holding the hearing in public enables appropriate scrutiny of the process and its outcome and promotes accountability. I have nevertheless kept under review whether any part of the hearing should be heard in private, and I was satisfied that no specific and evidenced risk to the administration of justice, the safety of any person, or the protection of sensitive information required departure from the presumption of a public hearing.

DC Malik attended the venue early this morning to consult with his Federation Representative but left before the hearing. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the Officer had due notice of the hearing and has voluntarily absented himself.

DC Malik was represented by his Federation Rep PC Leigh Bowden, who made an application for an adjournment on a number of grounds:

- (i) The Notification to the previous Federation Representative was on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2026 which was the bare statutory minimum.
- (ii) That the Officer had not been given notice / sufficient time to object to identity of the Chair or LQA
- (iii) That he had insufficient time to obtain the services of a Solicitor or Barrister to represent him
- (iv) That the “special conditions” for an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing were not met.

- (v) That the matter should be adjourned until the conclusion of civil proceedings (under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002) which are provisionally listed in September 2026.
- (vi) That he was mentally unprepared for today's hearing.

This application was opposed on behalf of the Appropriate Authority (AA) by Aaryan Sattani who produced a list of relevant emails dated from 17<sup>th</sup> March 2026 when the previous Federation Representative acknowledged that papers would be served later that day and when the Federation Representative and the Officer concerned accessed the Box file link.

### **Adjournment Decision**

I listened closely to the submissions made by PC Bowden on behalf of the officer, as well as the submissions made by the Appropriate Authority (AA). I determine the application by reference to the grounds relied upon.

**Grounds (i) and (ii): service and opportunity to object.** In my view there was good service within the framework of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. Service was received and acknowledged by the officer's Federation representative on 17 March 2026. The service of papers contained details of the Chair and the legally qualified adviser (LQA), thereby giving the officer sufficient opportunity to raise any objection to those individuals within the relevant timescales. I therefore reject grounds (i) and (ii).

**Grounds (iii) and (vi): legal representation and preparedness.** I have no evidence of any attempts being made to privately fund legal representation, and I am satisfied that there was sufficient time for the officer to have arranged representation had he wished to do so. I also note that the officer delayed opening the Box file for three days until 26 March 2026, which is not the fault or responsibility of the AA. Further, the officer attended the venue this morning to consult with his Federation representative and then chose to absent himself thereafter. In those circumstances, I am not satisfied that the officer's lack of representation or asserted lack of preparedness provides proper grounds to adjourn. I therefore reject grounds (iii) and (vi).

**Ground (iv): special conditions for an accelerated misconduct hearing.** I note the submissions in relation to the special certificate signed by Commander Ivey. Having reviewed the case, I am content that the special conditions for an accelerated misconduct hearing are met. I therefore reject ground (iv).

**Ground (v): adjournment pending civil proceedings.** The officer seeks an adjournment until September 2026 in line with on-going civil proceedings (under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002). That is wholly outside the expectations of the Regulations, which require accelerated misconduct hearings to be dealt with

expeditiously. I note in particular that the Regulations do not provide for adjournments for civil matters. I therefore reject ground (v).

Accordingly, having rejected each of the grounds relied upon, I refused the application to adjourn and directed that the matter proceeds today.

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority (AA) by Aaryan Sattani.

The allegation against DC Malik is that: -

### **Allegation 1:**

Between 2016 and August 2023, whilst a serving police officer, you routinely arranged sex workers for yourself and your associates during overseas trips, predominantly to Morocco and on other foreign holidays.

Particulars:

- i. Recovered digital material from devices CAH/1, CAH/3 and GET/150823/1 demonstrates extensive and repeated communication with sex workers to negotiate prices, arrange bookings, and organise group sexual encounters.
- ii. You frequently used multiple aliases including “Guggs/Gugs”, “Pav”, and “ADEM/Adam” to conceal your identity and maintain contact with sex workers and those arranging them.
- iii. You acted as the primary organiser for associates, coordinating which women were to attend, what they would be paid, and where the encounters would occur.

### **Allegation 2:**

Over the same period, you purchased, used, and facilitated the supply of Class A drugs, namely cocaine hydrochloride and MDMA, in the context of the sexual encounters arranged for yourself and your associates abroad.

Particulars:

- i. The recovered messages show you repeatedly offering cocaine (“coke”, “coca”, “cokey”, “yayo”) and MDMA to sex workers and associates as part of planned encounters.

- ii. Photographs and videos recovered from your devices depict white powder believed to be controlled drugs, discussions regarding drug quantities, and footage of you and associates handling and consuming drugs during foreign trips (including Brazil 2023).
- iii. A Drug Expert Witness concluded that the device holder was concerned in the offer and supply of cocaine and MDMA between 2016 and 2023.

### **Allegation 3:**

On 9 February 2024, you knowingly failed to provide the correct PIN for device CAH/3 when served with a court-authorized Section 49 RIPA Notice, thereby frustrating an active criminal investigation.

#### Particulars:

- i. You were lawfully served with a Section 49 RIPA Notice on 24 January 2024, requiring disclosure of the unlock code by 9 February 2024.
- ii. You knowingly provided a false PIN [REDACTED], which did not unlock the device.
- iii. Digital forensics later established the correct PIN as [REDACTED], and successfully accessed the phone.
- iv. Your refusal to comply hindered investigators from accessing substantial evidence relating to drug supply and the arrangement of sex workers.

#### Professional Standards of Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that your actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in the Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely:

- i. Discreditable Conduct – in relation to all three allegations
- ii. Honesty and Integrity – Allegation 1 – Integrity only and allegation 3 – Honesty and Integrity
- iii. Fitness for Duty - in relation to Allegation 2 only

In that your conduct may bring the police service into disrepute and damage the relationship of trust and confidence between the police and the public.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, your conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct, and your dismissal may be justified.

## Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether:

### **Allegation 1:**

Between 2016 and August 2023, whilst a serving police officer, he routinely arranged sex workers for himself and his associates during overseas trips, predominantly to Morocco and on other foreign holidays.

Particulars:

- i. Recovered digital material from devices CAH/1, CAH/3 and GET/150823/1 demonstrates extensive and repeated communication with sex workers to negotiate prices, arrange bookings, and organise group sexual encounters.
- ii. You frequently used multiple aliases including “Guggs/Gugs”, “Pav”, and “ADEM/Adam” to conceal your identity and maintain contact with sex workers and those arranging them.
- iii. You acted as the primary organiser for associates, coordinating which women were to attend, what they would be paid, and where the encounters would occur.

### **Allegation 2:**

Over the same period, he purchased, used, and facilitated the supply of Class A drugs, namely cocaine hydrochloride and MDMA, in the context of the sexual encounters arranged for himself and his associates abroad.

Particulars:

- i. The recovered messages show you repeatedly offering cocaine (“coke”, “coca”, “cokey”, “yayo”) and MDMA to sex workers and associates as part of planned encounters.

- ii. Photographs and videos recovered from your devices depict white powder believed to be controlled drugs, discussions regarding drug quantities, and footage of you and associates handling and consuming drugs during foreign trips (including Brazil 2023).
- iii. A Drug Expert Witness concluded that the device holder was concerned in the offer and supply of cocaine and MDMA between 2016 and 2023.

### **Allegation 3:**

On 9 February 2024, you knowingly failed to provide the correct PIN for device CAH/3 when served with a court-authorized Section 49 RIPA Notice, thereby frustrating an active criminal investigation.

#### Particulars:

- i. You were lawfully served with a Section 49 RIPA Notice on 24 January 2024, requiring disclosure of the unlock code by 9 February 2024.
- ii. You knowingly provided a false PIN [REDACTED], which did not unlock the device.
- iii. Digital forensics later established the correct PIN as [REDACTED], and successfully accessed the phone.
- iv. Your refusal to comply hindered investigators from accessing substantial evidence relating to drug supply and the arrangement of sex workers.

#### Breaches of Standards

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether it amounts of breach of the following standards of behaviour namely:

- (i) Discreditable Conduct - Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence whether on or off duty.
- (ii) Honesty and Integrity – Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

- (iii) Fitness for Duty – Police officers when on duty or presenting themselves for duty are fit to carry out their responsibilities.

DC Malik has not responded under Regulation 54 Police (Conduct) Regulations, but I understand from his Federation Representative that he denies Misconduct.

### Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the AA and carefully considered the documentary evidence provided to me.

I remind myself that the burden of proving the facts lies on the AA to the civil standard (i.e. the balance of probabilities).

I then have to determine whether the facts proven amount to a breach or breaches of Professional Standards of Discreditable Conduct, Honesty and Integrity and Fitness for Duty. The burden of proving the breaches of professional standards lies on the AA to the civil standard.

I find the breaches proved to the civil standard all each of the Professional Standards as alleged.

I now go on to make a provisional assessment of seriousness:

### Culpability – High

The Officer was responsible for his own actions. He was involved in complex and sustained activities that were criminal in nature and involved exploitation of women who were likely to be vulnerable. The use of sex workers and drugs are inextricably linked to organised crime networks, the very activity he was employed to investigate.

There were repeat and multiple breaches of the standards over a number of years.

### Harm - High

The harm to the reputation of the police in general and the Metropolitan Police in particular is immense. People rightly expect the police to act within the law, protect the vulnerable and investigate crime. These actions will clearly bring the MPS into significant disrepute.

Officers should always act with honesty and integrity. His refusal to provide the correct PIN number to his phone actively hindered the criminal investigation.

Overall, I assess the seriousness of the Officer's conduct as High.

### Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach or breaches of the standards of professional behaviour, which individually or cumulatively, are so serious that dismissal would be justified. Applying that definition – I find the matter **proven** as Gross Misconduct.

### Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I adopt the three-stage process, as outlined in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings to determine the appropriate sanction.

The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the conduct.

This is assessed by reference to:

- (i) The officer's culpability
- (ii) The harm caused by the misconduct
- (iii) The existence of aggravating facts
- (iv) The existence of mitigating factors

The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

I remind myself this has three elements:

- (i) To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service
- (ii) To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and
- (iii) To protect the public

I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils that purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.

## **Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct.**

I have made a provisional assessment of seriousness above and adopt them herein.

Culpability is High

The Officer was responsible for his own actions. He was involved in complex and sustained activities that were criminal in nature and involved exploitation of women who were likely to be vulnerable. The use of sex workers and drugs are inextricably linked to organised crime networks, the very activity he was employed to investigate.

There were repeat and multiple breaches of the standards over a number of years.

Harm is High

The harm to the reputation of the police in general and the Metropolitan Police in particular is immense. People rightly expect the police to act within the law, protect the vulnerable and investigate crime. These actions will clearly bring the MPS into significant disrepute.

Officers should always act with honesty and integrity. His refusal to provide the correct PIN number to his phone actively hindered the criminal investigation.

Aggravating Factors - When considering aggravating factors, I am mindful not to double count matters that have already formed part of my assessment of harm and culpability.

Mitigating Factors – There were no mitigating factors.

Conclusion on Seriousness

Taking all of these matters into consideration, I assess the seriousness of the conduct as high.

Personal Mitigation

I am mindful of the limits to the weight I should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings, and that the interests of the police service, and the protection of the public, are more important than those of the individual officer. No mitigation was advanced for the Officer in any event.

## **Stage 2: the purpose of the police misconduct regime.**

I remind myself this has three elements:

- (i) To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service
- (ii) To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and
- (iii) To protect the public

I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

I do acknowledge that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect: accordingly, the outcome should be no more than is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings.

## **Stage 3: The appropriate outcome**

I have considered the officer's record of service which records no prior findings.

As the matter came to the attention of the AA prior to the implementation of the 2025 Conduct Regulations the Court has to consider a lesser sanction before deciding which sanction is proportionate and commensurate with the seriousness of the case. Having considered all the matters I am of the view that no sanction short of dismissal without notice is appropriate in this case.

## **DECISION ON OUTCOME**

Having considered the matter fully and having had regard to the nature and severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour as well as the mitigation, my decision is that **DC Malik be dismissed without notice and placed on the College of Policing Barred List**

**Commander Andy Brittain**  
**Metropolitan Police Service**  
**31<sup>st</sup> March 2026**