

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing: Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: - Former PC Katarzyna Komor
Warrant No: P 240890
Date of Hearing: 31st March 2026
Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct and Confidentiality

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.

The hearing was held in **Public**, albeit with reporting restrictions around the name of [REDACTED].

Former PC Katarzyna Komor did not attend the hearing, though I am satisfied that she had due notice of it and has voluntarily absented herself. She was represented by her Federation Representative Leighton Gurney.

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

The allegation against Former PC Katarzyna Komor is that: -

Allegation 1:

Between 8th November 2017 and 6th November 2021, you carried out unauthorised searches on MPS computer systems, accessing information you were not entitled to view.

On 4th December 2025, at Southwark Crown Court, you pleaded guilty to an offence under Section 1 of the Computer Misuse Act 1990.

[REDACTED]

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
- ii. Confidentiality

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 issue of fact which I have to decide is whether:

Between 8th November 2017 and 6th November 2021, she carried out unauthorised searches on MPS computer systems, accessing information she was not entitled to view.

On 4th December 2025, at Southwark Crown Court, she pleaded guilty to an offence under Section 1 of the Computer Misuse Act 1990.

[REDACTED]

Breach of Standards

If this allegation is 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) Confidentiality – Police Officers treat information with respect and access or disclose it only in the proper course of police duties.

Former PC Katarzyna Komor has not responded under Regulation 54 Police (Conduct) Regulations.

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the AA and carefully considered the documentary evidence provided to me and any submissions made on her behalf.

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 find the facts proven not least by the Former Officer's Guilty plea.

I then have to determine whether the facts proven amount to a breach of Professional Standards and amount to Discreditable Conduct and Confidentiality. 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.

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

Culpability – High

The Officer was responsible for her own actions. There were repeat and multiple breaches of the standard of confidentiality over many years. This conduct was criminal in nature.

Harm - High

Breaching confidentiality and sharing of data is particularly serious. The harm that could have been caused to those whose data was breached could have been considerable. The harm to the reputation of the police in general and the Metropolitan Police in particular is immense. People rightly expect the police to keep personal information safe.

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 her own actions. There were repeat and multiple breaches of the standard of confidentiality over many years. This conduct was criminal in nature.

Harm is High

Breaching confidentiality and sharing of data is particularly serious. The harm that could have been caused to those whose data was breached could have been considerable. The harm to the reputation of the police in general and the Metropolitan Police in particular is immense. People rightly expect the police to keep personal information safe.

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

None were advanced.

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. None was advanced 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.

As the officer is now no longer serving having found Gross Misconduct, I have to consider whether the Officer would have been dismissed if still serving or not.

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 **FPC Komor would have been dismissed if still serving and placed on the College of Policing Barred List**

**Commander Andy Brittain
Metropolitan Police Service
31st March 2026**