

IN THE MATTER OF THE MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2024)

BETWEEN

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

and

FDS Jason Grafham

PANEL FINAL DECISION

Introductions:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for Former DS Jason Grafham (the Officer). The outline of the Panel decisions on facts and outcome was provided to the Officer during the hearing.
2. The Panel was chaired by Commander Paul Trevers (Chair), with independent members Ms Lesley Stephen and Mr David Scott. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Olivia Kong.
3. The Appropriate Authority was represented by Ms Louise McCulloch (AA's Representative). The Officer did not attend the hearing. He was represented by his Federation Representative, Mr Mark Scrutton (Federation Representative).
4. The hearing was held from 14 to 17 July 2026 at the Palestra House, 197 Blackfriars Road, SE1 8NJ.
5. At the outset of its determinations, and throughout the hearing, the Panel has remained mindful of the overarching purpose of police misconduct proceedings, namely:
 - i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;
 - ii. To uphold high standards of professional conduct and deter misconduct;

- iii. To protect the public.

The Allegations:

- 6. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of the Officer containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct, namely:

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

Allegation 1

On about 18th March 2024 you spoke to Ms C about some plastering that she wished to have done at her home address. You responded by saying words to the effect of “by the time I’ll have finished with you, you will look like a plasterer’s radio”.

Allegation 2

On about 17th April 2024 you invited Ms C to go to a concert with you. She told you that she had a broken foot and would not be able to go. You replied by saying words to the effect of “You stupid bint, you wouldn’t have to stand, they are VIP tickets so you would have a seat”.

Allegation 3

On about 14th November 2024 you made a comment about Ms B while she was bending over. You said words to the effect of “Oh, I didn’t bring my bike with me today”.

Allegation 4

Notwithstanding that the case of Sally Anne Bowman had been closed years before, you retained papers and photographs from the case, and when you had no policing reason to do so. You showed photographs of Sally Anne Bowman’s body to other officers, when there was no policing purpose to do so.

Allegation 5

You made a comment about clothing worn by DS Walker, to the effect of “Where did you get that shirt, GaysRUs?”

Allegation 6

On 16th December 2024 you attended a Mindfulness course, together with Ms A. You then said to her words to the effect that you had found the session really hard, and because you had been trying to look up her skirt.

Allegation 7

Also on 16th December 2024 you gave Ms A a Christmas card with a handwritten message. You said that “If you want a “White” Xmas then pull your knickers down immediately and I’ll oblige!”

Allegation 8

On 16th December 2024 you spoke to Ms B and described a Welsh colleague as having a penis like a grandfather clock. You said this in a mock false Welsh accent.

Allegation 9

In December 2024 you spoke about Ms C’s Outlook diary for her work plan for future days. You suggested that she would be “wanking from home”, rather than working from home on a certain day.

Your actions, as set out in paragraphs 1 to 3 and 5 to 9 inclusive, were

- a. Unnecessary,
- b. Offensive, both to the recipients and also to others within earshot,
- c. Sexually inappropriate, with regard to paragraphs 1, 3, 6, 7, and 9,
- d. Derogatory and/or discriminatory, with regard to paragraphs 2, 5 and 8.

Your actions with regard to paragraph 4 above were inappropriate and unnecessary.

Your actions as set out in paragraphs 1 to 9 inclusive breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour of Discreditable Conduct:

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

Your actions as set out in paragraphs 1 to 3 and 5 to 9 inclusive breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour of Authority, Respect and Courtesy:

Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

Your actions as set out in paragraphs 2, 5 and 8 breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour of Equality and Diversity:

Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.

- a. Your actions discriminated against women (paragraph 2), homosexuals (paragraph 5) and Welsh people (paragraph 8).

And take notice that the matters in paragraphs 1 to 9 inclusive amount to gross misconduct and are so serious as to justify dismissal.

Preliminary Issues

Application for anonymity of Witnesses

7. Anonymity for Ms A, Ms B and Ms C was applied for at the preliminary hearing. The Officer did not oppose the application. The Chair granted anonymity on the basis that these witnesses are complainants in relation to comments of a sexual nature, and that the extensive media coverage surrounding the matter may adversely affect the quality of their evidence. In those circumstances, it is appropriate that Ms A, Ms B and Ms C are anonymised.

The Panel's Approach

8. The Panel reminded itself of its core responsibilities:
 - a. To assess the facts of the case and make findings in relation to each allegation;
 - b. To determine whether those findings amount to a breach of the relevant Standards of Professional Behaviour;
 - c. To decide whether the conduct found proven constitutes misconduct or gross misconduct.
9. The Panel remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the AA throughout the proceedings. The applicable standard is the balance of probabilities, that is, whether the alleged conduct is more likely than not to have occurred.

10. In reaching its decisions, the Panel considered the purpose and nature of police misconduct proceedings. The primary aim is not to punish the Officer, but to uphold public confidence in the police service and protect its reputation by ensuring accountability and making clear that improper conduct will not be tolerated. A secondary aim is to affirm and promote high professional standards. A further purpose is to protect the public, the Complainant, and police staff by preventing recurrence of similar misconduct. In doing so, the Panel had regard to the principles established in *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512; *Chief Constable of Dorset v PAT, Salter (Interested Party)* [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin); and *R (Williams) v PAT* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).
11. The Panel also considered the relevant regulatory framework and guidance, including:
- a. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 (“the Regulations”), particularly the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2;
 - b. The 2018 Home Office Guidance (“HOG”), with specific reference to Chapter 1, which summarises the Standards;
 - c. The definition of misconduct under Regulation 3(1): “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour”;
 - d. The definition of gross misconduct under Regulation 3(1): “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified”.
12. The Panel listened carefully to all oral evidence and thoroughly reviewed the documentary evidence. It considered the totality of the evidence and submissions. While it does not propose to address every individual point raised, the Panel sets out its principal findings and conclusions.

Evidence

13. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:
- a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response) consisting of 185 pages;
 - b. AA’s opening note consisting of 6 pages;
 - c. The Officer’s police interview video.
 - d. The Officer’s service and training records.

14. The Panel also heard from the following live witnesses:

- a. Ms A
- b. Ms B
- c. Ms C
- d. DI Caveen

Case Summary

- 15. On 17 December 2024, Ms A disclosed to Acting Inspector Burke that she had received a Christmas card from the Officer containing handwritten comments of an inappropriate sexual nature. The previous day, 16 December 2024, Ms A had also reported that the Officer had made sexually explicit verbal remarks towards her, which caused her discomfort.
- 16. Following Ms A's disclosures, several other officers came forward and reported further incidents in which the Officer had used sexually explicit or inappropriate language towards or about colleagues.
- 17. In addition to these concerns, on 23 December 2024 a further matter was reported to DCI Foster. It was alleged that the Officer had been showing colleagues crime scene photographs from the 2005 murder of Sally Anne Bowman. The investigation into that murder, *Operation Afolkey*, was not part of the Cold Case Homicide Team's current portfolio, and the Officer had no legitimate policing purpose to possess or display such material.
- 18. Later that same day, DCI Foster conducted a search of the Officer's desk area. The search resulted in the recovery of crime scene photographs, an MG5 document, a photocopy of the custody record for the defendant, Mark Dixie, a copy of Dixie's confession letter, and five working copies of DVDs, all relating to *Operation Afolkey*.

Finding of Facts & Breaches

Findings and Decisions FDS Grafham (The Officer)

- 19. The Panel carefully considered all the evidence presented during the proceedings, including the agreed hearing bundle, the victim impact statement provided on the first day of the hearing, the oral testimony of the four witnesses, and the closing submissions made by counsel for the Appropriate Authority and the Officer's Federation Representative. The Panel also took account of the legal advice provided throughout the hearing and followed it with diligence.

20. In reaching its decision, the Panel has applied the civil standard of proof - namely, the balance of probabilities - and has kept firmly in mind that the burden of proof rests with the Appropriate Authority.

21. The Panel heard live evidence from the following witnesses:

Ms A

Ms B

Ms C

DI Caveen

22. The evidence of each witness was considered in full, including their respective interviews, written statements, oral testimony, and responses under cross-examination. The Panel also reviewed the Regulation 31 response from the Officer and his respective interviews and the investigation report during the hearing. Where applicable, the Panel distinguished between direct observations and hearsay and gave appropriate weight to each source of evidence based on its reliability, consistency, and corroboration.

23. The Panel notes that it is not in dispute that the Officer was a work colleague of Ms A, Ms B and Ms C, and that he acted as the exhibits officer in the case concerning Miss Sally Anne Bowman. The conduct underpinning the allegations is said to have arisen during the course of his interactions with those colleagues.

24. Against that background, the Panel is required to determine, on the basis of the totality of the evidence, whether the conduct alleged in each of the nine allegations occurred and, if so, whether it amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

The witnesses

Ms A

25. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Ms A, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was detailed, internally coherent and broadly consistent.

26. Ms A explained that she had worked with the Officer previously, not on the same floor but within the same building, and described having been happy working with him. She also described the Officer as struggling with significant personal issues and family bereavement. She was aware of his vulnerability, had concerns about his wellbeing, and believed he should not have been at work. She said she had signposted him to seek help and had informed his line manager. She

described him as a “broken man” following his family bereavement. She said the pain he suffered was “horrific” and that, in her view, the organisation had not put the right safeguarding in place. She said he had done a lot of good things in his job but had not received the support he should have for the trauma he had experienced.

27. Against that background, Ms A described a series of inappropriate and sexualised comments made by the Officer. She said he had previously commented on a photograph of her wearing designer heels, telling her he wanted to print it and place it by his desk. During a mindfulness photography session, he referred to her boots as “come fuck me boots.” Ms A said she did not respond at the time, thinking the remark was “crass,” and ignored it because the Officer often engaged in inappropriate banter.
28. During a mindfulness photography session, aimed at improving officer wellbeing, the Officer said, “I found it really hard in that session.” Ms A felt sorry for him, believing the session had raised sensitive issues for him, and she linked arms with him to offer comfort. She reassured him that such sessions can bring out emotions. He replied, “No it wasn’t that, I was trying to look up your skirt.” Ms A said she was shocked because she did not expect him to be “perving” over her in that situation. She disconnected her arm, mingled with the rest of the group, and thereafter deliberately avoided being alone with him. She later reflected that she may not have dealt with the incident correctly at the time and perhaps should have taken him aside to say it was inappropriate.
29. On the walk back to the office, the Officer again walked with her. He said something along the lines of, “I don’t know why Tricky turned you down.” “Tricky” was the nickname for police colleague with whom Ms A had previously flirted. When she asked why he had raised this, he replied, “I have no idea why he would have turned you down.” When she asked again why he was bringing it up, he said, “Because I wouldn’t have. I would have given you a good seeing to and if you were interested I would.” Ms A said she felt shocked, repulsed and nauseous, and at that point looked at him as a “dirty old man,” thinking, “What the fuck?” She told him they did not have that type of relationship and never would. He shrugged and replied, “Well if you ever change your mind, I definitely would.” She recalled wanting to get away from the situation.
30. Ms A also described receiving a Christmas card from the Officer which read: “What a crappy Xmas! If you want a ‘white’ xmas then pull your knickers down immediately and I’ll oblige! You are a true friend ‘Ms A’ Love Graffs x.” She said she felt disgusted and could not believe someone in the organisation would write something so derogatory. She was angry and embarrassed because the Officer had given her the card in front of her staff, most of whom were young female colleagues. In shock, she blurted out, “Urgh, that’s foul,” loudly enough for others to hear. The Officer turned and said, “Well don’t show anyone.” Ms A believed staff heard this because she saw two colleagues turn their heads with

concern. Other colleagues saw the card and commented that it was “not good” and “disgusting,” and told her she should report it.

31. Ms A spoke to DI Caveen about the card and said she no longer wished to continue as the Officer’s welfare officer. She said the incidents made her uncomfortable and caused her to lose confidence.
32. During cross-examination, Ms A accepted that she and the Officer had previously had a “bantering” relationship. She acknowledged sending him a picture of herself holding two Krispy Kreme doughnuts in front of her chest when he had given them to her. She said the Officer normally dressed very smartly, but at the photography session he did not, which made her worry that his personal issues were out of control. She reiterated her belief that he was vulnerable and that the organisation should have taken responsibility for supporting him.

Ms B

33. The Panel considered the evidence of Ms B, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was broadly consistent.
34. Ms B stated that the Officer showed graphic crime scene photographs from the murder of Sally Anne Bowman to DC Neale, describing disturbing details aloud as he did so. She said she overheard the Officer asking DC Neale whether he had seen the photographs; she could not recall DC Neale’s response, but the Officer showed them to him regardless. Ms B said the Officer had spoken about the case many times, as he had been involved in the investigation.
35. Ms B also described an incident in which she was under her desk plugging in a heater. The Officer made a suggestive comment: “Oh I didn’t bring my bike with me today.” When she replied, “What?”, loudly enough for a colleague on the other side of the office to look up, the Officer repeated the remark. Ms B understood this to mean he was referring to the size of her buttocks. She said she found the comment shocking, inappropriate, and uncomfortable. She said she often chose to sit at a different bank of desks to avoid hearing the Officer make inappropriate remarks while at work.
36. Ms B further recounted that Ms C had previously told her the Officer had spoken about the suspect convicted of the murder of Sally Anne Bowman and had said to Ms C, “You’d be just his type, Ms C.” Ms C had found this very upsetting because she had lived near the crime scene at the time of the murder. Ms B said the Officer appeared to have an obsession with the case and talked about it frequently. While Ms B understood officers discussing cases they had worked on, she found it disturbing that the Officer still possessed crime scene photographs from 20 years earlier. Ms B said she was sure the victim’s family would be horrified if they knew the Officer used the images for entertainment or bragging rights.

37. Ms B also described overhearing the Officer talking about a male colleague who was not present. The Officer referred to the colleague's penis as a "grandfather clock" and then continuing mocking the colleague, impersonating his Welsh accent in an exaggerated manner. Ms B said the Officer told her an inappropriate story and, despite her repeated requests for him to stop, he continued until she had to shout, "I don't want to know, I'm not listening." Even then, he laughed and carried on until she walked away.
38. Ms B stated that she was concerned for the Officer's welfare, given his personal difficulties, but she was equally concerned about the impact of his behaviour on the team. She said his inappropriate comments were making colleagues feel uncomfortable and that he could not continue to behave in that way.
39. When asked by the Panel, Ms B stated she had not received training from the Officer.

Ms C

40. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Ms C, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was detailed and consistent, and she demonstrated a clear distinction between events she directly observed and those relayed to her by others.
41. Ms C states that the Officer became her line manager when he returned to the team in September 2023 after a long sickness absence. She recalls that their first conversation was about the Sally Anne Bowman murder. Ms C told him she had lived a few streets away from the scene in South Croydon and that, on the night of the murder, she had been walking home late only a few hundred yards from where Sally Anne Bowman was attacked. The Officer responded by telling her she was "exactly Mark Dixie's type", a comment he repeated more than once. Ms C describes feeling uncomfortable, as he appeared to be comparing her to a raped, mutilated and murdered woman based on her gender and appearance rather than her proximity to the location.
42. She states that the Officer had been the exhibits officer on the investigation and would regularly refer to Sally Anne Bowman or Mark Dixie over the following months. Ms C believed he had a fixation on the enquiry despite it occurring around twenty years earlier. She later learned that the Officer still possessed graphic crime scene photographs from the case, which she found disturbing and professionally inappropriate.
43. Ms C describes an incident in which the Officer was chatting at their desk while she worked with headphones in. After she mentioned she had booked a plasterer, the Officer paused, looked directly at her with a grin, and said, "by the time I'll have finished with you, you will look like a plasterers' radio." He then laughed. Ms C recognised this as a reference to a comedian's description of men ejaculating on women's faces. She was disgusted and horrified that he appeared to enjoy making the comment. She responded, "Offer rescinded! You are never

coming to my house!” She notes that no one reacted, as he often tried to engage colleagues while they were concentrating. She returned to her work and he walked away. She did not initially think he intended to belittle her, but later felt the comment “definitely crosses a line” and made a note of it.

44. Ms C recalls another occasion when the Officer peered over DC Wilkinson’s shoulder during a Teams call and said, “Cor, she’s a bit of alright isn’t she! Who’s that?” The person speaking was a senior female officer. DC Wilkinson waved him away and said loudly, “Go away Jason”.
45. She states that when she broke her foot and informed him, he invited her to a gig in Camden. When she declined, he said, “you stupid bint, you wouldn’t have to stand, they are VIP tickets so you would have a seat.”
46. Ms C also describes an incident in mid-December 2024 when she updated her Outlook calendar to show she was working from home. The Officer read her entry aloud: “WFH – Op Effner”, then said, “What has Ms C put on her Outlook calendar? ‘Working from home on Friday for Op Effner’?” He added sarcastically, “Yes course she is. Of course, she is doing work from home on the Friday before Christmas – more like ‘wanking from home!’” Ms C states she was furious that he questioned her integrity and made a sexualised comment about her in front of colleagues. No one reacted. She was too angry to confront him and did not want any exchange involving masturbation.
47. Ms C also reports gendered and inappropriate remarks, including referring to management as the “Stasi” and “Lady DIs”.
48. She recalls another incident when DS Walker and DC Magner returned from the gym wearing fresh shirts. The Officer said something to the effect of, “Where did you get that shirt, GaysRUs?” and she heard Magner respond, “What would be wrong with that if he did?!” She states this was typical of the Officer, who frequently commented on people’s appearance and characteristics. She found it wearing that he habitually spoke to DC Morgan in an exaggerated Welsh accent and often said the first unfiltered thing that came into his head to amuse himself. She was not surprised he made homophobic jokes about DS Walker.
49. Ms C states the Officer made five members of the pod move their desks closer to him, increasing their interaction with him. He talked constantly, sometimes to himself, making it difficult to concentrate. She avoided him where possible, wore headphones, and limited communication to essential work matters. Colleagues told her he had said, “Ms C hates me. She looks at me with nothing but contempt.” She states she did not hate him; she simply did not want to be spoken to like that again. She did not feel physically threatened but would not want to be alone with him in a car or lift in case he made further disrespectful remarks. She also expressed concern about him being deployed on public-facing enquiries due to his propensity for inappropriate behaviour.

50. When asked by the Panel, Ms C stated she had not received training from the Officer.

DI Caveen

51. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of DI Caveen, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her clear and consistent oral testimony.

52. DI Caveen confirmed that she had been the Officer's line manager since 2024. She said Ms A had reported both the Christmas card incident and the incident during the mindfulness photography session to her. In relation to the Christmas card, DI Caveen said she had seen the card before meeting with Ms A. She described what the Officer had written as "appalling," "outrageous," and said she was "disgusted" by it. In her view, it was wholly unacceptable to say such things to colleagues or to anyone. Ms A also gave her background about the day of the mindfulness session and what had occurred.

53. DI Caveen confirmed she was aware of the Officer's struggles at the time, including personal issues and family bereavement. She said his presentation varied: he had periods of sickness, and at times appeared not to be coping. On occasion he had issues that required advice from Professional Standards. She said the Officer sought help from his GP and other sources. Although he could sometimes be jovial, DI Caveen did not think he was performing well in his role and did not consider him to be a good manager at that time. She said he had "better days," but his functioning was inconsistent. When asked by the Panel if consideration was given to a new role for the Officer, she explained that she knew of the Officer's history and could be better supported in his role with adjustments made in terms of reduced responsibilities. She said she tried to speak to him about many aspects of his duties and, over time, assigned him mainly administrative tasks, including managing the work calendar. She said she had to take over his investigative work herself and did not believe that his workload was causing the difficulties he was experiencing. She confirmed she had given him a low level of work.

54. In relation to his personal issues, DI Caveen said the Officer was supposed to undergo a medical process to assist him, but ultimately he returned to taking medication to address what she described as an unhealthy relationship with alcohol.

55. DI Caveen said she kept clear notes of the Officer's issues and had referred him to various agencies for support. She also referred him to Occupational Health to assist him with both his personal difficulties and his work. The officer was provided support from the charity Rock2Recovery and other alcohol support was offered. She also implemented a daily check in to ensure his welfare. She confirmed that he was not given any responsibility for training members of the team.

56. DI Caveen confirmed the officer had no legitimate policing purpose to have the material relating to the Sally Anne Bowman case and when asked by the Panel, commented that the Officer played no role in training colleagues.

DS Walker

57. DS Walker states in his statement that he did not witness the incidents himself; his account reflects information reported to him by colleagues. He was told that the Officer had shown colleagues crime scene photographs from the 2005 Sally Anne Bowman murder, which he found unusual and concerning given the passage of nearly twenty years.
58. He explains that he was approached by Mr Ndungu, who told him he was becoming increasingly concerned about the Officer's odd behaviour at work. Mr Ndungu said he had heard the Officer making sexualised comments in the office that might offend people, although he did not expand on what he meant by this.
59. DS Walker also recalls vaguely an incident that took place when he returned to the office after being in the gym. He cannot recall exactly what was said and was not personally offended by the language, but he does remember DC Magner correctly challenging what the Officer said in a respectful way, making the Officer aware that the comment was inappropriate. DS Walker states that DC Marshall may have overheard the homophobic comment and been affected. He also believed at the time that other officers in the vicinity might have been impacted by the Officer's inappropriate language.

Mr Ndungu

60. Mr Ndungu stated in his statement that while walking around the office he noticed the Officer seated with members of his team, including DC Neale and Ms C, and went over to greet them. They appeared to be in discussion, though he cannot recall the subject. He does remember hearing part of a conversation about working from home, which the Officer was commenting on. Mr Ndungu explains that he generally tended to "switch off" to avoid participating in office "banter", but his attention was caught by the Officer's laughter followed by a clear comment from DC Neale: "that's NOT in My Met". He interpreted this as a challenge to an inappropriate remark made by the Officer.
61. Mr Ndungu states he had noticed increasingly erratic behaviour from the Officer in recent weeks, and on that day he felt acutely concerned about the Officer's mental health. He discussed his concerns with DS Walker and considered making a welfare referral to DC Stokes, the Health and Wellbeing Officer.

DC Magner

62. DC Magner stated in his statement that he had been told by colleagues about an incident that occurred when he and DS Walker returned to the office after

coming back from the gym. He was informed that the Officer had said something along the lines of: "Was that from Gays-R-Us?" or possibly "was that from Gay.com?". DC Magner challenged what the Officer had said, responding with words to the effect of: "So what if it was?"

63. DC Magner explains that he cannot fully remember the incident or the exact words the Officer used. Although he cannot recall the precise wording or what he said in response, he agrees that the account described to him "does sound like the type of thing he would say".

DC Neale

64. DC Neale stated in his statement that the Officer had paperwork relating to the Sally Anne Bowman investigation on his desk. The Officer had previously told him that he was the exhibits officer on the case, and DC Neale believes he was also involved in interviews with Mark Dixie, who was convicted of Sally Anne Bowman's murder. The paperwork included crime scene photographs, presented as printed pages rather than in album form.

65. DC Neale sits immediately to the Officer's left. On the day in question, the Officer drew his attention by saying something like, "Did I mention that I was involved in the Sally Anne Bowman investigation?" DC Neale describes this as a running joke in the office, as the Officer regularly talks about the case. He notes that the Officer is extremely proud of his past work and often discusses previous investigations, particularly the Bowman case. According to DC Neale, the Officer has spoken about the job to most people in the office, though this was the first time he had seen any crime scene photographs.

66. The Officer spoke briefly about the investigation, though DC Neale does not recall the detail. As they talked, DC Neale looked over and saw a bundle of paperwork and photographs on the Officer's desk. When the Officer turned the pages, DC Neale saw three or four crime scene photographs. The Officer continued discussing the investigation as he flipped through the documents.

67. DC Neale did not know why the Officer had the paperwork out, but he appeared to be sorting through various files and folders.

[REDACTED] He states that nothing about the way the events unfolded struck him as improper. In addition to the Officer's personal involvement in the case, DC Neale describes him as someone who is always keen to impart relevant learning and experience to the team.

DI Greig

68. DI Greig stated in her statement that she was informed the Officer had been placed on local restrictions following an allegation of inappropriate behaviour

towards a female staff member. Although she was shocked, she was not entirely surprised, as she already had concerns about his language and behaviour. She was told by DS Walker that the Officer had shown crime scene photographs of Sally Anne Bowman to colleagues. As the case was not part of the Cold Case Homicide Team's portfolio, DI Greig considered there to be no policing purpose for the Officer to possess such material. She also had prior knowledge of the Bowman case through a related cold case rape investigation. She further recalls that Mr Ndungu had previously raised concerns about the Officer making sexual comments in the office. DI Greig informed both DCI Foster and DI Caveen about the photographs.

69. DI Greig states that she searched the Officer's desk and drawers, while DCI Foster searched the area behind the desk. DCI Foster located photocopies of the crime scene photographs and related paperwork, which were seized and secured.

DCI Foster

70. DCI Foster stated in her statement that she was informed by DI Greig that the Officer had allegedly shown graphic crime scene photographs of Sally Anne Bowman to colleagues. She notes that the case, known as *Operation Afolkey*, was not part of the Cold Case Team's active portfolio, and there was no legitimate policing reason for the Officer to possess any related materials.
71. A search of the Officer's desk area was subsequently conducted with oversight from the Directorate of Professional Standards and recorded on Body Worn Video (BWV). DCI Foster explains that behind the Officer's main computer desk was a pedestal used exclusively by him for storing files and personal items. From this area she recovered multiple discs labelled with references to *Operation Afolkey*, profiler reports, news coverage, and legal case materials. She also found correspondence from Mark Dixie, a colour photograph of Dixie, and a court order for his imprisonment.
72. In addition, DCI Foster located a 21-page photographic album containing crime scene photographs, including images of Sally Anne Bowman in situ, and a 53-page case summary report. All recovered items were secured in a locked cabinet in the DCI's office.

Summary of the Officer's account

73. The Panel considered the Officer's Regulation 31 notice, his interview, and his oral testimony, noting that he did not attend the hearing.
74. The Officer stated that he did not have any romantic or sexual interest in Ms A. He said he did not recall making any comment about looking up her skirt. He acknowledged that he and Ms A had exchanged playful and friendly teasing remarks and described their relationship as one based on humour. He noted that during a break in the mindfulness photography course, they had gone for a late breakfast with a group and that the atmosphere was light-hearted and jovial.

75. In relation to the Christmas card, the Officer said that at the time he was leading a cold-case homicide review team and was on medication. He said that when the card was written he was off duty and drinking alcohol, and that his judgement was impaired. He stated that when he handed the card over, he did not recall the message he had written. He said the card was intended as humour and not to offend. He framed the card as part of a relationship based on humour and expressed regret if it caused offence. He fully admitted sending the card and said he was remorseful.
76. In relation to the “bike” remark to Ms B, the Officer said it was something that had been said to him many times over the years, though he did not name who had said it. He described it as a reference to anatomy resembling a bike rack. He did not deny or admit saying this to Ms B.
77. In relation to the comment made to Ms C about a “plasterer’s radio,” the Officer said it was something he might have said to a male, although he had no recollection of doing so. He said he had “googled” the phrase and found it to be an old joke, not specifically associated with any comedian. He did not confirm saying it to Ms C and did not recall the specific context, but acknowledged the possibility of having used the phrase in general conversation.
78. The Officer accepted that he invited several colleagues, including Ms C, to accompany him to a concert because he had a spare ticket. He said this was never intended as a date. He denied using the word “bint,” stating it was not in his vocabulary. He said he had asked around half a dozen other people, including his daughter, before asking Ms C. He said he was not sure whether he was asking her seriously or simply bemoaning the fact that he could not find anyone to go with. He denied that the invitation was romantic, stating he was not attracted to her, and accepted that such a suggestion would be inappropriate and cross professional boundaries.
79. In relation to the allegation that he said Ms C’s diary entry of “WFH” meant “wanking from home,” the Officer denied using the term “wanking” in relation to a woman.
80. In relation to the remark about DS Walker’s shirt, the Officer recalled making a joking comment to DS Walker and DC Magner about whether a relationship was developing between them because they frequently went to the gym together. On reflection, he recognised the remark was inappropriate and apologised. He described the comment about the shirt as “crass” and inappropriate, but did not accept that it was intentionally homophobic, though he conceded it was ill-judged.
81. The Officer stated that he would never mock his colleagues. He denied being scornful or contemptuous toward the colleague referred to by Ms B and described their relationship as friendly. He said his reference to the colleague’s

penis as a “grandfather clock” was made in that context. He said he was struggling mentally at the time and suggested the remark was an attempt at humour, not intended to cause upset or offence.

82. The Officer admitted having a working copy set of crime scene photographs from the murder of Sally Anne Bowman, either in his personal desk drawers or in a physical box file. He admitted showing the photographs to DC Neale and said he gave a health warning due to their graphic nature. He said that in his experience it was not uncommon for officers to retain copies of exhibits that may inform their peers or assist other investigations. He named the parents of Sally Anne Bowman and said he believed they would not find it surprising or repugnant that he still had working copies of the photographs.
83. He described the floor where he worked as a “Red Zone” (Cold Case Homicide and other Confidential Operations), with limited access. He said he was the Advanced Exhibits Officer for the case and had attended the initial post-mortem of Sally Anne Bowman with senior officers. He said he was the only officer to attend the second post-mortem for a future defence, describing the first post-mortem as disturbing and the second as more traumatic due to the condition of the body. He provided extensive details of the case, his involvement, and his subsequent dealings with the convicted murderer, Mark Dixie.
84. The Officer said he had been diagnosed with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder due to his experiences in the MPS over his thirty-year service. He said he continued to receive treatment, was on prescription medication, and was a member of “Rock to Recovery,” a support organisation for ex-military personnel dealing with similar mental health challenges. He said his possession of the crime scene photographs was purely for professional purposes, including training and educating colleagues. He said that if he had caused offence or upset to anyone, he was truly sorry, would never want to do that, and asked for their forgiveness.

Finding of facts

85. The Panel notes that the Officer made full and unequivocal admissions in respect of Allegations 1, 3 and 7 at the earliest opportunity. His acceptance of those matters was consistent across both his Regulation 31 notice and his interview.
86. The Panel found Ms A, Ms B, Ms C and DI Caveen to be clear, open and candid witnesses who each gave detailed and coherent accounts of their interactions with the Officer and the incidents in question. Their evidence was not only consistent in relation to the alleged conduct but also demonstrated genuine concern for the Officer’s welfare and wellbeing. The Panel considered their accounts to be balanced and fair. Some aspects of their evidence were supported by contemporaneous documentary material, including the Christmas card. Taken together, the evidence of all witnesses in the AA’s case, including

those who did not give live evidence, painted a complete and coherent picture of the Officer's general attitudes and his struggles at work. Their accounts were mutually reinforcing and aligned with the contemporaneous managerial evidence provided by DI Caveen.

87. In contrast, the Officer's account, adopted from his Regulation 31 notice and interview, was partial, frequently reliant on lack of recollection, and framed his conduct as humour or impaired judgement. His explanations did not materially undermine the witnesses' evidence. The Panel also identified internal inconsistencies within his account, on the one hand, he stated that he retained the crime scene photographs for training purposes; on the other, he said that DC Neale was the only officer to whom he had ever shown them. Given that the murder occurred over twenty years ago, the Panel considered it unlikely that the photographs were retained solely for training if they had been shown to only one colleague. The Panel further noted that the Officer did not attend the hearing to give evidence or to be questioned about these discrepancies.

88. The Panel recognised that there were minor inconsistencies between aspects of the witnesses' accounts. These were confined to peripheral details and were unsurprising given the passage of time, the stressful circumstances in which the events occurred, and the fact that each witness observed different parts of a wider pattern of behaviour. The Panel concluded that these variations did not detract from the overall reliability of their evidence. Viewed in the round, the witnesses' accounts were broadly consistent with each other and with the contemporaneous material, and together provided coherent and mutually reinforcing support.

89. The Panel noted the Officer's explanation that his conduct occurred during a period of personal distress and insufficient organisational support. The Panel accepted DI Caveen's evidence that the Officer was experiencing fluctuating wellbeing and that she had taken considerable steps to support him in his role. However, there was no medical evidence before the Panel to suggest that the Officer's mental health prevented him from understanding or controlling his behaviour, nor any evidence that his difficulties caused the specific sexualised remarks and actions found proved. The Panel therefore concluded that while the Officer may have been under personal strain, this does not alter the Panel's assessment of the factual allegations or the reliability of the witnesses' accounts.

90. Taking the totality of the evidence, including the corroborative circumstantial evidence from multiple witnesses, the contemporaneous records, and the lack of detail or engagement in the Officer's account, the Panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the evidence in the AA's case was more reliable. The Panel therefore preferred the witnesses' accounts to that of the Officer.

Decisions on Facts

Allegation 1

91. On about 18th March 2024 you spoke to Ms C about some plastering that she wished to have done at her home address. You responded by saying words to the effect of “by the time I’ll have finished with you, you will look like a plasterer’s radio”.
92. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Ms C’s account to that of the Officer. Ms C gave a clear, consistent and credible description of the remark, including her immediate reaction and the context in which it was made. Her evidence was also consistent with the wider pattern of inappropriate and sexualised humour demonstrated in the Officer’s conduct towards multiple colleagues.
93. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 1 proved.

Allegation 2

94. On about 17th April 2024 you invited Ms C to go to a concert with you. She told you that she had a broken foot and would not be able to go. You replied by saying words to the effect of “You stupid bint, you wouldn’t have to stand, they are VIP tickets so you would have a seat”.
95. The Panel preferred Ms C’s evidence. She gave a clear and consistent account of the exchange, including her reaction and the surrounding circumstances. Her evidence was balanced, not challenged, and free from malice. It was also consistent with the wider pattern of inappropriate comments made by the Officer to several colleagues.
96. The Officer denied using the word “bint” but his limited account did not materially undermine Ms C’s evidence. The Panel also noted that Ms C’s description of repeatedly being offered the ticket was independently consistent with Ms A’s evidence of being offered the same ticket, which supported her recollection.
97. Taking the evidence as a whole, the Panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the Officer made the remark as alleged.
98. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 2 proved.

Allegation 3

99. On or about 14 November 2024, Ms B states that while she was bending over, the Officer said words to the effect of: *“Oh, I didn’t bring my bike with me today.”*
100. The Panel preferred Ms B’s evidence. She gave a clear and consistent account of the remark, describing it as shocking and inappropriate. Her immediate

reaction, and the fact that a colleague looked up, supported her recollection. She also explained the circumstances in a balanced and thoughtful way, including how she sought to avoid conflict and how she managed the situation. Her evidence was measured, detailed, and complimentary about how the Officer supported her welfare, which further reinforced her credibility.

101. The Officer neither admitted nor denied the remark but offered an explanation of its meaning, implicitly acknowledging its sexualised nature. His account did not undermine Ms B's evidence. The comment also sits within the broader pattern of inappropriate humour established through the evidence of multiple witnesses.

102. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel is satisfied that the Officer made the remark as alleged.

103. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 3 proved.

Allegation 4

104. Notwithstanding that the case of Sally Anne Bowman had been closed years before, you retained papers and photographs from the case, and when you had no policing reason to do so. You showed photographs of Sally Anne Bowman's body to other officers, when there was no policing purpose to do so.

105. The Officer admitted possessing and showing the photographs but claimed he retained them for training purposes. The Panel did not accept this explanation. Neither Ms B nor Ms C had ever been trained using the material, and DC Neale stated he had not asked to see the photographs and was shown them without prompting. This supports the inference that the Officer displayed them for personal gratification or "bragging", rather than for any professional reason.

106. The managerial evidence was clear and unchallenged. DI Caveen, DI Greig and DCI Foster all confirmed there was no policing purpose for the Officer to possess or show the material, and that the case was not linked to any work undertaken by the team at the time. Witnesses also described the proper procedures for storing crime scene material. The Panel noted that the Officer kept the photographs on an area behind his desk, making them easily accessible, which was wholly inconsistent with recognised local practice, and the sensitive nature of the material.

107. Taking the evidence as a whole, including the lack of any operational justification, the contradictions in the Officer's account, and the corroborative testimony of multiple witnesses, the Panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the conduct occurred as alleged.

108. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 4 proved.

Allegation 5

109. You made a comment about clothing worn by DS Walker, to the effect of “Where did you get that shirt, GaysRUs?”
110. Ms C gave clear evidence that words to that effect were used. DS Walker also confirmed that a comment of that nature was made about his shirt. The Officer stated that he could not remember the incident and did not accept that the words used were homophobic, but said that if he had made the comment, it would have been intended as light-hearted.
111. The Panel considered the consistency between Ms C’s and DS Walker’s accounts and drew the inference that words to that effect were said. The Officer’s acceptance that he may have made an ill-judged remark, coupled with his inability to provide a clear alternative explanation, did not displace their evidence. The comment also aligns with the broader pattern of inappropriate humour established through other allegations.
112. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel is satisfied that the Officer made the remark as alleged.
113. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 5 proved.

Allegation 6

114. On 16th December 2024 you attended a Mindfulness course, together with Ms A. You then said to her words to the effect that you had found the session really hard, and because you had been trying to look up her skirt.
115. The Panel preferred Ms A’s evidence. She gave a detailed and coherent account of the remark, set within the wider context of multiple sexualised comments made by the Officer. Her description of the circumstances was clear, including her immediate discomfort, her efforts to avoid him afterwards, and her decision to report the matter to DI Caveen. Her evidence was balanced and thoughtful, she spoke of previously supporting the Officer, feeling sympathy for his personal difficulties, and having been friendly with him, yet was plainly offended by the comment. This strengthened her credibility.
116. The Officer did not recall making the remark but did not deny it. His suggestion that their relationship was “banter based” was inconsistent with Ms A’s account of her discomfort and her subsequent behaviour. The Panel also noted that the comment aligns with the broader pattern of inappropriate and sexualised humour established through other witnesses.
117. Taking the evidence as a whole, the Panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the Officer made the remark as alleged.

118. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 6 proved.

Allegation 7

119. Also on 16th December 2024 you gave Ms A a Christmas card with a handwritten message. You said that “If you want a “White” Xmas then pull your knickers down immediately and I’ll oblige!”

120. The Panel has seen a copy of the card with the Officer’s handwriting, and there is no dispute that he wrote and sent it.

121. Ms A described feeling disgusted and embarrassed on receiving the card. Her account was clear, consistent, and aligned with her wider evidence of inappropriate sexualised remarks. She had previously been supportive of the Officer and sympathetic to his personal circumstances, which made her reaction more credible, despite that support, she was plainly offended by the explicit message.

122. The Officer admitted sending the card. His explanation that he had been drinking, was medicated, and intended the message as humour did not diminish the seriousness of the conduct. The Panel noted that such a sexually explicit remark directed at a colleague is wholly incompatible with professional standards.

123. The managerial evidence reinforced this view. DI Caveen described the card as “appalling”, “outrageous” and “disgusting”, confirming that there was no context in which such a message could be appropriate. The content of the card also sits within the broader pattern of boundary-crossing and sexualised behaviour established through other allegations.

124. Taking the evidence as a whole, the Panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the Officer wrote and sent the card as alleged.

125. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 7 proved.

Allegation 8

126. On 16th December 2024 you spoke to Ms B and described a Welsh colleague as having a penis like a grandfather clock. You said this in a mock false Welsh accent.

127. Ms B gave a clear and consistent account of the “grandfather clock” remark. The Officer admitted using those words, describing them as humour, and denied being scornful or contemptuous. He did not address the alleged mocking of the colleague’s physical features.

128. The Panel found Ms B's evidence credible in relation to the sexualised remark. Her account was coherent, detailed, and aligned with the broader pattern of inappropriate humour established elsewhere. The Officer's admission that he used the "grandfather clock" phrase supports her evidence.
129. However, Ms B's statement was not sufficiently clear as to whether the Officer made the remark *in* a mock Welsh accent. In the circumstances, and on the balance of probabilities, the Panel was not satisfied that the allegation regarding the mock Welsh accent was proved.
130. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 8 not proved.

Allegation 9

131. In December 2024 you spoke about Ms C's Outlook diary for her work plan for future days. You suggested that she would be "wanking from home", rather than working from home on a certain day.
132. Ms C gave a clear, detailed and consistent account of the remark. Her evidence was balanced, she described having been worried about the Officer and sympathetic to his personal difficulties, but also recognised that there were limits to the allowances she could make for his behaviour. This strengthened her credibility.
133. The Officer denied using the term "wanking" in relation to a woman. The Panel considered his denial but noted that he did not offer any alternative explanation of what he had said, nor did he challenge Ms C's account in any substantive way. His evidence therefore did not displace hers.
134. The managerial evidence corroborated Ms C's account. DI Caveen confirmed that managing the calendar was part of the Officer's role, which supported her description of the context in which the remark was made. The comment also aligned with the broader pattern of sexualised or inappropriate remarks made by the Officer to multiple colleagues.
135. Taking the evidence as a whole, and applying the balance of probabilities, the Panel prefers Ms C's evidence and is satisfied that the remark was made as alleged.
136. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 9 proved.
137. The Panel found the Officer's conduct in Allegations 1-3 and 5 -7 and 9 were unnecessary and offensive,
138. The Panel found the Officer's conduct in Allegations 1, 3 and 6 -7 and 9 were sexually inappropriate.

139. The Panel found the Officer's conduct in Allegations 2 and 5 were Derogatory and discriminatory.

140. The Panel found the Officer's conduct in Allegation 4 was inappropriate and unnecessary.

Findings on Breaches of the Standards

141. In light of the above findings, the Panel concluded that the Officer's conduct engaged the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct, Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Equality and Diversity.

Discreditable Conduct

142. The standard of Discreditable Conduct requires police officers to behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in the police service.

143. The Panel found the Officer's behaviour amounted to a breach of the Standard of Discreditable Conduct. Across multiple incidents, he engaged in sexually explicit, degrading and wholly inappropriate remarks to colleagues, retained and displayed graphic crime scene material without any policing purpose, and sent a sexually explicit Christmas card to a colleague. This conduct was incompatible with the expectations placed upon a police officer and was liable to bring discredit upon the police service. The nature and pattern of the behaviour would clearly undermine public confidence if known. The Officer's actions therefore fell significantly below the standard required.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

144. The standard of Authority, Respect and Courtesy requires police officers to act with self-control and tolerance, treated others with respect, and refrained from abusing his authority.

145. The Panel found the Officer repeatedly failed to treat colleagues with the dignity, respect and courtesy required of a serving police officer. His comments included sexualised remarks directed at female colleagues, intrusive references to their bodies, mocking of a colleague's physical features, and inappropriate humour directed at another colleague's working arrangements. He also displayed graphic crime scene photographs to a colleague without any operational reason. This behaviour demonstrated a disregard for professional boundaries and the respect owed to colleagues, and constituted a misuse of the authority inherent in his role. The Officer's conduct therefore breached the Standard of Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

Equality and Diversity

146. The standard of Equality and Diversity requires police officers to act with fairness and impartiality and avoided unlawful or unfair discrimination.
147. The Officer's remarks demonstrated discriminatory and prejudicial attitudes, particularly in relation to gender and sexual orientation. His comments included sexualised and objectifying references to women, and a remark implying a colleague's clothing was associated with being gay. These comments reinforced harmful stereotypes and were inconsistent with treating individuals fairly, impartially and without discrimination. The Officer's behaviour therefore breached the Standard of Equality and Diversity.

Assessment of Seriousness

Misconduct/Gross Misconduct

148. The Panel carefully considered the circumstances of the case, and the breaches found to assess whether the breaches amount to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
149. Under the *Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings*, gross misconduct is defined as:
150. *"A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious that dismissal would be justified."*
151. The Panel found the Officer's conduct meets the threshold for gross misconduct because it involved a deliberate and sustained departure from the professional standards expected of a police officer. His behaviour included repeated sexualised and discriminatory remarks to multiple colleagues, as well as the improper retention and display of sensitive crime scene material, all of which were wholly incompatible with the responsibilities and values of policing. The conduct caused clear distress to colleagues, the family of Sally Anne Bowman, and the wider public, and carried a significant potential to undermine public confidence in the police service. Taken together, these factors demonstrate behaviour of such seriousness that dismissal would be justified.
152. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the conduct found proven amounts to gross misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

The panel reminded ourselves of the 3 stages to determining outcome; namely:-

- (i) To assess the seriousness

- (ii) Keep in mind the purpose of imposing the sanctions
- (iii) Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

Stage 1: Assessment of Seriousness

Culpability

153. The Panel assesses the Officer's culpability as high, for the following reasons:
154. **The conduct was deliberate** The Officer's actions were intentional rather than accidental. He repeatedly chose to make sexualised, discriminatory and degrading remarks to colleagues, and consciously retained and displayed sensitive crime scene material without any policing purpose.
155. **The Officer was in a position of trust as a manager** He held a supervisory role and was expected to model professional behaviour, set standards, and ensure a safe working environment. Instead, he engaged in behaviour that undermined those responsibilities and misused the authority inherent in his role.
156. **The conduct had clear potential to undermine public confidence** Sexualised comments, discriminatory remarks, and the improper handling of graphic crime scene photographs are behaviours that, if known publicly, would seriously damage trust in the police service and undermine confidence in policing standards.
157. **The behaviour amounted to harassment** Several colleagues experienced repeated unwanted sexualised comments, intrusive remarks about their bodies, and degrading humour. The pattern and frequency of the behaviour were capable of causing distress and amounted to harassment.
158. **Elements of misogyny were present** The Officer's remarks included objectifying and sexualised comments directed at women, reinforcing harmful stereotypes and demonstrating attitudes inconsistent with equality and respect.
159. **The conduct involved an abuse of trust and misuse of his managerial role** Some remarks were directed at junior or newly trained colleagues, creating an imbalance of power. His behaviour demonstrated a failure to uphold the responsibilities expected of a manager.
160. **The Officer mishandled exhibits entrusted to the police and the victim's family** Retaining and displaying graphic crime scene photographs from a closed murder case was a serious breach of professional obligations and demonstrated a disregard for the sensitivity of material entrusted to the police.

161. **The conduct involved disrespect towards a victim of crime** The photographs related to a homicide victim. Displaying them without any policing purpose was profoundly inappropriate and demonstrated a failure to treat the victim with dignity.
162. **The behaviour included discriminatory elements relating to sexual orientation and sex** Remarks implying a colleague's clothing was associated with being gay, and repeated sexualised comments directed at women, demonstrated discriminatory attitudes contrary to policing values.
163. Taken together, these factors place the Officer's culpability firmly at the higher end of the spectrum.

Harm

164. The Panel assesses the harm as high, for the following reasons:
165. **The conduct caused significant reputational harm** The Officer's behaviour, sexualised remarks, discriminatory comments, and the improper handling of sensitive crime scene material, was capable of seriously damaging the reputation of the police service. The case has been widely reported in the media, amplifying the reputational impact and increasing the risk of public concern.
166. **The behaviour carried a clear and serious potential to undermine public confidence** Sexual harassment, discriminatory language, and misuse of sensitive exhibits are matters of acute public concern. Public reporting of the case heightens the risk that confidence in policing, both locally and nationally, will be undermined.
167. **The conduct contributed to discrimination affecting women's standing in the workplace** The Officer's repeated sexualised and objectifying remarks towards female colleagues reinforced harmful gender stereotypes and undermined their dignity, status and equal participation within the professional environment.
168. **The behaviour created substantial risks of harm even where actual harm was not always realised** The pattern of inappropriate comments and boundary-crossing behaviour exposed colleagues to ongoing risk of distress, embarrassment and humiliation, and contributed to an unsafe and uncomfortable working environment.
169. **Elements of misogyny were present** The Officer's remarks included objectifying comments about women's bodies and sexually explicit statements directed at female colleagues. This demonstrated attitudes inconsistent with equality and respect, and contributed to a harmful culture.

170. **The conduct engaged both local and national concern** Sexual harassment, discriminatory behaviour, and improper handling of sensitive material are issues of heightened public scrutiny. The widespread media reporting of the case places it squarely within matters that attract significant public concern and undermine confidence in policing standards.

171. **The behaviour caused emotional harm and professional discomfort** Colleagues described feeling disgusted, embarrassed, offended and uncomfortable. Some altered their behaviour to avoid the Officer or sought managerial support. The conduct undermined dignity, trust and safety within the workplace.

172. The Panel therefore finds the harm to be high.

Aggravating factors

173. **Regular, repeated or sustained behaviour, pattern of behaviour** The officer's conduct was not a single lapse but a sustained pattern across multiple months. The proven allegations demonstrate a consistent course of behaviour, not isolated incidents. This pattern increases seriousness because it shows the officer repeatedly chose to behave in this way despite numerous opportunities to stop.

174. **Continuation of behaviour after being told a number of witnesses gave clear evidence that each of them had challenged the officer about his inappropriate comments.** Despite this, he continued making sexualised remarks. This demonstrates a conscious disregard of boundaries and of direct feedback from colleagues.

175. **Psychological impact on victims** Ms A described feeling physically sick, embarrassed, and distressed. She also described shock and discomfort. Miss B stated clearly that she was embarrassed, and said his comments were inappropriate and made her uncomfortable. Ms C said she was made to feel uncomfortable and professionally undermined. In addition, the Panel took into account the Victim Personal Statement submitted by the mother of Sally Anne Bowman. Sally Anne's mother describes the profound distress and upset to the family caused by learning that the Officer had retained and displayed graphic crime scene images relating to their loved one's murder without any policing purpose. Their account makes clear that, even after twenty years, the emotional harm, grief, and disruption to their lives remain significant, and that the Officer's actions have compounded their suffering. The Panel considered the family's enduring distress, and their shock at the Officer's conduct, to be a serious aggravating feature demonstrating the wider and lasting consequences of his behaviour.

- a. These are clear psychological and emotional impacts, increasing seriousness beyond the inherent harm already captured in the harm section.

176. **Multiple proven allegations** The panel found numerous allegations proved (1,2 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9). These include sexualised comments, inappropriate advances, misuse of sensitive crime scene photographs, and degrading remarks about colleagues. The number and variety of proven allegations demonstrate entrenched misconduct, not a single lapse in judgment.

Mitigating factors

177. **Early admissions of three allegations** The officer admitted allegations 1, 3 and 7, which reduced the need for further challenge on those points and demonstrated some degree of insight. Although his account was partial and inconsistent overall, these admissions still represent procedural cooperation and are properly treated as mitigation.

Personal mitigation factors

178. **Medical issues** The Officer was described by both Ms A and DI Caveen as a “broken man” who was struggling with significant personal distress, fluctuating wellbeing, and a range of personal difficulties. The Panel accepted that these accounts reflected genuine concern from colleagues who had observed a deterioration in his presentation over time. However, in the absence of any medical evidence to substantiate a diagnosed condition or to demonstrate a causal link between his wellbeing and the misconduct, the Panel was required, in accordance with the College of Policing Outcome Guidance, to place only limited weight on this factor.

179. **Impact of family tragedy** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Witnesses described him as vulnerable and deteriorating in the period that followed. The Panel recognised the seriousness of this event and accepted that it contributed to the emotional strain he was under. The Panel could again only attach limited weight to this factor, consistent with the Outcome Guidance.

Stage 2: The purpose of imposing sanctions

180. The Panel have taken into account the threefold purpose for imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; upholding the high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and protecting the public).

Stage 3: Appropriate sanction

181. The Panel is mindful that the most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole.
182. The Panel noted that the Officer is no longer serving with the Metropolitan Police and is therefore a former officer for the purposes of the Police (Conduct) Regulations.
183. Having determined that the Officer's conduct amounted to gross misconduct, the Panel concluded that the only proportionate and appropriate outcome is dismissal without notice. As the Officer is a former officer, the Panel further determined that he should also be placed on the barred list.
184. The panel orders publication pursuant to regulation 43 (6) of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Right of Appeal

185. In accordance with Regulation 43(2), the Appropriate Authority shall provide the Officer with a copy of this report and a notice of the right of appeal. The Officer is reminded he has a right to appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal (PAT). The PAT may increase or decrease any penalty or overturn this decision.

Commander Paul Trevers

17 July 2026