

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

B E T W E E N:

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

Appropriate Authority

and

INSPECTOR TOM MARTIS-JONES

Officer Concerned

Introduction

1. These misconduct proceedings are brought under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended).
2. This hearing was held on 10 to 12 August 2026 at Palestra House, London. The Panel consisted of James Fielder (Chair), Ms Claire Bonnet and Mr Howard Freeman as Independent Panel Members.

Representation

3. Throughout the hearing the Appropriate Authority ('AA') has been represented by Dr Russell Wilcox. Inspector Martis-Jones was represented by Ms Fiona Robertson.
4. The Panel would like to thank all counsel for their assistance and professionalism throughout this case.
5. The Panel were assisted by Ms Ini Udom, Legally Qualified Advisor.

The Allegations

6. The Panel was referred to the Regulation 30 notice and the allegations that Inspector Martis-Jones' conduct amounted to gross misconduct:

"It is alleged that you, Inspector Tom MARTIS-JONES, by the conduct set out herein, have breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in the Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended), namely:

- (i) Equality and Diversity;*
- (ii) Discreditable Conduct;*
- (iii) Authority, Respect and Courtesy.*

It is further alleged that the breaches individually and collectively are so serious as to justify dismissal, and amount to Gross Misconduct.

PARTICULARS

It is alleged that on 6 February 2025, while off duty at the Founders Arms Venue, you made a series of misogynistic and derogatory comments which included referring to the smell of the 'pussy' or 'pussies' (vagina(s)) of a woman or women with whom you had recently had sexual intercourse, comparing women to 'dogs' and stating that it was necessary to 'leash' women, or words to like effect."

7. On the first morning of the hearing the Regulation 30 notice, as set out above, was read out. Inspector Martis-Jones confirmed that all allegations were denied.
8. The specific comments alleged to have been made will hereinafter be referred to as follows:
- a. The reference to the smell of the "pussy" or "pussies" (vagina(s)) of a woman or women with whom he had recently had sexual intercourse ('comment A')
 - b. The comparison of women to "dogs" ('comment B')
 - c. The statement that it was necessary to "leash" women, or words to like effect ('comment C').

The background

9. The case against Inspector Martis-Jones concerns a single social occasion which took place during the afternoon and evening of 6 February 2025 at the Founders Arms public house, Hopton Street, near Blackfriars, at which Inspector Martis-Jones and a number of others were present while off duty. Inspector Martis-Jones attended the gathering following an invitation from PC Maposa, having earlier had a drink with a fellow Inspector. It is alleged that while under the influence of alcohol, Inspector Martis-Jones made a series of misogynistic and derogatory comments.
10. During the course of the evening Mr Clayson was in contact with PS Hall, sending him a number of WhatsApp messages from 1709 and at 2051 a voice note, the transcript of which is as follows:

So it's a bit of an outrageous update to give you a skip, but, uh, this inspector. So sorry. Uh, long story short, my mate [REDACTED] came out for a few drinks and um, started chatting up this girl in the bar we were in, and um, yeah, he seemed like he was doing well and your governor came up to me and, uh, described the, the girl that my mate [REDACTED] was er, was with and chatting to, as a dog and saying, yeah, he just needs to get her, get her on a leash, and calling her a slag and all sorts of shite. So yeah, I just told him that he's a, he's a bit of a cunt and I told him that he is a bit of an animal and I said, don't you dare talk to my friend like he's that, 'cause my mate [REDACTED] is a lovely guy, um, would never talk to a woman like that and um, yeah, I just had a bit of an argument with your new governor because he's a really misogynistic piece of shit and um, yeah, I've just told him of such, one-to-one, in person.

So yeah, he probably doesn't like me, but I don't give a shit because oh my word, what a horrible little man. Um, yeah, so I am gonna Right Line him, I'm gonna Right Line him when I'm back in work, and um, yeah, I'll just pop you an email just asking for his collar number 'cause um, yeah that is absolute, the way he talked, was absolutely disgusting, and um, yeah, he should not be in public office, let alone inspector. So yeah, I'll pop you off, pop you an email when I'm back in work 'cause honestly the things he said to me, just genuinely disgusting and yeah, he, he should not be an Inspector and it makes me feel sick that he is. So, yeah, I'll pop you an email

when I'm back at work, skip and wow, I could not imagine someone worse to be an inspector. My word.

11. The conduct came to the attention of the Directorate of Professional Standards on 10 February 2025, following the submission of an intelligence report by PS Hall arising from the report made to him by Mr Clayson (at the time serving police officer).

The Panel's Approach

12. The Panel has approached its decision making by keeping in mind the purpose and character of police misconduct proceedings. The primary purpose being not to punish Inspector Martis-Jones but to protect public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service by holding officers accountable and making clear that improper behaviour will not be left unchecked. A secondary purpose is to be declaratory of high professional standards, and a final purpose is to protect the public, the Complainant and staff by preventing similar misconduct recurring in the future. The Panel has had regard to *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512; *ChieFraser Claysononstable of Dorset v PAT, Salter Interested Party* [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin) and *R (Williams) v PAT* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).
13. The Panel reminded itself it was: -
- a. Required to consider the facts of the case and to make its findings of fact in relation to each of the allegation;
 - b. Determine whether those findings of fact found constitute a breach of the relevant standards;
 - c. Determine whether the conduct found proven against the Officer amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct.
14. The Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof is on the Appropriate Authority throughout and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities, namely 'what is more likely than not'.
15. The Panel also had regard to a framework of regulations and guidance, in particular the following:
- a. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 as amended

- b. The Statutory Guidance on professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing issued by the Home Office (the “2020 HOG”), including in particular chapter 1, summarising the Standards;
- c. College of Police Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings
- d. The definition of misconduct given at Reg 3(1) of the Regulations: “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour”;
- e. The definition of gross misconduct given at reg 3(1) of the Regulations: “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified”.

16. Throughout, the Panel also had regard to the legal advice provided by the LQA.

Evidence presented

17. The Panel read and carefully considered every item of the evidence before it, including the detailed submissions from counsel and oral and documentary evidence provided, which included the following:

- a. Regulation 30 Notice dated 11 May 2026
- b. Investigating Officer’s Report
- c. Form 163 dated 03 April 2025
- d. MG11 PC FRASER CLAYSON dated 02 May 2025
- e. MG11 R L dated 25 June 2025
- f. MG11 PC Enock Maposa dated 25 June 2025
- g. MG11 PS Adam Hall dated 12 November 2025 (describing and exhibiting his phone contact with Mr Clayson)
- h. MG11 PS Adam Hall dated 19 November 2025 (exhibiting his phone contact with Mr Clayson)

- i. Exhibit AJH/4 (WhatsApp messages between Mr Clayson and PS Hall on 6-7 February 2025)
 - j. Exhibit AJH/2 – voice note recording sent by Mr Clayson to PS Hall at 2051 on 6 February 2025
 - k. Transcript of AJH/2 – Voice Note from PC FRASER CLAYSON
 - l. ROTI Inspector Tom Martis Jones dated 09 October 2025
 - m. A defence character bundle consisting of 25 character references (57 pages)
 - n. The submissions made counsel on behalf of the AA and Inspector Martis-Jones.
18. The Panel heard oral evidence from Mr L, PC Maposa, Mr Clayson and Inspector Martis-Jones.

Mr L

19. In evidence Mr L confirmed the contents of his witness statement. He further confirmed that he arrived at the Founders Arms between 1830 and 1900 and remained there until approximately 2130. During that time, he drank four pints of beer and maybe a shot. He believed that Mr Clayson had a similar amount.
20. When he arrived neither Mr Clayson, Inspector Martis Jones nor PC Maposa appeared to be drunk.
21. When he arrived Mr Clayson told him that he had not formed a good opinion of Inspector Martis-Jones. Mr Clayson did not give his reasons as to why. For his part, Mr L had a nice conversation with Inspector Martis-Jones, who seemed pleasant. They spent some time talking, one to one, about Mr L's line of work.
22. The conversation within the group then moved on to discuss stag dos such as the ones they had attended, the movie 'The Hangover' and there was some mention of some of the activities that could take place, such as pranks on the groom to be.
23. This conversation took place mainly while Mr Clayson was apart from the group. It changed when he returned. Mr L believed that it was made clear that such antics would not appeal to Mr Clayson and would not happen on his stag do. He could not recall Mr Clayson himself saying this.

24. Mr L did recall that there came a point in the evening when conversation was struck up with people on an adjacent table. He initiated the conversation with people at that table. Two groups began socialising and mixing together. The other table was made up of a group of men and women.
25. The exchange was pleasant and positive.
26. In Mr L's opinion the evening was good until the point that Inspector Martis-Jones and Mr Clayson walked towards the toilets. He noticed they had been gone for a while. When Mr Clayson returned from conversation his mood was slightly changed. He went outside with him to speak. They formulated a plan to get home. The time felt right as they had met straight after work, had not eaten and there was tension with Inspector Martis-Jones.
27. When he had the one-one conversation with Mr Clayson, Mr Clayson said that he had challenged Inspector Martis-Jones for being inappropriate. Mr Clayson said that he had an adverse opinion of the Inspector and had told him how he felt.
28. Mr L recalled that he went back into the pub to collect his bag. He shook hands with the Inspector and left.
29. Mr L did not think that there was any behaviour which required an apology from Mr Clayson. He did not think that any one person could be responsible for an entire entity. He did not recall Mr Clayson apologising for Inspector Martis-Jones' behaviour.
30. Mr L explained that the conversation around the stag do began with Inspector Martis-Jones and PC Maposa asking if they could come along. The conversation included reference to hiring strippers. This suggestion then moved onto hiring a topless dwarf, and then onto the topless dwarf being handcuffed to Mr Clayson. These comments were made by Inspector Martis-Jones, in relation to what he could facilitate at the stag do if he was invited. It was not a purely hypothetical conversation. The comments took Mr L by surprise. Himself, Inspector Martis-Jones and PC Maposa had been engaged in this conversation.
31. Mr L could not recall any other comments of this nature being said by Inspector Martis-Jones. He did not hear any other misogynistic comments.
32. Mr Clayson was away from the table during the conversation about the stag do. On his return the conversation ceased or it diverted to something else. In response to a question from the Panel, Mr L confirmed that he did not think that Mr Clayson had heard any of the conversation about strippers, topless dwarves or handcuffing.
33. Mr L was of the opinion that Mr Clayson would not appreciate the suggestions being made. Mr L considered it the type of Fraser Clayson conversation that

happened in sporting groups or changing rooms. Whilst it might not be something he would take offence at, he would separate himself from it.

34. His overall impression of Inspector Martis-Jones was that he was acting like someone trying to portray himself in a certain way, trying to act as a lad. Mr L described Inspector Martis-Jones' comments as brash, odd and off the mark. The Inspector seemed to be willing to make these comments with no understanding of who he was speaking to or the group he was in. Mr L did not believe that anything was said with malice. Inspector Martis-Jones had misjudged the conversation.
35. Mr L confirmed that his opinion of Metropolitan Police had not changed following that evening. He was confident that there were people doing great work within the force and policing in general. He stated that he would have less confidence with such comments coming from an Inspector and they were not something he would want to be associated with.

PC Maposa

36. PC Maposa confirmed contents of his witness statement.
37. He confirmed that in February 2025 he was expecting first child. Inspector Martis-Jones arranged to have a catch up with him before birth of his child. That was part of his reason for being in pub on 6 February 2025.
38. He could not remember what time he arrived. But when he did Mr Clayson had been there for several hours and it was clear that he had had a drink.
39. Inspector Martis- Jones arrived after him. He had been working that day and had gone for a drink with another colleague prior. The Inspector arrived at around 1700 and did not appear to be drunk.
40. PC Maposa explained that he introduced Inspector Martis-Jones and there was a general discussion around work and his movement through the ranks. Mr Clayson queried how he was an Inspector at such a young age. PC Maposa formed the opinion that Mr Clayson was biased against the Inspector on account of his age.
41. PC Maposa confirmed that he was a smoker and went outside several times to smoke. Inspector Martis-Jones went with him on a few occasions.
42. At one stage a conversation began about stag dos. Mr Clayson was due to be getting married. Mr L was involved in organising the stag do. Mr L, Inspector Martis-Jones and Mr Clayson were present. PC Maposa recalled that the conversation was extremely light-hearted. Everyone was involved in the conversation, which included discussion about stag dos previously attended

and the most outlandish things that had happened. Reference was made to the film The Hangover. That was a springboard to a hypothetical discussion of what could happen and a discussion on pranks played on stags, drinking lots of alcohol and strippers.

43. During the stag do conversation, Mr Clayson was actively listening and engaged with ideas. He spoke about previous stags he had been to.
44. PC Maposa accepted that there may have been some of the conversation that he did not hear as he was not present the whole time.
45. That conversation was not driven by Inspector Martis-Jones. PC Maposa stated that it had been himself who mentioned strippers.
46. PC Maposa recalled that at first Mr Clayson was reserved but then he came round to the idea as a joke. After some joking, he then said that he wanted it to be low key and just friends and family. This was quite abrupt and the conversation changed after that point. PC Maposa stressed that the conversation was intended to be light-hearted not making anyone the butt of the joke. Mr Clayson did seem uncomfortable.
47. He did not recall anything malicious, directed at a particular gender or offensive being said.
48. Later in the evening Mr Clayson came to speak to him and seemed a bit off. Mr Clayson mentioned that he did not believe someone of Inspector Martis-Jones' rank should be speaking in such way. Mr Clayson said that he did not like being spoken to like that. PC Maposa said that he did not understand the context and asked him what he was talking about, but Mr Clayson did not elaborate. This was not directly after the stag do conversation.
49. PC Maposa recalled that at some point his group began speaking with a nearby group of men and women. Inspector Martis-Jones had approached the group. The two groups were mixing well and there were no problems.
50. PC Maposa was asked whether he had heard Inspector Martis-Jones use the words alleged in the Regulation 30 Notice and stated that he had not. He said that it was not the sort of language he had ever heard him use and that if he had used it, he would have been shocked and challenged him.
51. PC Maposa confirmed that he had seen an exchange between Inspector Martis-Jones and Mr Clayson. After that the energy seemed off. There was tension but he did not know what had happened.
52. PC Maposa confirmed that Inspector Martis Jones had been a part of some very good operations he had also worked on. They had a good working relationship and after certain operations they would go for drink together with other officers.

The Inspector was never his line manager but rather they had an existing task relationship.

Mr Clayson

53. Mr Clayson gave evidence via video link and confirmed his statement.
54. He explained that the main purpose of meeting at the Founders Arms was to see colleagues from the safer neighbourhood team. He had been a police officer for three years and left policing in January 2026.
55. He was at the venue from midday and consumed alcoholic drinks over the course of the afternoon. From memory, PC Maposa arrived sometime in the late afternoon and Inspector Martis-Jones arrived around 1700. Mr Clayson was unclear as to when Mr L arrived and due to the passage of time could not confirm exactly when he left, but it was around 2100 / 2130.
56. Mr Clayson said that he was slightly intoxicated by the time Mr L arrived. He could not recall how much he drank after Mr L arrived but said that he would not have drunk as much as Mr L.
57. When Inspector Martis-Jones arrived, he did not seem to be intoxicated and was friendly, offering to buy a round of drinks. He was aware, having been told by others, that Inspector Martis-Jones had been for a drink with another inspector before arriving. Mr Clayson was introduced to the Inspector by PC Maposa and recalled being surprised that he was an Inspector at the age of 25.
58. When Mr L arrived Mr Clayson recalled that he told him he did not have a high opinion of Inspector Martis-Jones. He thought that by that point Inspector Martis Jones had already said something that he was uncomfortable with.
59. Mr Clayson denied having negative views about officers fast tracked for promotion.
60. Mr Clayson was taken to text messages he had sent to PS Hall. In relation to the message sent at 1709 ("*Just met the new Lambeth SNT guy, have you been making sure he gets his milk*") he explained that he was endeavouring to make a joke based on his immaturity which he perceived having met him. Mr Clayson suspected that the comment had more to do with the things Inspector Martis-Jones was saying rather than his age. He doubted that he would have said this if the Inspector had only been at the venue for 10 minutes as he was initially affable and nice.
61. Mr Clayson did not accept that the reply comment from PS Hall ("*...yeah another posh guy saving the world at 25*") was disparaging about a fast-tracked officer and stated that he trusted PS Hall's judgement quite a lot.

62. He was then taking to the message he sent to PS Hall at 1723 (“*He is a massive cunt*”) and stated that he regretted saying it as it was not appropriate language to use to describe a senior officer. He was not sure what led him to use that language, but it was likely the things that Inspector Martis-Jones was saying. Mr Clayson stated that he found him quite disgusting.
63. He was not sure whether Mr L was present at that time of the comments that resulted in the 1723 message. PC Maposa was present, but Mr Clayson could not confirm whether he had heard Inspector Martis-Jones’ comments.
64. The only other officer who was a part of the group was PC Hand, but Mr Clayson thought he had left before comments were made by Inspector Martis-Jones.
65. Mr Clayson accepted it was likely that Mr L and Inspector Martis-Jones had a conversation about work. He denied being annoyed that Mr L was being friendly despite the negative views he had expressed to him.
66. Mr Clayson could not remember leaving the table to get drinks and returning to a conversation about his stag do or hypothetical ideas of what could be done to intended grooms. He did recall that Inspector Martis-Jones made vulgar comments about dwarves.
67. Mr Clayson denied that he felt like the butt of the joke during the conversation or that he took umbrage. He did make it clear that it was going to be low key with just friends and family. Mr Clayson said that he would have stated that the things Inspector Martis-Jones was discussing would not be happening at his stag and if it did, he would leave the party.
68. Mr Clayson confirmed that he said to PC Maposa that he did not like Inspector Martis-Jones. This was nothing to do with how the Inspector spoke to him as he had done so in a convivial way and was very polite. Mr Clayson did, however, take umbrage to the things he was saying.
69. Mr Clayson said that there was a conversation about previous relationships and Mr L was present when Inspector Martis-Jones made the comment about vaginas (comment A).
70. Mr Clayson recalled that at one point Inspector Martis-Jones went over to speak to two women sitting nearby. There was a conversation between him, PC Maposa and Mr L. Mr Clayson said he was present as well. In all the conversation lasted 30 minutes maximum. He stated that Mr L did not spend much of the evening speaking with one of the women.
71. Mr Clayson stated that he recalled Inspector Martis-Jones saying something about using a leash to control a woman, which could have been in a sexual context. He was not sure whether Mr L was present. He thought that PC Maposa had been present.

72. Mr Clayson was taken to his witness statement where he refers to Mr L being present when that comment was made and the two of them exchanging a 'knowing look'. He stated that on reflection Mr L was present. He thought that was right at the beginning of the evening.
73. Mr Clayson stated that the period of time when Inspector Martis-Jones was making the vulgar and uncomfortable comments was during a 15-minute period, not long after he met him. Mr L had arrived at start or during that period.
74. He then went outside with Mr L and said sorry and that Inspector Martis-Jones was not what an officer should be. Mr Clayson said that he promised Mr L he would challenge the Inspector.
75. Mr Clayson stated that he did not challenge Inspector Martis-Jones immediately but remained outside mingling. When he went back inside Inspector Martis-Jones said something to him and he replied 'I don't want anything to do with you'.
76. When asked Mr Clayson confirmed that Mr Martis-Jones had made comments A - C.
77. Mr Clayson denied that he had consumed too much alcohol that evening and was annoyed that Inspector Martis-Jones had crashed the evening. Mr Clayson stated that it was not his event.
78. Mr Clayson further denied that he was annoyed that Mr L was friendly with Inspector Martis-Jones even though he had expressed dislike. He stated that he would never be annoyed if Mr L liked someone that he didn't. Mr Clayson said that once Mr L had heard what Inspector Martis-Jones had said he did not like him.
79. Mr Clayson denied that when Inspector Martis-Jones offered to buy a drink and he responded by calling him a 'wanker' or saying that 'you think you're all that with the ladies'. He did not lose his temper. Mr Clayson said that Inspector Martis-Jones had been speaking in a misogynistic way about some of the girls that he and Mr L had been talking to. He definitely remembered that and it annoyed him. He had just met the Inspector, would never see again and was about to get married.
80. When he spoke with Inspector Martis-Jones at the bar, the Inspector did say that Mr Clayson had got it all wrong and that was not the case, however, by that stage Mr Clayson was not listening to him. Mr Clayson stated that there was no way that he could have taken what Inspector Martis-Jones had said in another way. It was quite clear he was using misogynistic language. Mr Clayson felt it would be very difficult to listen to someone talk about leashing women, the smell of vagina, hiring dwarves and doing sexual acts with them and get it wrong.

81. Mr Clayson noted that Inspector Martis-Jones had joined the force long before him, as he joined later in life. He stated that he did not have umbrage with someone going through the ranks. Promotion should be about meritocracy and he was sure that Inspector Martis-Jones is a very able and competent officer. However, from what he witnessed that evening it struck him that the Inspector's morals and ideals were not in the right place. It may have been the alcohol talking but he hoped that the Inspector did not speak that way at work.
82. Mr Clayson commented that Inspector Martis-Jones should not be an inspector if those are his ideals as the comments made were not just brash comments about a stage do.
83. In re-examination, Mr Clayson confirmed that the reference to leashing women was made in a conversation referencing the girls Mr L and Inspector Martis-Jones were speaking to. He thought that the Inspector was instructing Mr L about how to approach women or what to do in private. He recalled the Inspector referring to women as dogs and needing leashing.
84. Mr Clayson distinctly remember Inspector Martis-Jones talking about the smell of vaginas although he could not recall the context.
85. The Panel asked Mr Clayson a number of questions. He confirmed that at no point in the evening was he so intoxicated that he could not understand what was being said. He was fully in control. He could not be precise as to how much he had drunk but could remember that he did not have loads and that at no point would he describe himself as drunk.
86. Mr Clayson stated that he had eaten before he arrived and had a meal whilst there, perhaps mid-afternoon. Initially there was a big group of officers present.
87. Mr Clayson was asked what he meant by 'slightly intoxicated' and explained that would describe somebody in full control and knowing what they were doing and saying, able to understand what is going on around them, able to make the same decisions and have the same behaviour as if they were sober. He was maybe a little giggly and better mood. He would not have driven a car.
88. Mr Clayson confirmed that initially he and Inspector Martis-Jones talked about how they knew each other, who they knew in common and what it was like at Brixton. It was general job talk.
89. He was taken to the message sent at 1737 ("*Within 10 minutes of meeting me he is talking about the smell of some girls vagina that he 'shagged'. How is this bloke in charge of others..*") and said that would have been some of the things Inspector Martis-Jones was saying. He could not remember exactly what was said that prompted him to send the message. Mr Clayson doubted that he would have been using his phone during a conversation. He could not have sent it on

the basis of how the Inspector first presented as he was a very nice man. His remarks were not immediate as they had a good conversation for 15-20 minutes. Inspector Martis-Jones seemed nice and then the conversation turned very dark. Due to the passage of time, Mr Clayson could not recall exactly when the Inspector arrived and when he made the alleged comments.

90. When further questioned, Mr Clayson said that comments B and C would have been a while after they first met as Mr L had arrived. He said that the comments were probably made at 1800 – 1900. PC Maposa and Mr L were present and likely to have heard the comments.
91. Mr Clayson could not recall who was present when comment A was made and could only say that Mr L and PC Maposa could have been. That comment was made before the conversation with the two women started. He could not confirm if Mr L was present. PC Maposa would have been in the building but he didn't know if he was there. He assumed PC Maposa was present as it was an unusual comment to make one to one.
92. Mr Clayson confirmed that when he left the voice note for PS Hall he had left the venue. He was walking down the tube steps into the station. Mr L might have been with him, however he did not think he was.
93. Mr Clayson said that the voice note referenced the comments Inspector Martis-Jones made precipitated by his conversation, alongside Mr L with the two women. The Inspector gave Mr L vulgar advice and Mr Clayson thought it was disgraceful. The reference to dogs and leashes was in the context of the two women.

Inspector Martis-Jones

94. Inspector Martis-Jones was the last witness to give evidence before the Panel. He confirmed that he stood by the account that he had given in interview and his Regulation 31 Response.
95. The Inspector stated that with hindsight he would not have gone to the pub that day as being in a drinks environment with people he did not know and have a familiarity with has potential for things to be taken wrongly. He believed 'the two beers and go' rule to be good but felt he also needed to take account how much others around the table have had to drink.
96. The Inspector explained his view that the alleged language from a serving officer could have damaging effect on several people's belief of what the police go out and do. He noted that he has several women on staff. The notion that bosses go around saying that such comment will lead to lack of Fraser Clayson confidence. It might lead to people within the force not standing up and reporting matters.

Particularly, with policing on back foot, following damaging and disgusting incidents and appalling things done to women.

97. He noted that the Police had worked to turn the ship around in relation to violence against women and girls. For the public to hear that an officer of rank had used that language would erode trust and confidence. Inspector Martis-Jones explained that he felt the language needs to be taken seriously as there are people who believe that there are bad apples and that language promotes the narrative that there are more of those bad apples. The result might be that a female victim might not call the police.
98. He set out his career history and long held desire to become a police officer, joining at 18. He was promoted to the rank of Inspector at the age of 25.
99. He accepted that even when off duty he is subject to standards of professional behaviour.
100. Inspector Martis-Jones explained that on 6 February 2025 he finished work at 1600 and he had a single drink with a fellow inspector. He had arranged to meet PC Maposa and so then travelled by tube to the Founders Arms in Blackfriars.
101. When he arrived PC Hand and PC Maposa were already there and he was introduced to Mr Clayson. PC Hand left within 15-20 minutes. Mr L arrived approximately one hour after the Inspector had arrived.
102. It was known to everyone present that he was an Inspector.
103. That evening he drank 5-6 pints and a short, which was a rum and coke or something similar. This included his earlier drink. He had eaten lunch but not yet had dinner.
104. Inspector Martis-Jones said that his recollection of everything said on 6 February was not perfect. He had been served with the Regulation 30 Notice many months later and his interview had been conducted on a broad basis.
105. Inspector Martis-Jones stated that he was not comfortable with everything that he said that evening and accepted that the conversation was 'brash'. With hindsight talking about a person's stag do and comedy films around such occasions was probably not the best thing to do. Inspector Martis-Jones said that he did not speak about strip clubs and his experience, as he has no experience of soliciting services at a strip club. He stated that the notion that he shared a personal experience was false and he disagreed with Mr L's recollection.
106. He did not deny that there was a conversation about strippers.

107. Inspector Martis-Jones accepted that topless dwarves were referenced and said that it was a part of the stag do scenario. It was not discussed from personal experience.
108. Inspector Martis-Jones did not accept that to talk in that way was taking part in a conversation which was derogatory. He challenged the assertion that it was derogatory to speak about strip clubs as they could have men or women working there and were not inherently derogatory and misogynist. It was a perfectly legitimate line of employment. He did confirm that the conversation was about women and female strippers. The reference to dwarves was not about women.
109. Whilst Inspector Martis-Jones did not accept that joking about attending female strip clubs in context of stag do would objectify women, he stated that he was not proud that he was involved in that conversation. He was not ashamed as the conversation was in the realms and context of a stag do. It was within a hypothetical conversation. Inspector Martis-Jones stated that in his view it would not be acceptable to discuss such matters at work, where a level of professionalism should be maintained and sexual themes would not be appropriate.
110. Inspector Martis-Jones disputed that he introduced topless dwarves into the conversation. With hindsight he should have walked away or brought discussions to an end. The conversation was light-hearted and 'brash' but he did not think it breached standards of professional behaviour. Inspector Martis-Jones stated that the context of the conversation is important. He agreed that it was not appropriate and he should not have been involved. Despite accepting that he engaged in that conversation he was not a person who was willing to make derogatory comments about women.
111. Inspector Martis-Jones denied making the alleged comments A – C.
112. Inspector Martis-Jones denied trying to show off to colleagues and being less inhibited as he had been drinking. He was not trying to be 'a lad'.
113. Inspector Martis-Jones acknowledged that PC Maposa was not always present when he was speaking to Mr L and Mr Clayson as there would have been periods when he was in the toilet, however if there were such occasions they were extremely minimal.
114. Inspector Martis-Jones felt that he had an interesting conversation with Mr L and was surprised that Mr L formed the impression that he did. He was less surprised that Mr Clayson formed the impression that he did. There were several points in the evening where he had the impression that Mr Clayson did not like him, however he agreed that his first interaction with him was pleasant. It was not that suddenly something changed as from the off he had the impression something was there.

115. The Panel asked Inspector Martis-Jones a number questions. He confirmed that he arrived at the venue at 1700. The venue was busy and got busier throughout the evening. He, however, experienced no issue with hearing conversations.
116. He spoke to Mr L for about half an hour about his work. The stag do conversation occurred after Mr L's arrival at around 1745 - 1800. It was apparent that Mr L was to be the best man.
117. Inspector Martis-Jones was asked about his description of Mr Clayson in interview as 'cumbersome' and explained this demeanour developed throughout the evening. He stated that Mr Clayson was definitely was not sober when he arrived. That said Mr Clayson was not disorderly and Inspector Martis-Jones had no fear that he could not get home safely. He had an image of him spilling a drink and with saliva around his mouth - that is where the description came from
118. Everyone in their group was present during the stag conversation. It started when Mr Clayson was absent as there was a secrecy to the plans. The whole context was the idea that the groom would not know what would happen. Mr Clayson was absent for no more than 5-10 minutes. The conversation became more hypothetical when he was present as clearly what was discussed would not be happening as he was there.
119. The conversation came to an end when Mr Clayson indicated that the event would be low-key.
120. Again, Inspector Martis-Jones stated that with hindsight the conversation, being an Inspector, might have been the point to step away. He did not, however, think that the conversation crossed the line or was a time for him to raise a challenge.
121. Inspector Martis-Jones was asked about his relationship with PS Hall. He stated that in his opinion the current proceedings stemmed from PS Hall. He went on to speak about the difficulties he encountered as a new Inspector managing the significant issues in teams previously headed by PS Hall and the work that had to be done to turn those teams around.
122. Inspector Martis-Jones stated that he had no doubt that PS Hall had a very dim view of him. He confirmed that at no point had PS Hall been under his line management.
123. Inspector Martis-Jones confirmed that no one else was present during his conversation at the bar with Mr Clayson. He had come out of the toilet and Mr Clayson was already at the bar. There were instant fireworks at the bar. He

reacted by saying to Mr Clayson words to the effect of 'hold on mate what has gone on here'.

124. Inspector Martis-Jones confirmed that PC Hand was a member of his immediate team. PC Maposa was not, however, there was overlay between them through additional work undertaken across Lambeth. Mr Clayson and PS Hall both worked on the Lambeth team. Mr Clayson and PC Maposa would have worked under PS Hall.

Findings – Decision

125. The Panel carefully considered all of the evidence presented.
126. It has determined that the allegation as set out in the regulation 30 Notice has not been proved.

Findings - Reasons

The Allegation

127. The Panel carefully considered all of the evidence available. It found that the timeline of events and clarity as to who was present when was a matter of importance when determining the allegation.
128. The following was agreed between the parties and not in issue:
- a. On 6 February 2025, at approximately 1200, Mr Clayson went to the Founders Arms public house. He met with former colleagues.
 - b. Mr Clayson was shortly due to be married. Mr L was to be his best man and was responsible for organizing his stag do.
 - c. PC Maposa and PC Hands arrived some time thereafter.
 - d. Inspector Martis-Jones arrived at the venue at approximately 1700. He had arranged to meet PC Maposa there. He was introduced to Mr Clayson.
 - e. Mr Clayson sent WhatsApp messages to PS Hall from 1709.
 - f. PC Hands left at around 1720.

- g. Mr L arrived between 1830 and 1900. It had been arranged that he would meet Mr Clayson there.
 - h. At some point in the evening, after 1830 and before 2051, the group of Inspector Martis-Jones, PC Maposa, Mr L and Mr Clayson began speaking with a group of people sat at an adjacent table.
 - i. Mr Clayson left PS Hall a voice note at 2051.
 - j. All officers within the Metropolitan police, who were present and connected to this case, were off duty.
129. On behalf of the AA, it was confirmed that the allegations against Inspector Martis-Jones were limited to comments A to C and did not include other aspects of the conversations, such as references to strip clubs, strippers and topless dwarves. It was submitted that those parts of the conversations were derogatory and misogynistic, but were before the Panel only by way of background. Having received that clarification, the Panel was content to proceed on that basis.
130. The Panel proceeded to deal with each of the alleged comments.

Comment A

131. Mr Clayson sent a WhatsApp message at 1737 referring to comment A being made to him. As stated above it was not in dispute that Mr L arrived between 1830 and 1900. The conclusion reached by the Panel was that Mr L could not have been present or heard this comment if it was made. Indeed, Mr L gave no evidence of having heard such a comment.
132. This was at odds with the evidence given by Mr Clayson when he said that Mr L was present and they exchanged a knowing look.
133. Mr Clayson was adamant that his initial interaction with Inspector Martis-Jones was positive and that the alleged comments were not made until at approximately half an hour had passed. The Panel was unable to reconcile the undisputed evidence that Inspector Martis-Jones did not arrive at the venue until 1700. But by 1709 Mr Clayson had already sent a disparaging text to PS Hall and at 1737 he texted to imply that comment A had been made within 10 minutes of him meeting the Inspector.

134. PC Maposa was present from the start of the evening. He, however, did not have any recollection of hearing comment A made.
135. PC Hand was also present at the start of the evening. No statement has been provided by him as a witness and so he is unable to corroborate the account given by Mr Clayson.
136. The Panel considered the complete denial asserted by Inspector Martis-Jones. It carefully assessed him as a witness. It considered his interview, Regulation 31 response and oral evidence. The Panel was satisfied that he was credible, consistent and balanced.
137. The Panel reviewed and accepted the character bundle that had been served. It noted the legal advice given to it in relation to good character evidence. The character bundle supported the Panel's views that there was a lack of propensity and high degree of Fraser Clayson's credibility that could be attributed to Inspector Martis-Jones.
138. Given the strength of the evidence of Inspector Martis-Jones, the inconsistencies within the evidence of Mr Clayson and his lack of recollection the Panel preferred the evidence of Inspector Martis-Jones.
139. All matters considered and applying the balance of probabilities, with the burden resting with the AA, the Panel did not find the allegation proved in relation to comment A.

Comments B and C

140. The Panel noted Mr L's evidence that before the conclusion of his conversation with Inspector Martis-Jones about Mr L's work, which lasted about 30 minutes, in his opinion, nothing inappropriate had been said within his earshot. The Panel accepted the evidence of Mr L that he was uncomfortable with the discussion around Mr Clayson's forthcoming stag do and found it to be "brash".
141. Importantly, Mr L did not believe that Mr Clayson had been present when the uncomfortable conversation around the stag do took place. The conversation ended when Mr Clayson returned to the table. Furthermore, Mr L

stated that after the stag do conversation he heard nothing else said that was concerning.

142. The Panel concluded that if Fraser Clayson comments B and C were made it must have been between the ending of the conversation between Mr L and Inspector Martis-Jones regarding Mr L's work and 2051, the latter being when Mr Clayson sent the voice note to PS Hall which appear to reference those comments.

143. Further, the Panel was satisfied that the comments must have been made after the group had begun socializing with the people seated adjacent to them, bearing in mind the content of the voice note. This was after the conversation about the stag do had ended.

144. By this stage PC Hand had left the venue.

145. PC Maposa's evidence was that he did not hear any such comment made. The Panel noted that on his account he was outside the venue a significant amount of the time smoking, frequently with Inspector Martis-Jones. In the circumstances PC Maposa's evidence of what he did or did not hear could not be determinative.

146. The Panel had regard to the content of the voice note that was sent to PS Hall. It noted that in evidence Mr Clayson stated that he had left the message as he was entering the tube having left the venue with Mr L. There were a number of difficulties with the account(s) given by Mr Clayson:

- a. In the voice note he says that Inspector Martis-Jones approached him and made the comments. By implication no one else could have been there.
- b. In evidence it was asserted by Mr Clayson that the comments were made by the Inspector in the course of him giving advice to Mr L on how to conduct himself with women. Mr L would have been present to hear the comments and yet he gave no account of the comments being made to him. Following further questioning Mr Clayson stated that he did not think that Mr L was present.
- c. In Mr Clayson's written and oral evidence he asserts that Mr L was present when the comments were made and a knowing look was exchanged between the two of them.

- d. Mr L had no recollection of Mr Clayson apologizing to him for Inspector Martis-Jones' comments.
 - e. In evidence Mr Clayson stated that he believed that PC Maposa was present when the comments were made.
147. Indeed, in oral evidence, Mr Clayson was unable to assist the Panel with any great detail. He could not initially recall his group joining the group on the adjacent table or the context in which comment C was made.
148. The Panel accepted that during the conversation around the stag do, the film the Hangover, strip clubs, stripper and topless dwarves were discussed. There appeared to be a conflation between what was said during the stag do conversation and what was alleged to have been heard by Mr Clayson which the Panel was unable to unpick. The Panel was not prepared to descend into conjecture and assumption.
149. Further, the Panel took into account the fact that alcohol had been consumed, with Mr Clayson having started drinking at midday. On the evidence available it would appear that by the time he left the venue at 2051 he had consumed nine pints of beer and a shot. The amount of alcohol consumed may have accounted for Mr Clayson's poor memory of events and also, potentially, his reactions and perception on the night in question.
150. Again, the Panel considered the evidence of Inspector Martis-Jones. As before it found him to be credible and his account to be clear, balanced and consistent.
151. In relation to the consumption of alcohol, the Panel noted that Inspector Martis-Jones had finished work at 1600 and was in the Founders Arms public house by 1700. There was little time for him to have consumed more than one drink at the first venue and before then travelling to Blackfriars. No one had suggested in evidence that upon arrival at the venue the Inspector was in any way intoxicated.
152. Given the strength of the evidence of Inspector Martis-Jones, the inconsistencies within the evidence of Mr Clayson and his lack of recollection, the Panel preferred the evidence of Inspector Martis-Jones. The observations relating to the good character evidence set out above also applied to the Panel's consideration of Fraser Clayson's comments B and C.

153. On the balance of probabilities, with the burden resting with the AA, the Panel did not find comment B and C to be proved.