

IN THE MATTER OF A MISCONDUCT HEARING
B E T W E E N:
THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS
Appropriate Authority
-and-
PC Oluwaseye Olajide (P253459) and Former PC Oliver Fellowes (P258832)
Subject Officers
POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020) as amended.

Clarification of the No Case to Answer Ruling by the Panel on 6th July 2026.

1. On 6th July 2026, at the close of the AA's case Ms Randall made a submission on behalf of PC Olajide that there was 'No Case to Answer'.
2. Ms Randall's submissions concentrated on the assertion that the AA could not prove there had been 'cheating' on the part of PC Olajide
3. The AA in response, emphasised that the allegation did not specify 'cheating'. The AA maintained this was an 'Integrity' case first and foremost and the Panel could infer advantage was gained, but that analysis was for the Panel to determine in its consideration of the factual circumstances (which were agreed) set against the online guidance and declaration signed.
4. The LQA gave oral directions in open session, which consisted of two points:
 - I. The Panel was at liberty to consider if there was a 'Case to answer' on both or either of the individual limbs of the Honesty and Integrity Standard of Professional Behaviour.
 - II. The 'Case to answer' test in short was, whether there was sufficient evidence before the Panel, taken at its highest, for it to properly make a finding on conduct on the balance of probabilities.
5. The Panel gave the following ruling:

»The.Panel.determined?at.this.stage?there.is.a.case.to.answer.on.the.admitted.facts.in.respect.of.the.alleged.breach.of.the.Integrity.limb.of.the.Standard.Honesty.and.Integrity«

6. The Panel made no positive finding that there was NOT a 'Case to answer' in respect of the 'Honesty' limb of the Standard.
7. The Panel understood that any finding of fact made with regards to a failure to act with integrity, considered objectively, may result in a failure to meet the Standard of Honesty and Integrity and amount to a breach of it. There is no requirement that each limb of the Honesty and Integrity Standard be breached. Rather a failure to meet an element (limb) of the Standard could result in a failure to meet the entirety of the breach of the Standard as alleged.
8. The Panel intended that upon its finding of a 'Case to answer' in respect of the 'integrity' limb of the Standard, the case should proceed and the breach of the 'Honesty and Integrity' Standard remained to be determined in its entirety.
9. For clarity the ruling should have been expressed as follows:
»The.Panel.determined?at.this.stage?there.is.a.case.to.answer.on.the.admitted.facts?at.the.very.least?in.respect.of.the.alleged.breach.of.the.Integrity.limb.of.the.Standard.Honesty.and.Integrity«
10. Following the ruling, no application was made by either party to amend the Regulation 30 Notice or the breach as alleged.
11. If there has been any ambiguity or misunderstanding as to how this case has proceeded following the ruling by the Panel, Ms Randall must be afforded every opportunity to make further submissions to the Panel or indeed re-call PC Olajide, if Ms Randall or indeed PC Olajide were labouring under a misconception or mistaken understanding as to the Panel's ruling.
12. This must be undertaken once all parties to the hearing are re assembled and before the Panel retires to consider its 'Finding of Facts'.

LQA – Judith Seaborne

6th July 2026.

Please distribute to all parties.

