

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: Officer A

Warrant No: [REDACTED]

Date of Hearing: 31st July 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct

Findings

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

The hearing was held in **Public**.

Officer A did not attend the hearing. She was represented by Counsel, Ms Rina Hill and supported by their Police Federation Representative, PC Shaun Robinson. The Appropriate Authority was represented by Counsel, Mr Daniel Hobbs and case manager, Mr Aaryan Sattani.

I am satisfied Officer A has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with. Officer A did not provide a Regulation 54 response.

Absence of the Officer

Officer A did not attend the hearing. Ms Hill provided me with details regarding the recent communications with the officer and the concerns surrounding their [REDACTED]. Having regard to Officer A's [REDACTED], I am satisfied that in line with Regulation 57, I can proceed in the officer's absence. Officer A is represented through Counsel, their solicitors and Federation Representative.

Application to Adjourn

An application to adjourn was made on behalf of Officer A on two grounds; namely, 1) adjourn to permit the officer to apply for [REDACTED] retirement and 2) it would be unfair to proceed with the hearing given Officer A's [REDACTED].

I have considered this issue with great care, having regard to the [REDACTED] evidence before me, the interests of Officer A, and the wider public interest in the timely resolution of serious misconduct matters.

[REDACTED] provided an independent [REDACTED] assessment of Officer A. [REDACTED] has produced four reports dated 10th June 2025, 24th June 2025, 9th November 2025, and 28th April 2026 (the most recent assessment being conducted on 13th April 2026).

[REDACTED] diagnosed Officer A with [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] consistent opinion across all four reports is that, on the balance of probabilities, Officer A is [REDACTED] or to engage meaningfully in the disciplinary process. Applying the framework under the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I understand that the application to adjourn is in part predicated on Officer A now potentially agreeing to explore [REDACTED] retirement. Given Officer A's [REDACTED].

I have also given careful consideration to the tension between fairness to Officer A and the public interest in the timely resolution of serious misconduct allegations. I have also considered whether an indefinite deferral would be appropriate [REDACTED].

I have considered whether an adjournment would be appropriate. In my judgment, it would not, for the following reasons:

- Officer A's [REDACTED] to engage meaningfully in the disciplinary process.
- [REDACTED] retirement is a separate and distinct process from the disciplinary proceedings. I note that [REDACTED] retirement requires Officer A's engagement. [REDACTED]. Therefore, I do not consider it proportionate to adjourn [REDACTED]

- Even if Officer A [REDACTED], I consider that she has had 14 months to apply for [REDACTED] retirement.
- The public interest in the resolution of serious misconduct matters is a weighty consideration, particularly where the allegation concerns conduct that is criminal in nature.
- A further adjournment would leave Officer A in a state of uncertainty, which is not in their best interests [REDACTED].

Accordingly, I am satisfied that it is fair and in the public interest to proceed with this hearing without delay.

The Allegation

On 27th February 2024, two of your mobile phones were seized by Surrey Police officers.

Following a download of your mobile phones, 19 “extreme images” were located.

These images display bestiality: all 19 images were of a sexual nature involving horses or dogs, engaging in sexual activities with humans.

Further, between the 28th January 2023 and the 15th February 2024 (inclusive), you accessed 300 websites linked to extreme pornography, specifically websites linked to bestiality porn.

Possessing images of an extreme nature is contrary to s.63 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

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

- i) Discreditable Conduct

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

The Hearing

I have considered the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and the submission behalf of Officer A. I have also carefully considered the documentary evidence contained in the hearing bundle.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the allegation against Officer A. I set out the evidence below.

On 27th February 2024, Officer A was arrested by Surrey Police. During the execution of that arrest, two mobile phones were seized from Officer A's bedroom. Those phones have been attributed to Officer A.

Forensic downloads of the devices were conducted. DC Gray provided a detailed breakdown of each of the 19 extreme images, confirming that they are illegal extreme images depicting bestiality.

The images were mostly cached and not directly user-accessible via the gallery but were clearly present on the devices as a result of the websites visited.

The web history on the devices showed repeated visits to websites specifically catering for bestiality, often with a variant of "zoo" in the title.

I note by way of example, on 13th February 2024 alone, between 12:04 and 19:41 hours, 101 such website visits were recorded with explicit bestiality-related descriptions.

In total, the seized phones were used to access extreme pornography websites on at least 467 occasions, all relating to bestiality involving sexual activity between humans and animals (dogs and horses).

I note that the criminal investigation by Surrey Police into the images was closed on public interest grounds.

If this allegation is proven, then I must decide whether it amounts to breach of the following standards of behaviour:

- **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.

Officer's position

Officer A did not provide a Regulation 54 response. A Regulation 17 Notice of Investigation regarding possession of extreme pornography was served at Officer A's home address on 30th January 2025 by DC Lepcha and DS Mallett. Officer A declined to engage and walked away. Written notice was left with their grandmother. Their mother and their Federation Representative, PC Shaun Robinson, were also notified.

Officer A has not responded to the allegation. No admissions have been made. I recognise that Ms Hill cannot address me on the facts of the case given Officer A being unfit and unable to provide instructions or participate in the proceedings. No substantive challenge to the forensic evidence was able to be made on their behalf. It was accepted that the case was criminal in nature, involving sexual impropriety.

I take note the submissions that Officer A's [REDACTED].

Ms Hill made detailed reference to the [REDACTED], my consideration of Officer A's culpability and harm caused by their conduct.

Decision on Finding

In accordance with Regulation 61(15), I have reviewed the facts and considered the documentary evidence provided to me.

The evidence in this case is, in my judgment, compelling and incontrovertible. Therefore, I have found the facts proven as outlined by the Appropriate Authority for the reasons set out below;

The 19 extreme images were recovered from two mobile phones seized from Officer A's bedroom, registered to their mobile number since January 2021, and linked to their billing address and email.

The web history demonstrates repeated access to bestiality websites over a period of more than 12 months (28th January 2023 to 15th February 2024), totalling at least 467 website visits.

No evidence has been put before me to challenge the attribution of the devices or data to Officer A, or to provide any innocent explanation for the presence of the images or the

browsing history. That being said, I do recognise that as Officer A is absent and [REDACTED] in the proceedings or provide legal instructions, Ms Hill cannot advance a positive case on behalf of Officer A.

Breach of Professional Standards

I have then gone on to consider whether the proven conduct amounts to a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour. In accordance with Regulation 61(16), I bear in mind that the burden of proving the breach rests upon the Appropriate Authority and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

The possession of extreme pornographic images is conduct that is criminal in nature. It is conduct which plainly discredits the police service and undermines public confidence in policing, whether committed on or off duty. A serving police officer who possesses illegal extreme images depicting bestiality has behaved in a manner which does not accord with the standards of behaviour expected of a serving police officer.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged its burden and the conduct did breach the Standards of Professional Behaviour as to Discreditable Conduct.

Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make a provisional assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors. I have carefully considered the submissions by the Appropriate Authority and the submissions on behalf of Officer A. I have carefully considered the [REDACTED].

In order to make a determination as to Officer A's culpability, I have carefully reviewed the frequency and volume of the cached images and website visits. This has led me to the conclusion that Officer A's conduct was intentional. [REDACTED] letter dated the 24th June 2025, and in particular the following paragraph;

[REDACTED]

I accept [REDACTED] opinion that the presence of pornography is likely connected to [their] [REDACTED]. However, this case goes beyond the presence of pornography. Officer A has repeatedly searched and accessed websites relating to extreme pornography, particularly bestiality. She retained 19 images depicting bestiality. The [REDACTED] evidence before me does, in my view, not draw a causal link between Officer A's

[REDACTED] relating to them [REDACTED] and their visits to bestiality websites on 467 occasions.

Culpability is high – Officer A’s conduct was intentional and sustained over a period of more than 12 months. The web history demonstrates at least 467 visits to extreme pornography websites between January 2023 and February 2024. On a single day (13th February 2024), 101 such visits were recorded.

Harm – is high. The conduct involves the possession of illegal extreme pornographic images. The existence of a market for such material contributes to the abuse and exploitation of animals. Officer A’s conduct causes serious harm to the reputation of the police service. Officer A’s behaviour undermines public confidence in policing at a time when the police and specifically the Metropolitan Police are aiming to demonstrate how seriously it is tackling higher standards over the last few years following highly publicised and damaging incidents.

Aggravating features – I do not find any additional aggravating features.

Mitigating features – I acknowledge that Officer A [REDACTED]. I have considered this evidence with the seriousness and sensitivity it deserves. Officer A’s [REDACTED].

Officer A is [REDACTED]. Officer A joined the Metropolitan Police Service on 30th September 2019. She has been [REDACTED] suspended from duty on [REDACTED] since late 2023.

Officer A has diagnoses [REDACTED].

However, whilst I have every sympathy for Officer A’s [REDACTED] difficulties, no evidence has been placed before me to establish that their [REDACTED] caused or materially contributed to the specific conduct alleged.

Gross Misconduct

Applying Regulation 2, I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the *Standards of Professional Behaviour* so serious as to justify dismissal. Applying that definition and Regulation 61(16), I must consider whether the breach is so serious as to cross that threshold.

In my judgment, it plainly does. The possession of illegal extreme pornographic images depicting bestiality by a serving police officer is conduct of the utmost seriousness. It is conduct fundamentally incompatible with the office of constable and the trust placed in police officers by the public.

I am satisfied that on the balance of probabilities the breach of professional standards does amount to gross misconduct.

Outcome Decision

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

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

assessed by reference to:

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

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

remind myself this has three elements:

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

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

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

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

I start by assessing the seriousness of the conduct. As stated, I found these provisionally as above

and adopt them herein.

Culpability is high – Officer A’s conduct was intentional and sustained over a period of more than 12 months. The web history demonstrates at least 467 visits to extreme pornography websites between January 2023 and February 2024. On a single day (13th February 2024), 101 such visits were recorded.

Harm – is high. The conduct involves the possession of illegal extreme pornographic images. The existence of a market for such material contributes to the abuse and exploitation of animals. Officer A’s conduct causes serious harm to the reputation of the police service. Officer A’s behaviour undermines public confidence in policing at a time when the police and specifically the Metropolitan Police are aiming to demonstrate how seriously it is tackling higher standards over the last few years following highly publicised and damaging incidents.

Aggravating features – I do not find any additional aggravating features.

Mitigating features – I acknowledge that Officer A suffers [REDACTED]. I have considered this evidence with the seriousness and sensitivity it deserves. Officer A’s [REDACTED].

Officer A is [REDACTED]. Officer A joined the Metropolitan Police Service on 30th September 2019. Officer A [REDACTED].

Officer A [REDACTED].

As aforementioned, whilst I have every sympathy for Officer A’s [REDACTED] difficulties, no evidence has been placed before me to establish that their [REDACTED] caused or materially contributed to the specific conduct alleged.

Personal mitigation

No personal mitigation has been advanced on behalf of Officer A. In any event, I am mindful of the limits to the weight I should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing’s Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings, and that the interests of the police service, and the protection of the public, are more important than those of the individual officer. The Guidance makes clear that personal mitigation, however compelling,

cannot override the need to maintain public confidence in the police service and to protect the public.

Conclusion on Seriousness

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

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

I have reminded myself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case.

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

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

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

I have considered the officer's record of service.

Under the 2020 Regulations, I have reminded myself to consider the least punitive outcome first. A reduction in rank is not available by virtue of the officer being a police constable.

I then considered whether a final written warning would be consistent with the public interest. In my view, it would not.

Whilst I have borne in mind the severity of Officer A' [REDACTED], it is entirely unacceptable for police officers who are responsible for enforcing the law, to engage in conduct that is criminal in nature. Doing so undermines public trust and confidence in policing, as well as the reputation of the Metropolitan Police Service.

In my view, the only appropriate outcome is dismissal without notice. A lesser outcome would not serve to mark the seriousness of this misconduct or deter others from similar misconduct and fulfil the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

OUTCOME:

Having considered the matter fully and having regard to the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, the sanction I impose is **dismissal without notice** and the officer should be placed on the College of Policing's barred list.

T/Commander Brigid Beehag-Fisher

Metropolitan Police Service

31st July 2026