Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Akbar Arabi
Warrant No: P265745

Date of Hearing: 24 July 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Honesty and Integrity, Discreditable Conduct, Orders and Instructions

Findings

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started, along with viewing the video material. 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.**

PC Arabi attended the hearing and he was represented by his federation representative PC Colin Brooke.

The AA was represented by Case Manager, Ms Molly Nairn. I am satisfied PC Arabi has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with. PC Arabi provided a Regulation 54 response.

The Allegation

It is alleged that on 23 August 2025, whilst off duty, you were driving a BMW motor vehicle, registration [Redacted], when you were stopped by police officers due to the manner of your driving.

During this interaction, you accepted that your driving fell below the expected standard and apologised to the officers. You further stated that you were attempting to “give her a thrill” in order to cheer up a female friend.

At the time of the stop, the vehicle was not registered to you, and you were unable to demonstrate that you held a valid certificate of motor insurance enabling you to drive that vehicle.

You were unable to provide any documentation to support your assertion that you held fully comprehensive insurance on another vehicle which permitted you to drive other vehicles. This was despite having possession of your mobile telephone and being given the opportunity to do so.

You were afforded a further opportunity to produce proof of insurance within seven days but failed to provide such documentation.

Subsequent enquiries established that your motor insurance policy did not permit you to drive other vehicles whilst insured.

Furthermore, you disclosed your status as a police officer, despite the expectation that you uphold the law both on and off duty.

Professional Standards of Behaviour

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

(i) Honesty & Integrity
(ii) Discreditable Conduct
(iii) Orders & Instructions

In that your conduct may bring the police service into disrepute and damage the relationship of trust and confidence between the police and the public.

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

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Ms Nairn and the representations made on behalf of PC Arabi by his federation representative PC Brooke, and PC Arabi himself.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the allegations against PC Arabi.

- On the 23 August 2025, at around 2am, officer observed a BWV vehicle being driven in a poor manner along Conway Street, Westminster. The manner of driving included wheel spinning, an illegal U-turn and weaving across the road at speed.

- The vehicle was stopped and PC Arabi was identified as the driver. He had three passengers in his vehicle. When spoken to regarding the manner of his driving, PC Arabi expressed that he was attempting to cheer his friend up. He made comments indicating he accepted that his driving was inappropriate. He wanted to give his friend a thrill.

- PC Arabi was unable to provide a driving licence, insurance documentation nor any form of personal identification to the officers, despite having a mobile phone on him.

- Enquiries in relation to the vehicle showed that only one of the passengers was insured to drive that vehicle. PC Arabi stated that he was insured through a separate vehicle, which allowed him to drive other vehicles.

- PC Arabi was permitted to leave the scene and given the opportunity to produce proof of insurance at a police station within seven days. He later provided a lease agreement for a vehicle, which did not provide insurance cover for him to drive other vehicles. PC Arabi did not provide evidence of any insurance entitlement to drive the BWV despite repeated requests.

- Enquiries with the insurance company revealed that PC Arabi was not insured to drive any other vehicle but for his leased vehicle.

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether it amounts to breach of the following standards of behaviour:

- **Honesty and Integrity** - Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.
- **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.
- **Orders and Instructions –** Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders.

Officer's position

- PC Arabi accepts that he drove without insurance but denies driving without due care and attention.

- PC Arabi admits his driving without insurance amounts to discreditable conduct to the level of misconduct. PC Arabi denies having failed to act without honesty and integrity or failed to comply with orders and instructions.

- PC Arabi suggest that there is no evidence that he was driving without due care and attention. There is nothing to suggest road users were impacted by his driving. There is no evidence of the alleged speed or that the u-turn was in fact illegal.

- PC Arabi identified himself as a police officer to the officers attending. He provided his warrant number and details of the station he was attached to. He accepts that he should have had his warrant card with him.

- PC Arabi made a genuine mistake as to the insurance. He genuinely believed he had comprehensive insurance on the temporary courtesy vehicle to the drive any other vehicles. PC Arabi stated that he received verbal confirmation as to the comprehensive insurance. PC Arabi admitted he only had third party insurance on his own vehicle.

- PC Arabi was open and honest with the officer. He accepted full responsibility for his conduct.

In line with Regulation 61(7) and Regulation 61(8), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority, from those representing PC Arabi and PC Arabi himself.

Decision on Finding

I have applied Regulation 61(15) and carefully listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary, and body worn video evidence provided to me, including the representations on behalf of PC Arabi, and PC Arabi himself as to his conduct on the 23 August 2025.

PC Arabi stated that he reflected on his actions and he has expressed remorse for his actions.

Overall, I have found the facts proven as outlined by the Appropriate Authority save for the following extract:

"Furthermore, you disclosed your status as a police officer, despite the expectation that you uphold the law both on and off duty"

Breach of Professional Standards

In line with Regulation 61(16), I bear in mind that the burden of proving a Breach of Standards rests upon the Appropriate Authority and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

- **Discreditable Conduct:** PC Arabi admits he drove without insurance. He says he relied on verbal confirmation that he had fully comprehensive insurance on his temporary courtesy vehicle which he took possession of on the 11 August 2025). However, PC Arabi had no documentation of the like.

  On the evidence before me, I reject the suggestion that he was verbally misled by the car dealership on having comprehensive insurance cover to drive other vehicles, noting that his main policy for his own vehicle was only third-party insurance. It would have been highly unlikely to have more advanced insurance on a courtesy car. The lease agreement provided to me describes the terms of insurance and conditions on loan (at pg.45). I noted that PC Arabi electronically signed both on the 11 August 2025. There is nothing contained within that document that enables him to drive other vehicles.

  PC Arabi is a police officer and therefore he should have an understanding of the inherent unlikeliness of being given a more comprehensive policy on a courtesy car when his own insurance policy is third party only.

  In addition, I do find that PC Arabi drove without due care and attention. He was observed by two police officers weaving in and out of traffic, driving erratically, causing the rear wheels to skid, and made a very sudden U-turn. On his own admission to officers on body worn video, he wanted to give his friend a thrill and apologised to the officers. For these reasons, I find on balance of probabilities that PC Arabi's level of driving fell below the standard expected of a competent and careful driver.

- **Honesty and Integrity**: I find PC Arabi acted dishonestly when he made a false statement to his fellow officers asserting he had fully comprehensive insurance. He did so knowingly in circumstances where he only had third party insurance cover on his main vehicle. PC Arabi only had full insurance to drive the courtesy vehicle alone. He was not insured on any other vehicle.

- **Orders and Instructions**: I have considered the circumstances of how and when PC Arabi declared he was a police officer. I do not find that PC Arabi was evasive or inappropriate in his disclosure that he is a police officer. He made the disclosure to assist officers with his identification. PC Arabi admitted that he didn't carry a warrant card, but the Appropriate Authority have not provided me with a policy that sets out that officers must carry their warrant cards at all times. Therefore, I do not find that PC Arabi breached the standards of professional behaviour as to orders and instructions.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden and the conduct did breach the standards of professional behaviour as to discreditable conduct, and honesty and integrity.

Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make a provisional assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors.

Culpability is high – PC Arabi's conduct was intentional and deliberate. PC Arabi failed to produce any insurance documentation for the BMW.

PC Arabi must have known that he was not insured to drive the vehicle. It is likely that PC Arabi would have had an email confirmation of the insurance policy on his courtesy vehicle; a policy which he electronically signed on the 11 August 2025. PC Arabi made a deliberate attempt to mislead his colleagues by making false assertions about having fully comprehensive insurance cover that would enable him to drive the BMW. When PC Arabi deliberately misled his colleagues, he hindered them in carrying out their duties and their investigation.

PC Arabi could have reasonably foreseen the risk of harm to his passengers and other road users by driving in an erratic manner.

Notwithstanding the absence of a criminal prosecution, PC Arabi's manner of driving and the driving without insurance are criminal in nature.

Harm – is high. PC Arabi's actions were unprofessional and cause harm to the reputation of the police service. PC Arabi was aware of the standards expected from a serving police officer, yet he chose to lie.

Police officers uphold the law, they should not break the law themselves.

His actions are also likely to undermine 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 am mindful not to double count or take to consideration any factors that have already featured in my determination of culpability and harm. I have considered that there is one additional aggravating feature, in that I do find that PC Arabi tried to conceal his wrongdoing by claiming he did not have any proof of insurance on his email, which he had on his phone (as per body worn video footage)

Mitigating features – I do not find any mitigating features.

Personal mitigation

I have been provided with personal mitigation on behalf of PC Arabi in the form of a character bundle, containing 6 references, that speak to his compassionate nature. They speak of his professionalism, approachable manner and good approach in dealing with victims of crimes, his decency and kindness.

However, 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.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the *Standards of Professional Behaviour* so serious to justify dismissal. Applying that definition and having undertaken an assessment of seriousness, I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards do amount to gross misconduct.

Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I bear in mind that the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025 ("The 2025 Regulations") came into effect on the 28 May 2025.

The 2025 Regulations amend Regulation 62 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ("The PCR") so that, where gross misconduct is proven against a serving officer, the panel must dismiss the officer unless there are exceptional circumstances.

[Redacted]

I have also considered the officer’s record of service.

I have carefully assessed the seriousness of the conduct and the personal mitigation advanced, as set out above, and I do not find any exceptional circumstances.

Therefore, the only available sanction is dismissal without notice and I am satisfied that it is the only appropriate sanction in this case.

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.

Former Commander Katie Lilburn
Metropolitan Police Service
24 July 2026