
PANEL FINAL DECISION

Introductions:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for PC Mohammed Nizam (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 Andy Brittain (Chair), with independent members Ms Lorna Beckford and Mr Clive Manning. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Olivia Kong.
3. The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by Mr Edmund Garnett (AA's representative) and the Officer was not legally represented but was assisted by the Federation Representative PS Joe Harrington.
4. The hearing was held from 6 to 8 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

You posted/reposted/liked on a public social media account one sided and/or politically motivated views of the war in Gaza as well as offensive, antisemitic and transphobic messages. The posts in question are those set out at §§4.4 to 4.71 of the Investigating Officer's report.

The above conduct was contrary to paragraph 1 of schedule of the Police Regulations 2003 in that it was an activity that was likely to interfere with the impartial discharge of your duties or which was likely to give rise to the impression amongst members of the public that it may so interfere.

Such conduct constitutes Gross Misconduct and amounts to a breach of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour: Discreditable Conduct; Equality and Diversity.

Preliminary Issues

Anonymity application

7. At the pre-hearing, the Officer applied for anonymity on the grounds of his family circumstances and his mental health. The AA opposed the application. At that stage, no documentary evidence had been provided in support of the asserted grounds, beyond the Officer's statement within his Regulation 31 response.
8. The Chair directed The Officer to provide any supporting evidence by 12:00 on 19 June 2026.
9. No supporting evidence was received from the Officer. The application for anonymity was therefore refused.

Admission of additional documents

10. On the first day of the hearing, the Officer's Federation representative applied to admit medical evidence comprising five pages of documents. The AA's representative raised no objection to its admission. Exercising the Chair's discretion, and in light of the parties' agreement, the medical evidence was admitted into evidence.

The Panel's Approach

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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).

14. 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".

15. 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

16. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:

- a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response) consisting of 142 pages;
- b. AA's opening note consisting of seven pages;
- c. The Officer's medical evidence of nine pages;
- d. The Officer's character bundle consisting of 14 pages respectively.

17. The Panel also heard from the following live witness:

- a. The Officer

Case Summary

18. Between September 2023 – July 2024, the Officer posted, reposted and 'liked' a number of pictures and comments on the social media. The contents of these posts included:

19. The Officer posted: "may allah grant victory to the Muslims of the balkans" if "the Serbs attack";

20. The Officer liked an image of a man (seemingly Bashar al-Assad) with a noose around his neck;

21. The Officer responded to a post from Sadiq Khan expressing distress at the terrorist attacks in Israel on 7 October 2023 with an image reading "you f**king w*nk stain";

22. The Officer liked a post responding to a Jewish commentator accusing him of continuing to "play the Holocaust card to justify Israel's genocidal attack on Gaza";

23. The Officer liked a post referring to the "Zionist-controlled mass media";

24. The Officer re-posted a post responding to "trans women are women" with "hot dogs are dogs";

25. The Officer posted “this bastard needs a firing squad” in relation to a person who had allegedly committed a murder based on anti-Palestinian sentiment;
26. The Officer liked a post stating that “we don’t have true democracy in the West”, and that Western leaders “are complicit in this attempted genocide of the Palestinian people”;
27. The Officer posted: “we have to speak out carefully about not wanting hospitals to get bombed while worrying about semitism whilst they can march on the streets chanting death to arabs”;
28. In response to a post suggesting that Hamas were responsible for the attacks on 7 October 2023, the Officer posted: “It’s funny because even the IDF scum don’t even think Hamas did it but you do for some reason. Twat”;
29. The Officer re-posted a post accusing the office of the Prime Minister of Israel as rationalising genocide;
30. The Officer re-posted a post stating that persons were “mass executed” by the “Zionist Apartheid State”;
31. The Officer re-posted a tweet stating that “Israel controls all the Muslim countries but Gaza”;
32. In response to a post referring to the death of eight IDF soldiers, the Officer stated: “Alhamdullilah. May their mothers cry the same tears as the mothers of the martyred Palestinian children”;
33. The Officer posted: “Ya Allah, rain down your curse on the Israeli military. Those soldiers are the same age as me, their mothers the same age as mine. Despite this, grant them a death so painful and humiliating that their mothers cry as much as my mother would cry for me”;
34. The Officer posted: “Israel by existence counts as the oppressors and aggressor. Arabs have attacked Israel multiple times I know that. The Israelis took their land and are now the colonial outpost of the USA and UK and the Arabs have the right to resist. The Palestinians have the right to be against...Their oppression and occupation by a scumbag army”;
35. In response to a post deprecating the celebration of the deaths of young men, the Officer posted: “I do not mock the deaths of Israeli soldiers but I do celebrate and say takbeer”;
36. The Officer re-posted a post mourning the death of an IDF soldier with “suck it”;

37. The Officer posted: “May the streets and alleyways of Gaza be drenched with the blood of the Israeli Occupation Forces”;
38. The Officer responded to a post depicting Israeli troops praying before entering Rafah with “May their coffins be draped with the Israeli flag in the coming weeks. May their funerals be flooded with tears of blood. May they be disgraced in this life and the next”;
39. In response to a post documenting the death of another Israeli soldier, the Officer posted: “Ha shaym you’re dead”;
40. The Officer re-posted: “Proudly Anti-Israel. Retweet if you are too”;
41. The Officer responded to a post recording the funeral procession of a dead Israeli soldier with “Seeing things like this really cheers me up”;
42. The Officer responded to another post recording the death of an Israeli soldier with “brings me great joy knowing his mother cries forever that her baby killer son will no longer return home May he rot in hell forever”;
43. In response to a post relating to Israelis mourning the death of soldiers, the Officer posted: “Ya Allah send them more funerals”;
44. The Officer posted: “May Israeli air force pilot never get a good’s night sleep again May the Israeli flags be draped over their coffins soon”.
45. The Officer responded to a post relating to the 7 October terrorist attacks describing them as an “act of resistance”;
46. The Officer posted “Ya Allah, drench the streets of Gaza with the blood of the Israeli soldiers Make their graves in Beit Hanoun, Khan Yunis and Rafah Splinter the hands of the Israeli carpenters when they have to make so many coffins for them. Ya Allah accept this dua”;
47. The Officer responded to a post referring to three Israeli soldiers having died with “liquidated”;
48. In response to an image of a dead child, the Officer posted: “May the Israeli soldiers receive so much pain their fathers cry the same tears as our beloved brother herr”.

Finding of Facts & Breaches

49. The Panel has carefully considered all the evidence presented during the hearing. This includes the agreed hearing bundle, the Officer’s character evidence, the Officer’s oral testimony, and the closing submissions advanced by

the AA's representative and by the Officer's Federation representative. The Panel also took full account of the legal advice provided throughout the proceedings and followed that advice with diligence.

50. 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 proving the allegations rests with the AA.
51. The Officer's evidence was examined in its entirety, including his interviews, his Regulation 31 notice, his oral testimony, and his responses under cross-examination. The Panel also reviewed the relevant exhibits contained within the bundle. Where appropriate, the Panel distinguished between direct evidence and hearsay, and afforded each source of evidence weight commensurate with its reliability, consistency, and corroboration.
52. The conduct underpinning the allegations concerns the Officer's posting of antisemitic, and his reposting or 'liking' of certain social media content. Against that background, the Panel must determine, on the basis of the totality of the evidence, whether the alleged conduct occurred and, if so, whether it amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct, or neither.

Summary of the Officer's Evidence

53. The panel considered his Regulation 31 notice, his interview, and his oral testimony. He accepted the alleged conduct without reservation.
54. He explained that his mental health had deteriorated following the 7 October 2023 attacks. He described becoming increasingly distressed by images of violence and the killing of children in Gaza, stating that he felt "incensed" by what he saw online. He accepted that some of the posts he 'liked' were antisemitic, and acknowledged that he had not considered the impact of his actions. He maintained that he is not antisemitic and expressed sympathy for the Israeli victims of the 7 October attacks. He accepted, however, that several of the comments he made would be deemed antisemitic under the IHRA definition. He stated that he deeply regretted the posts, recognised that such comments were wholly inappropriate for a police officer, and expressed remorse.
55. The Officer said his mental health continued to worsen at the time of the conduct. He sought support from his sergeant, engaged with mental health services, [Redacted]. He described this intervention as helpful and said it enabled him to recognise the extent of his difficulties.
56. He stated that, since the investigation began, he has undertaken significant personal reflection and education. He said he had broadened the sources he consulted, including reading Jewish News daily, attending events aimed at improving understanding of antisemitism, and seeking advice from members of

the Jewish community. He contacted the Jewish Police Association, who provided guidance and recommended materials to help him understand the harm caused by antisemitic content. He attended an online seminar on antisemitism, an event at a synagogue commemorating the Holocaust, and an exhibition displaying artefacts from terrorist attacks. He described these experiences as emotionally impactful and said they helped him appreciate the seriousness of his actions.

57. He accepted during cross-examination that some of the posts were made before he had seen images of children being killed. He also accepted that he had 'liked' comments alleging that Jewish people exploited the Holocaust, and acknowledged that these were profoundly wrong. He stated that he now understands the gravity of those remarks, describing them as "disgusting," and reiterated his remorse.
58. The Officer said he has deactivated all relevant accounts and believes he has undergone "enormous personal growth." He stated that he now recognises that people of different faiths share common humanity, and he expressed shame and regret for the comments he made.

Finding of facts

59. The Panel notes that the Officer made a full and unequivocal admission of the alleged conduct at the earliest opportunity. His acceptance of the conduct was consistent across his Regulation 31 notice, his interview, and his oral evidence at the hearing. The Panel further notes that a significant proportion of the posts in question were authored by the Officer himself, rather than merely reposted or forwarded.
60. The Officer accepted that he posted, reposted and 'liked' content that included antisemitic comments. He acknowledged that some of the material he engaged with, including posts he authored and posts he 'liked', would be regarded as antisemitic under the IHRA definition. His admissions were clear, direct and unambiguous.
61. During cross-examination, the Officer accepted that some of the posts he 'liked' were made before he viewed the images of violence in Gaza which he later described as contributing to his emotional state. Although the Officer maintained that his actions were driven by the distress and anger he felt after seeing those images, this admission makes clear that his explanation does not account for all of the posts. The Panel considered his explanations in full but notes that they do not alter the factual position regarding the nature and timing of the posts.
62. The Panel did not take into account the findings or conclusions of the investigation report, as those sections were redacted and not disclosed. However, the Panel did consider the Introduction and Background section, in

particular paragraphs 2.3–2.5, which record that the exhibits [Redacted]. [Redacted]. The Panel treated this material as contextual background only and did not rely upon it as evidence of the conduct itself.

63. Having considered the totality of the evidence, including the Officer's admissions, the content of the posts, and the documentary material within the hearing bundle, the Panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the conduct occurred as alleged.

Decisions on Facts

Allegation 1

64. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel finds Allegation 1 proved.

Findings on Breaches of the Standards

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

Discreditable Conduct

66. The Standard of Discreditable Conduct requires officers to behave in a manner which does not bring discredit on the police service or undermine public confidence. It applies both on and off duty, including conduct in private life where that conduct has the potential to impact public trust.
67. The Officer accepted that he posted, reposted and 'liked' content containing antisemitic comments. He acknowledged that some of the material he wrote, and some of the content he engaged with, would be regarded as antisemitic under the IHRA definition. The posts were made on a public platform and were capable of being viewed by members of the public. The nature of the content was plainly incompatible with the standards expected of a police officer.
68. The Panel is satisfied that the Officer's actions, viewed objectively and in context, were liable to bring discredit upon the police service and to undermine public confidence in policing. The conduct therefore amounts to a breach of the Standard of Discreditable Conduct.

Equality and Diversity

69. The Standard of Equality and Diversity requires officers to act with fairness, impartiality and respect, and to refrain from any behaviour that is discriminatory, harassing or otherwise inconsistent with the principles of equality.
70. The Officer accepted that some of the posts he engaged with contained antisemitic comments. He further accepted that he had not considered the impact of his actions at the time. Antisemitic content is discriminatory in nature and is fundamentally incompatible with the requirement to treat individuals and groups with fairness and respect, irrespective of religion or ethnicity.
71. The Panel is satisfied that by posting, reposting and 'liking' content of this nature, the Officer failed to act with fairness and impartiality and engaged with material that was discriminatory. The conduct therefore breaches the Standard of Equality and Diversity.

Misconduct/Gross Misconduct

72. Having found breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct and Equality and Diversity, the Panel then determined whether the proven conduct amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct. In doing so, the Panel is required to consider the seriousness of the conduct in light of the overarching purpose of the police misconduct regime, to maintain public confidence in policing, uphold high standards of behaviour, and protect the public.
73. The Panel considers the conduct to be very serious. The Officer posted, reposted and 'liked' content containing antisemitic comments on a public platform. Antisemitic material is inherently discriminatory and fundamentally incompatible with the values of fairness, impartiality and respect that underpin the policing profession. The Officer's actions were capable of causing offence to members of the public and of undermining confidence in the police service, particularly among Jewish communities and other minority groups.
74. A number of the posts were authored by the Officer himself, demonstrating personal agency in the creation and dissemination of discriminatory content. The conduct occurred over a period of time and was not an isolated lapse. The Officer accepted that he did not consider the impact of his actions at the time, and that some of the posts were made before the deterioration in his mental health which he later described. While the Panel has taken this context into account, it does not materially reduce the seriousness of the conduct.
75. [Redacted]. Although the Panel did not rely on this [Redacted] as evidence of the conduct itself, it underscores the potential gravity of the material with which the Officer engaged.

76. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the conduct found proven amounts to gross misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

77. The panel reminded ourselves of the 3 stages to determining outcome; namely:-
- To assess the seriousness
 - Keep in mind the purpose of imposing the sanctions
 - Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

Stage 1: Assessment of Seriousness

Culpability

78. The Panel assesses the Officer's culpability as **high**, for the following reasons:

79. **The Officer's actions were deliberate** The Officer chose to post, repost and 'like' the content, demonstrating conscious and voluntary engagement with discriminatory material.

80. **The Officer authored discriminatory content** A number of the posts were written by the Officer himself. This demonstrates personal responsibility for creating inappropriate material, elevating culpability beyond merely sharing or reacting to others' posts.

81. **The conduct occurred over an extended period** The behaviour was repeated and took place over a period of time, rather than being an isolated lapse. Repetition increases seriousness and may indicate attitudinal concerns.

82. **The content was clearly targeted and expressed in liberal terms** The posts were not neutral or incidental; they were directed, expressive, and plainly incompatible with the impartiality and fairness required of police officers.

83. **The Officer failed to consider the impact of his actions** The Officer accepted that he did not consider the consequences or potential harm of his conduct at the time. This failure to recognise the seriousness of discriminatory content increases culpability.

84. **The Officer's explanation does not account for all of the conduct** Some posts were made before the deterioration in his mental health which he later described. This context does not materially reduce culpability for those posts.

85. **The conduct was akin to a criminal offence – inciting racial hatred** The nature of some posts was similar to material that could amount to *inciting racial hatred*, a criminal offence. [Redacted].
86. **Some content encouraged hostility or violence** Certain posts endorsed or encouraged hostility towards particular groups, increasing seriousness.
87. **The conduct was discriminatory** The content included antisemitic comments, constituting discrimination on the grounds of race or religion. Discriminatory behaviour is inherently serious and fundamentally incompatible with policing values.
88. Taken together, these factors place the Officer's culpability firmly at the higher end of the spectrum.

Harm

89. The Panel assesses the harm as **high** for the following reasons:
90. **The content was inherently discriminatory** The posts contained antisemitic comments, which are discriminatory on the grounds of race and religion. Discriminatory conduct is inherently harmful and capable of causing offence and distress.
91. **The posts were publicly accessible** The content was posted on a public platform and could be viewed by members of the public, including Jewish communities and other minority groups. Harm may arise even without evidence of actual impact or complaint.
92. **The conduct risked undermining public confidence in policing** The dissemination of antisemitic material by a serving police officer risks eroding trust in the impartiality and fairness expected of the police service. This is particularly significant in the current climate of heightened concern about antisemitism.
93. **The conduct had the potential to damage community relations** The discriminatory nature of the posts could reasonably cause distress to affected communities and contribute to feelings of marginalisation or hostility. Harm includes impact on community confidence and cohesion.
94. **The Officer's status elevated the seriousness of the harm** As a serving police officer, the Officer holds a position of authority and trust. Discriminatory conduct by an officer may lead members of the public to question whether he can act impartially, thereby undermining confidence in his ability to perform his role.

95. **The content included material encouraging hostility or violence** Some posts endorsed or encouraged hostility towards particular groups. Conduct encouraging violence or hostility is highly serious and increases the potential for harm.

96. **The conduct created a significant risk of reputational harm to the police service** The nature of the content, combined with the Officer's role, created a real risk of reputational damage to the police service. Harm includes risk of reputational damage even where actual dissemination cannot be quantified.

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

Aggravating factors

98. No additional Aggravating factors

Mitigating factors

99. **Early admission of misconduct** The Officer made early and clear admissions at the investigation stage, accepting responsibility for posting, reposting and 'liking' antisemitic content.

100. **Evidence of remorse and developing insight** The Officer expressed remorse and demonstrated increasing understanding of the discriminatory nature and impact of the content.

101. **Co-operation with the investigation** The Officer co-operated fully with the investigation and did not obstruct or delay the process.

Personal mitigating factors

102. **The Officer's Mental Health** The Officer provided medical evidence confirming that he sought [Redacted] support for his mental health. The medical notes record a referral date of July 2025, which is two years after the alleged conduct began and one year after it ended. As the intervention occurred significantly after the relevant period, the Panel can attach only limited weight to this evidence in mitigation.

103. The panel noted the character bundle consisting of 9 statements, but in line with the College of Policing Outcome Guidance can only place limited weight on it.

Stage 2: The purpose of imposing sanctions

104. 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

105. 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.

106. In determining the appropriate outcome, the Panel considered the full range of sanctions available under the Police (Conduct) Regulations, beginning with the least severe.

Final written warning

107. The Panel first considered whether a final written warning would be sufficient. The Panel accepted that the Officer had provided some mitigation, including early admissions and evidence of remorse. However, the Panel concluded that the discriminatory nature of the posts, the extended period over which the conduct occurred, and the substantial risk to public confidence meant that a final written warning would not adequately address the seriousness of the conduct.

Reduction in rank

108. The Officer is a Police Constable, and therefore reduction in rank is not available.

Dismissal without notice

109. The Panel finally considered dismissal. The Panel determined that the conduct amounted to gross misconduct, being so serious that dismissal would be justified. The discriminatory content posted and reposted by the Officer, the risk of undermining public confidence, and the reputational harm to the police service collectively demonstrate a fundamental breach of the standards expected of a police officer.

110. Accordingly, the Panel directs that the Officer be dismissed without notice.

111. The panel orders publication pursuant to regulation 43 (6) of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Right of Appeal

112. 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 Andy Brittain

08 July 2026