

Notice of Outcome of Police Misconduct Hearing
Special Constable Salman LATIF

Regulation 43 Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020
as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024

The Allegation

Special constable Salman LATIF, whilst serving as an officer of the Metropolitan Police

1. In May 2021, you kicked Miss A in the region of her foot / ankle, thereby causing her bruising / swelling.
2. From February 2022 to March 2022, you harassed Miss A as follows:
 - a. Miss A had blocked your mobile number (ending -511) during this period from her mobile phone.
 - b. You made repeat telephone calls to her mobile during this period ("the Repeat Calls"), often late at night or in the early hours of the morning, for example:
 - i. On 10/02/22: 4 calls made.
 - ii. On 11/02/22: 14 calls made between 00:11 and 23:56.
 - iii. On 12/02/22: 2 calls made between 03:51 and 14:34.
 - iv. On 13/02/22: 5 calls made between 03:56 and 23:42.
 - v. On 15/02/22: 22 calls made between 22:41 and 23:51.
 - vi. On 16/02/22: 7 calls made 00:55 and 18:50.
 - vii. On 17/02/22: 1 call made at 23:51.
 - viii. On 18/02/22: 1 call made at 01:03.
 - ix. On 22/02/22: 3 calls made between 00:43 and 16:33.
 - x. On 01/03/22: 10 calls made between 16:47 and 17:41.
 - xi. On 04/03/22: 3 calls made at 15:39.
 - xii. On 08/03/22: 1 call made.
 - xiii. On 12/03/22: 1 call made at 01:15.
 - xiv. On 28/03/22: 2 calls made
 - c. The number of telephone calls you made to Miss A during this period was excessive and unwanted;
 - d. You made the Repeat Calls using your mobile phone (number ending -551) but intentionally calling as a private / withheld number;
 - e. The Repeat Calls had the effect of creating an intimidating / hostile environment for Miss A .
3. On the night of 3 April 2022, into the early hours of 4 April 2022, you physically assaulted Miss A causing her marks / bruising. This incident occurred at the Ground Zero Lounge Bar, UB6.
4. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) alleges that by reason of the matters above, either individually or collectively, your behaviour does not meet the standards required by

the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, specifically in respect of the following standard namely:

a. Discreditable Conduct

5. As a result of your behaviour as set out above, your conduct singularly or in its totality amounts to gross misconduct.

The Hearing

1. The misconduct hearing was heard over 4 days; from 27th to 30th July 2026. It was held in part in public and part in private. It was heard part virtually and part in person at the hearing centre at Sutton Police Station, Patrick Dunne Building, 6 Carshalton Road, Sutton SM1 4RF.
2. The Panel consisted of Former Police Commander Katie Lilburn as Chair, Mr Vincent Walker and Ms Zofia Darmas as Independent Panel Members and Mrs Remi Alabi sitting as the Legally Qualified Advisor (LQA). SC Latif (the Officer) was present. He was represented by a Federation Representative (the Federation) PC Ria Harrington. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by counsel Ms Jennifer Lanigan.

Preliminary Applications

Amendment to the Charge

3. A preliminary application was made by the AA to amend the Charge by adding the words in bold as follows

Allegation 1

"It is alleged that in '**around**' May 2021 you kicked [Miss A] in the region of her foot / ankle, thereby causing her bruising / swelling."

Allegation 2f:

"You knew or ought to have known that by making the Repeat Calls, you were harassing her."

4. Regarding the amendment to Allegation 1, the AA submitted that the amendment makes no material change to the nature of the allegation. The evidence of Miss A is that the incident occurred on 11 May 2021 at Terrace Lounge, Bideford Avenue. The Officer in his Regulation 17 response states that he was on Bideford Avenue albeit not at the Terrace Lounge on 11 May 2021. Furthermore, it was submitted that the amendment did not prejudice the Officer bearing in mind that the original pleading did not stipulate a specific date in May 2021 that the incident occurred.
5. The Officer did not raise any objections to the amendments.
6. The Panel received the legal advice of the LQA. The LQA drew the attention of the Panel to Rule 41(1) Police Conduct Regulations 2020 as amended (the Rules) which says:

The person conducting or chairing the misconduct proceedings must determine the procedure at those proceedings and, in so far as it is set out in these Regulations, must determine it in accordance with these Regulation.

7. The LQA also advised the Panel to consider the merits of the case and any prejudice, unfairness or injustice to the Officer and or to the proceedings in deciding whether or not to grant the application. The cases of *Chauhan v General Medical Council [2010] EWHC 2093* and *Ahmedsowida v General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 3466 (Admin)* were cited
8. Neither the AA nor the Federation raised any observations or comments on the legal advice given.
9. The Panel found that neither of the amendments made any material change to the substance of the allegations.
10. The Panel noted that the Federation confirmed that the Officer had had prior notice of the amendments and was ready to proceed without any objections. It therefore concluded that the Officer was not prejudiced by the amendments.
11. In light of the above the Panel granted the application and the allegation was amended accordingly.
12. The allegations now read as follows:

Allegation 1

It is alleged that in **around** May 2021 you kicked [Miss A] in the region of her foot / ankle, thereby causing her bruising / swelling.

Allegation 2

It is alleged that from February 2022 to March 2022, you harassed [Miss A] as follows:

- a) [Miss A] had blocked your mobile number (ending -551) during this period from her mobile phone.
- b) You made repeat telephone calls to her mobile during this period ("the Repeat Calls"), often late at night or in the early hours of the morning, for example:
 - i. On 10/02/22: 4 calls made.
 - ii. On 11/02/22: 14 calls made between 00:11 and 23:56.
 - iii. On 12/02/22: 2 calls made between 03:51 and 14:34.
 - iv. On 13/02/22: 5 calls made between 03:56 and 23:42.
 - v. On 15/02/22: 22 calls made between 22:41 and 23:51.
 - vi. On 16/02/22: 7 calls made between 00:55 and 18:50.
 - vii. On 17/02/22: 1 call made at 23:51.

- viii. On 18/02/22: 1 call made at 01:03.
- ix. On 22/02/22: 3 calls made between 00:43 and 16:33.
- x. On 01/03/22: 10 calls made between 16:47 and 17:41.
- xi. On 04/03/22: 3 calls made at 15:39.
- xii. On 08/03/22: 1 call made.
- xiii. On 12/03/22: 1 call made at 01:15.
- xiv. On 28/03/22: 2 calls made.

- c) The number of telephone calls you made to [Miss A] during this period was excessive and unwanted;
- d) You made the Repeat Calls using your mobile phone (number ending -551) but intentionally calling as a private / withheld number;
- e) The Repeat Calls had the effect of creating an intimidating / hostile environment for [Miss A].
- f) **You knew or ought to have known that by making the Repeat Calls, you were harassing her.**

Allegation 3

It is alleged that on the night of 3 April 2022 / early hours of 4 April 2022, you physically assaulted [Miss A], causing her marks / bruising. This incident occurred at the Ground Zero Lounge Bar, UB6.

Standards breached

It is alleged that the conduct outlined above is in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour ('SPBs') as set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulation 2020 (PCR 2020'), namely Discreditable Conduct.

Application to Admit Hearsay Evidence – Mr Jawed

- 13. The AA advised that Mr Jawed, a witness whose written statement had been received by the Panel was being relied on by the Federation. However, despite efforts to secure his attendance he had failed to attend as requested.
- 14. It was submitted that Mr Jawed was spoken to on 14 July 2026 and he had indicated that he was not willing to assist by attending to give oral evidence. All efforts to further contact him after this date had failed.

15. It was jointly submitted by the AA and the Federation that Mr Jawed's written statement be admitted and considered by the Panel as read.
16. The Panel received the legal advice of the LQA which highlighted the relevant principles in the cases of *Thorneycroft v NMC [2014] EWHC 1565 (Admin)* and *Mansaray V NMC 2023 EWHC 730 (Admin)* Neither party had any objections or comments to make on the advice given
17. In its consideration of the application, the Panel noted that the evidence of Mr Jawed was the only other evidence received in relation to allegation 3. He was an independent eyewitness and there was no indication that his account was fabricated.
18. The Panel determined that Mr Jawed's evidence was relevant and would assist the Panel in understanding and deciding on the issues in allegation 3.
19. The Panel went on to consider fairness in admitting the evidence and concluded that the AA had waived any rights to cross examination by its agreement to the application. The Panel also considered that it would not be able to test the evidence of the witness.
20. The Panel determined that it was able to weigh Mr Jawed's evidence against other available evidence in the light of any inconsistencies and safely attach appropriate weight to it.
21. The Panel was satisfied that every effort has been made to secure the attendance of the witness who has voluntarily absented himself and did not have the powers to compel him to attend or give oral evidence. The Panel also decided that it was not reasonable or in the interest of expedient progress to adjourn the hearing to ascertain if he would change his mind.
22. Taking all of the above into consideration, the Panel found it reasonable, necessary and just to admit Mr Jawed's statement into evidence.

Part Private Hearing

23. It was noted by the AA that some of the evidence before the Panel related to private and confidential matters of both parties.
24. It was conceded and accepted by the Panel that the hearing would go into private session as and when any private matters were addressed in the interest of keeping confidentiality and the protection of the private life of both Miss A and the Officer.

Background to the allegations

25. The Officer and the complainant Miss A were in a relationship for around two years approximately between August 2019 and February 2022.
26. The outline that follows is based upon Miss A's account. Around May 2021 the Officer and Miss A were at the TERRACE LOUNGE with friends as they all sat together at a table, Miss A became upset by a comment made by the Officer who then leant in towards her and said 'SHUT THE FUCK UP'. He then kicked her in the ankle under the table causing a bruise. Miss A asked him why he kicked her. Miss A said the Officer

said he didn't (kick her) and that there was no evidence of it. Miss A then left with her friend.

27. After breaking up with the Officer in February 2022, Miss A blocked contact from him on her phone as she didn't want any further contact from him. She was constantly receiving calls from private numbers and as she subscribed to a service called "SHOW ME THE NUMBER" she was able to see that the calls were coming from the number XXX511 which belongs to the Officer. From call data there were continuous and persistent calls from the number she ascribed to the Officer from 10th February 2022 to 28th March 2022. 77 calls were made in total during this period of time by the Officer to her. On 15th February 2022 alone he called 22 times in just over an hour.
28. On the 3rd April 2022 Miss A went to the Ground Zero bar with some of her friends. When she was leaving the venue she discovered that the Officer was at the same venue and his vehicle was parked near to her own. She was standing in the way of his car and he grabbed her, pulled her out of the way and then shoved her causing her to stumble on the edge of the pavement and causing a bruise to her left forearm. The Officer has then got into his car and left. This incident is said to have occurred in the presence of Miss A's friend.
29. After the 3rd April 2022 Miss A unblocked the Officer and sent him a picture of the injuries she had sustained following the incident on 3 April at the Ground Zero bar. The Officer didn't respond to her message so she started calling him. She doesn't remember how many times she called him. She stated that every time he answered the call the Officer would just give her verbal abuse to try and turn things against her. Miss A Blocked the Officer again on 16th April 2022 and has not unblocked him since then.
30. The Officer was arrested and interviewed on 13 May 2022. He denied all the allegations and asserted that Miss A raised false and malicious allegations against him because he ended the relationship.
31. In response to the charge the Officer admitted the factual contents of allegations 2a, 2b and 2d and denied allegations 1, 2c, 2e, 2f and 3.

The Evidence

32. Prior to the Hearing, the Panel received a 630 paged Misconduct Hearing bundle of video and documentary evidence which included
 - The reg 30 Notice of allegations
 - The reg 17 notice
 - The Officer's response to the Reg 17 Notice
 - 2 Statements from Miss A together with exhibited messages and injury photos
 - A statement from PC Bennet regarding the Officer's arrest
 - Video footage of Miss A's disclosure of the incident to the police
 - A Statement from PC Abigail Duffus detailing the withheld number calls to Miss A from 9th February 2022 to 23 March 2022
 - The Officer's phone subscriber details and call data results from 16 January 2022 to 3 April 2022
 - Transcript and video footage of the Officer's interview
 - Video footage of the Officer's arrest
 - The investigating officer's report

- Permitted Family Court documents

An 11-page addendum to the misconduct hearing bundle containing

- EBACS (data counting the Officer's work log in and off work details from 8 -25 May 2021
- Police CARMS data detailing the Officer work rota from April to July 2021
- A statement from Mr Shariq Jaweed owner of the Terrace Lounge
- A statement from PC Smart regarding enquiries from the Terrence Lounge
- A Statement from PC Elliot regarding missing CCTV from the Terrence Lounge

33. In asserting the facts in addition to the written evidence mentioned above, the Panel also heard oral evidence from Miss A and the Officer.

Oral Evidence of Miss A

34. Miss A adopted her witness statements dated 08 May 2022 and 07 September 2022 and her family court statements dated 24 May 2022, 5 September 2022 and 9 May 2023

35. Miss A confirmed that she had been in a relationship with the Officer from August 2021 which she described as exclusive but casual. She stated that he told her he was single but she discovered approximately six months later that he was married. After this the relationship deteriorated. She alleged that his wife began harassing her and her family, leading to increasing emotional distress and conflict between her and the Officer. Miss A maintained that she ultimately attempted to end the relationship in February 2022.

36. Miss A described incidents of alleged physical abuse by the Officer. She alleged that in May 2021 he kicked her under a table at the Terrace Lounge, causing bruising to her ankle, which she photographed but did not seek medical treatment for. She also alleged that on the night of 3rd to 4th April 2022, outside Ground Zero Lounge, the Officer grabbed both of her arms and forcefully pushed her during an argument after she confronted him about being with a new partner. She stated that these incidents left her frightened, unsafe, and shocked because he was a police officer whom she believed should have protected rather than harmed her.

37. Miss A further stated that she was subjected to sustained harassment by the Officer's ex-wife, which included repeated phone calls from a private number and alleged misuse of NHS information to obtain her home address and her brother's contact details. She stated that she reported the harassment to police about 5 times but believed the investigations were discontinued because the source of the private calls could not be proved. She further stated that the Officer initially appeared supportive but later passed information about her reports back to his wife, causing her to lose trust in him and increasing her fear of the consequences of reporting his conduct.

38. She accepted that evidence detailed extensive communication between her and the Officer throughout their relationship. She accepted making numerous phone calls to him, sending abusive messages, making threats in anger, and continuing to contact him after the relationship had ended and after he had blocked communications from her. She explained that her actions stemmed from the emotional distress she was under, displeasure over what she believed were the Officer's continuing relationship with his wife and with other women while he was seeing her, and her frustration arising

from the harassment from his wife which she also believed was connected to him. She acknowledged that her own conduct could amount to harassment and accepted that she had not appreciated the volume of calls she made until shown the call records.

39. Despite this, Miss A further stated that the Officer repeatedly contacted her using a withheld telephone number after she had tried to end the relationship. She stated that she installed an application to identify private callers because she believed the withheld calls were coming from the Officer and his ex-wife. She explained that these calls caused anxiety, panic attacks, and [REDACTED]. She also referred to what she described as "police talk" by the Officer (such as the terms 'welfare check' and 'negative, negative' and 'standby') including statements implying that police systems were monitoring her car, which she interpreted as intimidating and threatening.
40. In cross examination, Miss A accepted a number of inconsistencies in her evidence. She acknowledged uncertainty over several dates, including the precise timing of the alleged kick at the Terrace Lounge, and accepted that documentary evidence suggested the venue may not have been operating on the 11 May 2022 a date she identified in her written statement and which she was sure of in her oral evidence it being her mother's birthday. She also accepted making repeated calls and demanding that he call her after telling the Officer she wanted the relationship to end and didn't want him to call her. She also admitted assaulting him on one occasion by striking his arm during an argument. She also conceded that many of her text messages were abusive.
41. Miss A nevertheless maintained that the relationship continued and was emotionally complicated after their separation. She said she believed they continued to meet despite the Officer rarely responding to her messages and explained that arrangements were made during unevidenced telephone conversations. She denied that her allegations were malicious or fabricated, asserting instead that the Officer manipulated her emotionally, repeatedly drew her back into the relationship, and enjoyed provoking emotional reactions. She also described an alleged assault by a female she believed was the Officer's new partner and her friend in a public toilet, occurring on the 1st January 2022 where she claims she sustained injuries. She admitted that she did not formally report that incident because she feared the consequences.
42. In response to panel questions and during re-examination, Miss A reiterated that she regarded the relationship as exclusive and genuine despite its informal nature. She stated that she had not introduced him to her family or friends as a boyfriend, he had not attended her home nor had she attended his. When asked to describe the hold the Officer had over her, she explained that fear, emotional dependency, and what she perceived as the Officer's use of his policing role prevented her from leaving the relationship sooner. She maintained that the Officer's conduct had caused lasting psychological harm, leaving her fearful, distrustful, and constantly vigilant about her personal safety. Although she accepted shortcomings and inconsistencies in her own conduct and recollection, she remained firm that the alleged assaults, harassment, intimidation, and overall pattern of behaviour by the Officer had occurred and were the primary cause of her emotional and [REDACTED].

Half time No Case to Answer Submission

43. At the conclusion of Miss A's evidence and the close of the AA's case, the Federation made a half-time submission of no case to answer.
44. It was submitted that there is no case to answer in respect of all the disputed allegations under the second limb of the test in *R v Galbraith* [1981] 1 WLR 1039
45. It was accepted that although the AA's evidence is capable of addressing the elements of the alleged offence, the case rests entirely on Miss A's evidence, which was submitted to be fundamentally unreliable. It was argued that Miss A had provided materially inconsistent accounts of the alleged harassment and assaults, with contradictions concerning the timing, frequency and circumstances of the alleged conduct.
46. The Federation Representative submitted that during Miss A's oral evidence, she was unable to explain significant aspects of her assertions, frequently responding with uncertainty such as "probably" or "I don't know", rendering her evidence insufficiently reliable even on the civil standard of proof.
47. It was further submitted that Miss A's account was contradicted by the objective and contemporaneous evidence of phone records, messages and other communications. These demonstrated that Miss A frequently initiated contact with the Officer, including after she claimed to have told him not to contact her on 2 January 2022. Despite asserting that subsequent contact amounted to harassment, the evidence shows that she continued to send abusive messages and demanded that he contact her. She accepted in cross-examination that this level of communication had become normal within the relationship.
48. It was submitted that the documentary evidence, when viewed in context, undermines any suggestion of a one-sided course of conduct amounting to harassment.
49. In relation to the assault allegations, the Federation Representative submitted that independent evidence directly contradicts Miss A's version of events. With regards to Allegation 1, Miss A stated that the incident occurred on 11 May 2021, at the Terrace Lounge yet Metropolitan Police digital access records placed the Officer elsewhere at the relevant time. Furthermore, Miss A gave inconsistent accounts regarding who was present.
50. As to the third allegation, the Officer relies on the statement of an independent witness, Mr Jawed, who describes the complainant as the aggressor. It was submitted that there were concerns that an earlier witness statement provided to the Metropolitan Police was subsequently lost, further weakening the AAs case.
51. It was submitted that Miss A's conduct and motives further undermine the reliability of her evidence. The Panel was invited to consider that despite claiming the relationship had ended, Miss A continued monitoring the Officer's personal life and was unable to satisfactorily explain how she had knowledge of other women connected to him.

52. The Federation Representative highlighted that Miss A admitted that she only reported the allegations after being arrested for a criminal offence which she believed the Officer had reported. This demonstrated malicious intent.
53. In conclusion, the Federation Representative submitted that this is the exceptional type of case envisaged by the second limb of Galbraith, where the evidence is so weak, inconsistent and contradicted by objective material that no properly directed tribunal could safely find the allegations proved.
54. The Panel was therefore invited to uphold the submission of no case to answer and dismiss the proceedings.

AA Response to No Case to Answer

55. The AA opposed the application and submitted that there was a case to answer on all of the disputed allegations.
56. The AA submitted that the AA's case did not rest on Miss A's evidence alone.
57. It was accepted that there were some inconsistencies in Miss A's evidence but asserted that these inconsistencies in Miss A's evidence could be explained by the dynamics of the relationship as created by the Officer.
58. The AA reiterated the test for considering no case to answer in the case of Galbraith and invited the Panel to evaluate all of the AA's evidence, taken at its highest before deciding that no reasonable and properly directed panel could find the case proven against the Officer.
59. It was submitted that the inconsistencies in Miss A's evidence highlighted by the Federation were not such that other evidence could not be set straight by other evidence brought by the AA or that they were so materially tenuous that they cannot safely be relied upon, considering all of the AA's evidence at its highest.

Legal Advice on No Case to Answer

60. The Panel received legal advice from the LQA which highlighted the principles established in the cases of R v Galbraith [1981] 1 WLR 1039 and R (Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis) v Police Misconduct Panel [2025] EWHC 1462 (Admin). The former case establishing the test and factors for consideration and the latter case advising the Panel to err on the side of caution that stopping a case early can be an error of law if the evidence, when fully heard from both sides, could properly support a finding against the Officer.
61. Neither the AA or the Federation raised any observations or comments on the legal advice given.
62. The Panel decided to be guided by the caution given in the legal advice and determined that consideration of the no case to answer submissions should be made after hearing all the evidence from both parties.

Oral Evidence of the Officer

63. The Officer confirmed that he had been in a relationship with Miss A beginning in August 2019. He described it as a casual, non-exclusive relationship. He stated that he was separated from his wife albeit he was still religiously married to her. He explained that she was still living with him in his parents' home while gathering money to buy a place of her own. He maintained that he was open about his marital status with Miss A from the outset. He denied ever misleading Miss A about being single or having children.
64. He confirmed that he had a son from a previous relationship but did not have a daughter. He said the mother of his child had a daughter from a previous relationship. He explained that Miss A had wrongly accused him of being the father of his wife's nephew and niece.
65. The Officer went on to state that tensions arose between him and Miss A because Miss A became increasingly possessive and suspicious, while his estranged wife also became hostile towards Miss A. According to the Officer, Miss A frequently interpreted female friends as romantic partners, resulting in confrontations that ultimately damaged his friendships with at least two female friends.
66. The Officer rejected all allegations of assault and harassment, stating that in fact, he was the recipient of persistent and unwanted attention from Miss A after he sought to end the relationship in late 2021. He described her repeatedly contacting him by telephone, social media and messaging platforms, often making threats or demanding he see her. He stated that he blocked her phone contacts on several occasions and only resumed contact in early 2022 after she suggested they remain friends.
67. He accepted making the numerous telephone calls from 10 February 2022 to 28 March 2022 but states they were responses to calls and messages Miss A had made to him through applications that did not retain call records, and that he did not know his calls were unwanted because she continued asking him to contact her.
68. In relation to Allegation 1, the Officer unequivocally denied that any assault occurred. He denies ever attending Terrace Lounge where it is alleged the incident happened. He further explained, that although he initially stated in his written evidence that he had visited the road on which the Terrace Lounge was situated to smoke shisha on 11 May 2021, recently seeing his work attendance records, later demonstrated he had confused the dates due to the frequency of his visits to the road to smoke shisha at the time (explaining that he would go to this 'park & smoke' venue on average 5/6 times per week during the COVID restriction times).
69. He also disputed receiving photographs of Miss A's alleged injuries, maintaining that he had already blocked her phone contact by the time she said she sent them to him. Furthermore, in relation to this, he stated that the apparent contact name of "Shaks 2" (as it appeared to be entered in Ms A's phone) was not his name, nor the usual contact name used by Miss A. He offered this as a potential explanation as to why he maintained he did not receive the message or photo of the injury. He believed the allegation was fabricated because he had ended the relationship and she only reported

the allegations after her arrest for drink drive which she thought he was responsible for alerting police.

70. Regarding Allegation 2, the Officer accepts making approximately 71 calls during February and March 2022 but maintains these were neither excessive nor malicious. He explains that his phone frequently displayed a withheld number because he used it for police work and frequently had his phone on a private call setting explaining that he would want to prevent his number being visible when calling members of the public when carrying out the duties of a Special Constable. He denied any deliberate intention to conceal his identity purely during calls to Miss A.
71. He described Miss A as making numerous calls at unsociable hours, sending abusive messages, threatening violence and repeatedly attempting to contact him across multiple platforms. He stated that he chose not to report her behaviour to the police because he did not consider her to be genuinely dangerous. He also sought to calm the situation by ignoring her calls.
72. The Officer also denied Allegation 3 consisting of an assault arising from the incident outside Ground Zero Bar in April 2022. He stated that Miss A approached him as he sat in his car, whilst she was intoxicated, questioning why he was in the area, kicked his car, shouted at him and prevented him from leaving. He denied getting out of his car or making any physical contact with her, asserting that it was Miss A's friend who was present who physically restrained and removed her from the confrontation.
73. During cross-examination, the statement of Mr Jawed was put to the Officer which indicated that the Officer was not seated in his car during the altercation as he had said in examination in chief. The Officer accepted the discrepancy and reconsidered his testimony explaining that that there had been so many altercations with Miss A during their relationship that he had mixed up this incident with another that had happened prior to the one alleged. He confirmed that the incident when he was sitting in his car was a different incident alleged. He conceded that Mr Jawed was correct and that this allegation happened when he was standing outside his car with Miss A in front of him preventing him from getting in his car.
74. Regarding inconsistencies in his previous accounts that were put to him. He acknowledged describing Miss A only as a friend during his criminal interview despite it being an intimate one. He explained that he did not intend to conceal the relationship but viewed the intimacy as occasional and therefore not worthy of mention. He also accepted that his oral evidence concerning whether he was inside or outside his car during the Ground Zero incident differed from his earlier written accounts. He attributed this to a refreshed recollection rather than dishonesty. He, however, maintained that he had not assaulted Miss A in any way.
75. The Officer firmly rejected suggestions that he exercised control over Miss A or manipulated her emotionally. He characterised exchanges relied upon by the AA, including the emojis he sent, nicknames he had called Miss A and messages alleged to be taunting, as mutual banter within the relationship or attempts to defuse emotional situations.
76. He denied deliberately withholding information about his personal life, maintained that holidays with his estranged wife were pre-booked group trips which included her and

her family, and explained that his continued contact with his wife reflected the religious divorce process rather than a continuing relationship. He further denied that his application for a non-molestation order was retaliatory, stating it was a genuine response to what he considered sustained harassment by Miss A.

77. Finally, the Officer described the significant personal and professional impact the allegations have had upon him. He explained that although the criminal investigation concluded with no further action after seizure and an analysis of his phone, the experience caused considerable stress and anxiety. He now feels compelled to document conversations, retain receipts and maintain detailed records of his whereabouts to protect himself against future allegations.
78. Throughout his evidence, he maintained that he had never assaulted or harassed Miss A and that the allegations arose from the breakdown of their relationship, her resentment following his decision to end it, and her anger after she believed that he reported her for [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Consideration and findings on No Case to Answer Submissions

79. The Panel found that there is a case to answer on all of the charges in dispute having regard all the evidence from both parties.
80. Regarding Allegation 1 the Panel noted Miss A's account of what happened and consider it not entirely plausible. It noted that the Officer consistently denied this allegation but there was evidence of an injury which Miss A said was inflicted by the Officer. Therefore taking the AA's case at its highest, the Panel found that a reasonable panel properly considering all the evidence could find this allegation against the Officer.
81. In considering Allegation 2c the Panel noted that the calls were not denied. In assessing if the calls were unwanted or excessive, the Panel found that the evidence of both parties was plausible and therefore a reasonable panel properly considering the evidence of the AA at its highest and considering the evidence of both parties, could find the allegation proved against the Officer in respect of this charge.
82. In respect of allegation 2e there was also no dispute that the Officer made the calls. As in allegation 2c, the differing accounts of both parties regarding any harassment by the calls was equally plausible. The Panel therefore also found that a reasonable panel properly considering the evidence of the AA at its highest and considering the evidence of both parties, could make finding against the Officer in respect of Allegation 2e.
83. In considering Allegation 2f, there is no dispute that the Officer made repeated calls. Miss A says they caused her harassment. The Officer said he did not know and had no reason to believe that they caused Miss A any harassment. The Panel found both accounts plausible
84. The Panel applied the same reasoning and findings in allegations 2c and 2e to allegation 2f

85. In considering Allegation 3, the Panel found that both parties accepted that an altercation took place between them at the material time and Miss A sustained an injury. It was considered that from the evidence of the AA at its highest, that it was plausible that the injury could have been caused by the Officer during that altercation. It also noted from the officers' account that the injury could have been caused by Miss A's friend. The Panel concluded that even in the light of the different accounts, taking the AA's case at its highest a properly informed panel could make a finding against the Officer.
86. Having found that there was a case to answer on all the disputed facts and heard all the evidence from both parties, the Panel invited the parties to make stage 1 closing submissions.

Stage 1 Closing Submissions

AA Submissions

87. The AA provided detailed written submissions to the Panel and summarised them orally.
88. The AA submitted that the Panel should find all the disputed allegations proven on the balance of probabilities and conclude that they amount to gross misconduct. The AA submitted that the Officer's evidence was unreliable, inconsistent and tailored to fit the evidence as the proceedings progressed. The AA invited the Panel to draw adverse inferences from the Officer's failure to provide a full account during the investigation, submitting that he introduced significant new explanations only during oral evidence, including claims about his whereabouts, alleged calls via social media, and the circumstances of the incident regarding allegation 3 in particular.
89. By contrast, the AA contended that Miss A was a credible witness who made appropriate concessions, remained consistent on the central allegations, and whose minor inconsistencies were attributable to the passage of time rather than dishonesty.
90. In relation to allegation 1, the AA argued that Miss A consistently maintained that the Officer kicked her during an incident in May 2021, causing bruising to her ankle. The AA relied on contemporaneous photographs and messages sent by Miss A shortly after the incident accusing the Officer of assaulting her in front of friends.
91. In addition, the AA submitted that the communications strongly support Miss A's account and undermine the Officer's assertion that the allegations were fabricated after the relationship ended.
92. The AA stated that the Officer repeatedly altered his explanation regarding his whereabouts on the relevant date and only sought to rely on work records after previously placing himself in the vicinity, demonstrating that his evidence evolved to meet the documentary evidence.
93. Concerning the second allegation, the AA submitted that the Officer accepts making repeated withheld calls to Miss A and that the evidence demonstrates a sustained course of unwanted contact after she had told him not to contact her and had blocked

his number. It invited the Panel to reject the Officer's explanation that he was merely returning calls allegedly made through Snapchat and other platforms, noting that this account was raised for the first time during oral evidence and is unsupported by any documentary evidence or his earlier court applications. The AA argues that the frequency and persistence of the calls, together with the Officer's knowledge of the distress caused to Miss A by previous anonymous calls from his wife, establish that he knew or ought to have known his conduct amounted to harassment.

94. As to the third allegation, the AA submitted that Miss A consistently maintained that the Officer grabbed and forcefully pushed her during an argument outside Ground Zero, causing visible injuries which she photographed and immediately complained about in contemporaneous messages. The AA invited the Panel to reject the late statement of Mr Jawed as unreliable and to conclude that the Officer repeatedly changed his account of the incident to accommodate emerging evidence.
95. Overall, the AA submitted that the Officer's conduct constituted multiple breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct and, given the allegations of violence and harassment against a woman, the intentional nature of the conduct, the impact on Miss A, the absence of insight, and the damage such behaviour would cause to public confidence in policing, the conduct is sufficiently serious to amount to gross misconduct.

Federation Closing Submissions

96. The Federation Representative submitted on behalf of the Officer that Allegation 1 is unsupported by any reliable or independent evidence and depends entirely on the complainant's changing account. She emphasised that there is no CCTV, medical evidence, eyewitness testimony or contemporaneous complaint to corroborate the alleged assault, despite Miss A claiming she was kicked so forcefully that she was left bruised and unable to walk properly.
97. It was further submitted that Miss A repeatedly altered her account of when the incident occurred, yet ultimately insisted it happened on 11 May 2021. It further argued that the text messages said to show her sending photographs of her injuries are inconsistent because they were sent to a differently named contact, while Metropolitan Police EBACS records place the Officer at work when the assault is alleged to have occurred.
98. It was submitted that the AA's subsequent decision to amend this allegation by broaden the alleged date range was an attempt to overcome this objective difficulty rather than resolve it.
99. In relation to Allegation 2, the Federation accepted that the Officer made numerous telephone calls but argues that they must be viewed in the context of a highly volatile relationship in which both parties engaged in frequent and excessive communication. It highlighted Miss A's evidence that she told the Officer not to contact her on 2 January 2022, but pointed out that she continued demanding that he call her later that month and had never previously mentioned this alleged instruction she gave him on the 2 January 2022. The Federation relied on call records showing that the complainant herself made substantially more calls and sent hundreds of abusive messages, including 98 calls in a single day and 66 calls within 40 minutes shortly after the alleged

harassment. It submitted that this mutual pattern of communication meant the Officer had no reason to believe his own calls were unwanted or amounted to harassment, particularly where evidence showed ongoing conversations between them.

100. Regarding Allegation 3, the Federation submitted that Miss A's account is undermined by the lack of corroborative evidence but for the evidence of Mr Jawed who places her as the aggressor. The Federation drew the Panel's attention to the differing accounts of the incident and noted that 2 eyewitnesses had withdrawn support by refusing to testify before the Panel.
101. The Federation further submitted that there is no CCTV, body-worn video, medical evidence or other objective material supporting Miss A's account of assault in allegation 3, and that Mr Jawed's statement fundamentally contradicts her version of events. It also invited the Panel to reject the AA's assertions that any shortcomings in Miss A's evidence should be attributed to the passage of time and investigative failures rather than unreliability.
102. The Federation submitted that the AA's case depends almost entirely on the complainant's credibility, which it says has been significantly undermined by inconsistent accounts, changing timelines, anomalies in the documentary evidence and the absence of objective corroboration. It argued that the Officer's own inconsistencies should be viewed with the same degree of tolerance afforded to the complainant's uncertainty, rather than being treated differently.
103. The Federation concluded by stating that the related criminal investigation concluded with no further action, not as a determinative factor but as being consistent with the evidential weaknesses in the case. Taken cumulatively, the submission argued that the evidence is too unreliable to support findings against the Officer and therefore the Panel should conclude that the AA has provided insufficient evidence to prove any of the disputed allegations and make a finding that they have not been proved.

The Panels Approach and Legal Framework

104. The Panel received the advice of the legal adviser which was mostly read into the record. Following technical issues with the virtual hearing, the full legal advice was provided in writing to the Panel and parties.
105. The Panel was advised on the stages rules and procedures to follow in making findings of facts, breaches of the standard of behaviour alleged, misconduct and severity.
106. The legal advice included advice on matters of law in respect of the definition and elements of an assault, harassment, inappropriate and reasonable behaviour and adverse inference with reference to the following cases : *PSA for Health and social care V HCPC & Young 2021 EWHC 52 Admin*, on the need to establish the difference between harassment and inappropriate behaviour, *Robert Lambert-Simpson v Health and Care Professions Council [2023] EWHC 481 (Admin)* on the considerations for harassment and *R (Kuzmin) v General Medical Council (GMC) [2019] EWHC 2129 (Admin and General Medical Council v Udoeye [2021] EWHC 1511 (Admin)* on adverse inference

107. Following comments by the AA, interpretation of the significance of the caselaw cited by the LQA was mutually agreed. The Federation had no comments or observations to make off the legal advice.

Panel Findings on the Facts

108. The Panel were grateful to the witnesses and both the AA and the Federation who assisted by asking questions about the potential issues in the case. The Panel considered all the evidence before it which included documents, and the oral and written accounts.

109. Overall, the Panel found Miss A and the Officer to be largely credible, however it had concerns in relation to both witnesses stemming from their retrospective descriptions of their relationship which the Panel found to be inconsistent with the documentary evidence of their exchanged messages. This was equally undermining to them both.

110. With regards Miss A, the Panel found that generally, her emotional involvement in the relationship beclouded her actions and undermined the strength of her evidence especially when compared to the contemporaneous evidence. In the text messages, Miss A demonstrated a clear pattern of jealousy towards other women, she also displayed no apparent fear of consequences of reporting the Officer to the police. The Panel felt she did not accurately reflect this in her oral testimony.

111. With regards Officer, the Panel found that whilst he gave considered and careful testimony, he was selective about his own conduct in the relationship especially in regard to his relationship with his ex-wife and other female friends. The Panel felt the Officer was economical with the truth in his own reflections of the relationship, for example the Panel noted that he appeared to want to antagonise Miss A about staying the night at a female's house.

112. This resulted in some unacceptable inconsistencies to both witnesses testimony.

113. Turning to the assessment of the evidence in each allegation the Panel first identified the agreed and disputed facts and then went on to assess all the evidence with regards the issues.

Allegation 1

114. The Panel identified that there were no agreed facts. The Officer denied being at the location, on the day and time alleged with Miss A and denied assaulting her. The evidence of this allegation came solely from Miss A. No independent or corroborating evidence was provided.

115. The Panel carefully considered Miss A's evidence and noted several inconsistencies in her account of the alleged incident, which it found undermined the reliability of her evidence. Although she initially stated the incident occurred on 11 May 2022, her mother's birthday, she accepted she may have been mistaken about timings after noting the contemporaneous EBACS records which indicated that the Officer was

working until after 10pm on that day. There was also uncertainty over the location, with evidence indicating that The Terrace Lounge was closed under a suspension order during the relevant period, leaving unresolved whether the incident could instead have occurred at a different venue (potentially Yasmin's a separate venue on the ground floor).

116. The Panel also noted changes in Miss A's description of the alleged assault. It considered that she altered her evidence regarding which ankle was kicked after being shown a photograph of her bruising, changing both the injured ankle and the Officer's relative positioning to her whilst sat at the table. Her account of who was present similarly changed from four to five people after she was confronted with the initial police report (which had recorded her first account). Given her own evidence that the venue was poorly lit and she could not see beneath the table, the Panel considered there was no direct evidence identifying the Officer as the person who kicked her, leaving open the possibility that someone else may have caused the contact.
117. The Panel further questioned the plausibility of other aspects of Miss A's account. It found it difficult to reconcile her claim that she remained largely silent with no detectable reaction after receiving such a forceful kick causing significant bruising. It also noted contradictory accounts of the immediate aftermath of the assault that Miss A provided on the same day [8th May 2022] in her first account to the reporting officer of the crime report and then within her witness statement. In her statement, she says she verbally challenged the Officer saying "you just kicked me; why?" and this is contradicted with the entry by PC Uppal who wrote on the crime report that Ms A said that 'no-one noticed and I did not react'.
118. Her explanation for delaying reporting this assault to the police was because she feared the Officer because he was a police officer, was also viewed as inconsistent with her repeated and multiple threats to report him to police and have him dismissed from service. The Panel found that this conduct appeared at odds with someone genuinely fearful of the consequences.
119. Finally, the Panel identified weaknesses in the exhibited photos of the injury. Although Miss A said she took a photograph of the bruised ankle herself, no original digital image or metadata was produced to verify when it was taken, with the image appearing only in documentary evidence apparently dated 12 and 15 May 2021. The image on 12 May 2021 does not appear to have been sent to anyone, rather it appears to be a screenshot. In addition, there appears to be two still images and a video on 15 May 2021 and they appear to have been sent to a contact stored as Shaks 2. There is also another version of the same image which is undated. There was a lack of clarity as to when the images were taken, when they were sent and to whom.
120. The Panel considered that the Officer denied receiving any messages or seeing the injury photograph until his arrest in May 2022. The Panel noted that on 15 May 2021, Miss A sent an image of a bruised ankle to a contact stored as 'Shaks 2'. This referenced contact name, is different to the other stored contact names of 'Salman'. This difference in contact names, generally supports the Officer's account that he never received the message or indeed the image.

121. The AA produced no independent digital evidence confirming the transmission or receipt of the relevant messages. The Panel found that these evidential gaps reduce the weight that could be attached to the photographic evidence.
122. On balance, the Panel took into account the Officer's evidence and denial of the allegation and noted from the EBACS data that the Officer was working on 11.05.21 but logged out at 10:30pm. It found that the Officer was candid when he stated that it was possible albeit unlikely that he did go to Bideford Avenue, after the end of his shift, which was the same road that The Terrace Lounge was situated on. The Panel did not find that this was conclusive and certainly did not place him in the Terrace lounge (or inside another ground floor venue) as alleged. The Panel therefore found his account more credible than Miss A's.
123. The Panel also considered the invitation of the AA to draw adverse inference from the fact that the Officer did not previously put forward this explanation (of being on duty until 10pm) for his denial of this allegation when interviewed and when it was raised in the family court proceedings despite these accounts being given under caution.
124. The Panel found that the Officer has been consistent in his denial of allegation 1. He gave the reason for this denial in his oral evidence asserting that he did not assault or cause the injury to Miss A's leg as he was not present at the location at the time alleged by Miss A. His written evidence also gives the same consistent reason. In particular the Panel noted that in the Officer's response to the Reg 17 notice He stated
- "On 11th May 2021 I did not attend Terrace lounge and I have never been to terrace.*
- ...
- On the 11th of May 2021 I did not kick (Miss A) under the table neither did I go to an indoor place with ... Miss A"*
125. The Panel also considered the safeguards advised before drawing adverse inference reference in the AA's submissions and the advice of the LQA. It noted that in his oral testimony to the Panel, the Officer explained that he did not give reasons for his denial of allegation 1 when otherwise opportune to do so because he was advised not to do so by his legal representatives. The Panel found this to be good reason and found no other reason existed that would make drawing the inference procedurally unfair.
126. The Panel therefore decided not to draw adverse inference from the Officer's failure to disclose additional reasons for his denial of allegation 1.
127. In view of all the above, the Panel concluded that the AA had not provided sufficient evidence on the balance of probabilities to prove the allegation and found allegation 1 not proved.

Allegation 2a

128. Admitted and found proved

Allegation 2b

129. Admitted and found proved.

Allegation 2c

130. It was agreed and accepted that the Officer made all the calls alleged to Miss A from a withheld number. It is contested that the calls were excessive and unwanted. In assessing the dispute, the Panel considered the evidence of Miss A, the Officer and the evidence of PC Duffus.

131. In its assessment of whether the number of these calls was excessive, the Panel considered that there were about 71 of them. They were made over a period of around 6 weeks and found that they were followed by some 66 evidenced phone calls from Miss A to him. It also noted that both parties agreed that frequent calls between them was a constant feature of their relationship. On this basis the panel found that solely on the number of the calls was not in itself excessive.

132. The Panel then considered if the number of the calls were unwanted. It took into account the evidence of Miss A and noted in her oral evidence she said that on 02.01.22 she verbally told him not to contact her. However, it noted exhibited WhatsApp call from Miss A to the Officer on the 21.01.22 stating *"You better fucking call me" "Asap" "I aint letting this go"*

133. There is no evidence that Miss A told the Officer after 21 January 2022 not to call her.

134. The Panel considered the evidence confirmed by both parties that there had been other types of contact between them during this period on alternative platforms such as Snapchat, IMO and FaceTime that had not been evidenced.

135. The Panel also took into account the evidence of the Officer when assessing whether he had cause to reasonably believe that Miss A did not want him to contact her during this period. It drew inferences from her conduct and the surrounding circumstances.

136. The Panel found from the account of both Miss A and the Officer that the relationship was erratic in terms of its start and finishing. The Officer was clear about his desire to end the relationship. The Panel however found Miss A's intentions unclear and equivocal.

137. The Panel found that the general nature of the relationship was erratic with potential and actual volatility. There was evidence of previous threats and violence by Miss A and demands for the Officer to call with threats if he failed to do so. An example of which it found in an email sent by Miss A to the Officer on 25 December 2021 in which she stated

"Tell your dog looking girl if I ever see her I'm gonna show her what time it is! who the fuck does she think she is to touch me, I'll fucking deal with her when I see her next time!

You either deal with this in a humane manner otherwise it's not gonna be nice purely because I'm hurt, heartbroken, damaged, ruined and everything else, I won't be able to let you get away with all of what you've put me through and the way

things have been left. You don't give a fuck about my feelings, I done the most for you to treat me like this? Think wise before you decide what you want to do!

If I don't hear from you, then I'll see you around"

138. The Panel found that in the light of the above, Miss A's conduct and intentions were unclear and on the balance of probabilities, it was more likely than not that the Officer did not believe or have reason to reasonably believe that the calls he made to Miss A were unwanted.

139. The Panel further noted that the Officer explained in his oral evidence that the calls he made were in response to spoken threats and demands made by Miss A to call him which were not evidenced as they occurred on other applications. The Panel drew no adverse inference from this late detailed explanation.

140. In view of all the above the Panel did not find Allegation 2c proved.

Allegation 2d

141. Admitted and found proved.

Allegation 2e

142. As before the calls made were not contested. It was contested that they caused intimidation and a hostile environment amounting to harassment. The Panel considered the evidence of both parties being the only evidence to the disputed facts. The Panel also found the statement of PC Duffus helpful in its assessment of the surrounding circumstances.

143. In its assessment, the Panel found that there was no evidence of the content of the calls hence it could not base its assessment on the actual nature of the calls. The Panel therefore relied heavily on how the parties said they felt regarding the calls.

144. The Panel noted that Miss A in her oral testimony stated that she did not want to receive the calls and felt intimidated by the Officer during the course of their relationship but noted that she did not offer any specific evidence as to why she felt intimidated by these calls in particular or that they created a hostile atmosphere for her directly.

145. The Panel also noted that PC Duffus statement stated that the call data reveals that on 3 April 2022 a few days after the last of the Officer's unanswered calls, Miss A called him 66 times between 03:23 and 04:08. The Panel found that this was a plausible indication the Miss A did not feel intimidated by the calls made by the Officer.

146. PC Duffus's statement provided additional evidence of two calls immediately preceding and following this six-week period of alleged harassing calls, where there was telephone communication between the Officer and Miss A. Specifically, on the 9 February 2022, there were two outgoing calls to Miss A with a duration of 4 and 39 minutes respectively. In addition, on 28 March 2022 there were two outgoing calls to Miss A with a duration of 20 and 17 minutes respectively. The Panel noted that there was an absence of evidence about the content of these connecting calls that 'book end' the period of alleged harassment. This was ultimately an inconsistency in Miss

A's evidence, in that she spoke to him for a total of 37 minutes directly after a period of six weeks where she alleges she felt harassed.

147. Furthermore, the Panel found no evidence to suggest that the six-week period when the calls were made were any different from the rest of their relationship. It took into consideration aggressive and intimidating language constantly used by Miss A, verbally assaulting the Officer and making physical threats of retribution on his career and his family throughout the relationship.

148. In light of this, the Panel found that on the balance of probability it was more likely than not that Miss A was not harassed by the phone calls made by the Officer.

149. The Panel therefore found allegation 2e not proved.

Allegation 2f

150. The Panel in light of its finding in allegations 2c and 2e the Panel found allegation 2f not proved for the same reasons.

Allegation 3

151. It was not disputed that there was an altercation between the Officer and Miss A outside Ground Zero Lounge on the night of 3 April 2022 into the early hours of 4 April 2022. It is however disputed that Miss A sustained injuries that were inflicted by the Officer.

152. In its assessment of the disputed fact the Panel referred to the evidence of Miss A, the Officer, Mr Jawed and the documentary evidence of an injury to her forearm.

153. The Panel found that Miss A's own evidence portrayed her as the person who initiated the confrontation. She accepted that she was angry and upset after seeing the Officer with someone she believed was his new girlfriend at a venue that they used to frequent together. She admitted deliberately approaching him, likely blocking his path to his car. This account was consistent with the evidence of Mr Jawed, who described Miss A as the aggressor during the incident.

154. In relation to the alleged injury, the Panel noted there was contemporaneous reference to it in WhatsApp messages which contained an image of the alleged injury on Miss A's phone dated 4 April 2022. However, there was no evidence that the Officer responded to or acknowledged these allegations. The Panel held that the absence of an express denial in messages could not be treated as evidence of guilt, observing that, given the volatile nature of the relationship, choosing not to engage with the accusations may have been a reasonable course of action.

155. The Panel also found that the evidence did not clearly establish that any injury had been intentionally inflicted by the Officer. Miss A accepted that her best friend was attempting to pull her away and calm her down during the confrontation. Mr Jawed described the Officer acting defensively after Miss A blocked his path. He described Miss A grabbing the Officer, when he pulled his arm away she became unbalanced and stumbled.

156. The injuries shown in the photograph, include bruising and what appeared to be nail marks. The Panel found that these were potentially capable of being inflicted by Miss A's friend when she tried to pull Miss A from the scene.
157. The Panel decided that were two plausible but conflicting causes of the injury and the stumbling of Miss A (namely her friend's physical intervention and the defensive reaction of the Officer when he was grabbed by Miss A).
158. On balance the Panel considered the account of the Officer and accepted that the officer's testimony did change under cross examination when presented by Mr Jawed's conflicting account that the incident occurred when he was outside the car and not inside as the Officer had initially stated. The Panel noted that the Officer immediately accepted mixing up his facts and accepted that his explanation for doing so was plausible and credible.
159. In view of all the above, the Panel found that the AA had not provided sufficient evidence to prove allegation 3 to the requisite standard
160. Allegation 3 was found not proved.

Findings on Breaches of Standard of Professional Behaviour (SPB)

Discreditable Behaviour:

161. The Panel bore in mind that only the allegations found proved were those admitted namely 2a, 2b and 2d. It therefore considered only these allegations relevant for the alleged breach of the SPB - Discreditable conduct
162. The Panel considered what amounts to discreditable behaviour as described in the Regulations as *"Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty."*
163. In determining whether this standard has been breached the Panel paid due regard to the nature and circumstances of the Officer's conduct, including whether his actions were reasonable at the time of the conduct under scrutiny.
164. The Panel also recognised that the test of whether behaviour has brought discredit on policing, is not solely about media coverage and public perception and had regard to all the circumstances taking into account how a reasonable member of the public properly informed of the facts, would consider the conduct.
165. The Panel considered that allegation 2a was merely a factual and not an actual conduct carried out by the Officer. With regards allegations 2b and 2d, the Panel found that although admitted, they in themselves did not amount to a breach of police codes of conduct.
166. The Panel were mindful that its role was to focus strictly on the wording of the laid allegations. Whilst it noted some peripheral conduct of the Officer was unbecoming, it felt it was transgressing the remit of its function to comment specifically on this. For these reasons, the Panel found there had been no breach of SPB amounting to discreditable conduct.

Determination on Severity and Misconduct.

167. In light of the Panel's findings that there was no breach of professional standard alleged, the Panel did not find it necessary to consider a finding of severity.
168. It also concluded that considering the above, it would be inconsistent and inappropriate to find that the Officer's conduct found or admitted, amounted to misconduct.

Conclusion

169. In view of its finding of no misconduct the Panel considered whether the Officer should be referred to and dealt with under the Reflective Practice Review Process as prescribed in Regulation 42(1)(b); however, in view of the narrow wording of the allegations in front of the Panel it decided it would be outside of its remit to make such a referral.
170. The Panel determined that no further action is required.

30 July 2026