

**IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020, AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE
(CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024**

CONCERNING

PC Peter ZOGHBI ‘Officer Z’

OUTCOME REPORT

Introduction

The Misconduct Hearing for Police Constable (PC) Peter Zoghbi (Officer Z) was held in public from 17-19 February 2026 and a Notice was published to that effect in accordance with the amended Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended.

The Appropriate Authority (“AA”) was represented by Mr Richard Milne of counsel. Officer Z was represented by Mr Ashraf Khan of counsel. The chair of the panel was Commander Katie Lilburn. The panel was advised by Alice Koller, a Legally Qualified Advisor.

A Regulation 30 Notice was issued under the 2020 Regulations. It was alleged that Officer Z had behaved in a manner which breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to (a) Duties and Responsibilities and (b) Orders and Instructions which amounted to Misconduct.

The Allegation against Officer Z by the AA was as follows:

1) On 8th December 2022, whilst on duty, you attended an alleged incident in which a member of the public was stabbed, and you failed to properly act in accordance with your duties as the primary investigator.

It is alleged that this behaviour amounts to unacceptable behaviour and constitutes a breach of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

- a) Duties and Responsibilities
- b) Orders and Instructions.

It is further alleged that this conduct amounts to misconduct. However, as you had an outstanding live final written warning at the time of the severity assessment, should the matter proceed to misconduct proceedings, those proceedings will take the form of a misconduct hearing.

Regulation 31 Response

In his Regulation 31 response, Officer Z denied Misconduct in relation to the Allegation in the Regulation 30 notice. He disputed the Allegation in the Regulation 30 notice and denied breaching the Standards of Professional Behaviour alleged.

Officer Z said that he was on a busy late-turn emergency response shift on 8 December 2022. He had already been on duty since 2pm and was the only officer who spoke to the complainants inside the temple while his three colleagues remained in another room. He said that he had been under operational pressure and acknowledged that his crime report was written in rushed circumstances.

On arrival he spoke with the complainant, who did not appear to have sustained a head wound, and another witness. Officer Z said that he had spent approximately ten minutes viewing CCTV footage and circulated basic descriptions to colleagues.

Officer Z said that he formed the honest impression that the complainants were primarily concerned with having the suspects banned from the temple, rather than pursuing arrest or prosecution. He accepted that he did not explicitly ask them whether they supported police action or were prepared to provide statements, and that this was an error. He further accepted that he should have photographed the injury and asked to see it properly, and that he could have asked whether additional CCTV footage was available.

Officer Z said that he did not deliberately misrepresent the position or seek to neglect his duties. His communication may not have been as clear as it could have been. The Officer acknowledged English was not the complainants' first language and that he should have considered using Language Line, to provide an interpreter, although he believed they could understand one another.

Officer Z said that he recognised that he should have sought colleagues' assistance in dealing with both the victim and the CCTV, taken photographs of the injury, and recorded events in more detail. He now understands the importance of accurate record-keeping and clear communication and has come to appreciate the role of support resources such as Language Line.

17 February 2026

Officer Z revised his position on 17 February 2026, the first day of the hearing, admitting the facts alleged. He also, through counsel, admitted that his conduct breached the standards identified above. He denied that these breaches amounted to misconduct.

Misconduct Hearing of Officer Z was held on 17-19 February 2026

Background

1. On Thursday 8 December 2022 at around 18:48 hours police were called to attend a Sikh Gurdwara referred to as a '*Temple*' on Western Road in Southall London. This place of worship offered a free vegetarian dinner to members of the public.
2. The initial call indicated that had been a '*fight*' there and that the suspects had a '*knife*'. Officer Z responded to the call with three police colleagues. The Computer Aided Despatch (CAD) at 19:02 said that someone had been stabbed in the head.
3. However, when police arrived, it was clear that nobody had been stabbed in the head. A male complainant 'PR' had a '*cut*' injury to his hand by the '*right thumb*' possibly caused by a pair of scissors, as noted on the CAD record at 19:11.
4. No knife was seen on the available CCTV footage. At 20:30 the CAD refers to a '*scuffle*' and '*ABH*' to indicate a suspected assault occasioning actual bodily harm.
5. Officer Z's body worn video (BWV) camera recorded about twelve minutes of these events, including interactions with complainants PR and SR on 8 December 2022.

The complainant is heard to say that he thought he was injured by a pair of scissors.

6. On the BWV footage Officer Z is heard to say that there is '*nothing distinctive*' about the suspects, adding that if officers were to find any of the suspects, the police would ensure that they did not return to the Gurdwara.
7. At 21:39 Officer Z records the '*original main classification*' as GBH to indicate assault occasioning grievous bodily harm or '*serious wounding*'. The '*offence*' is then recorded as '*ABH*'. Details of witness PR and SR are included on the CRIS record, a Crime Reporting and Information System used by the Metropolitan police until 2024.
8. Injuries to PR were recorded by Officer Z, as a '*minor scratch*' to left forearm and a '*small cut*' between thumb and finger, with a note that PR did not require assistance from the London Ambulance Service (LAS).

9. The CRIS record said that the incident was covered by CCTV, but Officer Z added '*all 3 males had hoods up and could not be seen clearly*'... and wore dark clothes.
10. Officer Z's record indicated that the victim did not want the suspect/s to be arrested, just wanted them not to come back. The investigation was closed by Officer Z on this basis, with reference to '*evidential difficulties*' at 05:21 on 9 December 2022.

At that time, a police sergeant reviewed the investigation to ensure that '*minimum standards of investigation*' were met and any risk mitigated.

11. The CRIS was updated by Officer D, a faith liaison officer, on 13 December 2022 after speaking to the victim PR and another person at the Gurdwara. It transpired that they were disappointed with the lack of investigation or police action and had been '*shaken*' by the incident.
12. The victim PR said that police officers did not ask him on 8 December 2022 whether he would support police action. Officer D recorded on the CRIS that the victim's injuries were '*not minor scratches but quite substantial*'.
13. On 15 December 2022, a local Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) went to the Gurdwara to take statements. PR and SR indicated that they would support any further action by the police. Committee members at the Gurdwara were dissatisfied with the service provided by police on 8 December 2022.
14. In his statement dated 15 December 2022, PR said: '*Police attended and took our details down so they could log the report. No pictures were taken*' by police on 8 December 2022, although photographs were subsequently taken of injuries.
15. On 16 December 2022, a police sergeant Sergeant S recorded on CRIS that this case was not suitable for closure: '*Victim states that they would like to provide a statement and willing to attend court if necessary*'.
16. Officer Z was referred for an investigation of alleged misconduct due to the way he dealt with this incident.
17. On 20 March 2025, Officer Z provided a written statement under caution. Officer Z said that when he reviewed the CCTV, he could not clearly see the suspects' faces and assumed that the victim did not support police action due to the relatively low level of injury and option to ban those responsible from the Gurdwara / Temple.
18. Officer Z also reflected that he had completed the CRIS record in a rush. Officer Z conceded that he had not asked the main victim or any witness to provide a statement and accepted that neither stated explicitly that they did not support police action.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Allegation 1

19. The Panel was aware that the burden of proof is on the Appropriate Authority (AA) and that the standard of proof is the civil standard or balance of probability. The Panel had received and considered an 89-page hearing bundle, BWV footage and Opening from Mr Milne, counsel for the AA.
20. The evidence relied on by the AA included a Response statement dated 8 October 2025 from Officer Z. He accepted that he *'did not explicitly ask them whether they supported police action or were prepared to provide statements'* and this was an error. He accepted that he *'should have photographed the injury and asked to see it properly'* and that he could have explored whether additional CCTV was available.
21. On the first day of the hearing, counsel for the officer, Mr Khan, indicated that Officer Z accepted that, whilst on duty on 8 December 2022, he had attended an alleged incident in which a member of the public was stabbed, and that he had failed to act properly in accordance with his duties as the primary investigator.
22. The Panel did not identify any ambiguities in the Allegation or other reason not to accept Officer Z's admission, through counsel, of the facts alleged in Allegation 1. Taking account of this and evidence in support, the Panel considered that it was more likely than not that Officer Z had acted as alleged on 8 December 2022.
23. Allegation 1 was found proved.

BREACH OF STANDARDS

24. Mr Khan also said that Officer Z accepted that this conduct amounted to unacceptable behaviour and constituted a breach of two Standards of Professional Behaviour:
 - a) Duties and Responsibilities.

This requires police officers to be diligent in the exercise of duties and responsibilities.
 - b) Orders and Instructions.

This requires police officers to abide by police regulations and force policies.
25. After reviewing the CCTV footage, statements and other evidence, the Panel concluded that, on 8 December 2022, Officer Z had not acted diligently in the exercise of his duties and/or responsibilities. Officer Z failed to make an accurate record of the CCTV footage or descriptions of suspects. He did not ascertain witnesses' attitude to giving statements or willingness to attend court if arrests were made.

26. Officer Z had not complied with guidance to police officers including the *Code of Practice for Victims of Crime*. Officer Z failed to explain where the complainants may obtain further information about the criminal justice process and PR's rights as a victim.
27. Officer Z also failed to ask PR, as a complainant who had reported the crime of assault, whether he would support police action. The *Code* provides that a decision not to progress a criminal allegation '*should not be made unilaterally without input from the person reporting the crime*'.
28. Officer Z had failed to comply with the policy of the Metropolitan Police in relation to victims of crime. There was no good reason, such as being required to attend an emergency, for his lack of diligence in relation to this incident.
29. Therefore, the Panel agreed with Officer Z that his attendance at the incident on Thursday 8 December 2022 and failure to act properly in accordance with his duties as the primary investigator of an alleged assault with a bladed article (scissors) were in breach of both Standards of Professional Behaviour alleged by the AA:
 - a) Duties and Responsibilities
 - b) Orders and Instructions.
30. The Panel concluded that Officer Z had breached both standards on 8 December 2022.

SERIOUSNESS

31. The Panel next considered whether the breaches of standards found proved in this case constituted Misconduct or not, taking account of submissions from both counsel. The regulations define Misconduct as a breach of standards of professional behaviour that is so serious that disciplinary action is required.
32. Mr Milne said that the breaches of standards and underlying facts amounted to Misconduct. Mr Khan said that Officer Z did not accept that his conduct on 8 December 2022 amounted to Misconduct in all the circumstances.
33. The Panel first considered background and context.
34. The Panel was aware that police officers called to an incident will usually start to conduct a risk assessment on route to the call. On 8 December 2022, officers were informed that someone had been stabbed in the head. This transpired to be incorrect, requiring officers to recalibrate their response to deal with a less serious (but not trivial) event.

35. From the BWV footage it was evident that, on arrival of at least two police units (vehicles) at the scene, Officer Z assumed a lead role by speaking with the informants, getting his notebook out and recording and relaying information.
36. The victims presented calmly and, whilst it was evident that English was not their first language, they were able to provide clear accounts of events, without embellishment. Officer Z ascertained whether treatment was required for injuries and asked about CCTV.
37. However, he also suggested that the suspects could be banned from the Gurdwara without first asking the witnesses if they would be willing to make statements and attend court to give evidence, nor what action, if any, they would like police to take.
38. Officer Z's record contained several inaccuracies and could be interpreted as minimising the seriousness of the incident:

'On THURSDAY 8TH DECEMBER 2022 at around 1850 hours, [PR] was at the Venue when his attention was drawn to THREE (3) males sat in the canteen. He noticed they were watching a loud video of one of their phones, which was disturbing other worshippers and members. As such, [PR] has asked the three to leave and they became verbally abusive towards him. [PR] and a few other members of staff have then told the males that they were no longer welcome and would be removed from the temple. As [PR] and his colleagues have begun lawfully ejecting the males, one has become physically aggressive towards [PR] in the entrance hall. A minor scuffle has ensued between [PR] and the male before [PR] and his colleagues managed to forcefully eject the group, who then run off from the Venue and down towards BRENT ROAD, SOUTHALL and out of sight. During this fracas, [PR] sustained a minor cut to his left thumb. He did not require LAS and cleaned it with a tissue.

[PR] sustained a small cut to the webbing between his thumb and index finger on his left hand which was treated by officers on scene and did not require LAS etc. He also had a minor scratch to his left forearm which required no treatment at all.

The incident was covered by CCTV however all 3 males had hoods up and could not be seen clearly; basic descriptions are Asian males, 2 with facial hair, all wearing dark jackets/hoodies.

VIW1 does not want SUS to be arrested, just does not want him to come back...

Injury: No

...

PHYSICAL AND FORENSIC EVIDENCE

CCTV available: No

...

ADDITIONAL LINES OF ENQUIRY

SOLVABILITY ASSESSMENT

The investigation is complete.

The reason is: [Victim] does not wish to proceed.

...

[Victim] not support; evidential difficulties. The victim/s was informed of this decision.

39. It was incorrect for Officer Z to record no injury and no available CCTV. Officer Z also incorrectly stated that the victim did not wish to proceed. Any assumptions he made should have been checked by asking PR directly.
40. It was misleading to refer to evidential difficulties, given the availability of CCTV footage and cooperative witnesses. To close the investigation on the basis that it was complete was both misleading and an error of judgement.
41. The Panel was concerned about the characterisation of the incident as a '*minor scuffle*' or '*fracas*' in the context of skin-piercing injuries to PR's hand and arm, caused by scissors or similar bladed article. Cumulatively the errors in the record by Officer Z give the impression of a less serious incident than was required in relation to an injurious assault with a blade in a place of worship.
42. In addition, the words '*fracas*' and '*scuffle*' tend to suggest culpability on both sides, whereas the evidence indicated an unprovoked assault on an unarmed man.
43. The Panel also noted that the venue had several CCTV cameras, covering various rooms and access routes. Although Officer Z saw a few minutes of footage while in the venue's office, he made insufficient effort to try and obtain the best images of the suspects or look for other distinctive items as potential lines of enquiry. The Panel considered that Officer Z's description of all suspects having their '*hoods up*' was misleading, when one had a turban, another had a woolly hat and a third had a coat with hood down.
44. Although the Panel recognised that officers attending an apparent stab to the head (likely GBH) would anticipate more serious injuries and need to reassess how to deal with the situation on arrival, the Panel considered that Officer Z should have been more concerned to obtain or preserve identification and other evidence.
45. Officer Z should have asked the victim and other witnesses to consider making statements, with an interpreter, if necessary, on a future date. Officer Z did not follow police guidance, including the *Code for Victims of Crime*.
46. In assessing the level of seriousness of breaches of standards, the Panel adopted a structured approach, applying principles set out in *Fuglers LLP v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2014] EWHC 179.

Culpability

47. The Panel assessed the level of culpability of Officer Z to be medium. Officer Z was responsible for all mistakes and omissions, but the Panel recognised that these stemmed

from his initial error of judgement in the context of being required quickly to reappraise the situation.

48. Although the Panel recognised that the harm caused was unintentional, the Panel considered that Officer Z could reasonably have foreseen the risk of harm, given the investigative opportunities available at the scene at the time of reporting. His later entries on the CRIS record contained several inaccuracies.

Harm

49. Officer Z attended to the need to treat any injuries at the scene, but he failed to secure evidence by taking photographs. In addition, the victim and other witnesses at the Gurdwara were distressed by the lack of police action and failure to recognise that they were willing to give statements and cooperate with any investigation.
50. Whilst other officers consequently undertook remedial investigative action, the victim and witnesses at the Gurdwara lost confidence in Officer Z and potentially in the Metropolitan police. They deserved to have crime/s against them reported accurately and investigative opportunities pursued.
51. The Panel also noted the potential risk of other assaults or threats at similar venues locally. The witnesses reported that one suspect had a knife tucked in the lower trouser area. The psychological harm caused by the assailants was potentially compounded by the inaction / flawed response of Officer Z on 8 December 2022.
52. This was an unprovoked assault after an innocuous comment about abiding to a '*no mobile phone*' policy in the Gurdwara. Circulation of full, accurate descriptions and the timely pursuit of all investigative opportunities would have enabled the best intelligence to be shared with the local community.
53. There was also a further risk to public confidence, if the wider public was made aware that an unprovoked assault by three assailants, with at least one bladed article, in a place of worship had not been dealt with appropriately. The fact that the investigation was closed contrary to the wishes of the victim could significantly undermine public confidence in policing, especially in certain faith / religious sections of the community.
54. Overall, due to the reputational aspect of this case, the Panel assessed the (risk of) harm to be medium.

Aggravating Circumstances

55. The Panel did not identify any aggravating circumstances.

Mitigating Circumstances

56. The Panel took account of Officer Z's apology, early admissions, genuine regret for the impact of his actions and partial insight into potential consequences.
57. The Panel also considered that the need to recalibrate on arrival to deal with a less serious incident than first anticipated may have contributed to the Officer Z's apparent minimisation of the seriousness of the assault. Although this does not excuse his actions, it provides context.

Conclusion on Misconduct

58. In all the circumstances, including the need to maintain public confidence in police, the Panel concluded that the breaches of standards in this case are sufficiently serious to justify disciplinary action.
59. The Panel concluded that a finding of Misconduct is required.

Outcome

Background – Chronology

60. Officer Z had a Conduct Matter 932 of 2021 – reference CM/932/2021 – which resulted in the imposition on 28 September 2022 of a two-year Final Written Warning (FWW) for use of excessive force. This expired on 27 September 2024. Counsel both agreed that Officer Z was notified of his FWW and signed for it on 28 September 2022.
61. The severity assessment for this current case (events on 8 December 2022) was conducted on 20 December 2022 while the FWW was 'live' or extant. This is relevant because Regulation 42(8) of the 2020 Regulations (SI No 4) states that:

'Where, on the date of the severity assessment under regulation 14(1) of these Regulations, the officer concerned had a final written warning in force, neither a written warning nor a final written warning may be given.'

Submissions on Outcome

62. Counsel both provided written submissions on the options available to the Panel at this stage. Each recognised that the Panel has the option of dismissal.
63. Mr Milne, submitted that dismissal is the only option where a FWW is in place at the time of the severity assessment for the Allegation giving rise to this hearing, relying on Regulation 42(8) of the 2020 Regulations. He said the word '*final*' in FWW should be interpreted as such: '*it does what it says on the tin*'.
64. Mr Khan submitted that Officer Z had made an unintentional error of judgement which had been remediated sufficiently to minimise risk of repetition. He invited the Panel to consider taking no further action on the basis that a formal finding of Misconduct is itself a significant regulatory outcome which marks the conduct as unacceptable and reinforces the applicable professional standards.
65. Mr Khan added that the Panel may extend the FWW, taking account of Regulation 42(10) which provides, that where a final written warning is given, it '*may be extended, by the persons considering the question of disciplinary action, to a maximum period of five years.*' Mr Khan submitted that, read purposively, this provision would allow the Panel to mark the misconduct by '*extending the operative disciplinary period associated with the existing warning, rather than imposing the disproportionate sanction of dismissal*'.

Decision

66. The Panel considered that a FWW cannot be extended if it is no longer live, or extant. It was not possible to make the operative period of the final written warning end at a later date because it had expired in 2024.
67. Further the Panel accepted legal advice that it may only deviate from *Guidance on Outcomes (GoO)* if there was very good reason to do so, taking account of principles in ***Metropolis v A Police Conduct Panel [2022] EWHC 2857*** cited by Mr Milne.
68. The Panel took account of the *GoO* in the context of the applicable 2020 Regulations. As the Panel considered that it would be unable to '*extend*' the FWW the only remaining options would be dismissal, or, potentially, taking no further action if Mr Khan's submissions on proportionality were accepted.

69. The Panel considered whether there were any exceptional circumstances to justify deviation from *GoO*. It took account of contextual factors, evidence and submissions.
70. The Panel had been provided with background information indicating that Officer Z had previously made errors of judgment in relation to record-keeping and other police duties. In another conduct matter, PC 9192 of 2024, Officer Z was found to have made inaccurate entries on a crime report in relation to a welfare check on children. This was dealt with by way of a Reflective Practice Review Process (RPRP) an option that was available because the conduct came to light one week after the expiry of the FWW for the previous matter involving excessive use of force.
71. The Panel identified an apparent pattern of inaccurate record-making which could mislead officers relying on records made by Officer Z, to the detriment of their work to protect the public. The apparent failure of Officer Z to have changed his practice to avoid making such errors was of concern to the Panel.
72. Taking account of all the evidence provided, in the context of submissions by both counsel, the Panel was unable to identify any exceptional circumstances to justify deviating from the *GoO* and so followed its provisions, including paragraph 3.10:

'If the case against an officer is proven as misconduct, then disciplinary action will follow ... The ability to take no action where misconduct is proven was purposefully removed from Conduct Regulations.

It would be perverse to find misconduct proven and therefore amount to at least a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious to justify disciplinary action to then not implement one of the disciplinary action outcomes.'

73. The Panel concluded that the only available option was to dismiss Officer Z.
74. The Panel therefore decided to order that Officer Z be dismissed from his position as a police officer.

Publication - Barred List

75. When the Panel invited counsel to comment on publication of this Decision or inclusion of Officer Z's name on the (College of Policing) Barred List, Mr Milne requested that the

anonymisation of the names of complaints, as used in the hearing, be continued. Mr Khan had no comment.

76. The Panel was not made aware of any criminal proceedings arising from events on 8 December 2022, or other reason to delay publication of this Decision.
77. The Panel decided that this Decision is to be published, but the complainants, including the victim, will be referred to by the initials used in the hearing to protect their privacy.
78. In addition, the Panel directed that Officer Z's name should be included on the (College of Policing) Barred List.

Notification of Right of Appeal

79. A police officer has a right of appeal against any disciplinary finding or disciplinary outcome at a police misconduct hearing: Regulation 43(2)-(3) of 2020 Regulations.
80. Officer Z has a right of appeal against this decision to the Police Appeals Tribunal.