

IN THE MATTER OF POLICE MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE
(CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

BETWEEN

THE COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY

AND

FPC BHUPINDER SINGH

OFFICER CONCERNED

1. This hearing was held on 13 to 15 July 2026 at Empress State Buildings, London. The Panel consisted of Commander Andy Brittain (Chair), Ms Purnima Uppal and Ms Mary Anne Poxton Independent Panel Members. Ms Dale Simon was the Legally Qualified Advisor to the Panel.
2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Mr Dan Santos-Costa and the officer concerned was not in attendance and was unrepresented.

PRELIMINARY ISSUES

Application for reporting restrictions

3. Counsel for the AA made an application under regulation 39 of the misconduct regulations 2020 for the details of FPC Singh's alleged medical condition to be redacted from any published record of the hearing. The panel noted that the details of the medical condition were not relevant to the allegations before the panel and granted the application.

Application to proceed in absence of FPC Singh

4. Counsel for the AA made an application to proceed with the hearing in the absence of FPC Singh. It was submitted that FPC Singh had voluntarily absented himself from the hearing. FPC Singh was aware of the date and venue of the hearing and had indicated to the AA through his Federation Representative on two occasions that he would not be attending the hearing and did not wish to be represented. It was further submitted that there was a strong public interest in proceeding with the hearing expeditiously and that FPC Singh had provided a full response to the allegations against him in interview and in his regulation 31 response, therefore it was both fair and in the interests of justice to proceed in the absence of the officer.
5. The panel had regard to the submissions made by Counsel for the AA and the legal advice from the LQA and determined that FPC Singh was fully aware of hearing and had voluntarily absented himself, he had not made a request for an adjournment and as such an adjournment was unlikely to result in his attendance at a future hearing. The panel also noted that several witnesses had attended to give evidence. In light of these circumstances the panel decided that it was both fair and in the interests of justice to proceed with the hearing in the absence of FPC Singh.

Application to admit the evidence of Kirsty Singh in her absence

6. Counsel for the AA made an application to admit the evidence of Kirsty Singh contained within the following documentation:
 - a. Witness Statement of PS Carpenter dated 2 August 2024
 - b. PS Carpenter's notes of conversation with Kirsty Singh
 - c. Witness Statement of PC Laksari dated 6 August 2024
 - d. Witness Statement of PC Sol Akbary dated 28 January 2025
 - e. Email from PC Sol Akbary dated 27 January 2025
7. Counsel for the AA reminded the panel that hearsay evidence is admissible in these proceedings once it is relevant and fair. The panel was also referred to the factors that should be considered when determining whether to admit hearsay evidence set out in the case of *Thornycroft V Nursing and Midwifery Council* [2014] EWHC 1565 namely:
 - a. *Whether the statements were the sole or decisive evidence in support of the charges;*
 - b. *The nature and extent of the challenge to the contents of the statements;*

- c. Whether there was any suggestion that the witnesses had reasons to fabricate their allegations;*
- d. The seriousness of the charge, taking into account the impact which adverse findings might have on the [Officer's] career;*
- e. Whether there was a good reason for the non-attendance of the witnesses;*
- f. Whether the [AA] had taken reasonable steps to secure their attendance;*
- g. The fact that the [Officer] did not have prior notice that the witness statements were to be read.*

8. In respect of allegation 1 it is alleged by the AA that Ms Singh told PC Akbary and PS Carpenter that FPC Singh did not have a medical appointment on 26th October 2023, and instead he had picked her and their children up from Luton Airport at approximately 1pm. The substance of the mischief in this allegation is that FPC Singh lied to PS Carpenter about the reason for taking leave. In interview FPC maintains that he did attend a hospital appointment that day and stated that he would provide the AA with documentation regarding this appointment, but none has been provided to date. It was conceded by counsel for the AA that the only evidence to support the allegation that this was a deception comes from the hearsay evidence of Ms Singh and as such her evidence is the sole and decisive evidence in respect of allegation 1.
9. In respect of allegation 2 counsel for the AA stated that Ms Singh's evidence was pivotal in support of this allegation and conceded that her evidence was sole and decisive evidence as to the existence (or otherwise) of the family court proceedings. It is alleged by the AA that Ms Singh informed PC Laksari on the 21 November 2023 that there was no divorce and that FPC Singh had a gambling problem; and that she told PC Akbary on 27 January 2025 that "absolutely no court proceedings had taken place" and that the divorce was settled without recourse to the court.
10. In respect of allegation 3 it was submitted that there is no dispute that the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) record was accessed by FPC Singh. However, the AA contends that FPC Singh accessed the CAD without a proper policing purpose. FPC Singh does not allege that he had a proper policing purpose, but rather advanced in interview that he accessed the CAD by accident. FPC Singh also accepts that Ms. Singh told him about an incident that she had witnessed, and she told him the CAD number. FPC Singh said he noted it down, and he accidentally accessed it when he was finishing his admin at the end of a shift.

11. Ms Singh's evidence is that FPC Singh told her that he had accessed the CAD and told her that the male had been taken to Northwick Park Hospital for a scan. Interrogation of the CAD shows that the male was indeed taken to Northwick Park Hospital, and he underwent a CT scan. It was therefore, submitted that Ms Singh's evidence in respect of allegation 3 is persuasive and corroborated by other documentary evidence.
12. It was submitted that the AA had taken reasonable steps to secure Ms Singh's attendance. Both PS Carpenter and PC Akbary spoke to her in August 2024 and January 2025 respectively and she declined to make a formal statement. PC Akbary recorded as follows:

"Kirsty explained that her wishes from when we spoke in August 2024 remains the same. She explained that had it not been for having two young kids, she would have. However, she is very much concerned that if she was to support these proceedings/provide a statement etc, that her kids would grow up attributing blame to her, for any repercussions their father faces. This was quite upsetting for Kirsty and she was visibly upset, at the thought of her children growing resentment towards her if she was to give evidence against PC Singh."
13. In determining the application to allow the evidence of Ms Singh to be admitted into evidence in her absence the panel had regard to all of the evidence served on the panel, the submissions made by counsel for the AA and the legal advice provided by the LQA. The panel bore in mind that the hearsay provisions that apply to criminal cases do not apply to police misconduct hearings. The admissibility of evidence is determined by its relevance and fairness. Evidence is relevant if it is logically probative or disprobative of some matter which requires proof. Relevant evidence should be ruled inadmissible if it would be unfair to admit it because its probative value is clearly outweighed by its prejudicial effect.
14. The Panel first considered whether the evidence of Ms Singh was relevant and concluded that it was clearly relevant. In respect of allegations 1 and 2 it was the sole and decisive evidence relied on by the AA to prove these allegations and in respect of allegation 3 her evidence was relevant to the panel's consideration of whether FPC Singh had a lawful purpose for accessing the CAD. In considering whether it would be fair to admit Ms Singh's evidence in her absence the panel considered each of the principles established by the case of Thorneycroft in turn.

15. The panel also bore in mind that in cases where evidence was sole or decisive the decision whether or not to admit it requires the panel to make a careful assessment, weighing up the competing factors. The assessment should involve a consideration of the issues in the case, the other evidence to be called and the potential consequences of admitting the evidence and the panel must be satisfied having undertaken this assessment that, either the evidence is demonstrably reliable or that there is some means of testing its reliability.

16. The panel found that:

- a. the AA had taken reasonable steps to secure the attendance of Ms Singh, and that Ms Singh had clearly expressed why she did not want to support the proceedings.
- b. Ms Singh's account in respect of all allegations had been put to FPC Singh in interview, and he had responded to the allegations in full therefore he had prior notice that the AA were seeking to rely on her evidence.
- c. The allegations are very serious and if proven would be career ending if FPC Singh had still been a serving officer.
- d. Ms Singh's evidence in respect of allegations 1 and 2 is challenged and not accepted by FPC Singh, and the AA had not produced any documentary evidence that corroborates her account (even though she had informed PS Carpenter in August 2024 that she did not wish to support proceedings against FPC Singh).
- e. The sole and decisive evidence of Ms Singh in respect of allegations 1 and 2 is not demonstrably reliable, it is uncorroborated and disputed and there is no means of testing its reliability in the absence of Ms Singh.
- f. Ms Singh's evidence in respect of allegation 3 is partially accepted by FPC Singh and corroborated by the CAD

17. In light of the above findings the panel concluded that it would not be fair to admit the sole and decisive evidence of Ms Singh in respect of allegations 1 and 2. In respect of allegation 3 the panel concluded that Ms Singh's evidence was corroborated by the CAD and the panel had the benefit of FPC Singh's full account which included some

partial admissions. The panel therefore determined that the probative value of her evidence outweighed any prejudice to FPC Singh and as such her evidence in respect of allegation 3 was admissible.

18. Following the determination of the panel in respect of the inadmissibility of Ms Singh's evidence in respect of allegations 1 and 2, counsel for the AA informed the panel that the AA were no longer proceeding with allegations 1 and 2. The Panel therefore recorded that allegations 1 and 2 had been withdrawn.

THE ALLEGATIONS

19. The allegations facing FPC Singh are set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon him under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. These are:
- (1) - **Withdrawn**
 - (2) . **Withdrawn**
 - (3) PC BHUPINDER SINGH, it is alleged that on 14th January 2023 at 18:15 hours whilst off duty, you accessed a CAD with no lawful or policing purpose.

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

- a) Confidentiality
- b) Discreditable Conduct

It is further alleged that this conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

CASE SUMMARY

20. It is alleged that FPC Singh accessed a CAD without a lawful policing purpose. Ms Singh informed the Investigating Officer that FPC Singh had accessed the CAD relating to an incident that she had witnessed and disclosed to her details that the male involved had attended Northwick Park Hospital and undergone a scan. An internal audit of the CAD revealed that FPC Singh had accessed the CAD on 14 January 2023 at 1815 hrs whilst he was off duty and that the male involved had attended hospital and undergone a scan. In interview FPC Singh accepted that he accessed the CAD, but

maintained that he had done so accidentally; he did not know how Mrs Singh was aware that he had accessed the CAD.

EVIDENCE

21. In advance of this hearing the Panel was supplied with the documents in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, which included a copy of the papers served on FPC Singh in accordance with Regulation 30 and FPC Singh's response to the AA under Regulation 31. In determining the facts in this case, the Panel had regard to:

- All documents and materials in the hearing bundle, the Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response whether they were explicitly referred to or not during the hearing.
- The evidence of Ms Singh contained in the statement of PC Akbary
- The submissions made on behalf of the AA.
- The legal advice provided by the LQA

THE PANEL'S APPROACH

22. In considering the facts, the Panel was aware that the burden of proof is on the AA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. In line with the principle derived from *Byrne v General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 2237 (Admin)*, the Panel recognised that there is only one standard of proof in civil and regulatory cases, namely whether the facts in issue more probably occurred than not. The seriousness of an allegation does not of itself require more cogent evidence. The inherent probability of the relevant conduct is a matter which can be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and in deciding whether the event/conduct occurred; this goes to the quality of evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT

23. There is no dispute that FPC Singh was given the CAD number by his wife and that he accessed the CAD on the 14 January 2023 at 18.15 hrs while he was off duty. The

AA relies on the record of a conversation with Ms Singh made by PC Akbary and the CAD audit to prove that FPC Singh had no lawful purpose to access the CAD. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

24. In a statement dated 28 January 2025 PC Akbary states:

“I enquired with Mrs Singh if PC Singh had discussed anything as result of accessing the CAD to her. Mrs Singh stated that he had, having told her that a male had been taken to Northwick Park Hospital and undergone a scan. Having looked back at the CAD in question today (6691 12th January 2023), I am able to see that on page 5 and 6 there references to a hospital attendance at Northwick Park (referred to a NPH) and, that CT scans had taken place for the male involved in the incident itself”.

25. FPC Singh was interviewed about this allegation on 14 July 2025. He conceded that he had accessed the CAD. His explanation for doing so was that he had been working the late turn shift on 12th January 2023 when he received a call from Ms Singh. She sounded distressed and asked him to jot down a CAD number. He jotted down the CAD number on the “sticky note” on his laptop. He stated that generally before a nightshift he would “wind down”, log onto his MPS laptop and ensure he is up-to-date with his admin. This included ensuring that he had updated any CADs from any previous tours of duty. Whilst doing this, he accidentally accessed CAD 6691 and realised that this was not related to him and he closed it down. He accepted that on reflection he should have alerted his line manager. He briefly discussed the incident with Ms Singh but did not discuss the incident further. He was unable to account for how Ms Singh knew that he had accessed the CAD.

26. It was submitted by counsel for the AA that FPC Singh had accessed the CAD intentionally out of curiosity and as such for an unlawful purpose. It was further submitted that FPC Singh’s account is untrue, and is fundamentally undermined by the evidence.

Panel determination

27. The panel found that Ms Singh’s account of what FPC Singh had told her after he accessed the CAD was corroborated by the contents of the CAD. The panel found that FPC Singh’s account was implausible and clearly untrue, as Ms Singh would have no way of knowing what was recorded on the CAD unless FPC Singh had shared that

information with her. The panel therefore found that FPC Singh had accessed the CAD for an unlawful purpose as alleged by the AA.

BREACH OF STANDARDS

28. Having found the allegation of fact proved the panel went on to consider whether the conduct found proved breached the standards alleged namely:

Confidentiality

“Police officers treat information with respect and access or disclose it only in the proper course of police duties.”

Discreditable conduct: Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

29. The panel found that by accessing a CAD for no lawful purpose and sharing the information accessed with a third party, FPC Singh had clearly breached the professional standard of confidentiality. There is considerable public concern arising from high profile cases where confidential and sensitive information has been shared inappropriately by police officers, therefore behaving in this manner also clearly breached the standard of discreditable conduct.

GROSS MISCONDUCT OR MISCONDUCT

30. Having found the breaches of the standards as set out above proved, the Panel carefully considered whether the breaches amount to gross misconduct, misconduct or neither. Misconduct is defined in the Regulations as meaning a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross misconduct is defined as a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal. The Panel reminded itself of the circumstances of this case, the breaches of the standards found proved, the need to protect public confidence in, and the reputation of the Police Service, the need to maintain high professional standards and the need to protect the public and officers and staff by preventing similar misconduct in the future.

31. In assessing the seriousness of FPC Singh's conduct the Panel had regard to the outcome guidance which provides that Panels should assess the seriousness of the proven conduct by reference to the officer's culpability for the misconduct, the harm caused by the misconduct, the existence of any aggravating factors and the existence of any mitigating factors.

32. It was submitted on behalf of the AA that the conduct found proved amounts to gross misconduct. The regulations are clear that police officers must only access confidential information with a proper policing purpose. Counsel for the AA also referred the panel to the following paragraphs of the outcome guidance:

33. In particular the panel were referred to the following paragraphs:

4.34: *"The misuse of police computer systems or confidential police information more generally is a particular concern for the police service. Police computer and manual systems hold a significant amount of information about members of the public. Most of this is sensitive, and it is both a public expectation and a legal requirement that information obtained during the course of policing duties should be treated in strictest confidence, properly protected and used only for legitimate policing purposes"*

4.35: *"Under no circumstances should anyone access or use police information for personal benefit. Personal reasons for accessing confidential police information, such as general curiosity or a desire to check on criminal activity near an officer's home, are not acceptable. If an officer is accessing police information not available to the general public, there should always be a specific and proper policing purpose for doing so."*

4.36: *"Accessing confidential police information without a legitimate policing purpose is an abuse of an officer's position and may merit dismissal in serious cases."*

34. It was also submitted that the that the breach of confidentiality was serious, because it was deliberate and criminal in nature as it was akin to an offence under section 170 Data Protection Act 2018. It was further submitted that an aggravating factor adding to the seriousness of the breach was the fact that the data improperly accessed was sensitive.

35. The Panel determined that FPC Singh was fully culpable for his actions, he had deliberately chosen to access the CAD out of curiosity and in so doing he had abused his position as an officer. His conduct was akin to the criminal offence under section 170 of the Data Protection Act of knowingly disclosing personal data without consent, therefore the level of his culpability high.
36. In respect of harm the panel found that public confidence in the police was likely to be significantly undermined if the public were aware of the circumstances of this case. There have been a number of high-profile cases that have led to significant public concern because of police officers accessing and sharing sensitive information and images. The panel therefore found that the level of potential reputational harm to the police service was high.
37. The panel found that there were no mitigating factors relevant to seriousness in this case. The panel found that the following aggravating factors were relevant in this case:
- The information accessed was sensitive
 - FPC Singh disclosed the information to Ms Singh
 - FPC Singh attempted to cover up his improper access to the data
38. In light of the above findings in respect of seriousness the panel concluded that the level of seriousness in this case was high. The panel therefore determined that the breaches of the standards of professional behaviour were so serious as to justify dismissal and as such amounted to gross misconduct.

OUTCOME

39. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction the panel have had regard to FPC Singh's service record, the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf the AA and the legal advice received from the LQA. The panel applied the three-stage procedure set out in the outcome guidance. The Panel assessed the seriousness of the misconduct, keeping in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions and chose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.
40. For the reasons detailed above the panel found that the level of seriousness of the misconduct found proved was high.

41. The panel kept in mind at all times the threefold purpose of imposing sanctions, namely: (a) maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; (b) upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; (c) protection of the public. Of these, the maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service is paramount.
42. In line with the outcome guidance at paragraph 7.4, the panel considered the least severe outcome first. There is significant public concern arising from recent high-profile incidents involving the inappropriate disclosure of sensitive information by police officers; therefore, the panel determined that a final written warning would be neither proportionate nor appropriate to address the seriousness of the misconduct found proved and to uphold high standards in policing and deter other officers from acting in a similar manner.
43. The public rightly expects police officers to act with discretion and within the law. Accessing sensitive confidential information for non-policing purposes and then sharing it with others is totally inconsistent with the values of the MPS. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that the only appropriate sanction in this case if FPC Singh was still a serving officer would be dismissal without notice.

Commander Andy Brittain

15 July 2026