

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 ELLIOT BATT

OFFICER CONCERNED

1. This hearing has been held between the 1 June 2026 and 4 June 2026 at Patrick Dunne House, Sutton. The Panel consisted of Commander Jason Prins (Chair), Ms Mary Anne Poxton and Ms Rachel O’Connell Independent Panel Members. Ms Dale Simon was the Legally Qualified Advisor to the Panel.
2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Mr Edmund Gross and the former officer concerned was represented by Mr Jonas Milner.

PRELIMINARY ISSUES

3. In accordance with pre-hearing directions the ciphers (PC A and PC B) were used to protect the anonymity of the complainants, and the ciphers Person F, Person M and PC C were used to protect the identity of PC A’s parents and her current partner. Counsel for the AA requested that the panel direct that any published reports also redact references to specific dates to avoid the identification of witnesses by linking them to specific dates of events. [REDACTED]
4. Counsel for the AA also applied to amend the wording of the regulation 30 notice in respect of allegation 2 to accurately reflect the evidence of PC B. The proposed amendment was not opposed by counsel for FPC Batt. Accordingly, the words “*At this party*” were replaced with the words “*Later that evening at a [REDACTED]*”.

5. In respect of the proposed live evidence, Counsel for FPC Batt, who had been instructed after the pre-hearing, indicated that the officer no longer required the attendance of any witnesses apart from PC A and PC B. It was confirmed that FPC Batt did not accept some aspects of Person M's statement, however, the disputed issues did not relate to a matter that formed a specific allegation against the former officer. The panel therefore directed that all other witnesses for the AA could be released as their live evidence was not required to resolve a dispute in respect of an alleged allegation of fact facing FPC Batt.
6. The panel had also been informed prior to the commencement of the hearing, that the AA no longer sought to rely on the evidence of PC Tyler Adams. The panel were therefore requested to disregard all references to the evidence of PC Adams contained in the hearing bundle.

THE ALLEGATIONS

7. The allegations facing FPC Batt are set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon him under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. These are:

Behaviour towards PC A

1. Between June 2020 and October 2020 (inclusive of both of those months) ('the relevant period'), you subjected PC A - with whom you had a personal relationship - to controlling and/or coercive behaviour. In particular, your behaviour included the following during the relevant period:
 - a) Preventing her from wearing makeup or leggings when going into work.
 - b) Making her send to you a photo of the floor or pavement outside every address she attended so that you could establish her location.
 - c) You would ask for her posting every day.
 - d) Giving her your old Apple Watch supposedly as a gift but when she opened it you said that having it meant she could always message you.
 - e) You started sending her a large volume of text messages, to the extent that

she was having to stay on the phone to you when she got changed at work.

- f) You repeatedly accused her of cheating on you.
- g) At one point during the relevant period, you made her obtain her body worn camera in order for you to review it with her to prove that she was where she said she was and that she was not cheating on you. You had no lawful basis for requesting access to or reviewing this body worn footage.
- h) You started to insist on meeting the people she was posted with at work.
- i) You repeatedly would take issue with her working late.
- j) On one occasion during this period, you were together at [REDACTED] when you said you needed to see her phone so that you could trust her. She provided you with her phone and you then looked through everything, including text messages, emails, calls, contacts, photos and locations of her photographs. On leaving the restaurant you started saying words to the effect of, “You betrayed me!” and telling her that you were going to get really drunk and that she should hope [REDACTED]”
- k) You regularly checked her phone and would back up WhatsApp to the server.
- l) If she was ever at her home, you would expect her to be on a call or a FaceTime with you.
- m) You would smell her clothes to make sure that she was using the same washing powder.
- n) In October 2020 at your flat, you assaulted her by grabbing her clothes near the neck while screaming at her. You then proceeded to violently shake her and lifted her off her feet. After she left the flat, you then chased after her and said [REDACTED]. The same evening you assaulted her again by grabbing her clothing on her left shoulder with one hand and dragged her up the stairs. In doing so you started strangling her. As a consequence, her feet started bleeding. You then got angry with her while being very upset,

The above conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.

In addition to the above, the conduct set out at 1(g) above also breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Confidentiality, in that by doing so, you were accessing information not in the proper course of police duties.

Behaviour towards PC B

2. In early July 2022 you attended the public protection summer party which was held at [REDACTED]. At this party Later that evening at a [REDACTED] you:
 - (i) Inappropriately grabbed PC B's waist with both of your hands and pulled her back towards you when she was trying to walk away from you to speak to someone else.
 - (ii) Knew or ought to have known she did not consent to the behaviour in point (i) above.

The above conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.

Assessment of conduct if proven

3. The breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour are individually and collectively so serious as to justify dismissal and are accordingly assessed as gross misconduct.

CASE SUMMARY

8. Allegation 1 relates to PC A. FPC Batt met PC A while they were both training to become police officers at Hendon. They became close friends while training, and their friendship developed into a romantic relationship shortly after they both completed initial police training. Their romantic relationship lasted some 5 months and it is alleged that during the course of that relationship, FPC Batt subjected PC A to coercive and controlling behaviour including physical assaults, as detailed in allegations of fact 1a-1n.

9. Allegation 2 relates to PC B. It is alleged that FPC Batt and PC B had both attended a public protection summer party at [REDACTED]. Whilst there they exchanged phone numbers and agreed to meet up for coffee at a later date. After the summer party groups of officers went on to different pubs and bars in the area. PC B went to [REDACTED] with members of her team. FPC Batt texted her to find out where she was and subsequently joined her at [REDACTED] where they continued to drink alcohol together. PC B, her team and FPC Batt then moved on to another bar in Soho where it is alleged that FPC Batt grabbed PC B by the waist and pulled her back towards him, when she started to walk towards a male colleague across the room.
10. FPC Batt denies most of the facts alleged and does not accept that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct.

EVIDENCE

11. 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 Batt in accordance with Regulation 30 and FPC Batt'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 oral evidence of PC A, PC B and FPC Batt
 - The submissions made on behalf of the AA and FPC Batt.
 - The legal advice provided by the LQA

THE PANEL'S APPROACH

12. 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.

13. The Panel was also mindful not to assess a witness's credibility exclusively on their demeanour when giving evidence and that their veracity should be tested by reference to objective facts proved independently in their evidence, in particular by reference to the documents in the case. The Panel has also reminded itself that it should make a rounded assessment of a witness's reliability, rather than approaching their reliability in respect of each charge in isolation from the others: *R (on the application of Dutta) v GMC [2020] EWHC 1974 (Admin)*.

14. As to individual pieces of evidence, the Panel was mindful that it is entitled to draw proper inferences, that is to come to common sense conclusions based upon the evidence which it accepts as reliable; but it must not speculate. Similarly, the Panel must not speculate about what other evidence there might have been.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Allegation of fact 1

15. The panel considered each specified allegation of coercive and controlling behaviour in turn and then considered whether any allegations of fact found proved, either individually or collectively, amounted to coercive and controlling behaviour as alleged.

16. The AA relies primarily on the evidence of PC A to prove these allegations of fact. PC A adopted her written statements dated 3 April 2023, 23 June 2023 and 11 December 2025 as her evidence. The panel found that her oral evidence was consistent with her written statements and that she responded clearly and fully to questions put to her. Her evidence was also partially corroborated by other witnesses which supported the reliability of her evidence.

17. The panel found no evidence to support FPC Batt's assertion that there was a pattern of PC A getting into trouble or being criticised then seeking to blame FPC Batt as to why things have happened. On the contrary, PC A did not blame FPC Batt when she was reprimanded by her supervisors for excessive use of her phone. When PC A disclosed to her line manager her reasons for not wanting to work with FPC Batt on a specific occasion in September 2021, she indicated that she did not want to pursue any allegations against FPC Batt. Further, PC A only made a formal statement after she was approached by investigators in 2023 after two colleagues raised concerns about FPC Batt in a 'Share Your Experience' meeting for female colleagues to discuss culture and experiences within the Metropolitan Police. The Panel therefore determined that PC A was a credible witness.
18. In oral evidence, PC A stated that her friendship with FPC Batt developed from colleagues into a full relationship "*really fast*" but this didn't set off any alarm bells at the time. She stated that as they were not working on the same team they would message and call each other a lot. She stated that the level of his communication went up over time and he would message her on WhatsApp, Snapchat and Instagram; all messages were sent to her mobile phone. There were a lot of "*where are you?*" and "*what are you doing?*" messages. She stated that colleagues started to notice that she was on her phone quite a lot, she was spoken to about her phone use by Inspector Taylor and PS Elliot and they told her that she needed to "*tell her partner to stop*". She stated that she told FPC Batt about this conversation and that they needed to "*sort something out*"; however, he only changed for that evening, then he went back to normal.
19. PC A stated that when she was with FPC Batt she didn't speak to other people on the phone, for example she would only call her parents when she was alone. She described having to let FPC Batt know who she was posted with, what job she was on and where she was going. She described FPC Batt accusing her of being a liar and going through her phone. She stated that FPC Batt would come to pick her up from work, and she described this as being "*usually quite tense*" as there were lots of questions about what she had done. She stated that she constantly had to think about what she was saying and described this as "*quite exhausting*".

20. She confirmed that FPC Batt had physically assaulted her and described eventually ending their relationship after an argument while they were in bed and FPC Batt wanted to go through her phone again.
21. In response to cross examination, PC A accepted that prior to her romantic relationship with FPC Batt they contacted each other regularly on WhatsApp, text and Snapchat and would Face Time each other to go through mock exams and study together. She accepted that FPC Batt probably liked her more than she had liked him before their relationship started. She also stated that when they started their relationship FPC Batt sent her “loads” of messages; he was “*clearly into me*”, “*It was really nice having someone want me, at the time I thought he was a really nice guy*”. At the time “*it felt positive and happy*”.
22. PC A confirmed that FPC Batt had made her aware of his [REDACTED], but she did not accept that he was vulnerable because “*everything that he told me about wasn’t new and been dealt with*”. PC A also did not accept that she was the only person that FPC Batt could talk to about his [REDACTED]. She stated that she would go with FPC Batt to [REDACTED] whenever she was free to do so, if she didn’t go “*it was a guilt trip*”.
23. PC A confirmed that she did not mention being coerced by FPC Batt when she was reprimanded for her excessive phone use. She stated that this was because she was scared, she was aware of her duty to report unlawful behaviour, and she accepted that she lied about the calls to her supervisors.
24. FPC Batt adopted the contents of his statement under caution, full comment interview dated 18 April 2023, and the contents of his Regulation 31 response as his evidence. The panel found that there were several inconsistencies between the officer’s written evidence and his oral evidence (as detailed below) and that some of his explanations/assertions lacked plausibility, or were directly contradicted and as such undermined by the evidence of independent witnesses. The panel therefore determined that FPC Batt lacked credibility as a witness.

25. [REDACTED] He stated that he was living in the section house [REDACTED] during the COVID pandemic in 2020, lockdown was difficult for him and him [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]. He described meeting PC A because they were in the same class at Hendon, she was good at theory and he was good at the physical side of things, so they formed a friendship outside the class WhatsApp group.
26. FPC Batt stated that he and PC A were both keen to do well in their exams, so they trained for exams most evenings, by video call. PC A suggested that they meet and study in the park, he agreed and this was the first occasion when PC A kissed him. After the second occasion when they met and PC A kissed him, he thought that “*this could go somewhere*”. He stated that he moved out of the section house so that he could pursue a relationship with PC A, as she said that starting a relationship was conditional on him moving out. The panel noted that this was the first time that FPC Batt had suggested that PC A had asked him to move out of the section house.
27. He stated that he and PC A communicated on Snapchat while they were on shift, they both consensually used the share location function on Snap Chat. He accepted that they would discuss where they were posted and what they were doing but there was nothing “*sinister*” about this. He stated that PC A was assaulted whilst on duty, he was concerned by this, and it resulted in him contacting her more often
28. He confirmed that PC A had encouraged him to [REDACTED] and had occasionally accompanied him on visits. He also confirmed that the MPS [REDACTED].
29. FPC Batt stated that PC A would usually stay at his flat when she was working, because it was easier for her to get to work. He stated he “*could count on one hand*” the times that he collected her from work. He stated that she would usually jump on the bus. He stated that he didn’t like driving his car to the police station because he didn’t want his car to become known. He recounted going to the police station to pick up PC A on one occasion, he was tired and slept in the car while he was waiting for her to finish her shift.

Allegation of fact 1a. Preventing her from wearing makeup or leggings when going into work.

30. PC A's statement reads:

“ By this time I was no longer the chatty, extraverted girl I had been just a few months ago in Street Duties, he used to comment on me wearing make-up, things like, “Why are you wearing mascara? To attract men? I want you to stop.” so I stopped. He told me to stop wearing gym leggings or anything like it, he said that I was trying to make men look at me. He instead insisted that I wear his clothes which were baggier and less revealing, he once said he had seen a woman wearing leggings walking in Brixton and that she was embarrassing.”

31. In response to cross examination, PC A did not accept that the pictures produced by FPC Batt showing PC A in leggings and wearing makeup proved that FPC Batt did not have a problem with her wearing leggings or make-up. She stated that FPC Batt was with her when the photos were taken; his issue related to her wearing leggings and makeup when she wasn't with him.

32. In a statement dated 26 June 2023, PC Charlotte McCabe states that she met PC A in May 2020 whilst working on street duties and they became friends towards the end of June. She states that: *“PC A use to always wear makeup and leggings and I noticed that this started to stop.”* She further states that after PC A and FPC Batt separated PC A started “opening up to me” and told her that:

“ Elliot had being very controlling towards her and had stopped her from wearing makeup, fake tan and leggings.”

33. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

“At no time did FPC Batt prevent or attempt to prevent PC A from wearing makeup, leggings or any other specific item of clothing to work. He never sought to control her in any way”.

34. In oral evidence, FPC Batt maintained that he did not prevent PC A from wearing leggings or make up. He produced pictures of them together at their passing out ceremony and at the gym which he stated were taken in July/August 2020.

Panel determination

35. The panel found that the evidence of PC A was corroborated by the evidence of PC McCabe who recounts noticing that PC A had stopped wearing make up at work several months before PC A informed her of the reason for this change in her behaviour. The

panel noted that the allegation of fact specifically states that FPC Batt prevented PC A from wearing make up and leggings **when going to work**. FPC Batt was with PC A in one picture and the pictures of PC A in the gym had been taken by him. The panel therefore concluded that these pictures did not undermine the evidence of PC A and PC McCabe. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1b. Making her send to you a photo of the floor or pavement outside every address she attended so that you could establish her location.

36. PC A's statement reads:

“ The behaviour was getting worse still, as well as the calls at the beginning of the work day and the constant messages he would now make me send him a photo on Snapchat, this allowed him to know my location throughout the working day. At every address I attended he told me I had to take a photo of the floor or pavement outside which would give him my location ”

37. In oral evidence PC A stated that she would send FPC Batt photos of her location on Snapchat, *“because he asked me to”*. She agreed that these photos would be on her phone.

38. In response to cross examination, PC A stated that *“I gave my mobile phone to the officer who took my first statement”*. Enquiries were subsequently made and the following agreed facts were submitted to the panel. DI Hadleigh had taken PC A's statement on 31 March 2023. On reviewing her work diary she could not see that PC A's phone was handed in by PC A or seized by the investigation. DI Hadleigh had no recollection of the phone being handed in or seized. The AA has no record of either happening.

39. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

“At no stage did FPC Batt request photographs of PC A's location to establish her whereabouts. An examination of their respective phones and contact will demonstrate that this allegation is incorrect.”

40. In oral evidence, FPC Batt maintained his denial of this allegation and stated that sending a photo would not help to establish her location.

41. It was submitted on behalf of FPC Batt that the agreed facts in respect of there being no record of PC A's phone being seized for investigation meant that either PC A was not being truthful in her evidence when she stated that she submitted her phone to the AA, or the AA had failed without any good reason to adduce that evidence to prove relevant aspects of their case against FPC Batt. The panel also noted that no messages were recovered from FPC Batt's phone. In oral evidence, FPC Batt said that the phone that he handed to investigators was a new phone. The phone that he had in 2020 had been damaged and been replaced

Panel determination

42. . The panel had previously found PC A to be a credible witness. The panel noted that PC A had stated in her oral evidence that her call data was looked through by the lady who took her statement. In the opinion of the panel, given the nature of the allegations and the fact that FPC Batt's phone was investigated, it is highly probable that PC A's phone was at least looked at by the Investigating Officer (IO), even if the IO has no independent recollection or record of doing so. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1c. You would ask for her posting every day.

43. PC A's statement reads:

"He [FPC Batt] would ask for my posting every day and I would have to tell him as again if I didn't I would be bombarded with calls and texts. It was a constant in my life and I had a choice, either I had calls and messages constantly or I messaged him what he wanted. I chose to do what he wanted 100%. (A posting is who I would be working with and the callsign which denotes the vehicle I would be in)."

44. In his Regulation 31 response, FPC Batt states "*As would be expected in any relationship, both FPC Batt and PC A would often discuss their respective postings at work. That was not done to monitor her whereabouts, it was a perfectly normal topic of conversation between them.*" In oral evidence, FPC Batt accepted that he and PC A discussed their postings every day, but he denied that this amounted to controlling or coercive behaviour.

Panel Determination

45. The panel found that there was no dispute that FPC Batt contacted PC A every

day to discuss their postings; however, there was a significant difference between PC A's account of having to give FPC Batt the information that he wanted to avoid being bombarded by messages; and FPC Batt's account of the postings being part of a perfectly normal topic of conversation. The panel found that although there is no direct corroboration of PC A's account, there are similarities between this alleged behaviour and other allegations of coercive and controlling behaviour that are corroborated. Therefore, having already found that PC A is a credible witness, the panel preferred her account over that of FPC Batt and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1d. Giving her your old Apple Watch supposedly as a gift but when she opened it you said that having it meant she could always message you.

46. PC A's statement reads:

"Some time later he gave me his old Apple Watch, I remember he wrapped it up and everything like it was a great gift. He gave it to me and when I opened it he told me that now I wouldn't have to get my phone out and that I could always message him. It made me feel like I had no excuse not to be in constant communication with him. I hated wearing that watch, it was constantly going "ping, ping, ping" on my arm. That Apple Watch caused me so much stress and made me feel like I was constantly under pressure to reply to him and fast. This was at home, at work anywhere, all the time... Once I attended an address where I took a statement from a victim, I came out and saw I had twenty missed calls from him. The Apple watch had been constantly going ping ping ping on my arm."

47. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

"FPC Batt accepts that he gave PC A an old Apple watch of his. He does not recall saying that it meant that she could always message him, nor was it provided for that reason. She said she would like an Apple watch, he had one that he did not use, so he gave it to her."

48. In oral evidence, FPC Batt accepted that he had reset the settings on his Apple watch, which had originally been given to him as a gift by his mother, but he had subsequently paid his mother for the watch. He also stated that he had only used the watch once before giving it to PC A and maintained that he gave her the watch because she wanted one. In response to a question from the panel as to why he had thrown such a relatively new watch away, FPC Batt stated that he had never liked the watch and he couldn't gain entry to it after PC A returned

it to him.

Panel determination

49. The panel noted that FPC Batt had stated that he had reset the Apple watch before giving it to PC A but subsequently stated that he had thrown the watch away when returned to him by PC A because he didn't like it and couldn't access it. In the opinion of the panel, FPC Batt's explanation for throwing away a relatively new expensive watch which had been gifted by or purchased from his mother lacked credibility. Having found PC A to be a credible witness the panel preferred her account over that of FPC Batt and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1e. You started sending her a large volume of text messages, to the extent that she was having to stay on the phone to you when she got changed at work.

50. PC A's statement reads:

"Elliot was messaging me around one hundred times a day by this point, I was still having to stay on the phone to him when I got changed."

51. In a statement dated 26 May 2023 PC Lewis states:

"In August 2020 as the restrictions eased I was allowed to return back to work and met PC A myself. As one of the most senior officers I was posted alongside PC A with her acting as my operator. This posting lasted just one shift but during that time I quickly noticed, like others, that she was constantly texting whilst we were on driving on patrol".

52. In a statement dated 24 November 2023 PC Keogh states:

"I remember throughout the night PC A was constantly on her mobile phone either texting or taking phone calls. Whilst naturally I expected her to be on her mobile phone simply owing to the nature of the shift, I remember being struck by how much she was actually was using it. I remember her being on it constantly throughout the night and I remember thinking how excessive it was. Whilst I didn't know her very well so was unable to gauge her personality level in general I do remember through the course of the evening PC A becoming more and more withdrawn and it was obvious that she was upset. PC A at the start of the shift appeared very bubbly and happy but towards the end of the shift her demeanour changed massively and

aware that I didn't know her very well I didn't want to really ask her questions about this as I didn't feel it was my place to start asking such personal questions."

53. In a statement dated 7 September 2023 PC Barger states:

"PC A used to be on her phone constantly, she was always texting and at first she seemed happy about it. Other people used to complain about PC A always being on her phone. After a couple more times when I saw her on her phone she appeared to be stressed. We did have a talk about this and she told me that her boyfriend is always texting her and if she doesn't respond then he gets difficult."

54. In interview FPC Batt stated that he would message PC A around 20 times from "morning to night" but if there was "*carnage at work there would be more*". FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

"They each communicated with each other frequently by text and by other means. The communication was two-way and that will be demonstrated by an analysis of their respective phones and by call data records. FPC Batt never required PC A to respond to his messages, calls, or other contact. It is not clear to FPC Batt quite how 'sending her a large volume of text messages' could mean PC A having to 'stay on the phone' to him when she got changed at work. Clearly receiving and or responding to text messages could have no such effect."

55. In oral evidence FPC Batt stated that he and PC A were on opposite shifts on street duties, so they texted and called each other. In his opinion the volume of contact was the same as when they were training, he didn't think that they were spending too much time together, but they were "*both spending too much time talking to each other on shift*". He maintained that the level of contact was consensual not controlling.

Panel determination

56. The panel found that the statements of PCs Lewis, Barger and Keogh all reference PC A texting excessively while on shift which corroborates PC A's account of the volume of text messages that she was receiving from FPC Batt that she had to respond to. In the opinion of the panel, PC Keogh's reference to noticing PC A becoming withdrawn and looking visibly upset as the evening went on tends to suggest that the text messages were not consensual and two-way as suggested by FPC Batt. The panel therefore found this allegation of

fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1f, You repeatedly accused her of cheating on you.

57. PC A's statement provides the following:

"He would constantly accuse me of cheating on him."

"Elliot would accuse me of cheating on him; he would get really angry and upset. We would have huge arguments, I felt sick, stressed, anxious and I wanted to avoid this at all costs"

"I was constantly anxious, I thought he would constantly know where I was, he had shown me that he would follow me and wait to watch me get in the car. He would constantly accuse me of cheating on him. Sometime in September I was on a night duty, I was posted with another officer Regan, I can't remember his surname. We were posted to a crime scene, this is where officers have to be on a cordon to ensure that no one comes or goes unless we note their name and times. This particular crime scene was a building which was locked so we were able to do it from a car. It was raining and getting colder, I remember that summer had been really hot and that night it was chillier and more like Autumn. It was at the "News building" at the top of Tooley Street in London Bridge. I had in my mind that I could not let Elliot see me sat in a car at night with a male officer. Elliot would accuse me of cheating on him, he would get really angry and upset. We would have huge arguments, I felt sick, stressed, anxious and I wanted to avoid this at all costs, I stood outside the car all night in the rain. I would sit briefly in the car just to warm up a bit and then I would stand outside as soon as I got a text or calls from Elliot as I was scared he could see me. I remember being really cold and miserable that night, I went to the toilet just so I could sit down, this was probably the lowest point I had felt since becoming Elliot's girlfriend. I was so sad and scared, I was so disappointed in myself, how I had let this happen. I was ashamed."

"That morning I was sat on the toilet having a wee, he was in the bathroom and was arguing with me as normal. He looked at my knickers and saw some vaginal discharge. He immediately got angry and said that I had been aroused, that Regan had touched me, that I had cheated on him and that I was lying to him. I was so ashamed, this was beyond anything I could imagine. I explained that vaginal discharge is a normal part of being a woman, I justified myself, denied being unfaithful. The idea that Regan and I had done anything was so ridiculous, but I continued to make sure he was reassured.... About two weeks after the argument about Regan, his friend came down from Scotland, she was a woman. At one point he started a conversation about vaginal discharge, I was absolutely mortified, I knew exactly what he was doing and it left me in total disbelief."

58. PC Regan Keogh's statement reads:

"I recall the first time when me and PC A had been posted together. I cannot recall the date but remember it being fairly soon after she joined the team and we were working a 9 hour night shift. We were tasked with sitting outside a news building situated close to London Bridge Station. It was at a time when there had been increased Extinction Rebellion protests and therefore our tasking was to spend the evening posted outside the building as it was believed a potential target by the group for vandalism. ...Whilst I cannot remember the exact date we were paired together I do remember the weather being particularly cold. I remember despite having the warmth of the car PC A spend a good proportion of the shift outside. She would stand roughly about four to five meters away from the car whereupon I would see her on the mobile having a conversation with someone. She would then subsequently come back to the car for a bit before leaving again going back outside. I remember at first being baffled by this as it was freezing outside and I couldn't work out why she wouldn't just stay in the car to take the calls but towards the end of the shift when the phone calls kept coming I remember thinking to myself what else could she possibly have to talk about bearing in mind it was the middle of the night."

59. PC Anson Gates' statement reads;

"On exiting the carrier became aware of Elliot in the car park. Elliot looked really angry and he shouting down at the phone and it became apparent from the conversation that he was talking to PC A . I could hear him shouting 'where are you', 'who are you with', 'why are you off late', and 'I don't believe you'. He was being really inquisitive and aggressive towards her and I remember thinking that could only be PC A on the phone due to the nature of the questions being asked and the fact that I had just left her. I remember thinking his behaviour was well over the top and came across as really possessive,"

60. Person M's statement reads:

"More recently PC A has taken me to see George Ezra and I remember coming out of the train station in London and looking at a statue saying how pretty it looked. I remember PC A informing me that she had worked one of her worst shifts ever here and when I asked her why she informed me that she had been posted here on a night shift and that Elliot had told her that in no uncertain terms was she allowed to stay in the car with a male colleague so she had spent the night outside in the cold and wet only spending roughly 30 minutes in a nearby hotel toilet to try and dry and warm herself up."

61. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

"FPC Batt recalls just one occasion when he asked PC A if she was seeing someone else. That was as a result of conversations between them that caused him

that concern. He did not do so 'repeatedly', it was once and once only"

62. In oral evidence, FPC Batt stated that he and PC A would have “*arguments as couples do*”, he denied constantly accusing her of cheating. He stated that they had an argument on a few occasions about compliments that she received at work. He denied that he was coercive or controlling.

Panel determination

63. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities. PC A’s account of having to stand outside in the cold to avoid FPC Batt accusing her of cheating is directly corroborated by PC Keogh, and Person M also recounts being informed of FPC Batt’s behaviour by PC A. PC Anson-Gates recalls FPC Batt shouting down the phone aggressively at a person he inferred was PC A, asking who she was with and saying that he didn’t believe her. The panel also noted that FPC Batt accepts arguing with PC A on a few occasions over “compliments” that she received at work, the panel determined that this admitted behaviour suggests that FPC Batt reacted angrily if PC A received male attention. The panel therefore concluded that this behavioural trait made it probable that FPC Batt was also inclined to be jealous and accuse PC A of cheating.

Allegation of fact 1.g. At one point during the relevant period, you made her obtain her body worn camera in order for you to review it with her to prove that she was where she said she was and that she was not cheating on you. You had no lawful basis for requesting access to or reviewing this body worn footage.

64. PC A’s statement reads:

“That evening after work, I think we argued about me not responding again, I think that day was a late shift, he drove me to [REDACTED] Police Station late that night and made me get my body worn camera out of my locker. He then made me dock the camera and used the app we use at work to watch the footage to prove that I was where I had said and I wasn’t cheating on him”

65. In response to cross examination, PC A accepted that there could have been an occasion when she showed FPC Batt body worn footage of an incident when she used force on a suspect; she stated that she had also done this with other officers in the writing room. In response to questions from the panel, PC A explained that it was only possible to view your own BWV remotely if the

camera had been docked. FPC Batt wanted to know what she had been doing and where she was that day. He went onto Axon to see where her footage was and if it correlated with where she said she had been. She had not docked her camera, so he drove her back to [REDACTED] Police station where she docked her camera and then went back to view the footage.

66. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

"FPC Batt never 'made' PC A show him her body worn camera footage to where she was or to prove she was not cheating on him. That is simply not correct."

67. In oral evidence FPC Batt maintained his denial of this allegation. He stated that PC A had shown him BWV footage of her arresting a suspect who she "had kneed" and sought his advice.

Panel determination

68. This allegation of fact relies solely on the evidence of PC A. Having found PC A to be a credible witness, and having also found that FPC Batt had regularly accused PC A of cheating and persistently requested knowledge of her locations, the panel preferred her evidence over that of FPC Batt and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1h. You started to insist on meeting the people she was posted with at work.

69. PC A's statement reads:

"Then things got worse again, now Elliot wanted to meet the people I was posted with, I tried to work out the plan with my driver every day. Where would we have refs? Whether they had any enquiries to make, statements to take that kind of thing. I would then be able to tell Elliot and he would turn up randomly, he would always be rude and aggressive, especially if I was with a man."

70. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

"FPC Batt met some of PC A's colleagues and or people that she had been posted with. That was as a perfectly normal part of their relationship. He never insisted on it or even instigated it."

Panel determination

71. The panel had found PC A to be a credible witness. The panel noted FPC Batt

accepted that he had met some of the colleagues that PC A was posted with, and that he asserted this was a perfectly normal part of a relationship. In the opinion of the panel, it was not a normal part of a relationship to be introduced to your partner's work colleagues while they were at work. The panel also noted their finding that FPC Batt would regularly accuse PC A of cheating. The panel therefore preferred the evidence of PC A over that of FPC Batt and concluded that it was more likely than not FPC Batt had insisted on meeting the colleagues that she was posted with. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities

Allegation of fact 1i. You repeatedly would take issue with her working late.

72. PC A's statement reads:

"Elliot didn't like me being off duty late, as a Police Officer things happen quickly and without warning which means that quite often I would unexpectedly be off late. When this happened he would make me feel awful, he would make it clear in the tone of his text that he wasn't happy and this would make me feel guilty and stressed. It was mostly when I was on late shifts he would behave like this, I would say it was two out of every four shifts he would message me in this way."

73. In his statement dated 13 July 2023 PC Anson-Gates states:

"On exiting the carrier became aware of Elliot in the car park. Elliot looked really angry and he shouting down at the phone and it became apparent from the conversation that he was talking to PC A. I could hear him shouting 'where are you', 'who are you with', 'why are you off late', and 'I don't believe you'. He was being really inquisitive and aggressive towards her and I remember thinking that could only be PC A on the phone due to the nature of the questions being asked and the fact that I had just left her. I remember thinking his behaviour was well over the top and came across as really possessive."

74. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

"FPC Batt does not recall ever even complaining about PC A working late except for one occasion when he had needed to collect his flat keys from her"

75. In his oral evidence, FPC Batt denied the incident described by PC Anson-Gates happened. In his written and oral evidence, FPC Batt denied ever shouting at PC A.

Panel determination

76. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities. The panel found that the statement of PC Anson-Gates strongly corroborates the

evidence of PC A and directly contradicts/undermines FPC Batt's assertion that he only recollects complaining on one occasion when he needed his keys from PC A.

Allegation of fact 1j. On one occasion during this period, you were together at [REDACTED] when you said you needed to see her phone so that you could trust her. She provided you with her phone and you then looked through everything, including text messages, emails, calls, contacts, photos and locations of her photographs. On leaving the restaurant you started saying words to the effect of, "You betrayed me!" and telling her that you were going to get really drunk and that she should hope "nothing silly happens."

77. The statement of PC A reads:

" One day we had been on a date to [REDACTED] in Hertfordshire, I had been here before with a previous boyfriend and knew it was a nice place to go. During the day it was nice, we went on boats and at one point Elliot asked me whether I had been to this place before with someone else. I replied that I hadn't, I lied as I didn't want there to be an argument and I because it didn't matter. I was now with Elliot not the previous boyfriend. A couple of days later Elliot text me while I was at work and said, "I hate liars, I hate people who lie." We then had a messaged conversation and he asked me to meet him in [REDACTED] after work. I agreed and later that day we met up, I can't remember exactly when this was but I think it was the summer. He had messaged something like, "Make sure you bring the truth!" I was on edge and worried what would happen, I had not been unfaithful to Elliot. When I got to [REDACTED] he was clearly annoyed, he was starting at me and was borderline aggressive, he asked if there was anything I needed to tell him. I said I didn't know what he was talking about and he said he would give me two chances, I asked if he was talking about [REDACTED] and he then used this against me. He said, "So you do know then?" We had ordered food and we were now arguing, I was crying, he was accusing me of lying, he said that he couldn't trust me. I was saying that he could and that I had nothing to hide, he then asked to see my phone. He said he needed to see my phone so he could trust me. I was so upset, embarrassed and exhausted that I agreed. I was so fixated on making this argument stop that I didn't care about the crying. It made me feel horrendous though it was like I was on a TV show, he was checking through my phone and the waiter brought our food, Elliot told the waiter to take it away and we would get it later. He looked through everything on my phone, it took ages, texts, messages, emails, calls, contacts and photos. He then started looking at the locations of my photographs, there was one of a Palace, I think its Blenheim near Stevenage. He saw this and challenged me about it as I had a boyfriend who had lived there. I told him that I had gone there on Mother's Day with my Mum and it was nothing to do with my ex. I was still crying and telling him I loved him that I hadn't done anything and that I was sorry.....That night we left [REDACTED] and as we were walking up the street he was crying and talking loudly, I was trying to calm him down. He was saying things like, "You betrayed me!" and telling me he was going to get really drunk and that I should [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]. I was crying again and we were having a really

public argument. I remember a passer by stopped and asked if I was alright. He was shouting, "You're doing this, this is your fault!"

78. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states that he does not recall this incident at Honest Burger. In oral evidence he stated that he recalled a visit to Lea Valley with PC A and her parents, and asking her whether she had been there before but he didn't remember what the answer was. His evidence in respect of attending [REDACTED] was somewhat confused. He initially said that he had only met PC A at [REDACTED] after they had split up, he then stated that he had potentially gone there during the relationship, the purpose of the visit was to get food as people do in a relationship.

Panel determination

79. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities. The panel found PC A's detailed account of the events at [REDACTED] to be credible. In stark contrast FPC Batt denies the allegation but has no clear recollection of what actually happened at either venue. The panel therefore preferred the evidence of PC A over that of FPC Batt.

Allegation of fact 1k. You regularly checked her phone and would back up WhatsApp to the server.

80. PC A's statement reads:

"That morning I went round to his and resolved the normal arguments, he would check my phone regularly now, he would back up WhatsApp to the server so he could view all my messages. This was done regularly to capture any that he hadn't yet reviewed."

"Maybe one set of shifts later (6 days) we were at his place in Lewisham, it was before an early turn and we were lying in bed, he was questioning me again about who I had spoken to while I had not been with him, he asked if he could re download my phone again."

81. Person M's statement reads:

"Another example I found would be that if PC A went on her phone then Elliot would be overlooking her shoulder looking at what she was doing. He would be actively looking and I would witness PCA showing him the phone to show him what she was looking at in a reassuring manner."

82. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states that he never looked at PC A's phone inappropriately or for improper reasons. He never backed up the phone, nor it's WhatsApp content. In oral evidence he described the last time that he and PC A were together in bed. He stated that they were both in bed looking at their own phones, when he saw a message on PC A's phone that said "you look really buff;" he asked what that was about and stated that "it wasn't the first time that he had seen stuff like that on her phone".

Panel determination

83. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities. The panel found that person M's statement strongly corroborates the evidence of PC A. The panel also found that FPC Batt's account of lying in bed looking at his own phone but happening to see a comment on PC A's phone is consistent with Person M's account of seeing FPC Batt actively looking over PC A's shoulder when she is on the phone. The panel also concluded that his comment that "it wasn't the first time that he had seen stuff like that" suggested that this was not the first time that he had checked PC A's phone.

Allegation of fact 11. If she was ever at her home, you would expect her to be on a call or a FaceTime with you.

84. PC A's statement states that whenever she went home, FPC Batt would expect her to call him and be on a call or FaceTime constantly

85. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states:

"FPC Batt did not expect PC A to call or FaceTime him if ever she was at her home. Of course they communicated frequently, they were in a relationship in which both of them liked to contact the other. An examination of their respective phones and contact will demonstrate that this allegation is incorrect."

Panel determination

86. Having already found that PC A was a credible witness and that FPC Batt had acted in a manner that demonstrated that he was distrustful and jealous of her, the panel preferred the evidence of PC A and found this allegation proved on

the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1m: You would smell her clothes to make sure that she was using the same washing powder.

87. PC A's statement reads:

"He used to smell my clothes to make sure that the washing powder smell was the same. I believe he was smelling my clothes all the time as well, once he smelt a different washing powder on me as my Mum had washed it, we had an argument about this, he accused me of cheating."

88. In oral evidence, PC A stated that her clothes, makeup and perfume were all issues for FPC Batt as he would accuse her of trying to get male attention. She described FPC Batt causing her to stop using "Febreze" with an orange fragrance on her work vests because the smell would get male attention.

89. FPC Batt's regulation 31 response states that he never checked PC A's clothes to make sure that she was using the same washing powder. He recalls one occasion when he smelt a shirt from a washing basket to check if it was clean. He did not monitor nor care about PC A's washing powder.

90. During interview, FPC Batt provides a different and somewhat incoherent response; he states that he had a wash basket in his room and his room was smelling of a different aftershave he didn't know where it had come from so he said to PC A that it must be coming from work. He stated that PC A took it very personally. He then states that he didn't know if it was his shirt or her shirt as they both have the same looking shirts and he picked it up to wash them but he didn't want to wash PC A's shirt with his. He looked at the shirt and realised that it was PC A's shirt and she said "I'll tell you what it'll be is that I added a spray to the locker and I sprayed it over my shirts and I was like right well it doesn't matter what it is, I just thought the room smelt a bit weird". He concludes by saying that he told PC A that he quite liked the smell and maybe "we should get it for the cupboard".

91. In oral evidence FPC Batt stated that he forgot to put his things in the washer dryer overnight. He smelt the shirts to see which smelt best for work.

Panel determination

92. The panel found that the credibility of FPC Batt's account was undermined by the inconsistency between his account in interview and his later accounts. The Panel had found PC A to be a credible witness and therefore preferred the evidence of PC A and found the allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1n: In October 2020 at your flat, you assaulted her by grabbing her clothes near the neck while screaming at her. You then proceeded to violently shake her and lifted her off her feet. After she left the flat, you then chased after her and said [REDACTED]. The same evening you assaulted her again by grabbing her clothing on her left shoulder with one hand and dragged her up the stairs. In doing so you started strangling her. As a consequence, her feet started bleeding. You then got angry with her while being very upset, before [REDACTED].

93. PC A's statement reads:

"The next major incident that sticks out for me was after a late turn in October, we were arguing about the normal things. Elliott had had a drink, he normally drinks whiskey. I think he had drunk two or three, he wasn't falling over the place. I lost my patience and shouted that I was fed up, that I couldn't take it any more and he was winding me up. He stopped and looked at me, he was screaming words that I can't remember. I was so scared I stopped reacting, almost went into officer safety mode. (Officer safety is training that all officers receive to keep them safe while interacting with the public in particular dangerous or violent situations). I was wearing a round neck top or a hoodie, he grabbed me with both hands by the clothes near my neck. He shook me violently for a few seconds and lifted me off my feet, he was still screaming at me almost snarling. I didn't cry, he put me down and I was shaking and full of adrenaline. I left the flat and went and sat on the stairs in the hallway to gather myself. He came running out, he was hysterically crying and apologising. [REDACTED] I was pulling him away. We had another argument as he now did not want me to speak to any male Sgts at work and to stop speaking to my Dad. I didn't want to go into it then as I was so conscious of the state he was in, [REDACTED]. We were outside for about forty minutes I think, I remember being cold and shaking uncontrollably. Then he went quiet, he started being nasty towards me saying, "You will not speak to these men." He also said that he "only wanted me to speak to him. By this point we were still arguing but he wasn't screaming anymore. We were inside the front door, somehow I ended up on the stairs, I can't remember whether I fell. He was ahead of me a couple of stairs up. He then grabbed me by the left shoulder and clothing with one hand and dragged me up the stairs, hard and fast. I was in shock, I remember just thinking I needed to stand up otherwise I was going to get really injured. I was scrabbling with my hands on the stairs trying to get purchase so I could stand up. It was strangling me by him pulling me up the stairs, I thought I would die, I thought he would kill me. He was so animated and aggressive pulling me up those stairs. When I got up, he went into the flat and I followed him in, I looked down and saw that my feet were all scraped up like gravel rash, they were bleeding. He was crying and I was trying to console him,

I just wanted him to calm down, we were on his bed saying things like, “I didn’t mean to do it.” “you make me so angry, I just care so much.” “it’s you, you make me do these things”. Then he got up and went to the kitchen, [REDACTED]. I spoke to him for ages [REDACTED].

94. In response to a question from the panel, PC A clarified the location of FPC Batt’s flat in relation to the stairs. She stated that there is corridor with the entrance doors to other flats before you get to the stairs.

95. PC McCabe’s statement provides:

“At some point, I believe around November 2020 I became aware that PC A and Elliot had separated and it was after this separation that PC A started opening up to me and disclosing more in detail about what had happened. She informed me that during the whole relationship Elliot had always been abusive towards her. She explained that the majority of the abuse had been verbal although there were incidents of physical and I remember her telling me this had included him on one occasion grabbing her around the throat and on another occasion punching her.”

96. PS Courtney Hunt completed a crime report in 2021 after PC A spoke to her about not wanting to be being posted on aid with FPC Batt and her past relationship with him. The crime report is largely consistent with PC A’s subsequent statements but in respect of physical violence the report states:

“[PC A] stated that Elliott BATT was never violent to her however made full body gestures that put her in fear.”

97. PC A provides an explanation for the information on the crime report in her statement dated 11 December 2025:

“The reason why I never mentioned in detail what PC Batt had done to me in 2021 is because when I had ended my relationship with PC Batt and I was on a new team. I had been put on aid with him PC Batt and managed to get out of it a week before.

I spoke with my line manager and asked if I could not do aid with him as I didn’t want to work with him or see him again. My line manager decided that a crime report needed to be created from what I had told them. I was asked if PC Batt had ever been physical with me and I never answered.

A sergeant approached me who I had never met before , and they told me that I need to complete a 124d risk assessment. This made me extremely upset and I didn’t want this to happen. I was trying to deal with everything that he had done to me, and I didn’t want to open up to anyone I had never met before, so I just answered the questions as blankly as possible as I just wanted it all to go away. He was still in the background, and I was very scared of what he might do. It was a very difficult time and I just wanted it all to end.

It wasn’t until I made my statement that I opened up and said everything that

had happened between us.”

98. Person M’s statement dated 9 May 2023 provides:

“It was approximately a year later that PC A called me besides herself after she was posted on aid and realised that Elliot would also be posted on the same carrier as her. It was obvious that she was in complete fear and distress at the thought of being on the same carrier as him. I believe that she spoke with a sergeant regarding this and that the sergeant informed her that she needed to put a report in about it. I am afraid I don't know much more about this other than remembering her sheer panic at the thought of completing this aid. I also believe it may be at this point she was encouraged to put a report in.”

99. Person F also gives detailed evidence about the incident described by Person M above.

100. FPC Batt’s regulation 31 response states:

“FPC Batt never strangled or assaulted PC A in any way, at any time. There was an occasion when she injured her toe when the sliders that she was wearing got bent, but that was not as a result of any assault by him.”

101. In his interview dated 18 April 2023, FPC Batt describes an incident when he wanted to leave his flat in Lewisham, but PC A prevented him from doing so and pushed him forward. PC A was wearing his “sliders” at the time and as she pushed him the slider curved over and she hit her toe. He said let’s go back inside and clean this up. He treated the injury with TCP. He states that he called his Dad to check if TCP oil was the right thing to use, and his Dad confirmed that it was.

102. In FPC Batt’s written response to caution he states:

“We did not have verbal arguments and there was no physical altercations. I never assaulted PC A”

Panel determination

103. The panel found that PC A’s account of being assaulted by FPC Batt was partially corroborated by the evidence of PC McCabe who recounts PC A informing her of being physically assaulted by FPC Batt. The panel noted that PC A’s account of the assaults by FPC Batt was detailed and credible; as was her explanation for not initially disclosing the details of the assault to PS Hunt. In contrast, FPC Batt’s account of PC A stubbing her toe and causing an injury that was serious enough for him to call

his father to check that TCP was the right thing to use to “clean it up” lacked plausibility. In the opinion of the panel, it was more probable that he sought advice on how best to clean the injury to PC A’s feet because PC A’s feet were “scraped up like gravel rash and bleeding”.

104. Further, FPC Batt’s statement in response to caution that there were no physical altercations with PC A, directly contradicts his account of PC A pushing him. His oral evidence to the panel in which he stated that he and PC A would become “frustrated” with each other and would argue directly contradicts his written statement under caution that he did not have verbal arguments with PC A. He also accepted that arguments did include disagreements over PC A getting compliments from another officer and shift patterns,

105. In light of the inconsistencies in FPC Batt’s evidence and the lack of plausibility of his account of the injury to PC A’s feet, and the partial corroboration of PC McCabe, the panel preferred the evidence of PC A and found this allegation of fact proved in its entirety on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation of fact 1. Between June 2020 and October 2020 (inclusive of both of those months) (‘the relevant period’), you subjected PC A - with whom you had a personal relationship - to controlling and/or coercive behaviour.

106. Having found all of the facts alleged in paragraphs 1a-1n proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts found proved either individually or collectively amounted to coercive and controlling behaviour as alleged.

107. In determining whether FPC Batt had engaged in coercive and controlling behaviour towards PC A, the panel reminded itself that while the behaviour alleged is akin to the criminal offence of coercive and controlling behaviour (contrary to section 76 of the Serious Crime Act 2015 (SCA)), the panel must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that PC Batt’s behaviour towards PC A was coercive and controlling in order to find this allegation of fact proved. Coercive and controlling behaviour is defined as an intentional pattern of behaviour over time in which one person exerts power and control over another, causing fear, distress or substantial adverse effects on daily life.

108. Under S76 SCA a person commits an offence of controlling or coercive behaviour within an intimate family relationship if they repeatedly or continuously engage in behaviour towards another person that is **controlling or coercive** while being **personally connected** to them, and the behaviour has a **serious effect** on the other person, which the person engaging in the controlling and coercive behaviour knows or ought to know will occur.
109. There is no dispute that PC A and FPC Batt were in an intimate relationship when the facts found proved occurred. The panel determined that the facts found proved are all examples of behaviours that are recognised as controlling and coercive in the Home Office Statutory Guidance on Controlling or Coercive Behaviour (2023). The behaviours found proved occurred repeatedly in the months June 2020 through to October 2020 and PC A and a number of witnesses provide evidence about the effect of FPC Batt’s coercive and controlling behaviour on PC A.
110. The insidious nature of the coercive control affected many aspects of PC A’s life, including her personal and work relationships, her ability to carry out her job, and to wear what she wanted to wear and go where she wanted to go with whomever she wanted. PC A was physically assaulted and describes being made to feel anxious, distressed and fearful on numerous occasions.
111. A number of witnesses provide evidence of the impact on PC A.
112. PC Lewis states *“A couple months later I became aware that PC A and Elliot had split and since then PC A met her now boyfriend. After PC A split with Elliot it was clear to me that PC A’s demeanour changed considerably. She became more outgoing and outspoken, she was more engaged with the team and her phone usage dropped massively. I had the opportunity to work with her on a few more shifts after and found her rather a pleasure to work with and she genuinely seemed a lot happier in herself.”*
113. PC McCabe states *“Whilst undertaking street duties PC A come across as a very friendly female with a bubbly and happy personality, It was around August/September 2020 that I started noticing a real decline in PC A. She would come into work constantly looking stressed and coupled with the fact of seeing her constantly being on the phone to Elliot I started feeling like something was not quite right, what was evident to me and other members of the team was PC A’s demeanour after splitting from Elliot. Almost immediately she sprung back into her normally bubbly self and was a lot happier. The phone use dropped*

dramatically and she was hardly seen to be on her phone. I did not see her earphones again. I recall her on occasion being slightly stressed at the thought of going to Brixton due to Elliot working there but other than that she was in a much better place.”

114. PC Anson-Gates states *“After the separation and PC A being rotated, I didn’t see PC A as much. I subsequently moved to a different department in December 2021 and PC A later joined my team approximately 12 months ago. On seeing PC A again it was like she was a completely different person. Everything that she was previously was on team she was the complete opposite when joining the department. I would describe PC A now as being funny, bubbly, happy and a confident female who is not afraid to speak her mind. This is completely different to how she presented previously,”*

115. Person M states *“Since the relationship has ended with Elliot, I have seen PC A become back to her more cheerful and bubbly self. I have noticed that she has become a lot more appreciative of me and will be ringing me up more wanting to go out and do stuff together. Our telephone communication has gone back to our regular 3 times a week at least. I genuinely believe that PC A being withdrawn during that period in 2020 was as a result of being with Elliot and the controlling nature he had.”*

116. The panel therefore determined on the balance of probabilities that FPC Batt’s controlling and coercive behaviour had a serious effect on PC A. The panel also determined on the balance of probabilities that FPC Batt should have known that his coercive and controlling behaviour would have a serious effect on PC A; firstly because PC A states that she told him how his behaviour was making her feel and secondly because as a trained police officer he should have been fully aware of the potential serious effects of coercive and controlling behaviour. Having found all of the elements required to prove the criminal offence of coercive and controlling behaviour proved on the balance of probabilities, it follows that the panel also found allegation of fact 1 proved.

Allegation 2

117. The AA relies primarily on the evidence of PC B and DS Julian Bates to prove this allegation of fact. The panel heard oral evidence from PC B who adopted her written statement dated 25 April 2023 as her evidence. The panel found that PC B’s oral evidence was clear, plausible and consistent with her written statement and that some elements of her evidence were corroborated by the evidence of DS Bates. The panel therefore determined that she was a

credible witness.

118. In response to cross examination, PC B confirmed that she had exchanged phone numbers with FPC Batt earlier in the evening, that FPC Batt had joined her and her team at All Bar One after she told him their location, and that they had continued to consume alcohol when they moved onto the club in Soho. She described herself as being a little drunk, 6 or 7 out of 10. She described feeling embarrassed by FPC Batt helping her to change her shoes and wanting to go and speak to her colleague Julian who was across the room. She described FPC Batt placing his hands on her waist and pulling her back, the whole incident was very quick 1-2 seconds, she brushed his hands away and went over to Julian. She didn't say anything to FPC Batt.

119. PC B recounted receiving a few missed calls from FPC Batt, but she didn't see him again that evening. She stated that she considered making a complaint at the time but she was concerned that they worked in the same department and a complaint would make her life at work difficult.

120. In response to re-examination PC B confirmed that she did not give FPC Batt permission to hold her waist, she described his action as sudden and unexpected. The force used was about 7 out of 10, he caused her to lose her balance and fall back onto him, she regained her balance, brushed his hands away and didn't say anything.

121. DS Bates' statement dated 22 January 2026 provides that he was on a "night out" with colleagues including PC B on 22 July 2022. Everyone in the group had been consuming alcohol. He recalls PC B approaching him late in the evening – she was upset, and telling him that the cause of her upset was FPC Batt. DS Bates had no recollection of the discussion that he had with PC B, but he recollects her asking him to walk her to the train station.

122. In his written response to caution, FPC Batt stated that he might have touched PC B's waist on the dance floor and when he was talking to her, but he did not touch her waist with a sexual intent. He also denied trying to prevent her from leaving by taking hold of her waist. He also stated that he did not

remember helping her to put on her shoes. FPC Batt stated in his regulation 31 response that he had no recollection of placing his hands on PC B's waist and pulling her backwards.

123. In oral evidence, FPC Batt stated that he recalled helping PC B with her shoes but he did not intend to cause her any embarrassment. He confirmed that he recollected and agreed with PC B's account of the evening save for the fact that he had no recollection of holding her waist and pulling her backwards. In response to cross examination, he described his level of intoxication as 4 out of 10; he stated that he had called PC B a maximum of two times after she left the club possibly to check that "she had got home safely". In response to re-examination, FPC Batt stated for the first time that when he said that he had no recollection he meant that the alleged incident did not happen.

Panel determination

124. The panel found that DS Bates provided some corroboration of PC B's account, in that he recalls her being upset when she joined him. And he recollects her stating that she was upset due to FPC Batt. The panel found that there were inconsistencies between FPC Batt's written and oral evidence, including not recalling putting PC B's shoes on in his written account under caution, but then recalling the incident in his oral evidence including detail such as PC B stumbling which caused him to assist with the shoes. The panel also found FPC Batt's assertion that he could remember everything about the evening apart from whether he held PC B around the waist as alleged implausible, especially as he described his intoxication level as 4 out of 10. The panel therefore preferred the evidence of PC B and found this allegation of fact proved in its entirety on the balance of probabilities.

BREACH OF STANDARDS

125. Having found all of the allegations of fact against FPC Batt proved, the panel went on to consider whether the conduct found proved either individually or collectively breached the standards alleged namely:

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

“Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

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.”

Confidentiality

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

126. In respect of FPC Batt’s conduct towards PC A, the panel concluded that by engaging in controlling and coercive behaviour towards PC A over several months and forcing her to give him access to her BWV, FPC Batt had clearly breached all of the professional standards alleged.

127. In respect of PC B, the panel found that by putting both of his hands around the waist of PC B and pulling her backwards without her consent, FPC Batt had breached the standard of authority respect and courtesy. The panel noted that the contact with PC B’s waist lasted some 2 seconds, was not sexual and FPC Batt had let go of PC B immediately when she brushed his hands away. The panel concluded that given the context of this contact, FBC Batt’s conduct towards PC B did not breach the standard of discreditable conduct.

GROSS MISCONDUCT OR MISCONDUCT

128. 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.

129. In assessing the seriousness of FPC Batt'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.

130. The Panel determined that the allegations found proved in respect of PC A were akin to the criminal offence of coercive and controlling behaviour. The Officer's culpability for his actions was high. The level of harm was also high. PC A had been caused actual physical harm and significant emotional distress by FPC Batt; and the harm to the reputation of the police service at this time of heightened public concern about Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) and misogyny in the police service was also high. The allegations were aggravated by amongst other things, the period that the behaviour continued. The panel found no mitigating factors that were relevant to the seriousness of the allegations.

131. The panel therefore concluded that the conduct found proved in respect of PC A was very serious and clearly amounted to gross misconduct.

132. In respect of PC B, the panel found that FPC Batt was fully culpable for his actions, he took hold of her waist without her express consent and as a police officer he should have known that she did not consent to his conduct. Therefore, the panel determined that the level of culpability was high. PC B described FPC Batt's behaviour as a shock and unexpected, therefore the panel determined that the level of actual harm was medium to low. The panel determined that the risk of reputational harm in all the circumstances of this case was low, given that FPC Batt's conduct was not deemed to amount to discreditable conduct. The panel found that there were no aggravating factors. The panel found that there were no mitigating factors that were relevant to seriousness.

133. The panel therefore concluded that the conduct found proved in respect of PC B was serious enough to justify disciplinary action and as such amounts to misconduct.

As FPC Batt is no longer a serving police officer and the breach of the standard found proved in respect of PC B does not amount to gross misconduct, the panel's finding in respect to allegation 2 will therefore be noted in accordance with regulations.

OUTCOME

134. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction the panel have had regard to FPC Batt's service record, the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf of the AA and FPC Batt 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.

Seriousness of the misconduct

135. In assessing the seriousness of the misconduct, the Panel have considered:

- i. The former officer's culpability for the misconduct.
- ii. The harm caused by the misconduct.
- iii. The existence of any aggravating factors.
- iv. The existence of any mitigating factors.

136. Culpability is defined as the blameworthiness or responsibility of the officer for their actions. The panel determined that FPC Batt was entirely culpable for his behaviour towards PC A: his actions were deliberate, sustained over several months, and criminal in nature. This is an allegation that falls within the category of violence against women and girls (VAWG). The panel therefore had regard to paragraph 4.62 of the guidance which provides that "*violence against women and girls perpetrated by a police officer whether on-duty or off-duty will always have a high degree of culpability with the likely outcome being severe*". The panel therefore concluded that the level of FPC Batt's culpability is high.

137. Harm can be caused in several ways; the guidance emphasises how the public might perceive such behaviour if it were to become known is a relevant factor to take

into account when making a determination of the level of harm. PC A suffered significant emotional distress, which caused her to feel anxious and afraid, and actual physical harm. VAWG and misogyny in the police service are issues of local and national concern, which have a significant impact and detriment on the standing and reputation of the profession as whole. The panel therefore concluded that the level of harm in this case was high.

138. The panel found the following aggravating factors in this case:

- The coercive and controlling behaviour was regular and repeated.
- The behaviour was continued after he realised or should have realised that it was improper.
- Multiple proven allegations

139. In considering mitigating factors the panel noted the submissions made on behalf of FPC Batt. [REDACTED]. The panel therefore concluded that there are no mitigating factors in this case that are relevant to the panel's consideration of seriousness.

Purpose of the Sanction

140. 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 are paramount.

Choosing the most appropriate sanction

141. The Panel has considered the purpose of the misconduct regime and having had due regard to all of the circumstances, including the risk of undermining public confidence in the police service, the panel considers this to be a highly serious breach of professional standards. The Panel had careful regard to the purpose of outcomes and

that they are not intended primarily to be punitive. The Panel also had regard to the need for outcomes to be proportionate.

142. In line with the outcome guidance at 7.4, the panel considered the least severe outcome first. The panel determined that a final written warning would be neither proportionate nor appropriate to address the seriousness of this case and to retain confidence in policing.

143. There is no place in the police service for officers who abuse their partners through coercive and controlling behaviour; this type of behaviour is totally inconsistent with the values of the Metropolitan Police Service. In these circumstances, the only appropriate sanction is that if FPC Batt had been a serving officer, he would have been dismissed without notice.

Commander Jason Prins

Rachel O'Connell

Mary Anne Poxton

5th June 2026