

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: FPC Justin Tanija

Warrant No: P 261682

Date of Hearing: 10th July 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct

Finding

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started. I am satisfied that the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been served. These are matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.

The hearing was held in Public

FPC Justin Tanija did not attend the hearing, but I am satisfied that he was aware of this hearing, was served the required notice of hearing, and has voluntarily absented himself with no discourtesy to the proceedings. Accordingly, I decided that it was appropriate to continue this hearing in his absence.

The Appropriate Authority was represented by Molly Nairn and the Former Officer by his Federation Representative [Redacted] who raised an application for an adjournment of this Accelerated Misconduct Hearing as a preliminary issue. This application centred on the recent lodging of an application for leave to appeal against conviction by the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) and seeking to adjourn this AMH until the resolution of that appeal

I have listened very carefully to the representations made on FPC Tanija's behalf but ruled against adjourning this matter for the following reasons:

- (i) This is conviction case where the officer was represented at trial and where a jury has returned a unanimous Guilty verdict on 4th June 2026.
- (ii) I have reviewed the College of Policing's Guidance on outcomes and paragraph 4.19 which states that I cannot question the conviction or the sentencing imposed.
- (iii) As noted above FPC Tanija has lodged a notice of appeal with the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) which has been acknowledged by a receipt dated 2nd July 2026 and was included in the bundle of papers before me.
- (iv) [Redacted]
- (v) The application for leave to appeal is currently with the relevant section in the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) office and is under consideration.
- (vi) We have no timescales for when the matter might be considered by the Single Judge. Furthermore, there is no certainty that leave to appeal would be

- granted. Even if it were granted this would usually be on an “arguable grounds” basis which of itself does not guarantee a favourable appeal in the longer term.
- (vii) With the uncertainty of both the timescales and likely outcome it seemed to me that adjourning this AMH for an indeterminate period was neither reasonable nor proportionate.
 - (viii) Delay is not in line with the principles of expedition embedded within Part V of the Police Misconduct Regulations 2020 as amended.

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Molly Nairn.

The allegation against FPC Tanija is that on 4th June 2026 at Harrow Crown Court he was unanimously convicted by a jury of one Count of Sexual Assault contrary to Section 3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. He was sentenced on Friday 3rd July 2026 to a 9-month sentence of imprisonment suspended for two years with conditions. He is also subject to the Notification requirements.

Particulars:

- i. The offence took place during a Personal Protection Safety Training (PPST) session at Hendon. During a multi-officer lift exercise, you inappropriately touched a female colleague. You were formally charged with this offence on 6th December 2023. You entered a plea of Not Guilty, however following a trial, you were convicted by a unanimous jury. This conduct represents a serious breach of the standards expected and resulted in a criminal conviction.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that FPC Tanija’s actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely:

- Discreditable Conduct

In that your conduct may bring the police service into disrepute and damage the relationship of trust and confidence between the police and the public.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, your conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct, and your dismissal may be justified.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities that FPC Tanija on 4th June 2026 at Harrow Crown Court was unanimously convicted by a jury of one Count of Sexual assault contrary to

Section 3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and was sentenced on Friday 3rd July 2026 to a Suspended sentence order of 9 months imprisonment suspended for 18 months with specified requirements. The specifics of the sexual touching were that the female officer was in leg restraints for training purposes and FPC Tanija ran his hand up her inner thigh towards her crotch.

Particulars:

- i. The offence took place during a Personal Protection Safety Training (PPST) session at Hendon. During a multi-officer lift exercise, he inappropriately touched a female colleague. He was formally charged with this offence on 6th December 2023. He entered a plea of Not Guilty, however following a trial, he was convicted by a unanimous jury. This conduct represents a serious breach of the standards expected and resulted in a criminal conviction.

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether they amount to breach of the following standards of behaviour:

- 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

FPC Tanija has filed a Regulation 54 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations response to the effect that he maintains his denial of the offence and has lodged an Appeal against conviction with the Court of Appeal Criminal Division.

FPC Tanija did not attend to give evidence.

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary evidence including FPC Tanija's PACE interview under caution on 13th July 2022 in which he provided a Prepared Statement and thereafter answered No comment.

I remind myself that the burden of proving the case is on the AA and the standard of proof is the civil standard i.e. the balance of probabilities.

Having considered all the evidence, I am satisfied the particulars of the allegation is proven to the civil standard.

Breach of Standards of Professional Behaviour

I then have to consider whether the facts proved amount to a breach of standards. It is for the AA to prove breach of standards on the balance of probabilities.

I am satisfied that the AA has discharged that burden and that the actions of FPC Tanija as described above did breach the standards of Professional Behaviour as to Discreditable Conduct. My reasons for this are as follows:

- That within the papers there is a certificate of conviction

I now go on to make a provisional assessment of seriousness by reference to the College of Policing's Guidance on outcomes

Culpability - High

FPC Tanija was convicted of a Sexual assault (Sexual touching under section 3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003) after a jury trial. This offence occurred in the workplace where the victim, a serving officer, should have felt safe.

FPC Tanija was responsible for his own actions.

Harm – High

It is unacceptable for police officers who are responsible for enforcing the law to break the law (Para 4.17). Sexual offences are particularly serious and likely to terminate an officer's career. Such offending involves a fundamental breach of the public's trust in police officers and inevitably brings the profession into disrepute (Para 4.20)

FPC Tanija would be well aware that his conduct amounted to criminal conduct.

The public would not expect a serving officer to behave in this way.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the Standards. of. Professional.Behaviour so serious that it could justify dismissal. Applying that definition, I am satisfied that FPC Tanija's breach of the standards of Discreditable Conduct does amount to gross misconduct

Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I adopt the three-stage process, as outlined in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings to determine the appropriate sanction.

The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the conduct.

This is assessed by reference to:

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

The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

I remind myself this has three elements:

- i. To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
- ii. To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and
- iii. To protect the public.

I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils that purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.

I start by assessing the seriousness of the conduct:

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

Culpability

FPC Tanija was convicted of a Sexual assault (Sexual touching under section 3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003) after a jury trial. This offence occurred in the workplace where the victim, a serving officer, should have felt safe.

FPC Tanija was responsible for his own actions.

I therefore assess the culpability as High

Harm

It is unacceptable for police officers who are responsible for enforcing the law to break the law (Para 4.17). Sexual offences are particularly serious and likely to terminate an officer's career. Such offending involves a fundamental breach of the public's trust in police officers and inevitably brings the profession into disrepute (Para 4.20)

FPC Tanija would be well aware that his conduct amounted to criminal conduct.

The public would not expect a serving officer to behave in this way.

In this case, the harm is therefore High

Aggravating Factors

When considering aggravating factors, I am mindful not to double count matters that have already formed part of my assessment of harm and culpability.

Accordingly, there are no aggravating factors in this case.

Mitigating Factors

There are no mitigating factors beyond this being a single episode (albeit of significant seriousness).

Conclusion on Seriousness

Taking all these matters into consideration, I assess the seriousness of the conduct as High.

Personal Mitigation

I am mindful of the limits to the weight I should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceeding, and that the interests of the police service, and the protection of the public, are more important than those of the individual officer.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

I have reminded myself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case.

I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

I do acknowledge that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect: accordingly, the outcome should be no more than necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings. Therefore, in deciding the appropriate outcome I shall consider less severe outcomes before more severe outcomes and shall impose the least severe outcome that deals adequately with the issues identified, whilst protecting the public interest.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

I have considered the former officer's record of service.

As FPC Tanija is a former officer there are only two findings that I can make – either he would have been dismissed if still serving or he would not have been dismissed if still serving.

I have considered the matter fully, including the nature and severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

OUTCOME:

My decision is that the gravity of FPC Tanija's behaviour means that I do not consider that had he remained a serving officer that any sanction less than dismissal without notice would have been justified. Therefore, the sanction would have been dismissed if still serving and to be placed on the College of Policing's public barred list

Commander Andy Brittain

Metropolitan Police Service

10th July 2026