

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: CI Kevin Weeden

Warrant No: P197826

Date of Hearing: 14 July 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Authority, Respect and Courtesy, Orders and Instructions, Equality and Diversity, Duties and Responsibilities.

Findings

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started, along with viewing both the edited and unedited digital material. 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**.

CI Weeden has attended the hearing and was represented by Counsel, Mr Felix Keating and supported by his federation representative PS Joe Ross. CI Weeden provided a Regulation 54 response.

The AA was represented by Counsel, Mr Kevin Saunders and Case Manager, Mr Aaryan Sattani. I am satisfied CI Weeden has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

The Appropriate Authority applied for permission to amend the allegations. In exercising my case management powers under Regulation 61(1) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, I carefully considered the extent of the amendment and took the view that the amendment did not prejudice the officer concerned. I also note there was no objection on behalf those representing the officer concerned. Accordingly, I allowed the Appropriate Authority to make the requisite amendment.

The Allegation

At all times of the alleged conduct below, you were a Chief Inspector and/or a senior manager within the Major Operations & Training Unit at MO6 Public Order Command.

Allegation 1: Abuse of Position for a Sexual Purpose

It is alleged that between August 2024 and February 2025, you abused your position for a sexual purpose in respect of a female Police Constable [Redacted] your junior.

Particulars:

- i. During this period, you pursued a sexual and/or emotional relationship with the officer, including sending communications of a personal and intimate nature expressing romantic intent.
 - a. On a date after the [Redacted] 2024, you sent the following message, ““Hi [Redacted] bet you weren't expecting this text today!!! Can we go out to dinner, no deep and meaningful chats just fun and enjoy ourselves. It's clear we both still have feelings for each other. [Redacted] I know you have an opinion of yourself but I see YOU and I like what I see. I know what I'm asking of you. I don't need an answer now, I'll give you as much space as you need, please seriously think about it. x”
 - b. You also sent the following message, “Oh and I just wanted to kiss those lips of yours so lucky you didn't come up...”
- ii. You stated in interview you were in a “situationship” with the officer and admitted to sending personal messages and providing a significant personal gift.
- iii. You sent emails and messages to the officer which were personal and inappropriate in tone, including referring to her as:

- a. "my favourite person"
 - b. "a silly sausage"
- iv. During the same period, the officer worked with you on at least 24 occasions, including at least 19 deployments, placing her under your direct supervision and command.
- v. You failed to declare your perception of a relationship or manage any conflict of interest, and you took no steps to prevent the officer working under your direction.
- vi. You facilitated and encouraged the officer working under you, and communications demonstrate preferential treatment, including:
 - a. arranging or supporting her deployments
 - b. requesting items or opportunities for her;
 - c. indicating you would justify such actions.

It is alleged that your conduct demonstrates that you used your position, rank and supervisory authority to initiate control and/or pursue a sexual/emotional relationship, thereby creating and exploiting a clear power imbalance.

Allegation 2: Unwanted and Persistent Contact

It is alleged that between November 2024 and February 2026, you engaged in persistent, unwanted and inappropriate communications.

Particulars:

- i. The junior officer sent you the following message, "The messages need to stop now as well as trying to follow me on Instagram etc. it's causing me so much stress especially when I have said before I want to be left alone. Please stop texting me or talking about me to anyone, I just want to be left alone. It's upsetting. I thought my not replying was clear".
- ii. She also sent you the following, "'I can't and don't want a relationship so maybe it's best that I stop working for/with you. you talk about boundaries a

lot and I thought I'd made mine clear but it doesn't feel I have. The constant messages about how you feel do overwhelm me and the gifts are too much for me. I feel a massive amount of pressure to do and be something I'm not comfortable with and I've told you that a million times".

iii. You continued to contact the junior colleague on multiple occasions:

- a. 20 November 2025: "Hi [Redacted], just wanted to say something small. I've respected the space and there's no pressure from me at all. If you ever want to reconnect at any point, you're always welcome to reach out. Take care."
- b. 1 January 2026: "Hi [Redacted], I'm not looking for a reply but just wanted to wish you a Happy New Year and hope you are ok".
- c. 11 January 2026: "Hi [Redacted], at your pace I'd like to reconnect, slowly. I know you'll need space and will pull back and go quiet at times and I'm ok with that, I didn't understand before but I do now. I'd carry on with my life and when you felt safe enough you could reconnect. I'd be there when you came back. I know it will be really hard but reach out when you are able to, if you don't I will leave you alone now and won't chase x"
- d. 7 February 2026: "[Redacted] it was good seeing you the other day even if a passing encounter. Can you unblock me, lets [sic] start just chatting again. I miss the good times we had and would love to work things through, if you are open to it. I miss your random questions even the ones in the middle of the night. I want you as you are. I see your worth but it's whether you will let me show you your worth. Ive [sic] always prouded [sic] myself on being able to solve things, i need your help with this. That's ok. I have no clue how to solve this but i know i want to be with you. just give me your best that's all I want, it will be enough as know it's coming from you and is your best. I would also like to talk through what path to take re my career. I value your opinion. Also I'm an outside shot to be silver for the next huge Tommy R protest/nakba day. If I am I want you to consider [Redacted], I need someone I can trust. Yes I have [Redacted] but want you. Look I have no idea what to do, I'm not desperate this is a choice. all I know I want to share my life with you. X"

It is alleged that, taken together, your conduct amounted to persistent and unwanted contact, which you knew or ought reasonably to have known was unwanted.

Professional Standards of Behaviour

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

- (i) Discreditable Conduct
- (ii) Authority, Respect, and Courtesy
- (iii) Orders and Instructions
- (iv) Equality & Diversity
- (v) Duties and Responsibilities

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.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Mr Saunders and the submissions on behalf of CI Weeden by Mr Keating.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the allegations against CI Weeden.

- CI Weeden abused his rank [Redacted] to attempt to pursue an inappropriate

sexual/emotional “situationship” with a junior female colleague between August 2024 and February 2025.

- Following her withdrawal of consent to contact, he engaged in a persistent unwanted communication between October 2025 and February 2026, even using ChatGPT in assisting him in his further pursuits.
- CI Weeden abused the authority vested in his rank and entirely failed to treat his junior colleague with respect.
- CI Weeden knowingly bypassed mandatory force policies designed to protect the integrity of the service and safeguard personal relationships and behaviours in the workplace.
- CI Weeden failed to declare or manage the conflict of interest and expressed that he wished to continue deploying her as he ‘wanted’ her. Documentary evidence establishes that no declaration of his perceived relationship was made to the Appropriate Authority or Professional Standards.
- CI Weeden abandoned fairness and impartiality in his supervisory duties, electing to use his rank to provide unearned preferential treatment and “*workplace advantage*” to a young female officer solely because he was sexually/romantically pursuing her.
- CI Weeden is an officer of 29 years’ service. He had completed his APSP e-learning, yet pursued an emotional/sexual relationship with an officer [Redacted] his junior.
- CI Weeden allowed his personal, sexual and emotional desires to distort his operational decision-making and supervisory responsibilities.
- CI Weeden used official Metropolitan Police Service email systems to send communications to Officer A, who worked directly under his command on 24 occasions, that were inappropriate and devoid of any policing purpose. CI Weeden’s actions lacked professional judgement.
- On the 20 November 2025, CI Weeden was given a written warning for similar

conduct. That allegation centred around WhatsApp exchanges with another junior female colleague.

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether it amounts 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.
- **Authority, Respect and Courtesy** - Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy. Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.
- **Orders and Instructions** - Police officers only give and carry out lawful orders and instructions. Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders.
- **Equality and Diversity** - Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.
- **Duties and Responsibilities** - Police officers are diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities. Police officers have a responsibility to give appropriate cooperation during investigations, inquiries and formal proceedings, participating openly and professionally in line with the expectations of a police officer when identified as a witness.

Officer's position

- CI Weeden has provided a response under Regulation 54 and adopted that response as his evidence in chief. Therein, CI Weeden admits that he sent the messages which form part of the sub-allegations, though he disputes the messages at 1(i)(a) was sent on or around the 26 November 2024. He acknowledged that he hoped a romantic relationship would develop between him and Officer A. However, CI Weeden disputes that he abused his position in order to pursue a relationship with Officer A. He did not give her preferential treatment.

- CI Weeden gave a detailed account as to the schedule of the officers he would use [Redacted]. CI Weeden gave evidence as to [Redacted] availability on the records, setting out how he did not favour Officer A.
- CI Weeden admitted in his interview under caution that he had given Officer A a necklace around Christmas time in (2024). CI Weeden did not accept that this was inappropriate.
- CI Weeden accepts that the emails sent to Officer A were personal in tone. However, he did not accept that they were inappropriate.
- CI Weeden explained that Officer A was 'bread crumbing him', she would reach out to others in relation to him and in turn he would contact her.
- CI Weeden did not accept that his style of communication in messages was inappropriate. In fact, CI Weeden did not accept that the messages were inappropriate. The messages were a reflection of the particular circumstances and perceived relationship between CI Weeden and Officer A.
- CI Weeden did not know why he selected specific messages to enter into ChatGPT. He simply wanted to understand how he could best understand Officer A.

In line with Regulation 61(7) and Regulation 61(8), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority and from those representing CI Weeden.

[Decision on Finding](#)

I have applied Regulation 61(15) and carefully listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary evidence provided to me. I have also carefully considered the evidence of CI Weeden, his Regulation 54 response, and the representation made on his behalf by Mr Keating.

Overall, I have found the facts proven as outlined by the Appropriate Authority. I have heard from CI Weeden and in my view his account was not credible and I will address my reasons in detail below.

At the outset, I noted CI Weeden's demeanour in giving evidence. He appeared to have

what I can only describe as a selective memory when it came to his recollection of events. Whilst he was unable to recall on a number of occasions why messages had been saved by him or why communications with Officer A had occurred, he could recall very specific details of non-contentious matters during the same time period, f.ex., on the 7 August 2024, when he utilised a driver from Gravesend.

I have found that CI Weeden abused his position for a sexual purpose. CI Weeden pursued an inappropriate relationship with Officer A, an officer [Redacted] his junior, and failed to declare or properly manage this conflict. There was a clear power-imbalance between CI Weeden and Officer A, yet CI Weeden kept pursuing Officer A. He did not distance himself to maintain professional integrity. Ultimately, it was Officer A who had to do so, feeling overwhelmed by his continuous advances. (p.193 Bundle) CI Weeden repeatedly selected Officer A to work for him, despite his clear feelings for and expressed towards Officer A.

Whilst I take into account CI Weeden's evidence as to the availability of his 'go-to' [Redacted] and [Redacted], CI Weeden put his sexual or personal desires above operational integrity by selecting Officer A, an officer for whom he harboured emotional/sexual desires for and he kept the perceived relationship concealed.

On the evidence before me, I do not accept that a casual mention of the 'situationship' to Chief Superintendent Williams in 2024 amounts to a proper declaration, even on multiple occasions. I understand that enquiries were made with Chief Superintendent Williams. No material arising from those enquiries was deemed disclosable by the Appropriate Authority on the basis that it does not undermine the Appropriate Authority's case or assist CI Weeden's case.

CI Weeden, as part of operational management, would have been aware of the duties and obligations pertaining to his rank, including a proper declaration of the perceived 'situationship' as an association. Further, CI Weeden asserts he did not declare the perceived 'situationship' to his line manager, on account of a dispute relating to a policy change. In my view, even if CI Weeden was uncomfortable reporting to his direct line manager on account of an unrelated work dispute, he was fully aware of his obligations to declare his association and he did not do so.

CI Weeden has 29-years' experience within the Metropolitan Police Service ('MPS') and his role involves enforcing standards. Accordingly, he would have been aware of MPS Policies, which require police officers to report any association with any individual that may pose a risk to their integrity. In my view, that is clearly applicable here. CI Weeden allowed his emotional desires to impact his operational decision-making and compromise his integrity, by repeatedly selecting

Officer A to work under him, despite the clear conflict; making a request for equipment for Officer A, claiming "I will find a way to justify it" (p.38 Bundle), and obtaining a work advantage for Officer A by supporting her deployment to work with Inspector [Redacted] (p.38 Bundle), referring to Officer A as his 'Number 1 [Redacted]' (p.46 Bundle), which CI Weeden described as a 'tongue and cheek comment', and adding her to his team, stating on the 8 January 2025, it was 'impossible for anyone to be more suitable... getting your name added'. (p.47 Bundle)

I noted, CI Weeden did not accept that he arranged for Officer A to work with Inspector [Redacted], however, he went on to thank Inspector [Redacted] as he had 'accepted his advice'. In my view, that creates an irresistible inference that CI Weeden was not candid in his account and that he in fact supported Officer A's deployment to Inspector [Redacted] command.

Further, CI Weeden asserted that his attempt to obtain a coat for Officer A was not done in an attempt to pursue a relationship, he did so for a number of other colleagues. He also remarked the coat was not acquired in the end. I do not accept that the reason for obtaining a coat will be the same on every occasion. In the circumstances of this case, on the evidence before me, it is demonstrative of preferential treatment, specific to his pursuit of a relationship with Officer A.

CI Weeden gave evidence that his APSP course covered abuse of position but only in relation to members of the public. I have reminded myself of the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes and in particular 'Abuse of Position or Authority' at paragraph 4.45 which makes reference to the power imbalances, including those arising out of positions of responsibility. I have also had regard to the APSP training documentation provided to me - Chief Constable National Counter Corruption advisory group (p.262 Bundle) and NPCC Guidance (Bundle p.55). In my view, CI Weeden would have been aware that not only should he have reported his perceived relationship with Officer A in the circumstances, but also that his conduct towards Officer A could amount to an abuse of position.

Moreover, CI Weeden gave Officer A a Christmas gift which she returned (Bundle p.192). CI Weeden adopted a very familiar tone in his message and email exchanges with Officer A. In his messages, CI Weeden made clear advances, telling Officer A he wanted to 'kiss those lips' (p.118 Bundle) and asking her out for dinner, stating; 'It's clear we both have feelings for each other'. CI Weeden referred to Officer A as a 'silly sausage' and as his 'favourite person'.

I also note, that all contacts and communications between CI Weeden and Officer A take place in a work-related context. There is no evidence before me from either the Appropriate Authority or the officer concerned that shows a relationship between both parties outside of the work structure.

It is entirely tied to CI Weeden's ability to operate in his command position.

In my view, CI Weeden's conduct plainly lacks professionalism and in circumstances where Officer A was under his command on at least 24 occasions, I can only conclude that CI Weeden has abused his position for a sexual purpose.

Therefore, taking into account the submissions from both parties and all of the above, I find allegation 1 proven.

I have then gone on to consider the alleged unwanted and persistent contact. At the outset, I acknowledge that there are messages between CI Weeden and Officer A that appear uncontroversial. (Example - Bundle p.202) However, I did take the view that CI Weeden tried to reconnect with Officer A multiple times. (Example Bundle p.201)

I also noted that on the messages before me, and I am mindful that this is a selection of screenshots, Officer A only initiated contact once, letting CI Weeden know she'd be running late for work. (Bundle p.201).

I am deeply troubled by CI Weeden's evidence that if Officer A didn't want him to contact her, she should have blocked him everywhere. CI Weeden drew a distinction between only being blocked on WhatsApp and not iMessage or his number being blocked. CI Weeden described Officer A as 'bread crumbing' him and then went on to clarify it was 'indirect bread crumbing', i.e., Officer A approaching others in relation to CI Weeden so he would then in turn contact her. In my view, CI Weeden plainly disregarded the boundaries expressed by Officer A and deflected responsibility. He is the senior officer. It is highly unlikely that Officer A, a junior officer, would block a senior officer permanently on all forms of communication. CI Weeden had a duty to consider his position in circumstances where he was explicitly told about the pressure Officer A was feeling on account of his behaviour and the need for boundaries that were not respected. (p.193 Bundle)

CI Weeden was told by Officer A to cease contacting her, yet he persisted on a number of occasions over several months, as alleged.

In my view, CI Weeden has demonstrated a lack of insight when it comes to the conduct alleged and his previous misconduct. CI Weeden repeatedly attempted to justify his actions that resulted in a Written Warning he received in November 2025. The conduct alleged was similar in nature to the present matters, against another female officer. In my view, CI Weeden's previous conduct is relevant, in that it demonstrates that CI Weeden has a propensity to disregard boundaries, and inappropriately message junior female officers.

Moreover, CI Weeden utilised ChatGPT to provide him with strategic guidance how to resume his perceived 'situationship' with Officer A despite being told to seize contact. He ventilated his frustrations within ChatGPT, including setting out that he was upset being told by Officer A not to contact her anymore and being 'soft blocked'. CI Weeden was not in a position to explain why he took screenshots of particular messages to input into ChatGPT. CI Weeden suggested he wanted to better understand Officer A. However, in my view, that is not borne out within the extracted ChatGPT material.

CI Weeden appears unable identify boundaries or respect them. Accordingly, I am satisfied that allegation 2 is made out.

Breach of Professional Standards

In line with Regulation 61(16), I bear in mind that the burden of proving Breach of Standards rests upon the Appropriate Authority and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden and the conduct did breach the standards of professional behaviour as to

- i) Discreditable conduct, in that, the allegations found would bring discredit the police service and undermine public confidence. Individually and cumulatively, CI Weeden failed to adhere to the standard when he abused his position for a sexual purposes and engaged in persistent and unwanted contact with Officer A.
- ii) Authority, Respect and Courtesy, in that, police officers must act with self-control and tolerance, treating colleagues with respect and courtesy, and must not abuse their powers or authority. In finding the allegations proven as set out above, CI Weeden failed to adhere to this standard in relation to Officer A.
- iii) Orders and Instructions, in that, police officer abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders. CI Weeden failed to declare his perceived relationship with Officer A and failed to abide by force policies, despite being arguably well-trained and alive to his obligations as CI.
- iv) Equality and Diversity, in that police officers act with fairness and impartiality. In conferring benefits, demonstrating preferential treatment, including by

selecting Officer A for duties and responsibilities, CI Weeden failed to act with impartiality and fairness.

- v) Duties and Responsibilities – police officers are diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities. CI Weeden breached this standard when he put his personal desires over his duties and responsibilities as a senior leader in the MPS.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the *Standards of Professional Behaviour* so serious to justify dismissal. Applying that definition and in line with Regulation 61(15), I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards do amount to gross misconduct.

Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make an assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors. I have carefully considered the submissions on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and the representations on behalf of CI Weeden during the course of this hearing.

Culpability is high – The conduct was premeditated and deliberate, CI Weeden was responsible for his own actions. He failed to declare and/or manage the conflict of interest arising out of his perceived relationship with Officer A. CI Weeden's conduct was targeted, he encouraged Officer A to work under his direct supervision and actively intervened to secure preferential treatment, opportunities, and police resources for her. He abused his position for a sexual purpose. CI Weeden engaged in a campaign of unwanted and persistent contact. He utilised an AI tool to provide him with strategic guidance on how to resume the perceived relationship with Officer A.

Harm – is high. CI Weeden's conduct caused direct harm to Officer A (as expressed at p.193 Bundle). Further, CI Weeden's conduct causes serious harm to the reputation of the police service. CI Weeden was aware of the standards expected from him as a serving police officer and in particular, an officer in senior leadership.

CI Weeden's conduct undermines public confidence in policing at a time when the police and specifically the Metropolitan Police are aiming to demonstrate how seriously it is

tackling higher standards over the last few years following highly publicised and damaging incidents.

Aggravating features – I am mindful not to double count or take to consideration any factors that have already featured in my determination of culpability and harm. I do not find any additional aggravating features.

Mitigating features – I do not find any mitigation features.

Personal mitigation

I have been provided with personal mitigation on behalf of CI Weeden, in particular five-character references and five commendations. I took into account references as to his professionalism and the positive features describe by his female colleagues.

However, 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 Proceedings, and that the interests of the police service, and the protection of the public, are more important than those of the individual officer.

Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I bear in mind that the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025 ("The 2025 Regulations") came into effect on the 28 May 2025.

The 2025 Regulations amend Regulation 62 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ("The PCR") so that, where gross misconduct is proven against a serving officer, the panel must dismiss the officer unless there are exceptional circumstances.

I have considered the officer's record of service.

This case is based upon what amounts to irrefutable evidence in the form of digital evidence.

I have carefully assessed the seriousness of the conduct and the personal mitigation advanced, as set out above, and I do not find any exceptional circumstances.

Therefore, the only available sanction is dismissal without notice and I am satisfied that it is the only appropriate sanction in this case.

OUTCOME:

Having considered the matter fully and having regard to the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, the sanction I impose is **dismissal without notice** and the officer should be placed on the College of Policing's barred list.

Deputy Assistant Commissioner Galvin KPM

Metropolitan Police Service

14 July 2026