

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: Former DCI Soole

Warrant No: P199520

Date of Hearing: 22 July 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, 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**.

Former DCI Soole did not attend the hearing. However, was represented by his federation representative, PC Mark Scrutton. I am satisfied Former DCI Soole has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

The AA was represented by Case Manager, Aaryan Sattani. Former DCI Soole did not provide a Regulation 54 response.

Proceeding in Absence

Former DCI Soole was represented by his federation representative, PC Mark Scrutton, who confirmed DCI Soole was served with the papers for this hearing and he was aware of today's proceedings. I am satisfied that he has voluntarily absented himself from today's proceedings. Under Regulation 57, I am satisfied it is reasonable in these circumstances to proceed in the former DCI's absence.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Mr Sattani.

The Allegations

The following conduct was committed whilst you were a serving police officer.

Allegation 1:

Between 10 May 2025 and 12 November 2025, you used an MPS-issued mobile telephone to send and receive personal, intimate and sexually explicit messages, without a policing purpose and contrary to MPS ICT policy.

Particulars:

- i. You exchanged personal, intimate and sexually explicit messages using your MPS-issued mobile telephone. For example:
 - a. “[REDACTED EXPLICIT]” which was delivered on or around 09:47hrs on 24 June 2025;
 - b. “[REDACTED EXPLICIT]” which was delivered on or around 09:43hrs on 24 June 2025
 - c. “[REDACTED EXPLICIT]” which was delivered on or around 09:51hrs on 24 June 2025
- ii. This conduct occurred over a prolonged period between May 2025 and November 2025;
- iii. The messages were sent and received whilst both on and off duty.

Allegation 2:

Between 10 May 2025 and 12 November 2025, you used an MPS-issued mobile telephone to arrange and facilitate meetings of an intimate nature within police buildings, for purposes unconnected with policing duties.

Particulars:

- i. You used your MPS-issued mobile telephone to communicate with two female colleagues about meeting at Holborn Police Station and Kentish Town Police Station;
- ii. The content and context of those messages indicate that the proposed meetings were personal and intimate in nature rather than for a policing purpose;
- iii. The messages reveal a consistent pattern of arranging in-person meetings, in police buildings, with an emphasis on privacy, locked offices and avoiding interruption. For example:

- a. "I'm limited in what I can say on your job phone concerning things I'd like to do" which was received on or around 13:35hrs on 27 May 2025;
- b. "Promise your door locks?" / "Yep" which was received/sent on or around 12:22hrs on 30 May 2025;
- c. "Actually 12th is better as it's in complete darkness... and LDSS have locked the key away" which was sent on or around 15:42hrs on 8 August 2025;
- d. "Risk of collateral intrusion" which was received on or around 16:07hrs on 8 August 2025;
- e. "New location identified"/ "I'm very keen to be sorted out and put in my place"/ "Come over now then and delay for 20 mins"/ "I can't today and on route already...He tracks my 360 for progress on homeward journeys"/ "Haha 360 would show Holborn police station, so that ties in with a quick meeting" which was sent/received on or around 14:25 on 10 November 2025.
- f. "True, were I not already headed home x...But definitely works for another days and I'm very keen to allow things I've wanted to before but couldn't" which was received on or around 14:33 on 10 November 2025.

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) 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.

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 Former DCI Soole

- Former DCI Soole used an MPS issued mobile phone without a proper policing purpose on numerous occasions between the 10 May 2025 and 12 November 2025 to communicate with two female officers and a female member of the public.
- Former DCI Soole exchanged 715 messages with Female A, over 300 messages with Female B, and 18 messages with Female C. The communications were personal, inappropriate and/or sexual in nature.
- The messages included, but were not limited to, former DCI Soole arranging to have separate sexual encounters with the two female officers, including Holborn Police Station and Kentish Town Police Station. The messages indicate that former DCI Soole deliberately used his MPS issued device. He knew it was wrong.
- Former DCI Soole provided his MPS issued mobile phone for download after he had factory reset it on the 13 July 2025. He had entered an incorrect access code too many times. On review of the download, the messages subject to the allegations were discovered.

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
- **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

- Former DCI Soole accepts both allegations, on the basis that the evidence is irrefutable evidence of his conduct. He does make it clear that all interactions with the women in question were consensual. The officer communicated this through his federation representative PC Mark Scrutton.

In line with Regulation 61(7) and 61(8) I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority and the representations made by PC Scrutton.

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary evidence (namely the extraction download reports from the MPS device) as well as the representation on behalf of former DCI Soole by PC Mark Scrutton.

Accordingly, I have found the facts proven as outlined above.

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 AA and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

I am satisfied that the AA has discharged that burden and the conduct did breach the standards of professional behaviours as outlined previously.

Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make an assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors.

I consider the allegations individually and cumulatively. The Appropriate Authority addressed me on seriousness and contend that the conduct amounts to gross misconduct as the conduct is deliberate, intentional and caused serious harm to the reputation of the police.

I have carefully considered the submissions by both parties/the Appropriate Authority. I find that Former DCI Soole's conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

Culpability is high – Former DCI Soole’s conduct was intentional and deliberate. Former DCI Soole knowingly used his MPS issued mobile phone without a proper policing purpose to effectively cover up his sexual communications with Females A, B and C. Former DCI Soole used his device to engage in and coordinate sexual encounters on police premises and beyond. The messages were also exchanged on and off duty.

Harm – is high. Former DCI Soole’s conduct causes serious harm to the reputation of the police service. His behaviour clearly contravenes his police duties and responsibilities. He was in a leadership position and should have been aware that his conduct has far-reaching implications not only on public perception but also on junior officers, who would have considered him a role model. The public would be rightly appalled by former DCI Soole’s conduct. They would expect any serving police officer to conduct themselves with utmost professionalism, particularly when on duty. Former DCI Soole’s actions demonstrated a disregard for his professional duties and his colleagues.

Aggravating features – I have considered that there are additional aggravating features, namely there were multiple incidents. This conduct was persistent and took place over a sustained period of time.

Mitigating features – I do not consider that there are any mitigating features present.

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 considering Regulation 61(15), I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards do amount to gross misconduct.

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 note this case does involve a former officer and no representations as to exceptional circumstances were made on behalf of former DCI Soole by his federation representative PC Scrutton.

I have considered the officer's record of service.

This case is based upon what amounts to irrefutable evidence from the facts as outlined by the Appropriate Authority.

The only available sanction is dismissal without notice. I am satisfied had the officer still been serving he would have been dismissed without notice.

OUTCOME:

Having considered the matter fully and having regard to the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, had Former DCI Soole still been a serving police officer, he would have been **dismissed without notice** and is to be placed on the College of Policing's barred list.

Former Police Commander Katie Lilburn

Metropolitan Police Service

22 July 2026