

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

OFFICER X

OFFICER CONCERNED

1. This hearing was held on 22 June 2026 at Palestra House, London. The Panel consisted of Mr Colin Attree (Chair), Ms Placida Ojinnaka and Mr Pradeep Agrawal Independent Panel Members. Ms Dale Simon was the Legally Qualified Advisor to the Panel.
2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Mr Alex Maunders and the officer concerned was represented by Ms Tilly Taylor.

THE ALLEGATIONS

3. The allegations facing Officer X are set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon her under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. These are:
 1. You knew or should have known, the MPS policy on declarable associations that sets out personnel must always declare an association where they know, believe, or suspect that the association has: (i) persons with criminal convictions and cautions ... (ii) persons charged with a criminal offence.

Allegation 1

2. That Witness A was someone convicted of a criminal offence.
3. Witness A was an 'association' of yours under the terms of the MPS declarable association policy set out in (1).

4. That you knew, believed, or suspected that Witness A had been convicted of a crime.
5. That you did not declare this association to Witness A as required per the MPS declarable association policy set out in (1).

Allegation 2

6. That Witness B was someone who had been charged with a criminal offence.
7. Witness B was an 'association' of yours under the terms of the MPS declarable association policy set out in (1).
8. That you knew, believed, or suspected that Witness B had been charged with a criminal offence.
9. That you did not declare this association with Witness B as required per MPS declarable association policy set out in (1).

Allegation 3

10. That on 6 June 2018 at 13:37 you sent to a friend, Witness C, a picture of a zombie knife take from a suspect you had apprehended.
11. That this was an unauthorised disclosure of information relating to an investigation because Witness C was a civilian, unrelated to any police investigation.
12. It is contended, with reference to the above, that your behaviour does not meet the standards required by the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, specifically:
 - a. in respect of all of the allegations the standards of Duties and Responsibilities and Discreditable Conduct; and
 - b. in respect of just allegation 3 the standard of confidentiality.
13. Your conduct as set out above, both individually and taken together, amounts to gross misconduct.

PRELIMINARY ISSUES

4. In accordance with pre-hearing directions the cipher of Officer X was used to protect the identity of the officer concerned. On the morning of 22 June 2026 counsel for the AA also requested that ciphers were used for the named associations in respect of Allegation 1 and Allegation 2 to avoid the jigsaw identification of Officer X. It was directed that the ciphers of Witness A and Witness B would be used in respect of allegation 1 and 2 respectively.
5. Counsel for the AA also advised the Panel that the AA were no longer proceeding with allegation 3, therefore this allegation was withdrawn. It followed that the alleged breach of the professional standard of confidentiality was also withdrawn.

CASE SUMMARY

6. It is alleged that Officer X had declarable associations with Witness A and Witness B as they were both associates of Officer X and the officer knew, believed or suspected that they had been charged, cautioned or convicted of a criminal offence. Officer X accepts (with hindsight) that she should have completed a declarable association form in respect of Witness A and Witness B. She also accepts that her behaviour amounted to misconduct and breaches of the SPB 'Duties and Responsibilities; Discreditable Conduct). She denies gross misconduct.

EVIDENCE

7. 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 Officer X in accordance with Regulation 30 and Officer X'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, amounting to 215 pages

- A defence character bundle consisting of 7 character references and details of 2 commendations.
- The submissions made on behalf of the AA and Officer X.
- The legal advice provided by the LQA

THE PANEL'S APPROACH

8. 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.
9. In considering whether the burden of proof has been satisfied in this case the Panel also had regard to the character references submitted on behalf of Officer X and her previous good character which positively support the credibility of her account.

FINDINGS OF FACT

10. The Panel found the allegations of fact in respect of allegations 1 and 2 proved by way of admission.

BREACH OF STANDARDS

11. Having found all of the allegations of fact against Officer X proved by way of admission, the Panel went on to consider whether the conduct found proved either individually or collectively breached the standards alleged namely:

Duties and responsibilities: Police officers will be diligent in the exercise of

their duties and responsibilities.

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.

12. The Panel found that by failing to disclose her associations with Witness A and Witness B Officer X had clearly breached the standards alleged. The Panel also noted that Officer X accepted that her conduct had breached the standards alleged.

GROSS MISCONDUCT OR MISCONDUCT

13. 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.
14. In assessing the seriousness of Officer X'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.
15. It was submitted on behalf of the AA that the conduct found proved amounted individually and collectively to gross misconduct.
16. Counsel for Officer X submitted that the admitted breaches of the professional standards amounted to misconduct only.

17. The Panel determined that Officer X was fully culpable for her actions in that she had failed to disclose her declarable associations with witnesses A and B, however, the Panel found that her non-disclosure was not deliberate or intentional which lessened the seriousness of her conduct.
18. In respect of harm the Panel found that public confidence in the police was unlikely to be significantly undermined if the public were aware of the circumstances of this case. The Panel had regard to Officer X's good character and accepted Officer X's account of the nature of her relationship with witness A and Witness B. Officer X had first met these witnesses when she was aged 14. Witness A was in effect the friend of a friend who had been convicted of serious offence in 2012, and Witness B was a casual friend who had been charged, tried and acquitted for an offence of battery in 2013. The Panel therefore concluded that the risk of reputational harm to the police service was low.
19. The Panel found that the following aggravating factors were relevant in this case:
- Multiple proven allegations and breach of the standards - Officer X failed to declare her association with two individuals and had breached two standards namely duties and responsibility and discreditable conduct.
20. The Panel found that the following mitigating factors were relevant in this case:
- An element of threat that may have affected the officer's judgment – Officer X states in respect of Witness A that she was fearful for her safety as she did not know what he was capable of.
 - Mental ill health, disability, medical condition or stress that may have affected the officer's ability to cope with the circumstances in question – [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
 - Open admissions at an early stage- Officer X made full admissions during her first interview in 2023
 - Evidence of genuine remorse, insight and/or accepting responsibility for one's actions

21. In light of the above findings in respect of seriousness the Panel concluded that the level of seriousness in this case was medium. The Panel therefore determined that the breaches of the standards of professional behaviour were so serious as to justify disciplinary action and as such amounted to misconduct.

OUTCOME

22. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction the Panel have had regard to Officer X's service record, the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf the AA and Officer X 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

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

- i. The 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.

24. For the reasons detailed above the Panel found that the level of seriousness of the misconduct found proved was medium.

Purpose of the Sanction

25. The Panel kept in mind at all times the threefold purpose of imposing sanctions, namely: (a) maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; (b) upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; (c)

protection of the public. Of these, the maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service is paramount.

Choosing the most appropriate sanction

26. In line with the outcome guidance at 7.4, the Panel considered the least severe outcome first. The Panel noted that the purpose of the Declarable Association Policy is to safeguard the integrity of Met officers and staff, to prevent actual or perceived compromise of persons and intelligence belonging to the Met or other law enforcement agencies coming into the possession of the organisation, and to enhance public trust and confidence in the Met. Although, the Panel had concluded that the risk of reputational harm in the circumstances of this case was low, the Panel determined that a written warning would be neither proportionate nor appropriate to address the seriousness of the misconduct found proved and to uphold high standards in policing and deter other officers from acting in a similar manner.
27. In these circumstances, the Panel concluded that the only appropriate sanction in this case was that of a final written warning. In determining the appropriate length for this order, the Panel had regard to the protracted length of the proceedings and determined that a final written warning for a period of 3 years was appropriate.

APPLICATION TO LIFT RESTRICTIONS ON PUBLICATION.

28. Counsel for the AA invited the Panel to lift the reporting restrictions in respect of the name of the officer, now that the proceedings had concluded and finding a misconduct had been made. In making this application, counsel for the AA relied primarily on the home office guidance and the principles re-affirmed in *R (Newsquest Media Group Limited) v The Legally Qualified Chair of the Police Misconduct Tribunal and others* [2022] EWHC 299 (Admin) at paragraph 45(a)-(g).
29. The application was opposed by counsel for Officer X who reminded the Panel that, the original decision to grant anonymity for Officer X was granted on the basis of the likely impact of publication on Officer X's health and wellbeing. Officer X had always

indicated her acceptance of the facts and that her conduct amounted to misconduct, therefore the outcome in this case had not changed the defence position.

30. In considering the application the Panel had regard to the submissions made and the legal advice from the LQA. The Panel determined that there was evidence to suggest that publication of the officer's name was likely to have "*a severe adverse effect on the officer's health*" and as such these concerns outweighed the public interest in publishing the officer's identity. In the opinion of the Panel the publication of the outcome report which includes the nature of the misconduct found proved and the sanction was sufficient to maintain high standards in the police service and deter repetition. The application the lift the reporting restrictions was therefore refused.