

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Joseph PRIESTMAN-BENNETT

Warrant No: P 255578

Date of Hearing: 10th July 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Honesty and Integrity – Integrity only, Orders and Instructions.

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.

The hearing was held in **Public**.

PC Priestman-Bennett did not attend the hearing and was not represented and did not supply a Regulation 54 response. However, I am satisfied that he had notice of the hearing as papers were served on him on 25th June 2026 via his Federation Representative and has voluntarily absented himself. In the circumstances I decided to proceed to deal with this matter in his absence.

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Melissa Gordedo.

1. The allegation against PC Priestman-Bennett is that whilst on and off duty, you engaged in the use of sex workers specifically for the purpose of “financial domination” also known as “findom”. In particular
 - (i) On approximately September 2023, you made electronic payments via Wishlist to a sex worker as part of “serving her”. When questioned, you confirmed that these payments were made by you stating: “Most of them definitely are”
 - (ii) On 17th June 2025, whilst on duty, you engaged a sex worker at 11.03 on the social media platform X and sent the following sexually explicit message:
 - a. “Please can I have permission to [REDACTED]? Even if its not on the call? I’m just kneeling here covered in pegs and wax lol I just realised I have this John Lewis gift card Miss. Does that earn me permission to [REDACTED]?”
 - (iii) On 2nd August 2025, you arranged and attended an in-person meeting with a sex worker in St Albans and subsequently provided her with cash as part of that arrangement.
 - (iv) You disclosed personally identifying information to at least one sex worker who advertised blackmail as part of her services. In doing so, you, as a

serving police officer, created a clear risk of blackmail and thereby exposed yourself to compromise and corruption.

This conduct was in clear contravention of the MPS Guidance on the *Use of Sex Workers and Sexual Services by Officers* and the NPCC *Sex Worker National Police Guidance*, which states that officers should not engage in any activity involving the provision of commercial sexual services that may expose them to an increased risk of corruption by virtue of blackmail.

Professional Standards of Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that PC Priestman-Bennett'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
- Honesty and Integrity – Integrity only
- Orders and Instructions

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 his 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 whether PC Priestman-Bennett whilst on and off duty, engaged in the use of sex workers specifically for the purpose of “financial domination” also known as “findom”. In particular

- (i) On approximately September 2023, he made electronic payments via Wishlist to a sex worker as part of “serving her”. When questioned, he confirmed that these payments were made by him stating: “Most of them definitely are”
- (ii) On 17th June 2025, whilst on duty, he engaged a sex worker at 11.03 on the social media platform X and sent the following sexually explicit message:
 - a. “Please can I have permission to [REDACTED]? Even if it's not on the call? I'm just kneeling here covered in pegs and wax lol I just realised I have this John Lewis gift card Miss. Does that earn me permission to [REDACTED]?”
- (iii) On 2nd August 2025, he arranged and attended an in-person meeting with a sex worker in St Albans and subsequently provided her with cash as part of that arrangement.

- (iv) He disclosed personally identifying information to at least one sex worker who advertised blackmail as part of her services. In doing so, he, as a serving police officer, created a clear risk of blackmail and thereby exposed himself to compromise and corruption.

This conduct was in clear contravention of the MPS Guidance on the *Use of Sex Workers and Sexual Services by Officers* and the NPCC *Sex Worker National Police Guidance*, which states that officers should not engage in any activity involving the provision of commercial sexual services that may expose them to an increased risk of corruption by virtue of blackmail

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
- Honesty and Integrity – Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position
- 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.

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered all the documentary evidence in particular the Officer's MG14 in which he denies the allegations in so far as they relate to the use of sex workers whilst on duty and denied causing any reputational harm to the MPS or engaging in behaviour which would amount to Discreditable conduct. I also take into account his No comment interview at Charing Cross Police Station on 4th February 2026

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

I find the particulars proven in total.

Breach of Professional Standards

I bear in mind that the burden of proving this rests upon the AA and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

I find this proven in total.

Culpability

PC Priestman-Bennett knowingly engaging with sex workers in direct contravention of the MPS Guidance on the *Use of Sex Workers and Sexual Services by Officers* and the NPCC *Sex Worker National Police Guidance*. He was responsible for his own actions.

I assess the culpability as High

Harm

His actions lead to a significant risk of blackmail and corruption. This misconduct took place on many occasions over many months.

Damage to the reputation of the MPS would be significant when known that a serving officer was breaching national and local orders and instructions and placing himself and others at risk of blackmail and physical danger.

I assess the Harm as High

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 PC Priestman-Bennett did breach of the standard of Discreditable Conduct, Honesty and Integrity (Integrity only) and Orders and Instructions and that his conduct individually and cumulatively this 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

PC Priestman-Bennett knowingly engaging with sex workers in direct contravention of the MPS Guidance on the *Use of Sex Workers and Sexual Services by Officers* and the NPCC *Sex Worker National Police Guidance*. He was responsible for his own actions.

I assess the culpability as High.

Harm

His actions lead to a significant risk of blackmail and corruption. This misconduct took place on many occasions over many months.

Damage to the reputation of the MPS would be significant when known that a serving officer was breaching national and local orders and instructions and placing himself and others at risk of blackmail and physical danger.

I assess the Harm as 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.

Mitigating Factors

There are no mitigating factors.

Conclusion on Seriousness

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

Personal Mitigation

I have taken account of a significant number of character references supplied on his behalf which attest to the Officer's better qualities. I am also 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. It was disappointing to note that a number of the referees appeared to have no knowledge of the disciplinary charges or very limited information. This further undermined their weight.

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.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

I have considered the officer's record of service.

As the matter came to the attention of the Appropriate Authority after 28th May 2025, I have to consider whether there are any exceptional reasons for me to find against the presumption of Dismissal without notice. I find that there is not.

OUTCOME:

Therefore, the sanction I impose on PC Priestman-Bennett is **dismissal without notice** and that he be placed on the College of Policing's **public** barred list

Andy Brittain

Commander

Metropolitan Police Service

10th July 2026