Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Kheava Gould-Ryan

Warrant No: P267367

Date of Hearing: 23 June 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Authority, Respect and Courtesy

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.**

PC Gould-Ryan attended the hearing and provided a Regulation 54 response.

PC Gould-Ryan was represented by Counsel, Ms Claire Robinson and his federation representative, PC Chris Brinsley. The AA was represented by Counsel, Mr Stephen Morley and Case Manager, Mr Shane Hanna. I am satisfied PC Gould-Ryan has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

The Allegation

On the 19 September 2024, you were on duty at Charing Cross Police Station.

Whilst engaged in a conversation with a BBC reporter, who was working undercover as a Detention Officer, you were told about a 'tiny' juvenile who was in custody and who had been abusing police officers when you said the following (or similar words):

"Just fucking leather him, why would you not";

"If he's a little lad, just fucking elbow, smack, get in there, lay the fuck down, go to sleep"; and

"I'm surprised someone's not PAVA'd him, that would be funny to see".

Your language trivialised the use of force on detainees and suggested you condone the use of unreasonable force and found it amusing that a juvenile would be sprayed with PAVA in custody.

Your behaviour breached the:

‘Authority, Respect, and Courtesy’ paragraph of the Standards of Professional Behaviour because your behaviour was disrespectful and discourteous and indicated you did not respect the rights of detainees; and

‘Discreditable Conduct’ paragraph of the Standards of Professional Behaviour because your behaviour was likely to bring discredit upon the police service and/or undermine public confidence in the police service.

Your breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour was so serious that they amount to gross misconduct.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Mr Morley and the representations made on behalf of PC Gould-Ryan by Ms Robinson.

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 PC Gould-Ryan.

During his undercover filming Mr Bibb recorded PC Gould-Ryan on 19 September 2024 when he was on duty and talking about the use of force on a detained child.

The full recorded conversation takes place between 00:36 minutes into the recording and 00:51 minutes into the recording. The interaction between PC Gould-Ryan and Mr Bibb lasts approximately 14 minutes. The offensive comments are made between 00:42 and 00:43.

The comments in reference to a 17-year-old detainee are;

“Just fucking leather him, why would you not”;

“If he’s a little lad, just fucking elbow, smack, get in there, lay the fuck down, go to sleep”; and

“I’m surprised someone’s not PAVA’d him, that would be funny to see”.

PC Gould-Ryan’s comments trivialise the use of force on a child; encourage the use of unreasonable force on a child; and express views that using inappropriate force on a child would be ‘fun’ or entertaining to see.

Moreover, at 00:46:26, PC Gould-Ryan goes on to comment that the people he deals with are ‘pricks.’

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.

Officer's position

PC Gould-Ryan admits that he made the comments alleged.

PC Gould-Ryan accepts that the language he used appeared to trivialise the use of force on detainees; suggested that he condoned unreasonable use of force and that he found it amusing that a juvenile might be sprayed with PAVA in custody.

PC Gould-Ryan accepts the conduct alleged amounts to discreditable conduct and a breach of the standard of authority, respect and courtesy.

PC Gould-Ryan avers that the breach amounts to misconduct only, not gross misconduct.

In line with Regulation 61(7) and Regulation 61(8), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority, from those representing PC Gould-Ryan and PC Gould-Ryan himself as to his education and career within the Metropolitan Police Service.

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, and video evidence provided to me, including the representations on behalf of PC Gould-Ryan, and PC Gould-Ryan himself as to his conduct in September 2024 and his continued service whilst on restricted duties within the Metropolitan Police Service.

PC Gould-Ryan expressed that he was 'disgusted' when he heard the comments he made. He does not believe use of force should be trivialised. PC Gould-Ryan has considered why he made the comments at the time. However, he cannot offer an explanation as to why he made the comments in question. PC Gould-Ryan confirms he's never used PAVA, or his baton, or discharged his taser.

I have also considered the differences between the wording of facts as outlined by the Appropriate Authority and the transcript of the comments made by PC Gould-Ryan. I am of the view the minor discrepancies do not make a difference to my assessment of the facts, nor do they cause unfairness to the officer's case.

Overall, I have found the facts proven as outlined by the Appropriate Authority.

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 discreditable conduct, authority, respect and courtesy.

Assessment of Seriousness

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

The Appropriate Authority addressed me on seriousness and contend that the conduct amounts to gross misconduct as the conduct is deliberate, PC Gould-Ryan alone was responsible for the comments he made, which trivialised force being used on a vulnerable 17-year-old in custody, and suggesting he found it amusing. PC Gould-Ryan's comments undermine public confidence.

The Appropriate Authority concedes that the comments made by PC Gould-Ryan are limited to an isolated incident.

I have carefully considered the submissions by the Appropriate Authority, and I have considered the submissions on behalf of PC Gould-Ryan and the evidence given by PC Gould-Ryan. He does not advance any excuse for his conduct in September 2024. He cannot offer an explanation for his conduct but impresses that it is not a reflection of his true thoughts or beliefs. It was also noted that at the time, he returned to work following paternity leave and a study period at university. PC Gould-Ryan understands and was/is aware of the standards expected of a serving police officer. He understood he has a duty of care to people in custody.

Culpability is high – PC Gould-Ryan's conduct was deliberate. Whilst I accept that this incident was an isolated incident, PC Gould-Ryan alone was responsible for the comments he made. He chose to trivialise the use of force by the words used. In the video, PC Gould-Ryan expressed that he would find force being used against this 17-year-old detainee funny.

Harm – is high. PC Gould-Ryan's actions were unprofessional and cause harm to the reputation of the police service. PC Gould-Ryan was aware of the standards expected from a serving police officer.

Although the footage was not aired as part of the Panorama program, I do find the comments made by the officer 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 have considered that there are no additional aggravating features as I am mindful not to double count or take to consideration any factors that have already featured in my determination of culpability and harm.

Mitigating features – PC Gould-Ryan accepted his conduct and made early admissions. He does not seek excuse or justify his comments, showing insight into his conduct. These comments appear to have been made in isolation. PC Gould-Ryan is of good character.

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 having undertaken an assessment of seriousness, I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards do amount to gross misconduct.

Personal mitigation

I have been provided with personal mitigation on behalf of PC Gould-Ryan, particularly it is highlighted that he was under significant personal pressures at the time, although he does not seek to excuse his actions. He is an officer with an otherwise unblemished service record and I am told PC Gould-Ryan's actions are not a reflection of his true character.

I have been provided with a character bundle, containing 12-character references, which describe him as a dependable and capable officer, with a positive and proactive attitude.

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, particularly video evidence. I have also borne in mind PC Gould-Ryan's own admissions as to the conduct.

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 **public** barred list.

Commander Andy Brittain

Metropolitan Police Service

23 June 2026