

IN THE MATTER OF A MISCONDUCT HEARING
B E T W E E N:

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS
Appropriate Authority

-and-

PS Matthew Jones P198907
Subject Officer

NOTICE OF OUTCOME OF POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING
(REGULATION 43(1) POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020) as amended.

This conduct matter came to the attention of the appropriate authority on **21st May 2025**, as agreed by both parties at the outset of the hearing.

Officer concerned: **PS Matthew Jones** (“the Subject Officer”).

Appropriate Authority (“AA”): The Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis

Date of hearing: 15th- 19th June 2026.

Panel Chair: Commander Andy Brittain

Independent Panel members (IPMs): Dr Nigel Westwood and Ms Patricia Richardson.

Legally Qualified Advisor (LQA): Ms Judith Seaborne.

Legal counsel for the AA: Mr Montu Miah.

Legal counsel for the subject Officer: Mr Thomas Daniel

Federation Representative for the subject Officer: PS Andy Swift

Relevant regulations: The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (“2020 Regulations”) as amended.

Summary of Hearing

1. The misconduct alleged was set out in full in the Regulation 30 notice. In general terms, it related to unwanted conduct (of a sexual nature) complained of between December 2024 (prior to in respect of allegation 2) and April 2025 which breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour of Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.

2. The Panel found the factual allegations not proved and dismissed the allegations.

Representation

3. Throughout the misconduct proceedings and hearing, the AA was represented by Mr Montu Miah. (counsel) and the Officer was legally represented by Mr Thomas Daniel (counsel).

4. **The Factual Allegations**

The Panel was referred to the Regulation 30 notice wherein it was alleged in respect of **PS Matthew Jones**

5. **Alleged facts**

Allegation 1:

(i) PS Jones used language and/or behaviour towards Ms H that amounted to sexual harassment in the workplace,

(ii) PS Jones's conduct towards Ms H violated their dignity and/or created an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating, and/or offensive environment for them in the workplace,

Allegation 2:

PS Jones made inappropriate sexual and misogynistic comments and/or exhibited inappropriate behaviour concerning female colleagues in the workplace,

If proved, the allegations amount to gross misconduct for the following reason:

- a) *The conduct would be a breach of the standards of professional behaviour: Authority, Respect and Courtesy; and Discreditable Conduct; and that.*
- b) *The breach of the standards of professional behaviour is so serious as to justify dismissal.*

6. **Standards of Professional Behaviour**

The Appropriate Authority contended that the aforesaid conduct breached the following Standard of Professional Behaviour (Schedule-2, 2020 Regulations):

Authority, Respect and Courtesy - Police Officers should act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

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.

The alleged behaviour described above was assessed by the AA as Gross misconduct and so serious as to justify dismissal.

7. Preliminary Issues

This hearing was conducted pursuant to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as amended, in Public.

Anonymity had been granted by the Chair for the complainant witness, [REDACTED] ('the complainant'), appearing in this matter for the AA. The cipher 'Ms H' was adopted for the complainant. References to the name, however, remained undisturbed where they appeared within the documents and evidence. Screens were also granted for the complainant to enable her to give her 'best evidence' at the Hearing.

A further witness, PS Navraj Dusanjh also appeared in this matter for the AA. No anonymity was granted for PS Dusanjh, but screens were granted, to enable him to give his 'best evidence' at the Hearing.

On 3rd June 2026 the Chair determined (upon an application by the subject Officer) that any 'character references' that spoke to the Officer's conduct in the workplace could be admitted and read (as agreed, by the AA which did not dispute the contents thereof) in PART 1 (Finding of Facts) of these proceedings. The Chair referenced that across multiple appellate authorities, the High Court has been unequivocal that 'good character' evidence can be considered at the fact-finding stage, and in the interests of a fair and transparent hearing, compliant with the principles of natural justice, he considered the credibility and propensity of the subject Officer to be an issue for the

Panel to determine in the context of its deliberations as to its 'Finding of Facts' in PART1 of these proceedings.

8. Evidence

9. The Panel was referred to the Hearing Bundle consisting of 60 pages, the Officer's bundle (including his Regulation 31 response) consisting of 63 pages, the Officer's character bundle consisting of 46 pages and additional disclosure (as requested by the Officer in his Regulation 31 response) consisting of 75 pages.
10. During the misconduct hearing the Panel heard live evidence from PS Navraj Dusanjh, Ms H, DS Steven Camp, PC Katie Jones and the subject Officer PS Matthew Jones. The Panel considered the subject Officer's MG14 response dated 22nd August 2025, and his Regulation 31 response dated 16th December 2025 together with his live evidence at the hearing.
11. The Panel additionally received an Opening Note from the AA and two further statements together with an agreed 'function' document from 'WhatsApp'. The further MG11 statements provided to the Panel from PS Nav Dusanjh and Ms H were dated 17th June 2026 and were in response to inquiries by the Panel concerning missing 'WhatsApp' messages and the meaning of a message response from PS Nav Dushanjh shown in a screenshot dated 3rd April 2025.

12. FINDINGS OF FACT

PS Jones denied the allegation in its entirety. It therefore fell to the Panel to determine the facts on the evidence presented to it. The Panel's findings are set out below.

In coming to its conclusions, the Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof remains on the AA throughout and the standard of proof is on the balance of probabilities. All decisions made by the Panel were made in accordance with this burden and standard of proof.

The Panel considered all the evidence presented in this case, including the accounts provided in writing, and evidence provided orally during the hearing.

13. **The Panel found Allegations 1) and 2) not proven on the balance of probabilities** on the basis:

14. Allegations 1(i) and (ii) concerned the witness Ms. H only. Ms H and PS Nav Dusanjh were witnesses of fact in respect of these allegations which were alleged to have occurred on 5th December 2024, 13th March 2025 and 3rd April 2025.

Allegation 2 concerned Ms B, Ms M and Ms C, but the only witness of fact as to these occurrences was PS Nav Dusanjh.

The witnesses to the allegations were Ms H, PS Nav Dusanjh, the subject Officer and DS Camp. Some agreed 'first disclosure' evidence was provided by a statement from Caroline Partington in the form of an email dated 19th June 2025.

In light of the denials as to the facts alleged, the credibility of all witnesses was in issue for the Panel to determine.

15. The Evidence.

The evidence of Ms H.

The Panel found Ms H to be an unremarkable resolute witness, save for her use of florid descriptors, colourful language and moments of distress when giving her evidence.

Ms H gave live evidence from behind a screen at the hearing and was cross-examined by Mr Daniel for the subject Officer.

Ms H adopted her statement of 8th July 2025 as her evidence in chief. This witness focused on three incidents arising on 5th December 2024, 13th March 2025 and 3rd April 2025.

The chronology of this witness reporting the conduct alleged in particulars 1(i) and 1 (ii) of the allegation was as follows.

1. Email from Ms H to PS Dusanjh dated 28th April 2025 Exhibit ---/03, detailing the rudeness of the subject Officer and his annoyance that Ms H had to be asked twice by him 'if she was ok'.

2. Dissemination Report dated 7th May 2025- sent anonymously.

3. Email dated 29th May 2025 from Ms H to Nav Dusanjh and forwarded on the same date by PS Dusanjh to Simon Robson of the MPS Professional Standards Department (PSD). PS Dusanjh anonymised Ms H's email before forwarding it by redacting the "From" (i.e. sender) email address.
4. Email from Caroline Partington to the Investigating Officer [IO] dated 19th June 2025 detailing this witness's first disclosures to her regarding the conduct of the subject Officer.
5. MG11 statement dated 8th July 2025.
6. Undated Word Document titled 'Matt Jones' Exhibit KJH/01.
7. Self-selected screen shots of personal messages exchanged between Ms H and PS Nav Dusanjh Exhibit KJH/02 on 3rd April 2025 only.
8. MG11 Statement dated 17th June 2026.

16. Status of Ms H's relationship with PS Nav Dusanjh.

Ms H denied being in a romantic/sexual "relationship" with PS Nav Dusanjh and stated that she would have declared any romantic relationship with him but did not do so as they were "simply very good friends".

Ms H maintained that she only became aware of rumours circulating within the workplace concerning their relationship status approximately six months ago i.e. January 2026. She denied emphatically that she was aware of the rumours in 2024 or 2025.

When she became aware of the rumours, her evidence was that she denied them but did not question who started them. She conceded she was "*angry*" about there being rumours when they were just friends and she agreed it was "*quite an embarrassing thing to happen*". Ms H gave evidence that she did not assume or conclude that the subject Officer had started the rumours.

Ms H was aware that the subject Officer had warned PS Nav Dusanjh to 'wind it in' in reference to her relationship with PS Nav Dusanjh.

The subject Officer's account (confirmed by PS Nav Dusanjh at the hearing) was that that he had told PS Nav Dusanjh about the rumours and to tone it down in 2024/2025. PS Nav Dushanjh also confirmed in evidence that he told Ms H when he found out about the rumours from the subject Officer. He was the one to break the news to Ms H and she was upset and swore.

The evidence of DS Camp covered the conversation between himself and PS Nav Dusanjh when DS Camp was accused of spreading the rumours sometime after September 2024. According to the evidence, PS Nav Dusanjh had only shared his relationship status with two people- DS Camp and the subject Officer. DS Camp denied spreading the rumours, leaving PS Nav Dusanjh to conclude *"it must have been Matt"*.

It was further noted by the Panel that the Investigating Officer [IO] Lucy Jordan had raised the point with Ms H in September 2025, upon receipt of the subject Officer's MG14 response.

The Panel found Ms H's evidence to be contradictory and less than truthful as to when she became aware of the rumours.

17. Rumours of Ms H's relationship with PS Nav Dusanjh. (subject Officer's bundle)

Page 29 MG11 Ann Walters dated 22/01/26 "Around January 2025, I started noticing Nav and [Ms H] would be openly flirty towards each other whilst in the office. Prolonged eye contact, sitting in each other's personal space, discrete shoulder and arm touching, long periods of time out of the office together and whispered conversations".

Page 42 MG11 Lisa Wickstead dated 21/01/26 (i) "With regards to Nav Dusanjh and [Ms H] being in a relationship I can only go by rumours that this appears to be the case". (ii) "I did witness Nav and [Ms H] in the same car together coming into work and parking in the Old Farm Road car park..." (iii) "Rumours have been circulating for some time regarding Nav and [Ms H] being in a relationship. I heard that they come to work together, sit together and go to the gym"

Page 46 MG11 Steve Camp dated 23/01/26 "I have also been asked to clarify if I was aware of a relationship between Nav and [Ms H]. On one occasion that I believe was in September 2024, I was in the office with Nav and [Ms H] and was seated in between them. I became aware that on several occasions when I left the office and returned, they would have moved their chairs close to each other and appeared to be in deep quiet conversation. I didn't immediately think too much of it, but the fact that it happened several times made me start to suspect something".

Page 48 MG11 Sarah Nunn dated 23/01/26 "I was asked if [Ms H] and Nav were in a relationship to which I responded neither party had ever said that they were however how they behaved in the office left me to assume they were."

Page 52 MG11 David Eaton dated 03/02/26 "I remember one shift being sat in the middle and Nav had told [Ms H] all about home life/marriage and she sat there with a smile on

her face saying she was giving him a counselling session and should charge him. I remember this day as I said to him 'wow Nav as a man you have really opened up today and I could never do that'. As the shifts went by the talking and flirty chat/ behaviour became more apparent to me, some shifts I was literally ducking whilst they spoke and used me as piggy in the middle to settle battles about favourite milkshake flavours or if not liking a toby carvery made you a snob. This was noticed by other staff who were performing the VFD role and would say to me why do I always have the people come to me and that they should stop flirting and help out. It appeared the staff on the office floor had noticed they were close.

Page 55 **MG11 Sue Leonida-Layton dated 18/01/26.** I can confirm I had heard rumours [Ms H] and Nav were in a relationship together, but I was not and am still not able to confirm if this is true. However, I had witnessed on multiple occasions them chatting whilst in close proximity to each other and acting in a flirtatious manner. They would also be locked in deep conversations throughout the day. Nav often seemed to seek out [Ms H] and would chat to her but would not necessarily engage with the other supervisors present. [Ms H] had also at times seemed to seek out Nav during the working day and both would not be around for some time".

Page 57 **MG11 Sophie Lugar-Mawson Undated** (i) "When working with both [Ms H] and Nav Dusanjh I have felt incredibly uncomfortable and excluded owing to how they conduct themselves together in the office. They sit close together whispering, laughing and flirting and regularly go off together for extended periods of time." (ii) "I did not think it was appropriate for Nav Dusanjh to line manage [Ms H] for a period of approximately 1 month whilst the T2 supervisor, Siobhan McCarthy, was on a period of extended leave."

18. Private WhatsApp messages

In June 2025, Ms H gave evidence that she initially understood that DPS wanted her to hand over her phone for examination and she refused. Her evidence was that she did not speak to PS Nav Dusanjh about this and that he made his own individual decision regarding the handing over of his phone without speaking to her.

Ms H was cross-examined about an email dated 8th July 2025 from Ms H to the IO in the 'Disclosure' bundle in which Ms H said, *"I have spoken to Nav and he would prefer to provide screenshots regarding our conversations"*.

Ms H went on to say that she didn't remember speaking to Nav, but this "possibly happened".

A second request was made by DPS in January 2026. She refused to hand over/export all the messaging between herself and PS Nav Dusanjh, as they were private and were not relevant to the conduct allegations. She provided self-selected screenshots of messages between

them from 3rd April 2025. On this occasion, Ms H was adamant that she had not spoken to Nav Dusanjh about this request as she had been told by the Investigating Officer not to.

Ms H was referred to a message on page 51 of the Hearing bundle (a screenshot) which was signed off '*Miss you xx*'. It was put to her that she had inadvertently failed to crop this message to remove the sign-off but denied having done so.

With reference to page 37 of the hearing bundle, Ms H maintained that she treated PS Nav Dusanjh the same as anyone else. She accepted that sometimes she would arrive at work in the same car as him and confirmed that she had said she would send him a picture of her in a Halloween costume as a zombie nurse, as stated by DS Camp.

The Panel considered the refusal by both witnesses to export the WhatsApp messages exchanged between themselves to indicate a desire by Ms H and PS Desanjh to conceal the true nature of their relationship. Both witnesses confirmed they messaged each other frequently and disclosing their WhatsApp messages would be an obvious way to confirm that they were "simply very good friends", rather than being in a romantic/sexual relationship.

The self-selected provision of WhatsApp messages from 3rd April 2025 by Ms H was brought into sharp focus during the hearing, arising from a query from the Panel and resulted in the making of Ms H's further statement dated 17th June 2026.

The Panel noted a substantial gap in the screenshots (Pages 49-50 Hearing bundle) of approximately 50 minutes between the messages supplied. Ms H was recalled to give evidence arising from her statement in which she stated those messages had now been deleted as she had activated a 'disappearing messages' function on WhatsApp. Based on agreed 'evidence' as to WhatsApp functionality, she was challenged that this functionality was not retrospective and she was being untruthful and had, in fact, deleted the 'missing' messages herself. She denied this.

The refusal to disclose fully all messaging between Ms H and PS Nav Dusanjh relevant to the allegations proved problematic for the Panel throughout these proceedings. The Panel accepted there was no means by which to force these witnesses to provide their private messages.

The AA's reliance however on self-selected messages by Ms H, with obvious gaps on relevant dates (3rd April 2025) gave rise to the suspicion that the witnesses did not want to expose the full context of their conversations or indeed their relationship. The Panel chose not to rely on the self-serving messages of 3rd April 2025 as corroborative of any allegation arising on that date.

19. 5th December 2024 incident.

Ms H was cross-examined about the differences between her accounts.

1. Email dated 28th April 2025 Exhibit KJH/03, detailing the rudeness of the subject Officer and his annoyance that Ms H had to be asked twice by him 'if she was ok'.
2. Dissemination Report dated 14th May 2025- sent anonymously.
3. Anonymous email dated 29th May 2025 from Ms H to Nav Dusanjh and forwarded on the same date to Simon Robson of PSD.
4. MG11 Statement of 8th July 2025.

In Ms H's first report of the conduct of the subject Officer in Exhibit KJH/03, she makes no mention of any inappropriate sexual conduct.

The account given by Ms H on 29th May 2025 was materially different from that in her MG11 witness statement dated 8 July 2025. For example, in her earlier account Ms H stated "I was walking past him, I was wearing a skirt, and I could see him just staring at my legs, he had this look on his face, almost salivating as he was looking at me. I sat down on my chair, and he came over towards me". In her later MG11 witness statement, Ms H stated "I was sitting by the window at one end of the supervisor's bank of desks and Nav at the other, leaving an empty desk between us. At some point I have noticed Matt acting bizarre and he has approached, having taken the spare chair between myself and Nav and sat really close to me".

She agreed the versions were completely different, but her evidence was that her later statement of 8th July 2025 was correct.

The Panel found the inconsistencies in the accounts, together with omissions embellished in later accounts to be stark.

In her MG11 statement of 8th July 2025, she described sitting next to the subject Officer who was 'frothing at the mouth, behaving like a dog on heat, salivating and rubbing his thighs. He then touched her skirt and rubbed it between his fingers. PS Nav Dusanjh was present and nearby.

Ms H confirmed in evidence that PS Nav Dusanjh did not intervene and said nothing to address the behaviour of the subject Officer.

Ms H was cross-examined about emails sent to the subject Officer by her after this incident (email 16.2.25 -Officer's bundle page 15/ email page 23 Officer's bundle- saving seats for him on two occasions).

In evidence, Ms H conceded that she was saving seats for the subject Officer and herself to sit together.

After disagreeing at first, when it was put to Ms H again that she would sit with a female supervisor in preference to sitting with the subject Officer if the subject Officer had been sexually harassing her, Ms H said, *"Agreed"*.

On 25th March 2025, Ms H and the subject Officer exchanged WhatsApp's about a haircut, and she hoped he was feeling better and sent a smiley face. According to Ms H, this was after all but one of the allegations had occurred.

20. 13th March 2025 incident

Page 39 of Hearing bundle *'Corr, you'd get it'*. Ms H gave evidence that this was said to her by the subject Officer in the open-plan office. PS Nav Dushanjh was not present but several other were present on the victim focus desk. Ms H provided the IO with the names of 19 persons who were present and within earshot of the remark. These persons were asked by the IO whether they heard the remark, and their answers were presented in the Disclosure bundle. Eighteen stated positively that they had not heard the remark, and one stated they could not recall any conversation between Ms A and the subject Officer on that day.

Ms H stated she 'froze', said nothing and complained to no-one.

Ms H was again cross-examined about messages she exchanged with the subject Officer after this incident (Officer's bundle page 25) on 25th March 2025, 12 days later- joking about a haircut. Ms H gave evidence that this was all about "keeping the peace" as she had to continue to work with the subject Officer. She could not recall when she told PS Nav Dusanjh about this incident.

21. 3rd April 2025 incidents

Pages 39-40 Hearing bundle.

Ms H gave evidence that the subject Officer took hold of her photo-ID on its lanyard and said- *"I'll save that for the wank bank later"*.

Ms H described how on 3rd April 2025 she accompanied the subject Officer to the 15th floor to search for his wife's body harness in the female locker room. Despite making no allegations

of improper words or conduct on the part of the subject Officer, she described being so scared of the subject Officer that she was “*shitting herself*” during this interaction.

Inconsistencies were again highlighted in cross-examination from Ms H’s previous versions of events (Hearing bundle pages 31/32). Ms H maintained that her statement dated 8th July 2025 (6 weeks later) was the correct version. Ms H gave evidence that PS Nav Dushajh was by then aware of the incidents on 13th March 2025 and 3rd April 2025.

Ms H was again referred to cordial messages she exchanged with the subject Officer on 3rd April 2025 (Officer’s bundle page 27), maintaining it was in her best interests to “keep the peace” to sustain a professional relationship with the subject Officer.

Ms H was taken to the first report she made about the subject Officer’s behaviour on 28th April 2025 (Hearing bundle page 52) in which she makes no mention of any sexual harassment, but describes PS Jones as being “rude”, “aggressive” and “quite difficult to work with”. Ms H said she wanted it documented, as the subject Officer’s mental health had been deteriorating over the past few weeks. She said she did not initially think the incident in December 2024 was necessarily assault or harassment at the time, but her complaint had nothing to do with the fact the rumours about her relationship with Nav were ‘hotting up’.

When pressed in cross-examination, Ms H said, “*I saw him once in Manchester and it was for 10 minutes*” Apart from that, Ms H denied ever meeting PS Nav Dushanjh outside work.

In answer to questions from the Panel, Ms H said the December 2024 incident came out of the blue and there was no inappropriate behaviour by the subject Officer towards her prior to this. Ms H elaborated on her being ‘scared’ of the subject Officer. She believed he was “fixated” with her. He wanted her for himself and hated it when she wasn’t giving him attention. She described how in 2025 he always wanted to sit next to her. She described being aware he had a gun and she was worried he would shoot her. She described being very wary of him after the incident in December 2024. Ms H described the subject Officer’s insistence that she accompany him to the female Officer’s locker room, despite another staff member, Sue Leonida-Layton, volunteering for the role. She gave evidence that nothing happened, but she was ‘*shitting herself*’.

22. Inconsistencies and inaccuracies.

Ms H was taken through a number of inconsistencies in her various accounts of the facts. Ms H insisted her statement of 8th July 2025 was the correct version of events, despite this version being the most remote from the incidents themselves. Ms H insisted this was the case as

when she made her MG11 witness statement on 8th July 2025, she was being asked questions by an Officer trained in taking witness statements, whereas when preparing her version dated 29th May 2025 “I’m typing this not thinking straight” and “my head was all over the place”.

The witness was challenged as to the fact that she ‘saved seats’ for the subject Officer to sit next to her according to messages disclosed, despite complaining that he frequently invaded her personal space and always wanted to sit next to her throughout 2025. (Page 22 Officer’s bundle- 13th March 2025)

23. Collusion

The Panel observed that there appeared to be several instances of collusion between the only two witnesses for the AA, as to the subject Officer’s conduct.

The Panel noted the similarity of wording in both witnesses ‘crime stopper’ reports dated 7th May 2025 (Dusanjh) and 14th May 2025 (Ms H). Both reports were written in the third person and referenced multiple complaints.

The Panel were struck by PS Nav Dusanjh’s statements, taken as his evidence in chief which purported to reflect what he witnessed in December 2024 and appeared to be taken directly from the earlier accounts given by Ms H, which she later claimed were inaccurate. PS Nav Dusanjh was not aware of the contents of Ms H’s later statement of 8th July 2025 which she relied upon as her evidence in chief.

The witnesses accepted they were very close and that they engaged in extensive communications with each other in private WhatsApp messages. Whatever the true extent of their relationship, the Panel had to question whether or not there had been any collusion between the two in the evidence they had provided to the DPS.

The witnesses both claimed that the only time they saw each other outside work was in Manchester for about 10 minutes. This was contradicted by the evidence of DS Camp who revealed that PS Nav Dusanjh had confided in him that he had been to Ms H’s house and that he had met her children.

Both witnesses gave evidence that they thought the request from DPS to export their messaging was a request to hand over their phones to DPS. This was despite PS Nav Dusanjh clarifying the request with the IO and being advised that the IO merely required them to export and provide the messages between PS Dusanjh and Ms H.

24. Independence

The Panel could not conclude that PS Nav Dusanjh and Ms H were independent witnesses (to each other) or as they presented to the Panel, due to the overwhelming evidence of their relationship and closeness. The Panel did not attempt to determine the actual status of the relationship between them, but it was obvious from all the evidence presented (and agreed) that they were extremely close.

25. Credibility

The Panel found that the inconsistencies in Ms H's accounts, whilst appearing at first blush to be minor, were undermining of the veracity and accuracy of her account of events and consequently undermining of her overall credibility. The Panel found it inconceivable that PS Nav Dushanjh would have failed to see the subject Officer 'frothing at the mouth', salivating like he wanted her and rubbing his thighs 'out of the blue' whilst being in close proximity to Ms H and the subject Officer in December 2024.

The Panel determined that the exaggerated descriptors used by Ms H seriously undermined her credibility. PS Nav Dushanjh confirmed he did nothing, said nothing and did not intervene during the allegation on 5th December 2024, but reportedly advised Ms H after the event that the subject Officer touching her skirt (which he maintained he witnessed) was an assault, and that she should report it.

The Panel found this witness's account of the 3rd April 2025, resulting in her "*shitting herself*" absent of any description of improper conduct, implausible.

26. The evidence of Nav Dusanjh.

1. MG11 Statement dated 5th May 2025- Pages 34-25 Hearing bundle.
2. MG11 Statement dated 22nd September 2025- Pages 36-37 Hearing bundle

The Panel found this witness to be inconsistent and implausible at times.

PS Dusanjh initially asserted that his first MG11 statement was made on 5th May 2025, as indicated on the MG11 form itself. It was only when it was pointed out by the subject Officer's counsel that he had first raised his concerns in a report to Crimestoppers dated the 7th of May 2025, that PS Dushanjh conceded that his first MG11 must have been made on 5th June 2025.

He confirmed for the first time that he had told his close friend, the subject Officer, that he was in a relationship with Ms H. This occurred in late 2024 or early 2025. He gave oral evidence that this was in fact a lie but maintained he said it because he wanted the subject Officer to leave Ms H alone. He did not tell Ms H he had done this. PS Dusanjh confirmed he had never previously disclosed this 'lie' to DPS or to anyone else.

He accepted he had moved the messaging between himself and Ms H onto 'private' chat mode using functionality in WhatsApp, but Ms H would have been unaware he had done so. He did this as he didn't want his wife, with whom he was estranged, to see the messages between himself and Ms H. as she would not have taken it well.

He confirmed telling the subject Officer that he had turned down another female's request for private gym sessions with him, as Ms H would be annoyed. He gave evidence that he really liked Ms H and hoped there would in the future be an opportunity for them to be in a romantic relationship with each other and didn't want to jeopardise this.

He never disclosed to Ms H his true feelings or future hopes for them as a couple and described it as being a daydream at the time. He told DS Camp that he liked Ms H and that if the opportunity came up, he would 'take his shot'.

He agreed that PS Jones had advised him to 'tone it down' with Ms H due to the rumours about their relationship, which he became aware of in late 2024/early 2025. He described sharing the news of the rumours with Ms H pretty much as soon as he became aware of them, and she wasn't very happy.

This witness was asked about his discussion with DS Camp, during which DS Camp reported the subject Officer as saying '*she'd fucking get it*' on hearing the news that Ms H was joining the team. He maintained this was not a lie and was reported to him by DS Camp. He said that he had never fallen out with DS Camp, having known him around the same length of time as he'd known the subject Officer.

27. Private WhatsApp messages

Nav Dusanjh confirmed he had discussed the exporting of their messaging for DPS with Ms H, upon the first request.

He said he refused to give his phone over but then clarified with the IO that they only wanted the messages. He maintained it was not his preference to go down the 'screenshot route. It was Ms H's idea to send screenshots. It was down to Ms H what she wanted to send. He said he didn't want 'the job' to have access to his private messages but maintained he was not hiding anything.

PS Nav Dusanjh was asked about allegation 2 and his description of the subject Officer's behaviour towards other female members of staff as detailed in his statements of 5th June 2025 and 22nd September 2025 regarding Ms B, Ms M and Ms C. He confirmed he had made no notes in respect of these incidents. He could not say when they arose, he did not report it, he did not send an anonymous report, he did not tell anyone, including the victims and did not

put any safeguarding measures in place. He further confirmed he did not challenge the subject Officer as he was a good friend. He described these omissions as his own failings.

28. 5th December 2024 incident

This witness denied that he had copied what Ms H had described in her initial account of 29th May 2025 but confirmed he had forwarded this account to Inspector Simon Robson on her behalf and had not had sight of her later MG11 statement dated 8th July 2025.

He maintained his witness statement reflected what he had seen. He did not describe PS Jones frothing at the mouth or rubbing his thighs but maintained he wouldn't have seen everything all of the time. He confirmed he did not intervene, say anything or do anything at the time or make any contemporaneous notes of this incident. He described this as his failing.

He was cross-examined about the tone of his emails he had sent to the subject Officer (Officer's bundle pages 16/17) on 8th March 2025 and 14th April 2025 and accepted he was being 'two faced'.

29. **Allegation 2**

In answer to questions from the Panel, PS Dusanjh thought the instances he described in respect of Ms B, Ms M and Ms C happened months before December 2024.

He was cross-examined about his 'Crimestoppers' report dated 7th May 2025 and his references to 'females' in the plural, instances of the subject Officer harassing 'them' and ogling 'them' in the plural and the fact that he stated he had 'overheard' "*She's got massive tits*" in respect of Ms C, despite the fact that it was he who heard this being said. He accepted that the report gave the impression there were multiple alleged targets of the subject Officer's inappropriate sexual comments, when at this time there was only Ms H. He accepted his report, dated 7 May 2025, was "*misleading*"

He described the comment '*She'd get it*' made to DS Camp was not unexpected as the subject Officer made frequent comments that were close to the edge.

He could not recall if he had said anything to Ms H about the incidents regarding Ms B, Ms M and Ms C prior to December 2024. He said he didn't think to warn her at all.

He recalled that Ms H told him about the March and April incidents when they occurred. He described Ms H being calm at first, but that this tapered off into her not wanting to be at work with the subject Officer and that was when he tried to be in work at the same time as the subject Officer being on shift "just to reassure her, and to intervene with anything if required".

When Ms H described to him the subject Officer asking her where she had parked and feeling that she was being stalked, this witness resolved that he had to do something and made the 'Crimestoppers' report dated 7th May 2025 but failed to mention in it the car parking conversation. He did not recall discussing with Ms H her submission of the second 'Crimestoppers' report of 14th May 2025.

30. Inconsistences and inaccuracies.

The Panel could not fail to place significant emphasis upon PS Dusanjh corroborating the subject Officer's account, for the first time in these proceedings, namely that he did tell the subject Officer that he was in a relationship with Ms H. In making this revelation in oral evidence for the very first time during these proceedings, PS Dusanjh finally corroborated the subject Officer's evidence which he has maintained from the outset, namely that PS Dusanjh had told him that he was in a relationship with Ms H. PS Dusanjh also accepted that if, as he maintained, he was not actually in a relationship with Ms H, then he was plainly lying to the subject Officer.

The Panel were struck by the fact that this witness's recall of events of 5th December 2024 mirrored that of Ms H's earlier versions of events, which were later abandoned by her as inaccurate.

The Panel rejected this witness's version of events regarding his conversation with DS Camp and preferred the evidence of DS Camp that no such conversation had taken place.

31. Collusion

The Panel determined there had been collusion between PS Dusanjh and Ms H in a number of instances, as recited in paragraph 23 above.

32. Independence

The Panel could not conclude that PS Nav Dusanjh and Ms H were independent witnesses (to each other) or as they presented to the Panel, due to the overwhelming evidence of their close relationship. The Panel did not attempt to determine the actual status of the relationship between them, but it was obvious from all the evidence presented (and agreed) that they were extremely close.

33. Credibility

The Panel found this witness to be less than credible.

The Panel found his evidence to the Hearing that he did in fact disclose his relationship with Ms H to the subject Officer, but that this was in fact a 'lie' to protect Ms H from PS Jones to be highly implausible. The reason given for the 'lie' appeared to the Panel to be illogical, given the number of avenues available to PS Nav Dusanjh to stop the alleged improper conduct of the subject Officer towards Ms H, which as an Acting Inspector he would have been more than familiar with.

34. Caroline Partington- (evidence read).

1. Email to IO dated 19th June 2025 Page 55 Hearing bundle.

This witness's evidence comprised an email dated 19th June to the IO rehearsing details of disclosures made to her by Ms H in April 2025 and on 18th June 2025. The disclosures by Ms H were that the subject Officer appeared to be "obsessed with her" and 'creepy around her'. Specific instances were given as examples, being the 'save it for the wank bank later' comment and the instance of accompanying him to the 15th floor to recover his wife's harness.

Given the disclosures to Caroline Partington were made finally on 18th June 2025, the Panel noted the paucity of detail and instances referred to.

The Panel treated this agreed evidence as hearsay and placed little weight on it. The Panel could not discount the possibility that Ms H may have spoken to Ms Partington in April 2025 in order to establish a paper-trail of "recent complaint evidence" before making her Crimestoppers report in May 2025.

35. PS Matthew Jones (Subject Officer)- evidence

The Panel found this witness to be consistent, plausible, compelling and credible. His answers to all questions put to him had the 'ring of truth', in that they were logical and reasonable answers in response to the propositions put to him.

The Officer gave a brief history of his family's service in the Metropolitan Police and details of his personal circumstances.

The Officer gave a history of his own service and details of those he had managed over the years. He maintained he always used appropriate language and would challenge those who did not.

He confirmed Ms McCarthy was his line manager and she was "very approachable and nice". He confirmed he had never faced any Misconduct proceedings previously, Gross or otherwise

and never received any complaints or allegations previously of inappropriate sexual words or behaviour.

The subject Officer described being told by PS Nav Dusanjh that he was in a relationship with Ms H and how pleased he was for him, as he seemed happy.

36. 5th December 2024

The Officer accepted he was in the office on the 5th December 2024 but denied the conduct as alleged by Ms H ever took place.

37. 13th March 2025

The Officer denied saying the words “*Corr you’d get it*” and confirmed numerous people were present within earshot when this alleged remark was said to have been made.

38. 3rd April 2025

The Officer denied taking Ms H’s photo-ID on its lanyard and saying “*I’ll save that for the wank bank later*”

The Officer described in detail Ms H accompanying him to the 15th floor to search for his wife’s harness in detail and appeared baffled by any allegation (if there was one) that he had somehow acted inappropriately.

39. Allegation 2.

The Officer denied ever making comments about three other females in the office and asserted this simply didn’t happen.

The Officer maintained he was a happily married man, long serving Officer whose reputation was not that sought to be portrayed by Ms H and PS Nav Dusanjh in these proceedings.

The Officer confirmed he felt things change in relation to his work colleagues, which resulted in him sending an email on 7th May 2025 to numerous people asking if he had ‘pissed them off in some way or offended anyone’. He accepted at this point he was becoming “paranoid and stressed” working from home in isolation.

The Officer was never invited to interview in respect of the allegations but cooperated throughout with the proceedings.

40. **Character bundle**

A character bundle consisting of 22-character testimonials which all spoke highly of the subject Officer and were in direct contradiction to the 'character' belying the allegations made. Most of those providing testimonials confirmed that they were aware of the allegations and expressed disbelief that PS Jones would behave in the manner alleged.

41. **DS Camp**

1. Statement of 26th June 2025 (Officer's bundle page 63)
2. Statement of 23rd January 2026 (Officer's bundle pages 46-47)

The Panel found DS Camp to be an impressive witness. He was clear and compelling, answering questions head on. The Panel treated him as a genuinely independent and objective witness of fact.

Surprisingly, this witness was called for the defence. The AA took his first MG11 Statement on 26th June 2025, but it was DS Camp himself who followed up, then subsequently the subject Officer's Federation representative commissioned his second MG11 Statement of 23rd January 2026.

DS Camp recalled in the months leading up to allegations being made, the subject Officer asked him if he had upset anyone, possible in January 2025. He felt he may have upset people. He mentioned Ms H and PS Nav Dusanjh specifically. DS Camp had noticed a difference in PS Nav Dusanjh's behaviour in the team. PS Nav Dusanjh was angry because he had found out people were talking about his and Ms H's relationship. He felt it might have been DS Camp or the subject Officer spreading these rumours.

DS Camp described the subject Officer as a very well-liked member of the team who would go above and beyond. He was very empathetic. DS Camp had neither witnessed nor heard of any inappropriate conduct on the part of the subject Officer.

Around November/December 2025, DS Camp explained how PS Nav Dusanjh had told him that he had not entered into a full romantic relationship yet with Ms H but hoped they would when he was divorced. DS Camp described being pleased for him.

DS Camp was emphatic that he never indulged in conversations about females' appearances or indeed repeat such conversations.

DS Camp firmly denied telling PS Dusanjh that the subject Officer had said to him "she'd fucking get it" upon the subject Officer learning of Ms H imminent deployment to the team.

DS Camp described feeling initially very upset, when hearing what had been attributed to him. He said he subsequently left the unit as PS Nav Dusanjh was a friend and his superior and had said an untruth about him.

DS Camp confirmed that PS Nav Dusanjh told him that he and the subject Officer were the only people he had talked to about his relationship with Ms H.

DS Camp was asked if he could think of any reason why PS Nav Dusanjh would make this up. He responded that *"If I were pushed to purely speculate, then the only other rationale I can think of is that it is to try to lend credence to the allegations that have been raised against Matt"*

Following questions from the Panel, DS Camp repeated information from his conversations with PS Nav Dusanjh about his relationship with Ms H. He described how several times a day they would walk the stairs together. They talked a lot, met up outside work and that PS Dusanjh had met Ms H's children at her house. Nothing had happened romantically, but he hoped it would when he was divorced.

DS Camp described how PS Nav Dusanjh blamed DS Camp and the subject Officer for commenting on his and Ms H's relationship. One of the comments/rumours that PS Dusanjh appeared concerned about was around whether Ms H was the cause of his divorce. DS Camp described PS Nav Dusanjh as angry, staring ahead and talking in a stern voice. DS Camp denied it was him, PS Nav Dusanjh said therefore it must be the subject Officer.

DS Camp described how PS Nav Dusanjh's behaviour changed towards the subject Officer. The subject Officer had previously offered for PS Nav Dusanjh to stay at his house if things were difficult at home pending any divorce. They were very good friends. Subsequent to this PS Nav Dusanjh would largely sit away from the team after that.

42. **PC Katie Jones-** wife of the subject Officer.

1. MG11 Statement dated 21st January 2026- Officer's bundle page 36

This witness described in detail the 'locker room' incident in so far as she corroborated the request for her husband to retrieve her harness from the female locker room on the 15th floor.

The witness elaborated upon the subject Officer's character at work and in his private life, and how he dealt with stress.

The Panel attached little weight to this evidence, given her relationship to the subject Officer. Her evidence in any event did not assist the Panel in determining the facts in issue.

43. **Overall Determination**

The Panel considered the evidence as a whole.

The Panel found the evidence of the two main witnesses Ms H and PS Nav Dusanjh, to be calculated, and lacking in credibility. Any corroborative value that might have attached to the evidence of PS Dusanjh in support of Ms H's evidence was, in the Panel's view, entirely negated by the evidence it had of collusion and the compelling evidence that Ms H and PS Dusanjh were very close and in the eyes of many colleagues, displaying conduct consistent with them being in a relationship.

The Panel preferred the consistent evidence of the subject Officer, that of DS Camp and the plethora of agreed testimonials speaking to the subject Officer's conduct and character in the workplace.

The Panel did not find the AA to have discharged their responsibility to prove the allegations against the subject Officer on the balance of probabilities.

The Panel found the allegations not proven and dismissed them.

Commander Andy Brittain (Chair)

Dr Nigel Westwood and Ms Patricia Richardson. (IPMs)

19th June 2026