

IN THE MATTER OF THE MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2024)

BETWEEN

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

and

FDC Lindsay Blackman

PANEL FINAL DECISION

Introductions:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for FDC Lindsay Blackman (the Officer). The outline of the Panel decisions on facts and outcome was provided to the Officer during the hearing.
2. The Panel was chaired by Mr Richard Westlake (Chair), with independent members Ms Purnima Uppal and Ms Christine Nwaokolo. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Olivia Kong.
3. The Appropriate Authority was represented by Ms Louise McCulloch (AA's rep). The Officer did not attend the hearing and was not legally represented. His Federation Representative, Ms Natalie Henry-Noel, was in attendance via Microsoft Teams.
4. The hearing was held from 2 to 5 June 2026 at the Patrick Dunne House, Sutton Police Station, 6 Carshalton Road, Sutton, SM1 4RF.
5. At the outset of its determinations, and throughout the hearing, the Panel has remained mindful of the overarching purpose of police misconduct proceedings, namely:
 - i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;
 - ii. To uphold high standards of professional conduct and deter misconduct;

- iii. To protect the public.

The Allegations:

6. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of the Officer containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct, namely:

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

It is alleged that DC Lindsay Blackman breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, namely:

Discreditable Conduct

It is alleged that DC Lindsay Blackman:

Allegation 1

On 23rd October 2018, whilst off duty, assaulted Ms A by throwing her onto a bed.

Allegation 2

On 1st December 2018, whilst off duty, assaulted Ms A by pulling her hair and hitting her on the face.

Allegation 3

On 11th January 2019, whilst off duty, assaulted Ms A by pinning her down and punching her twice on the arm. It is further alleged that your conduct was motivated by the pursuit of a sexual or improper emotional relationship with Ms A.

Allegation 4

Between 1st February 2018 and 20th March 2019 repeatedly or continuously engaged in behaviour towards Ms A that was controlling or coercive, at the time he was personally connected to Ms A, the behaviour had a serious effect on Ms A and DC Blackman knew or ought to have known that the behaviour would have a serious effect on Ms A.

It is further alleged that his conduct, individually or collectively, if proven, amount to gross misconduct in that they are so serious as to justify dismissal.

Preliminary Issues

Application to Stay the Proceedings

7. Prior to the commencement of the hearing, the Federation representative made an application to stay the proceedings. The grounds advanced were:
 - (i) the CPS decision to discontinue the criminal investigation;
 - (ii) that the Officer had already been dismissed for an unrelated matter and was already on the barred list;
 - (iii) that there would be no meaningful outcome in continuing; and
 - (iv) that it would be unfair to proceed.

8. The Panel heard submissions from both the AA's rep and the Federation representative and determined the application as follows.

9. (i) CPS Discontinuance
The Panel noted that the criminal and disciplinary processes serve different purposes and apply different tests. A CPS decision not to prosecute does not prevent the Panel from examining the same underlying facts. The Panel found no evidence that the CPS decision had caused any prejudice to the Officer's ability to participate in or defend the misconduct proceedings.

10. (ii) Officer Already Dismissed and Barred
The Panel noted that the statutory scheme requires allegations of misconduct to be determined even where an officer has left the service or is already on the barred list. Findings remain important for accountability, transparency, and maintaining public confidence. The fact that the Officer is already barred does not, of itself, render the continuation of proceedings unfair.

11. (iii) No Meaningful Outcome
The Panel did not accept the submission that the continuation of the hearing would serve no meaningful purpose. Misconduct proceedings are not solely concerned with sanction; they are concerned with establishing the facts, determining whether the Standards of Professional Behaviour have been breached, and upholding public confidence. Even where the range of potential outcomes is limited, the determination remains significant.

12. (iv) That it would be unfair to proceed
Having considered all grounds advanced, the Panel found that none demonstrated actual or irremediable prejudice, nor anything that would make it impossible for the Panel to reach a fair determination. The Panel was satisfied that there was no unfairness and therefore a stay was not justified. The proper course was therefore for the hearing to proceed.

Clarification of the Federation Representative's Role

13. At the outset of the hearing, enquiries were made of the Federation representative to clarify the scope of her instructions and the basis for her attendance. She stated that her instructions were limited to making an application for a stay of the proceedings on behalf of the Officer and to provide a further statement she had received from the Officer. She informed the panel that she had no further instructions.
14. A short adjournment was granted to allow the representative to contact the Officer to confirm her position. Following the adjournment, the representative confirmed that she had spoken with the Officer and stated that she now had instructions to remain in attendance and observe the proceedings, but she had no instructions to conduct any cross-examination or to make any oral submissions on the Officer's behalf.

Admission of additional documents

15. On the first day of the hearing, the Panel received an additional statement from the Officer, together with an email, both submitted through the Federation representative. The Federation representative confirmed that these documents formed part of the Officer's Regulation 31 case and were provided as an extension of his existing account.

Other matters

Application to Exclude a Member of the Public

16. At the end of the first day of the hearing, the Panel was informed that an individual, Mr X, had applied to attend the proceedings on the following day as a member of the public. The AA's rep opposed his attendance and indicated that it would be making an application for his exclusion.
17. On the morning of Day 2, the AA's rep provided a three-page written submission in support of that application. **[REDACTED]** Staff at Patrick Dunne House also raised general concerns about the risk of an outburst or physical confrontation within the public gallery. In addition, Mr C was due to attend to give evidence, and there were concerns about the potential for confrontation between Mr X and Mr C.
18. The Panel recognised the presumption of open justice that applies to misconduct hearings. However, having considered the grounds advanced by the AA's rep, the Panel concluded that the welfare of the witness would be compromised were Mr X permitted to attend, and that no conditions would

adequately address the risk. The Panel therefore determined that exclusion of Mr X was a necessary and proportionate restriction under Regulation 39(3)(a).

Anonymity of Witnesses

19. The Panel noted that anonymity for Ms A had been granted at the pre-hearing stage. As Ms A is anonymised, and given her mother and brothers were witnesses and an application concerning her former partner had been made, the Panel determined that it was necessary to anonymise them as follows:

- Mrs B, her mother
- Mr C, her brother
- Mr D, her brother
- Mr X, her ex-partner

To do otherwise would risk Ms A being identified by association.

The Panel's Approach

20. The Panel reminded itself of its core responsibilities:

- a. To assess the facts of the case and make findings in relation to each allegation;
- b. To determine whether those findings amount to a breach of the relevant Standards of Professional Behaviour;
- c. To decide whether the conduct found proven constitutes misconduct or gross misconduct.

21. The Panel remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the AA throughout the proceedings. The applicable standard is the balance of probabilities, that is, whether the alleged conduct is more likely than not to have occurred.

22. In reaching its decisions, the Panel considered the purpose and nature of police misconduct proceedings. The primary aim is not to punish the Officer, but to uphold public confidence in the police service and protect its reputation by ensuring accountability and making clear that improper conduct will not be tolerated. A secondary aim is to affirm and promote high professional standards. A further purpose is to protect the public, the Complainant, and police staff by preventing recurrence of similar misconduct. In doing so, the Panel had regard to the principles established in *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512; *Chief Constable of Dorset v PAT, Salter (Interested Party)* [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin); and *R (Williams) v PAT* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).

23. The Panel also considered the relevant regulatory framework and guidance, including:
- a. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 (“the Regulations”), particularly the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2;
 - b. The 2018 Home Office Guidance (“HOG”), with specific reference to Chapter 1, which summarises the Standards;
 - c. The definition of misconduct under Regulation 3(1): “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour”;
 - d. The definition of gross misconduct under Regulation 3(1): “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified”.
24. The Panel listened carefully to all oral evidence and thoroughly reviewed the documentary evidence. It considered the totality of the evidence and submissions. While it does not propose to address every individual point raised, the Panel sets out its principal findings and conclusions.

Evidence

25. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:
- a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response) consisting of 243 pages;
 - b. AA’s opening note consisting of 5 pages;
 - c. AA’s skeleton argument re: stay of proceedings;
 - d. Federation Representative’s application re: stay of proceedings;
 - e. CPS discontinuance notice and letter to Ms A;
 - f. The additional statement made by the Officer (extension of Reg 31 response);
 - g. The email sent by the Officer to the Federation Representative (extension of Reg 31 response);
 - h. The Officer’s service and training records (at the outcome stage)

- i. A Victim Impact Statement by Ms A (at the outcome stage).

26. The Panel also heard from the following live witnesses:

- a. Ms A
- b. Mrs B
- c. Mr C
- d. Mrs Anna Byles
- e. DC Chappell

Case Summary

27. Ms A married the Officer in Cyprus on 24 October 2018. She alleged that on the previous day, 23 October 2018, the Officer threw her onto a bed, causing her to fall forwards and sustain a bruise to her leg.

28. She further stated that on 1 December 2018, while the couple were in Amsterdam, the Officer pulled her hair and struck her across the face with the back of his hand.

29. Ms A described a further incident on 11 January 2019 after they had both attended a wake, during which the Officer consumed a significant amount of alcohol. She said he became verbally abusive and derogatory towards her. That night, when she attempted to sleep in her son's room, the Officer dragged her from the bed, threw her into another room, pinned her down and punched her twice on the arm.

30. Ms A also described a wider pattern of controlling and coercive behaviour by the Officer throughout their relationship.

Finding of Facts & Breaches

31. The Panel carefully considered all the evidence presented during the proceedings, including the agreed hearing bundle, the Officer's additional statement and an email of 2 June 2026 provided on the first day of the hearing, the oral testimony of the five witnesses, and the closing submissions made by the AA's rep. The Panel also took account of and followed diligently the legal advice provided by the Legally Qualified Person throughout the hearing.

32. In reaching its decision, the Panel has applied the civil standard of proof - namely, the balance of probabilities - and has kept firmly in mind that the burden of proof rests with the Appropriate Authority.
33. Each witness's evidence was considered in full, including their respective interviews, written statements, oral testimony, and responses under cross-examination. Where applicable, the Panel distinguished between direct observations and hearsay and gave appropriate weight to each source of evidence based on its reliability, consistency, and corroboration.
34. The Panel notes that it is not in dispute that the Officer was in a relationship with Ms A and that they were married. The conduct underpinning the allegations is said to have arisen during the course of that relationship.
35. Against that background, the Panel is required to determine, on the basis of the totality of the evidence, whether the conduct alleged in each of the four allegations occurred and, if so, whether the standards were breached and whether this amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

The witnesses

Ms A

36. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Ms A, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was detailed and broadly consistent.
37. Ms A stated that she was in a relationship with the Officer and later married him. She said his behaviour changed soon after they moved in together, particularly through secretive and excessive consumption of alcohol. He would return home smelling of alcohol and attempt to disguise it. Because of what she described as his abusive behaviour and alcohol misuse, she decided it was not fair to bring further children into the relationship and underwent two terminations.
38. She said the Officer was persistently jealous, frequently accused her of infidelity, and questioned her contact with her mother. She reduced social contact, stopping talking to neighbours and going out with friends, and her mother stopped coming round. He also discouraged her from speaking to neighbours and questioned her about any interaction with them.
39. At work, Ms A said the Officer projected his insecurities onto her, resenting that she was two ranks senior. He repeatedly questioned who she spoke to, accused her of inappropriate behaviour with male colleagues, and monitored her movements. She described seeing him watching her at work and later challenging her about phone calls and her use of her mobile. He went through her phone, demanded information about confidential meetings, and suggested

colleagues spoke negatively about her, which she said made her paranoid. She eventually left her original team because she felt he was stalking her at work.

40. Ms A described financial pressure within the relationship. She said the Officer lacked financial stability, failed to pay agreed expenses, and blamed her for his failure to pass the sergeant's exam. He put an offer on a house without her involvement and put pressure on her to remortgage her own property to fund the deposit. The Officer wanted a new car and put pressure on her to part-exchange her car to fund it. Further the Officer promised to pay for a holiday that was booked with her credit on that basis, and then refused to repay her, resulting in her having to borrow money. She said his behaviour made her feel bullied into decisions she did not want to make.
41. She said the Officer repeatedly accused her of cheating. The Officer told her not to trim her pubic hair, and when she did, he accused her of cheating. He would smell her underwear to check for signs of sexual activity.
42. Ms A described three incidents of physical abuse.
43. On 23 October 2018 in Cyprus, she said the Officer had been drinking throughout the day while they were preparing for a pre-wedding dinner. An argument developed about the seating plan, during which the Officer said he would change the arrangement so that her cousin could not sit near her. Ms A said he was jealous of her cousin and accused her of cheating with him. She stated that the Officer threw her onto the bed with force, causing her leg to strike the front panel of the bed. This resulted in a bruise. She photographed the injury. She did not report the incident because approximately 50 family members had already travelled to Cyprus for the wedding, and she felt unable to cancel it.
44. On 1 December 2018 in Amsterdam, Ms A said an argument began because she was indecisive about what to eat. She was wearing her hair down, and as she walked away the Officer pulled her hair from behind, causing her head and neck to jerk backwards and then pushed her head forward. When she challenged him, he struck her face with force with the back of his hand. Tourists intervened and questioned his behaviour, and the Officer confronted them. Ms A had to pull him away. She said he was drunk at the time. She did not report the incident because they were abroad and she did not want to escalate matters.
45. On 11 January 2019, Ms A said they attended the wake of someone known to the Officer. She saw him go to the bar several times and believed he was drinking heavily, although he denied it and claimed the pints were diluted with soft drink. She said a comment made by a family friend about how he had "pulled a pretty wife" may have triggered him, as colleagues had previously told him he was "punching above his weight." When they returned home, the Officer became verbally abusive. He made a comment about her appearance and said "I've had prettier women than you". He also made racist comments about her and called her insulting names.

46. She went to sleep in her son's room, but the Officer followed her, told her to return to their bedroom, and tried to remove her pyjama bottoms. When she refused sex, he shouted that he would "finish" her and "destroy" her. She said he dragged her by the arm back to their bedroom, blocked the door to prevent her leaving, and told her that the only way he would leave was "if the police put a bullet in his head." She described feeling physically overpowered and that she feared he would cause her serious harm. She contemplated jumping out of the window. Each time she tried to get up, he pulled her back. She said he pinned her on the bed and punched her arm twice.
47. Her son, then nearly three, was woken by the noise and entered the room; the Officer told him everything was fine. Ms A managed to call her mother's phone, which her brother answered at around 4 a.m., and she asked him to come quickly. When her brother arrived, she showed him the bruising on her arm. The Officer left the house before her other brother arrived. She later attended her GP and told him she had been assaulted by her husband. When questioned by the Panel, she said that she told the GP that this was the first instance of domestic assault because she was worried about social services becoming involved. She said that she did not report the matter to the police because she knew that the team which would attend would be the domestic violence team, which she was due to start managing the following week.
48. When the Officer's account was put to her by the Panel, Ms A said it was "very different" from her own and he was lying. She confirmed that she and the Officer reconciled briefly after the January incident but ultimately the relationship ended soon after.

Mrs B

49. The Panel considered Mrs B's evidence which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her evidence was broadly consistent.
50. Mrs B said that when Ms A first spoke of the Officer, she described him as "a nice guy" who pursued her and spent money on her. Mrs B recalled him attending her home after work appearing intoxicated, and Ms A later realised alcohol missing from her home had likely been taken by him.
51. Ms A told Mrs B that she terminated two pregnancies during the relationship because she believed the Officer's abusive behaviour and heavy drinking made him unfit to be a parent. Mrs B said he shouted at Ms A's son and that Ms A was frightened of him. Ms A told her he was controlling, restricted her contact with friends and family, and swore at her. Mrs B eventually stopped visiting as she felt the Officer did not want her there.
52. Mrs B believed the Officer was jealous of Ms A's role in the police, recalling him saying he could "match your daughter any day." When visiting Mrs B, he would

often stand outside a nearby pub on his phone for long periods, which she found suspicious.

53. She described an incident at Asda where, after Ms A's cousin paid for items for Ms A, the Officer became angry and drove off in Ms A's car, leaving Ms A and the cousin behind.
54. Ms A married the Officer in October 2018 in Cyprus. At the reception he became intoxicated and behaved aggressively towards Ms A's cousin. Mrs B pleaded with him to stop. Although he later apologised to her, he did not apologise to the cousin and refused a family discussion to resolve the matter.
55. Mrs B said the Officer became increasingly controlling, questioning Ms A's whereabouts, accusing her of infidelity, and monitoring her at work. He instructed her to pay for flights to Jamaica on her credit card, promising reimbursement but later refusing, leaving Ms A distressed and reliant on family support. The holiday did not take place.
56. Mrs B described what Ms A told her about the January incident. She said Ms A reported that the Officer, heavily intoxicated, entered her son's bedroom, pulled her out of the room and threw her onto her own bed, pinning her down and covering her mouth. Ms A said she was scared but she managed to open a window and scream for help. Mrs B said Ms A was clear that he had not strangled her. In her oral evidence, Mrs B stated that she had spoken to Ms A on the phone on the night of the January incident, and that Ms A was distressed and scared.

Mrs Anna Byles

57. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Mrs Byles, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was detailed and consistent, and she demonstrated a clear distinction between events she directly observed and those relayed to her by others.
58. Mrs Byles described having a very close and friendly relationship with Ms A from the time she moved into the property. They spoke daily and often spent time together in the garden.
59. She stated that this changed significantly after the Officer moved in. Ms A became withdrawn, avoided conversation, and would sometimes retreat indoors when she saw Mrs Byles outside. Ms A's family, who had previously visited most weekends, also stopped attending, as did a friend who lived nearby. Mrs Byles felt that this was because the Officer did not want anyone around Ms A. She also interpreted these changes as signs that Ms A was anxious or fearful.
60. Mrs Byles reported hearing raised voices from both adults on several occasions through the adjoining wall, sometimes accompanied by the child crying, although she could not hear the substance of any arguments. She recounted hearing what she described as a "mega row" including the sound of doors

banging and the child crying, and then she saw the officer leave the house. Ms A confirmed to her the next day that she had asked him to leave, after which their neighbourly relationship returned to its earlier closeness.

61. After moving house, Mrs Byles remained in contact with Ms A. She said Ms A later disclosed that the Officer was controlling, drank heavily, and that his drinking caused arguments. Ms A also told her that he insisted on driving her car and driving her everywhere, that her family did not like him, and that he disliked how clingy the child was.
62. Mrs Byles explained that she had no relationship with the Officer, who only spoke to her husband. She had exchanged only a single greeting with him. She said she formed the view that he was controlling because of Ms A's withdrawal and apparent fearfulness, and because she would see the Officer in the garden while Ms A remained inside. She described having an instinctive sense of unease about him.

Mr C

63. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Mr C, which was adopted in full from his written statement and supported by his clear and consistent oral testimony. His account demonstrated insight into both his own experiences and the Officer's behaviour.
64. Mr C described attending Ms A's home in January after answering their mother's phone at around 4 a.m. When he arrived, the Officer opened the door. Mr C went upstairs to his sister. He found Ms A in her bedroom, looking deflated, worried and, in his words, "scared." She showed him the bruise and said "he hit me". Mr C went back downstairs and told the officer not to be there when he returned. Feeling extremely angry, he briefly left to calm down. He also phoned his brother, Mr D. When he returned after 15 minutes, the Officer had left.
65. Mr C described the Officer's behaviour more generally as unusual and controlling. He said the Officer constantly watched Ms A, appeared on edge, and was overly focused on what she was doing or saying. Mr C did not consider the Officer genuine and described him as manipulative. He also said the Officer was a heavy drinker who hid alcohol in the car, and whom he regarded as an alcoholic, even though he often did not appear visibly intoxicated.
66. He recalled an incident before Ms A's wedding when the Officer insisted on adding a song titled 'Murderer' to a playlist and then at the wedding reception danced to it in front of a cousin in a confrontational fashion. Mr C considered this an example of the Officer's poor judgement and failure to consider consequences.
67. He described Ms A as patient, kind and family-orientated. During her relationship with the Officer, however, she became more enclosed and sought her family's presence more often. He said he did not visit as often as he wanted to because

of the Officer's behaviour. After the relationship ended, he observed Ms A taking deliberate steps to improve her wellbeing.

Mr D

68. Mr D described in his statement that he received a call from his brother, Mr C, in the early hours of 11 June 2019, reporting that Ms A had been struck by the Officer and was crying. He attended Ms A's address where Mr C informed him that the Officer had already left. Mr D stated that Ms A was upset and showed bruising to her body, though he could not recall the precise locations. He recalled that Ms A took photographs of the injuries.
69. Mr D confirmed that he had seen the Officer since the incident, but they had not discussed it further, and he was not aware of any subsequent assaults.
70. He also recalled an incident at Ms A and the Officer's wedding in October 2018, during which the Officer repeatedly sang lyrics containing the word "murder" while directing his attention towards their cousin. He believed this behaviour upset Ms A and appeared intended to intimidate their cousin.
71. Mr D further stated that the Officer had been verbally abusive towards Ms A during their relationship, particularly when he had been drinking, using swear words directed at her, though he could not recall specific occasions or wording.

DI Cullen

72. DI Cullen stated in her statement that she had known Ms A since around 2010/2011, having met through work, and described her as a careful and responsible person with money. She recalled receiving a call from Ms A in approximately 2018 or 2019, asking to borrow £1,000. Ms A explained that she and her then partner, the Officer, had booked a holiday, believed to be to Jamaica, using her credit card, but the Officer had not provided his share of the payment. Ms A was concerned that her mortgage payment was due and she could not afford both.
73. The witness offered to lend the money herself or ask her partner to assist. Ms A later called back to say she had borrowed the money from another friend and no longer required the loan. The witness recalled finding the situation unusual, noting that Ms A had always been prudent with finances. She believed the incident occurred after her own partner's retirement in 2018.

Dr Datta

74. Dr Datta stated in his witness statement and clinical notes that Ms A attended his clinic on 16 January 2019 for a routine medical consultation. During that appointment, Ms A reported to him that she had been assaulted by the Officer.

Dr Datta recorded that he observed a bruise on Ms A which she said had resulted from that assault.

DC Chappell

75. C Chappell gave evidence and explained that, in relation to the alleged assault on 11 January 2019, the incorrect date of June appearing in the written statements of both Mr C and Mr D arose from a clerical error on her part. She confirmed that this was an administrative mistake she had made, and not an error attributable to either witness.

The Officer's account

76. The Panel considered the Officer's evidence, which was adopted in full from his Regulation 31 notice and his interview. The Officer denied that he sought to dominate or inappropriately influence Ms A. He said his behaviour reflected commitment to the relationship rather than an attempt to control it. He stated that although he sometimes felt uncomfortable with aspects of Ms A's conduct, including references to rank and influence, he nonetheless remained committed to the relationship.
77. The Officer denied being intoxicated during the incident on 11 January 2019. He denied restraining, striking, or behaving violently towards Ms A on that occasion. He said he chose to leave the address to de-escalate the situation and avoid further conflict.
78. More broadly, the Officer denied ever assaulting Ms A during the relationship. He denied using physical force against her or behaving in a violent or threatening manner at any time.

Finding of facts

79. The Panel first considered the relevance of the CPS discontinuance notice. The Panel accepted the legal advice that the CPS decision to discontinue the criminal case should not determine the outcome of these misconduct proceedings. It reflected the application of criminal law tests, which are distinct from those governing disciplinary matters. The Panel also recognised that the criminal and disciplinary processes serve different purposes. There is a higher standard of proof in criminal proceedings. The panel's task is to make its own findings on the evidence before it, applying the civil standard of proof. For these reasons, the Panel attached minimal weight to the CPS discontinuance notice.
80. The Panel found Ms A to be a clear, open and candid witness who gave a detailed and coherent account of the relationship and the three incidents. Her evidence was supported by contemporaneous material, including photographs of her injuries and GP records documenting the bruising she described. The Panel took

full account of the Officer's Regulation 31 response, including two additional notes submitted on the first day of the hearing, as well as his police interview. It found his evidence lacking in specific detail in relation to the alleged incidents. Due to the Officer's non-attendance, the panel did not have the opportunity to explore this further.

81. The Panel noted that there were minor inconsistencies between aspects of the witnesses' accounts. These were limited to peripheral details and were unsurprising given the passage of time, the stressful circumstances in which the events occurred, and the fact that each witness observed different parts of the wider pattern of behaviour. The Panel considered that these variations did not detract from the overall reliability of their evidence. When viewed in the round, the witnesses' accounts were broadly consistent with each other and with the contemporaneous material, and together they provided coherent and mutually reinforcing support for Ms A's account.
82. The Panel considered Ms A's explanation for not reporting the incidents to the police and found it to be credible and consistent with the wider evidence. Ms A explained that she did not report the Cyprus incident because her family had already travelled abroad for the wedding and she felt unable cancel it. She did not report the Amsterdam incident because they were overseas and she did not want to escalate matters. She did not report the January 2019 incident because she was due to start managing a domestic violence team the following week and did not want that team to attend her home. The Panel accepted these explanations as rational and consistent with the behaviour of someone who was fearful and experiencing coercive control, who was concerned about intervention by social services, and who had concerns for her reputation within a policing environment. Her actions at the time, photographing her injuries, contacting family for help and attending her GP, were consistent with someone experiencing the events she described, even if she did not make a formal report.
83. The Panel also considered the plausibility and coherence of the respective accounts. Ms A's evidence was specific and grounded in identifiable events, whereas the Officer's denials were generalised and unparticularised. His assertion that he was never intoxicated and never behaved violently was inconsistent with the wider evidence of his drinking habits and behaviour when consuming alcohol. His explanation that he left the address on 11 January 2019 to "de-escalate" the situation was inconsistent with the evidence of Ms A's distress and the injuries she sustained. His account also failed to address key features of Ms A's evidence, including the contemporaneous injuries and the corroborative accounts of his behaviour from other witnesses.
84. Taking all the evidence together, the Panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that Ms A's evidence was more reliable. The Panel therefore preferred Ms A's account to that of the Officer.

Decisions on Facts:

Allegation 1

On 23rd October 2018, whilst off duty, the Officer assaulted Ms A by throwing her onto a bed.

85. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Ms A's account to that of the Officer. Ms A's account is supported by a photograph of the injury, and circumstantial evidence about the Officer's conduct and drinking at the wedding.

86. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 1 proved.

Allegation 2

On 1st December 2018, whilst of duty, the Officer assaulted Ms A by pulling her hair and hitting her on the face.

87. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Ms A's account to that of the Officer.

88. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 2 proved.

Allegation 3

On 11th January 2019, whilst off duty, the Officer assaulted Ms A by pinning her down and punching her twice on the arm.

89. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Ms A's account to that of the Officer.

90. Her account is supported by photographic evidence of the bruise to her arm which was shared with the Officer a few days later. In addition, the combination of Ms A's report to her GP, Mrs Byles's evidence of a "mega row" that night and Mr C's account of responding to his sister's phone call and finding her with a bruise which she attributed to the officer hitting her add additional weight.

91. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 3 proved.

Allegation 4

Between 1st February 2018 and 20th March 2019 the Officer repeatedly or continuously engaged in behaviour towards Ms A that was controlling or coercive, at the time he was personally connected to Ms A, the behaviour had a serious effect on Ms A and DC Blackman knew or ought to have known that the behaviour would have a serious effect on Ms A

92. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Ms A's account to that of the Officer.

93. The other witnesses provided important circumstantial support for the pattern of behaviour described. They described marked changes in Ms A's presentation during the relationship, including increasing isolation, anxiety and withdrawal, and gave consistent accounts of the Officer's jealousy, controlling behaviour and heavy alcohol consumption.

94. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 4 proved.

Findings on Breaches of the Standards

95. In light of the above findings, the Panel concluded that the Officer's conduct engaged the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct and Orders and Instructions.

Discreditable Conduct

96. The standard of Discreditable Conduct requires police officers to behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in the police service.

97. The Panel was satisfied that the Officer's behaviour amounted to a breach of the Standard of Discreditable Conduct. The conduct involved repeated abusive, controlling and violent behaviour within an intimate relationship, which is behaviour wholly incompatible with the expectations placed upon a police officer. Such actions, if known, would clearly discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it. The Panel therefore found that the Officer's conduct fell below the standard required and amounted to Discreditable Conduct.

Misconduct/Gross Misconduct

98. The Panel carefully considered the circumstances of the case, and the breaches found to assess whether the breaches amount to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

99. Under the *Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings*, gross misconduct is defined as:

100. "A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious that dismissal would be justified."

101. The Officer's conduct meets this threshold for the following reasons:

102. The behaviour was deliberate and represented a conscious departure from the professional standards expected of a police officer. It involved the use of violence against a woman in circumstances that were wholly incompatible with the responsibilities and values of policing. The conduct carried a clear potential to undermine public confidence in the police service and caused significant distress to Ms A. Taken together, these factors demonstrate conduct of such seriousness that dismissal would be justified.

103. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the conduct found proven amounts to gross misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

104. The panel reminded ourselves of the 3 stages to determining outcome; namely:-

- a. To assess the seriousness
- b. Keep in mind the purpose of imposing the sanctions
- c. Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

Stage 1: Assessment of Seriousness

Culpability

105. The Panel assesses the Officer's culpability as **high**, for the following reasons:

106. **The conduct was deliberate.** The Officer's actions during the incidents were intentional rather than accidental, involving purposeful use of force and controlling behaviour within the relationship.

107. **The conduct is akin to a criminal offence.** The Officer's conduct is akin to common assault and controlling and coercive behaviour.

108. **Violence against women.** The Officer's conduct involved violence directed towards a woman in an intimate relationship, a context in which she was entitled to feel safe and protected.

109. **The conduct involving violence.** The Officer's use of physical force, combined with the wider pattern of controlling and abusive behaviour, represents a grave departure from the standards expected of a police officer.

110. Taken together, these factors place the Officer's culpability firmly at the higher end of the spectrum.

Harm

111. The Panel assesses the harm as **high** for the following reasons:

112. **Physical Injury.** Ms A sustained physical injuries during the incidents.

113. **Financial loss.** Ms A incurred financial loss as a result of the Officer's conduct, including costs incurred in unpaid holidays and gym membership.

114. **Risk of undermining public confidence.** Domestic violence perpetrated by a serving police officer poses a serious risk to public confidence. The public is entitled to expect officers to uphold the law and protect victims, not engage in such behaviour.

115. **The scale of national concern.** Domestic violence is a matter of significant national concern, with policing bodies and the public increasingly focused on the protection of victims and the accountability of perpetrators. Conduct of this nature by a police officer therefore causes wider harm, as it strikes at the heart of public trust in the police service's ability to respond effectively to domestic abuse.

116. The Panel therefore finds the harm to be high.

Stage 2: The purpose of imposing sanctions

117. The Panel have taken into account the threefold purpose for imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; upholding the high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and protecting the public).

Aggravating factors

118. Regular, repeated or sustained behaviour over a period of time

119. Serious psychological impact on the victim

Mitigating factors

120. None

Personal mitigation factors

121. No personal mitigating factors have been put forward.

Stage 3: Appropriate sanction

122. The Panel is mindful that the most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole.
123. The Panel noted that the Officer is no longer serving with the Metropolitan Police and is therefore a former officer for the purposes of the Police (Conduct) Regulations.
124. Having determined that the Officer's conduct amounted to gross misconduct, the Panel concluded that the only proportionate and appropriate outcome had he been a serving Officer would be dismissal without notice. As the Officer is a former officer, the Panel further determined that he should also be placed on the barred list.
125. The panel orders publication pursuant to regulation 43 (6) of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Right of Appeal

126. In accordance with Regulation 43(2), the Appropriate Authority shall provide the Officer with a copy of this report and a notice of the right of appeal. The Officer is reminded he has a right to appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal. ("PAT"). The PAT may increase or decrease any penalty or overturn this decision.

Richard Westlake

5 June 2026