

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

FPC Joslin James

PANEL FINAL DECISION

Introductions:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for FPC Joslin James (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 Commander Jason Prins (Chair), with independent members Ms Louise Fox and Dr Nigel Westwood. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Olivia Kong.
3. The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by Mr Montu Miah (AA's representative) and the Officer was represented by Mr Craig Rush (Officer's representative). The Officer was also supported by the Federation Representative PC Barry Edwards.
4. The hearing was held from 11 to 15 May 2026 at Palestra House, 197 Blackfriars Road, SE1 8NJ.
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 former Officer containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct, namely:

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

Allegation 1

It is alleged that between 15 August 2023 and 16 August 2023 you gave Ms A, an alleged victim of crime who you contacted in the course of your duty, your personal telephone number.

It is further alleged that you told Ms A “not to tell” anyone that you had given her your personal telephone number.

Your conduct was in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely Discreditable Conduct.

If proved, allegation 1 amounts to gross misconduct.

Allegation 2

It is alleged that on 16 August 2023 you had an inappropriate telephone conversation with Ms A, in particular that you:

- (a) discussed aspects of your sexual experiences with Ms A;
- (b) told Ms A that she should attend church;
- (c) told Ms A that she should consider having an abortion;
- (d) enquired as to whether Ms A had blonde hair;
- (e) told Ms A that you found her to be attractive, having viewed the picture on her police record.

It is further alleged that your conduct was motivated by the pursuit of a sexual or improper emotional relationship with Ms A.

Your conduct was in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely Discreditable Conduct.

If proved, allegation 2 amounts to gross misconduct.

Allegation 3

It is alleged that you failed to abide by the decision dated 16 May 2024 that your photography business was incompatible with your continued membership of the Metropolitan Police. In particular, between 17 May 2024 and 15 October 2024 you failed to remove or cause to be removed webpages where you solicited bookings for photography services.

Your conduct was in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely Orders and Instructions.

If proved, allegation 3 amounts to gross misconduct.

Preliminary Issues

Anonymity of Witnesses

7. Anonymity for Ms A and Ms B was applied for at the pre-hearing. The officer did not oppose the application. The Chair granted anonymity on the basis that Ms A [REDACTED].
8. As Ms A is to be anonymised, and Ms B is her daughter, anonymising Ms B is also necessary. To do otherwise would risk Ms A being identified by association.

Disclosure

9. [REDACTED].
10. [REDACTED].
11. [REDACTED].

Admission of additional documents

12. During the second day of the hearing, the AA's representative sought to introduce a final written warning issued to the officer in 2021 as additional evidence. The officer's representative objected to its admission. The Chair considered the application in light of the Home Office Guidance, which makes clear that material served outside the prescribed timetable may only be admitted at the

Chair's discretion, and that the default position is that late-served documents should not be admitted unless it is shown that they were not previously available. The overarching consideration is fairness to both parties.

13. The Chair noted that the document had been in existence, and in the possession of the AA, well before the service deadline. No adequate explanation was provided for the failure to serve it in accordance with the timetable. In the absence of any such justification, the presumption against late admission remained firmly in place. The Chair was satisfied that admitting the material at this stage would risk compromising the fairness and orderly progression of the proceedings.
14. For these reasons, the application was refused and the document was not admitted into evidence.
15. At the conclusion of the AA's case, the AA's **representative** applied to admit an eight-line statement made by Ms A on 16 August 2023. The officer's **representative** raised no objection to its admission. Exercising the Chair's discretion, and in light of the parties' agreement, the statement was admitted into evidence.

The Panel's Approach

16. 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, gross misconduct, or neither.
17. 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.
18. 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).

19. 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”.
20. 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

21. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:
- a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response) consisting of 256 pages;
 - b. AA’s opening note consisting of 15 pages;
 - c. The additional 8-lines statement made by Ms A dated 16 August 2023;
 - d. The character bundle (including the officer’s service and training records) consisting of 14 pages.
22. The Panel also heard from the following live witnesses:
- a. Ms A

b. Ms B

c. The officer

Case Summary

23. [REDACTED]. In an email to DI H[REDACTED] in September 2023, Ms A disclosed that the officer had previously provided her with his personal telephone number, telling her to contact him outside working hours, and told her not to inform anyone as he would “lose his job”.

24. In September 2023, PC B[REDACTED] attended Ms A’s address in relation to an unrelated matter. During that attendance, Ms A made further disclosures regarding the officer. She stated that, during the telephone call, the officer made inappropriate and sexualised comments. Ms A explained that she had not reported this at the time because she feared it would adversely affect the case concerning her ex-partner.

25. On 26 April 2024, the officer submitted an application to register a photography business under the name “*Jos James Photos*”. In his application, the officer stated that he did not charge customers for taking photographs and was merely “showcasing” his work. He provided links to online platforms where the business was being advertised.

26. On 16 May 2024, the officer’s application to register the business interest was declined. The decision letter set out the reasons for refusal. At the time of submitting the application, the officer was already subject to restricted duties, specifically prohibiting face-to-face contact with members of the public.

27. Despite the refusal, screenshots taken on 15 August 2024 showed that the officer’s photography business remained active on the online platforms he had previously identified. On 15 October 2024, DC D[REDACTED] reviewed one of those platforms and confirmed that the business continued to be advertised on that date.

Finding of Facts & Breaches

28. The Panel has carefully considered all the evidence presented during the proceedings, including the agreed hearing bundle, the additional statement of Ms A dated 16 August 2023 and the oral testimony of two witnesses and FPC James, and the closing submissions made by the AA’s representative and the officer’s representative. Legal advice provided throughout the hearing has been followed with diligence.

29. 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 AA.
30. Each witness's evidence was considered in full, including their written statements, oral testimony, and responses under cross-examination. The Panel also reviewed various emails in the bundle during the hearing. 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.
31. The Panel notes that it is not in dispute that the officer contacted Ms A by telephone on 16 August 2023 for the purpose of obtaining an additional statement in relation to an existing complaint concerning her former partner. The conduct underpinning Allegations 1 and 2 is said to have arisen during the course of that call.
32. It is further accepted that the officer operates a photography business with an associated website, and that his application to register this business interest with the Metropolitan Police Service was refused on 16 May 2024. These matters are not contested.
33. 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 three allegations occurred and, if so, whether it amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

The Witnesses

Ms A

34. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Ms A, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony.
35. Ms A stated that, [REDACTED], she received a telephone call from an officer who identified himself as PC Joslin James. He informed her that he was assisting a colleague and required a further statement from her [REDACTED]. Ms A queried whether this was connected to [REDACTED], but the officer "stated that he could not comment".

36. The following day, 16 August 2023, the officer telephoned Ms A again to complete the statement. The call lasted 1 hour, 19 minutes and 31 seconds. During this conversation, Ms A said the officer began making inappropriate personal disclosures, including accounts of being invited to a threesome, engaging in extra-marital affairs, and details about his age and family. She stated that he told her “off the record” about these matters and explained that he “duffers (sic) with dyslexia” while taking her statement.
37. Ms A explained that she had recently discovered she was pregnant and was struggling emotionally due to [REDACTED]. She stated that the officer advised her to “sit in a church and have consideration around having an abortion”, suggesting that doing so would “free [her] from it all” [REDACTED].
38. Ms A said the officer provided her with his personal telephone number and told her she could contact him outside working hours if she wished to “meet or confide in him”, adding that she should not tell anyone as “he would get sacked from the police”. She recalled him asking whether she had blonde hair, explaining that he had seen her photograph on police systems and thought she was “really pretty”. Ms A stated that he also commented on the difficulties she had been through, implying he had been “reading up” on her [REDACTED]. Her daughter, Ms B, overheard part of the conversation and remarked that the officer appeared to be flirting with her.
39. Ms A said that although she felt uncomfortable, she continued with the call so that her statement could be completed. After the statement was finalised, the officer told her he would email it to her for signature. She confirmed that subsequent text messages between them were limited to the statement and were professional in tone.
40. [REDACTED]. She stated that she felt “angry and hurt” and reported the officer’s inappropriate comments to DI H by email but did not believe any action was taken. She also disclosed the allegations to another officer during a video-recorded report [REDACTED], which she said was captured on body-worn video.
41. Ms A described feeling “vulnerable and isolated” as a result of the officer’s conduct, particularly given her [REDACTED] and her reliance on police support. She stated that the officer’s comments about abortion were especially distressing due to her past experiences. She explained that she did not challenge the officer at the time because she feared it might affect the police response [REDACTED]. She said the incident left her feeling “exploited” and caused her to lose trust in the police, stating: “I came to the police for help and instead they have tried to take advantage of me when I was at my most vulnerable.”
42. [REDACTED].

Ms B

43. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Ms B which was adopted in full from her written statement.
44. Ms B stated that she overheard a telephone conversation between her mother, Ms A, and a police officer she believed to be named PC Joslin James. She recalled that the incident occurred approximately nine months before she made her statement, at a time when her mother had recently discovered she was pregnant. Ms B explained that she and her mother were at home when Ms A received a call from the police. Initially, the conversation appeared routine, but Ms A then gave her “a funny look” and placed the call on loudspeaker so that Ms B could hear what was being said.
45. Ms B stated that she heard the officer advising her mother that she should “consider going to church” and “maybe... consider having an abortion as this may be for the best”. She recalled thinking that this was inappropriate, [REDACTED], and she observed that the comments caused her mother visible upset.
46. Ms B further stated that the officer then began discussing his own sexual experiences, including having had “threesomes” and details of previous relationships. She said he started flirting with her mother, telling her she was good looking, asking whether she had blonde hair and blue eyes, and providing his personal telephone number. Ms B recalled the officer telling her mother not to disclose that he had given her his number because “he would lose his job” if she did. She described her mother as shocked and unsure how to respond. Ms B estimated that the call lasted “roughly about an hour”, during which the officer spoke at length while Ms A responded only occasionally with simple replies such as “yes” or “okay”.
47. After the call ended, Ms B said her mother became upset and expressed that she felt vulnerable, frightened, and unsure whom to seek help from. Ms A told her she no longer knew whether she could trust the police and wanted to block the officer’s number. Ms B stated that her mother subsequently reported the officer’s conduct to the police. She confirmed that she had never met the officer and had only heard him during the call.
48. Ms B explained that she was later contacted by DC N[REDACTED] and provided her statement. She said she felt “shocked” by the officer’s behaviour and believed her mother should not have been subjected to such conduct. She expressed concern about “how many other women he has done this to”.
49. In her live evidence, Ms B clarified that she was 15 years old when she made her statement. She also stated that she heard the entire conversation as it was on loudspeaker throughout, that in her recollection the call lasted approximately 20

minutes, and that she had not discussed the incident with her mother since the day it occurred.

The Officer

50. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of the officer, which was adopted in full from his Regulation 31 response and supported by his oral testimony.
51. The officer stated that he contacted Ms A on 15 August 2023 to explain that he needed to take a further statement from her. Ms A told him she was unable to do so at that time and asked him to call back the following day at 11:00am. He said he could not recall whether he used the office landline or his work mobile for the call, but he was at [REDACTED] Police Station and other colleagues were present.
52. On 16 August 2023, the officer telephoned Ms A and took her statement. He said he explained that some of the questions might be embarrassing but were necessary for the review of her allegation. He maintained that he was “respectful and professional” throughout.
53. The officer stated that Ms A repeatedly asked him personal questions, including whether he was Black, where he was from, where he went to school, and where he had lived growing up. He said he answered briefly to avoid appearing rude but attempted to steer the conversation back to the statement. He denied asking Ms A any personal questions unrelated to the investigation.
54. He asserted that all contact with Ms A was via his work mobile, police email, or a [REDACTED] Police Station landline, and that he did not provide his personal mobile number to her. He denied telling her not to disclose anything to others. He suggested that Ms A may have obtained his personal number from his public social media profiles, where his number and business email had been displayed in connection with his photography work. He explained that these details were visible because he had intended to develop a photography business after retiring.
55. The officer denied discussing sexual experiences with Ms A, describing such allegations as impossible because he is a private person and would not speak in that manner to anyone, let alone a stranger during a work call. He denied telling Ms A to attend church, denied advising her to consider an abortion, and denied making comments about her appearance or asking whether she had blonde hair. He also denied accessing her police records.
56. He stated that during the call he was seated in an open-plan office at [REDACTED] Police Station, surrounded by colleagues, and that any inappropriate comments would have been overheard and challenged by others.

He said the only personal conversation he recalled was limited to Ms A asking about his background, which he said she initiated.

57. Regarding the photography business, the officer explained that he had a long-standing interest in photography and intended to establish a business after retiring from the Metropolitan Police in August 2025. On 26 April 2024, he submitted a Business Interest Application, stating that he did not intend to make financial gain while still serving. He said he showcased his work on a website and social media platforms such as Flickr and Instagram to build a portfolio for future use.
58. On 16 May 2024, he was informed that his business interest application had been rejected because he was on restricted duties, including a restriction on face-to-face contact with the public. He said he understood this restriction to apply only to his policing role and stated that he had no face-to-face contact with the public through his photography activities. He accepted that once his application was declined, he should have taken the website down or made clear that the business was not trading, but said he failed to do so due to personal distractions and apologised for this oversight.
59. In his oral evidence, the officer told the Panel that he introduced himself to Ms A as “Jos James”. He said there was no reference on his social media accounts to him being a police officer. He said that he did not tell Ms A about his interest in photography. He stated that he had been given a list of questions by the investigating officer and adhered to them, and that he had no prior knowledge of Ms A’s background. Regarding the business interest, he said he asked a friend to take the website down after the application was refused but did not check whether this had been done.

PC B[REDACTED]

60. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of PC B[REDACTED], which was adopted in full from his written statement.
61. PC B[REDACTED] stated that he attended Ms A’s home address on 19 September 2023 in relation to an unrelated policing matter. The issue was resolved quickly, and appropriate advice was given. As he prepared to leave, Ms A asked whether she could tell him something. He observed that she appeared concerned and worried, and she expressed fear that she might “get into trouble” if she disclosed what was on her mind.
62. PC B[REDACTED] reassured Ms A that anything she wished to disclose would be treated sensitively. After some conversation, Ms A felt sufficiently comfortable to explain her concerns. She told him that she had recently been involved in a police investigation [REDACTED] and had been in regular contact with the officer

in charge of her case. She said that on one occasion she received a call from an officer she had not previously dealt with.

63. Ms A informed PC B[REDACTED] that the conversation with this officer quickly became inappropriate. She said the officer made “strange and offensive comments” about the investigation, [REDACTED]. She reported that the officer told her he had [REDACTED] “liked what he saw”, along with other unwanted comments of a similar nature.

64. Ms A further stated that the conversation progressed into sexually inappropriate territory, with the officer making a number of sexualised remarks and propositions, as though he wished to begin a relationship with her. She told PC B[REDACTED] that she felt “very harassed and alarmed” by the officer’s conduct and had been afraid to disclose what had happened because she was worried it might jeopardise the progress of her investigation.

DI H[REDACTED]

65. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of DI H[REDACTED], which was adopted in full from her written statement.

66. On 8 September 2023, DI H[REDACTED] emailed Ms A [REDACTED]. Shortly afterwards, Ms A replied expressing dissatisfaction [REDACTED]. In that email, Ms A also raised concerns about the conduct of the officer, stating:

67. “When PC Joslyn James called me to make my continued witness statement a few weeks ago... he provided me with his personal number... and asked me to contact him out of work hours and to not tell anyone. Is that how corrupt the police are?”

68. DI H[REDACTED] did not ask further questions about the officer, instead advising Ms A that she could take the matter further if she wished. Ms A replied again, stating:

69. “In regards to PC James giving me his mobile number and telling me to not tell the police or he will lose his job, I’ll take that further.”

70. DI H[REDACTED] did not engage further with Ms A on this point.

71. After receiving this information, DI H[REDACTED] checked Aware for contact details for the officer but found no number listed. She then contacted the officer’s line manager, DS V[REDACTED], via WhatsApp to request a contact number. DS V[REDACTED] provided a number, which matched the number Ms A had reported. When asked, DS V[REDACTED] confirmed he believed it to be the officer’s personal number, as it was the only number he had for him. DI

H[REDACTED] also reviewed the crime report and noted entries confirming that PC James had been in contact with Ms A.

DC D[REDACTED]

72. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of DC D[REDACTED], which was adopted in full from her written statement.
73. DC D[REDACTED] stated that on 15 October 2024, she conducted a fact-finding exercise in relation to the officer's photography business, which had been identified as a potential unauthorised business interest.
74. As part of this fact-find, DC D[REDACTED] visited the website advertising the officer's photography services. She observed that the site displayed a "Book Now" option. When she selected this, she was taken to a booking page offering a range of different photoshoot options. She selected one of the photoshoots and proceeded to book an appointment for Thursday 17 October 2024 at 12:00pm.
75. DC D[REDACTED] stated that she was then directed to a page requiring him to enter personal details and complete the booking by clicking "Complete". She took a screenshot of this page, which she produced as exhibit PAD/11. The screenshot, taken on 15 October 2024, showed the booking page from <https://book.heygoldie.com/josjamesphotograph> with a photoshoot selected for 17 October 2024 at 12:00pm.
76. DC D[REDACTED] confirmed that this demonstrated the website Jos James Photography was still active, operational, and capable of accepting bookings from customers, indicating that the business remained transactional despite concerns that it constituted an unauthorised business interest.

Finding of facts

77. [REDACTED].
78. The Panel next evaluated Ms B's evidence. Ms B stated that she heard what was said by the Officer during the phone call on 16 August 2023 as her mother, Ms A, had placed her phone on loud speaker mode. Ms B's evidence largely corresponded with that of Ms A in terms of the content of the phone call and although there were some differences of detail in their respective accounts, these did not, in the Panel's assessment, render Ms B's evidence unreliable. It was accepted by Ms B that she is very close to and supportive of her mother, but Ms B stated that she would never lie for Ms A. Nevertheless, the Panel determined that as Ms A and Ms B live at the same property, it is highly likely that they would have discussed the alleged content of the phone call between 16 August 2023 and the making of Ms B's statement on 11 March 2024. The Panel

therefore determined that the corroborative value of Ms B's evidence was significantly diminished by the potential for cross-contamination between the two witnesses. For the avoidance of doubt, in drawing this conclusion the Panel makes no criticism of Ms B and it accepted that Ms B was doing her best to give a faithful account of what she heard.

79. The Panel noted that Ms A first referred to the Officer providing her with his personal mobile telephone number and asking her "to contact him out of work hours and not to tell anyone" in an email to Detective Inspector H[REDACTED] dated 8 September 2023. Ms A expressed dissatisfaction with the service she had received. That email did not contain details of the content of the telephone conversation; [REDACTED].
80. The fuller account emerged on 19 September 2023, when PC B[REDACTED] attended Ms A's home address on an unrelated matter. In his statement, PC B[REDACTED] recorded that Ms A appeared "concerned and worried" and feared that disclosing the information might "get her into trouble". The Panel considered this behaviour consistent with someone recounting a distressing experience rather than fabricating one. It was only after reassurance from PC B[REDACTED] that Ms A disclosed the details of the call.
81. The Panel accepted Ms A's explanation that she did not raise the matter earlier because she did not wish to jeopardise the investigation [REDACTED]. The Panel also considered that her reluctance reflected her previous experiences with the police and her lack of confidence in the service.
82. The Panel found Ms A's evidence to be consistent on the central allegations, notwithstanding some variations on peripheral matters. Such variations were not considered unusual or undermining. The Panel noted that Ms A had nothing to gain by making a complaint against the Officer, and no discernible ulterior motive for attending a misconduct hearing three years later to give evidence against him.
83. The Officer's evidence was that his personal mobile number was displayed on his Facebook, Instagram and Flickr social media accounts, that these accounts were not private and that they were readily discoverable through an internet search of his name. The Panel therefore assessed the plausibility that Ms A obtained the Officer's personal telephone number through an internet search. Ms A had never met or seen the Officer before, he did not inform her of his photography website, and the Officer stated in evidence that none of his social media accounts identified him as a police officer. The Panel determined that Ms A could therefore have located one or more of the Officer's social media accounts via an internet search, but determined that had she done so, she had insufficient information to make a positive connection between those accounts and the Officer.

84. It was common ground that the telephone conversation on 16 August 2023 lasted 1 hour and 19 minutes. The witness statement elicited during that call, however, contained only eight lines of substantive content. The Officer explained that the length of the call was due to Ms A being “difficult” and providing lengthy answers that strayed off-topic. The Panel noted that Ms A volunteered additional information during her oral evidence, but did not find her responses to be rambling or long-winded.
85. The Officer stated that he had been provided with a list of questions by the Officer in the Case (OIC) and adhered to them. The Panel noted that the Officer is an experienced officer, having served as a PCSO since 2006 and as a police constable since 2016, and is well-versed in obtaining evidence from members of the public.
86. The Officer claimed in his evidence that he had no knowledge of the background of Ms A [REDACTED] prior to calling her. The Panel accept that there is no audit of the Officer looking Ms A up on police systems. However, the Panel consider it unlikely that the Officer would have called Ms A without being aware of any background information. [REDACTED]. She was vulnerable [REDACTED]. The Panel found it improbable that he was given a list of highly personal questions to ask relating to Ms A’s membership of ‘swinging’ clubs but made no attempt to understand the background to those questions prior to contacting her.
87. The Panel also did not consider it tenable that a call of such duration would result in a statement containing only eight lines of substantive material had the content of that call been confined to securing the statement. As an experienced Officer who was in control of the interview, the Panel therefore does not accept the Officer’s explanation that the excessive duration of the interview was because of Ms A’s tendency to go off-topic.
88. The Panel found Ms A to be open and candid about her personal circumstances and her dissatisfaction with the police. There was no evidence that she had previously made false allegations. There was also no rational explanation as to why she would single out this Officer, as several other officers had dealings with her in relation to both past and ongoing matters. Indeed, the officer was positively assisting Ms A [REDACTED], rather than frustrating her in that endeavour, and was not a decision maker as to whether her complaint was progressed or not. The Panel further noted that Ms A had not embellished or expanded her complaint against the Officer at any later stage after her conversation with PC B[REDACTED].
89. The Panel determined that it was inherently unlikely that Ms A had fabricated the conversation alleged in Allegation 2. The alleged topics were highly disparate, ranging from the Officer’s previous sexual experiences, telling Ms A to attend church and to consider having an abortion and asking whether she had blonde hair. Such a conversation would have been disjointed and the Panel determined

that had Ms A been intent on making a false allegation, she would have been more likely to allege a straightforward sexualised conversation rather than construct such a complex and unusual narrative. [REDACTED].

90. For these reasons, on the balance of probabilities, the Panel found Ms A's account of the telephone conversation on 16 August 2023 more likely than the Officer's.

91. In relation to the allegation that the Officer failed to ensure the removal of the webpage advertising his photography business, the Officer stated that he had asked his friend and business partner to take the website down, but that this individual failed to do so and the Officer did not subsequently check whether the removal had been carried out.

92. The Panel found that the responsibility for ensuring compliance with the requirement to remove the webpage rested ultimately with the Officer. Whether he undertook the task personally or delegated it to another, it remained his responsibility to verify that the website had in fact been removed.

Decisions on Facts

Allegation 1

93. It is alleged that between 15 August 2023 and 16 August 2023 you gave Ms A, an alleged victim of crime who you contacted in the course of your duty, your personal telephone number. It is further alleged that you told Ms A "not to tell" anyone that you had so given her your personal telephone number.

94. The Panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the Officer provided his personal telephone number to Ms A. The Panel further determines that, given the Officer would have been aware that doing so was contrary to the applicable standards/rules, it is more likely than not that he also instructed Ms A not to disclose this to anyone.

95. The Panel therefore finds this allegation proved.

Allegation 2

96. It is alleged that on 16 August 2023 you had an inappropriate telephone conversation with Ms A, in particular that you:

- a. discussed aspects of your sexual experiences with Ms A;**
- b. told Ms A that she should attend church;**

- c. **told Ms A that she should consider having an abortion;**
- d. **enquired as to whether Ms A had blonde hair; and**
- e. **told Ms A that you found her to be attractive, having viewed the picture [REDACTED].**

97. **It is further alleged that your conduct was motivated by the pursuit of a sexual or improper emotional relationship with Ms A.**

98. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Ms A's account to that of the Officer. While the initial purpose of the call was operationally justified, the Panel is satisfied that the content and direction of the conversation went beyond any legitimate policing purpose. The nature of the topics introduced by the Officer, the duration of the call, and the absence of any professional necessity for such discussion support the inference that his conduct was motivated by an intention to pursue a sexual or otherwise improper emotional relationship with Ms A.

99. Accordingly, the Panel finds Allegation 2 proved.

Allegation 3

100. **It is alleged that you failed to abide by the decision dated 16 May 2024 that your photography business was incompatible with your continued membership of the Metropolitan Police. In particular, between 17 May 2024 and 15 October 2024 you failed to remove or cause to be removed webpages where you solicited bookings for photography services.**

101. The Panel is satisfied that the Officer failed to ensure that the webpage advertising his photography business was removed, as he was required to do.

102. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 3 proved.

Findings on Breaches of the Standards

103. 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

104. 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.
105. The Panel is satisfied that the Officer's conduct during the telephone conversation with Ms A amounts to a breach of the Standard of Discreditable Conduct. While the initial purpose of the call was operationally justified, the Panel has found that the content and direction of the conversation went beyond any legitimate policing purpose. The Officer provided his personal telephone number to Ms A and instructed her not to disclose this to anyone. The Panel has further found that aspects of the discussion were motivated by an intention to pursue a sexual or otherwise improper emotional relationship with her.
106. Such conduct represents a clear and serious departure from the professional boundaries that a police officer is expected to maintain. It is behaviour that would reasonably be regarded as discreditable and is capable of undermining public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the police service. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Standard of Discreditable Conduct has been breached in respect of the telephone conversation.

Orders and Instructions

107. The Panel is satisfied that the Officer's conduct amounts to a breach of the Standard of Orders and Instructions. The Officer was expressly notified of a decision dated 16 May 2024 that his photography business was incompatible with his continued membership of the Metropolitan Police. This was a clear and unambiguous instruction that applied to him at the relevant time.
108. The Panel has found that, between 17 May 2024 and 15 October 2024, the webpages remained active and accessible. Whether the Officer undertook the task personally or delegated it to another individual, the obligation to ensure compliance with the instruction remained his. His failure to verify that the webpages had been removed demonstrates non-compliance with a requirement that was both specific and mandatory.
109. In those circumstances, the Panel is satisfied that the Officer failed to abide by an instruction that applied to him and therefore breached the Standard of Orders and Instructions.

Assessment of Seriousness

110. 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.

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

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

112. The Officer’s conduct meets this threshold for the following reasons:

113. The behaviour was deliberate and represented a conscious departure from the professional standards expected of a police officer. It involved a misuse of his position and a serious breach of professional boundaries during an operational interaction with a member of the public. The conduct had a clear potential to undermine public confidence in the police service, and it caused distress to Ms A. Taken together, these factors demonstrate conduct so serious that dismissal would be justified.

114. For these reasons, the Panel is entirely satisfied that the misconduct is properly to be categorised as gross misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

115. The panel reminded itself of the 3 stages to determining outcome; namely:

- (i) To assess the seriousness
- (ii) Keep in mind the purpose of imposing the sanctions
- (iii) Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

Stage 1: Assessment of Seriousness

Culpability

116. The Panel assesses the Officer’s culpability as high, for the following reasons:

- The conduct was deliberate. The Officer consciously chose to provide his personal number and to instruct Ms A not to reveal this. These were intentional acts, not errors of judgment or inadvertent lapses.
- The conduct involved a misuse of his professional position. The Officer initiated and maintained the conversation under the authority of his role in an ongoing police investigation. He used that position to pursue an improper personal purpose.

- The Officer was an experienced officer. He had served for many years and would have been fully aware of the professional boundaries expected when dealing with members of the public, particularly those who may be vulnerable.
- The conduct represented a clear departure from professional standards. The Officer's actions were inconsistent with the obligations of impartiality, integrity, and maintaining appropriate boundaries.
- Aspects of the conversation were of a sexual nature. Introducing sexual content into an operational interaction represents a serious and deliberate departure from professional boundaries, and reflects a misuse of the authority and trust inherent in the Officer's position.

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

Harm

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

- Impact on Ms A. Ms A was a complainant in an ongoing matter and had previous difficult experiences with the police. The Officer's conduct risked exploiting that vulnerability and caused her distress, as evidenced by her reluctance to disclose the incident and her concern that doing so might "get her into trouble".
- Risk of undermining public confidence. Members of the public are entitled to expect that officers will maintain clear professional boundaries. Conduct of this nature, occurring during an operational interaction, has a clear potential to damage trust in the integrity and impartiality of the police service.
- Damage to the reputation of the police service. The misuse of a policing interaction for personal or sexual motives is conduct that the public would rightly regard as serious and unacceptable. It risks bringing the service into disrepute.
- Potential safeguarding implications. Although no physical contact occurred, the nature of the conduct created a risk of emotional or psychological harm and blurred the boundaries that exist to protect members of the public.

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

Aggravating factors

- Scale or depth of local or national concern about male police officers initiating improper emotional / sexual relationships with female complainants

Mitigating factors

- Misconduct confined to a single episode
- The Panel note the evidence given by the Officer in relation to allegation 3, that he was [REDACTED] that caused him to ‘not have his eye on the ball’, and not check the website had been removed

Personal mitigation factors

- Character evidence provided by five character witnesses
- However, we are careful to caveat that with the reminder that purely personal mitigation is not relevant to the seriousness of the misconduct and thus will have a limited effect on the outcome

Stage 2: The purpose of imposing sanctions

120. The Panel has 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).

Stage 3: Appropriate sanction

121. The Panel have taken into account the character evidence and personal mitigation. However, 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.

122. The Panel noted that the Officer retired in August 2025 and is therefore a former officer for the purposes of the Police (Conduct) Regulations. The Regulation 30 notice was served in December 2025, which is after the statutory trigger date of 28 May 2025 introduced by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025. In such circumstances, where gross misconduct is found, the statutory presumption of dismissal applies unless exceptional circumstances are established. The AA’s representative and the Officer’s representative agreed with the legal advice to the Panel in this regard.

123. The Officer's representative confirmed that no exceptional circumstances arise in this case.

124. In the absence of any such circumstances, and having determined that the Officer's conduct amounted to gross misconduct, the Panel concluded that the only proportionate and appropriate outcome is the former officer would have been dismissed without notice. As the Officer is a former officer, the Panel further determined that he should 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.

Commander Jason Prins

Louise Fox

Dr Nigel Westwood

20 May 2026