

**IN THE POLICE MISCONDUCT PANEL AND IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE  
(CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020**

**BETWEEN**

**COMMISSIONER OF POLICE FOR THE METROPOLIS**

Appropriate Authority

**AND**

**FPC CONSTABLE 254109 STANLEY KENNETT**

Officer Concerned

1. This misconduct hearing has been held between 15 May, 18 May and 19 May 2026 at Patrick Dunne House, Chalk Pitt Way, SM1 4RD (DPS Hearings Suite, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor). The Panel consisted of Mr Adam Khan (Chair), Mr Adam Williamson (Independent Panel Member) and Ms Joy Tweed (Independent Panel Member).
2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Mr Daniel Frier. Former PC Kennett was represented by his Police Federation Representative.

**PRELIMINARY ISSUES**

3. A preliminary direction was made prior to the hearing to impose publication restrictions in respect of any matter that might identify the complainant, Officer C. Officer C was also granted the special measure of using screens when she gave her evidence, to help her provide her best evidence. Special measures had previously been agreed for the remaining two witnesses, Officer A and Officer B as part of pre-trial discussions between

parties. The anonymity order agreed between the parties on the morning of 15 May 2026 places publication restrictions in respect of any matter that might identify Officers A, B and/or C.

4. The Opening Note served by the AA explains that former PC Kennett was dismissed from employment by the MPS on 12 February 2026 following adverse findings at an AMH chaired by Commander Brittain. He was found to have operated a private business whilst suspended on full pay by the MPS, in contravention of Force policy and after his business interest application had been refused. Therefore, FPC Kennett is a former police constable for this hearing.

## **THE ALLEGATIONS**

5. The allegation against FPC Kennett is set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon him under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020:
  - i. *It is alleged that FPC Kennett has approached and / or behaved towards female colleagues on Team A, Sutton, seeking to form sexual relationships with them, both on and off duty*
  - ii. *It is alleged that on or around December 2021 after a night out with colleagues, FPC Kennett touched Officer A on her waist without her consent, the touching being sexual or alternatively at the least inappropriate and invasive.*
  - iii. *It is alleged that whilst waiting for a taxi at the FPC Kennett's address, Officer A has felt tired and asked to lie down. She was directed to lie on the Officer's bed. Uninvited,*

*the Officer followed her into the room, lay down on the bed next to her and placed his arm across her waist. This made her feel very uncomfortable.*

- iv. It followed the Officer having sent Officer A flirtatious messages via Snapchat which were also unwanted and unwarranted. The complainant had deleted these messages.*
  - v. Separately, it is alleged that FPC Kennett exerted unwanted and unwarranted sexual attention on Officer B. On her second night shift with the FPC Kennett, he asked her who she found attractive and who she would sleep with on the team. This vein of questioning continued, and he asked her what her sexual preferences were and how many people she had slept with.*
  - vi. At one point, he had an erection and asked if she would help him with it. This same night, the Officer mentioned taking her to Banstead Golf Club.*
  - vii. During the inappropriate conversation, he had also placed his hand above her knee / thigh and asked what she would do if he touched her leg. She replied that she would PAVA him, and he did not continue*
  - viii. Subsequently in June 2023 on a team social, PC Kennett hugged and said something along the lines of "I'd fuck you right now". She ignored this and was not surprised by an inappropriate comment coming from PC Kennett. FPC Kennett continued to send her unwanted and inappropriate sexualised messages for some period of time.*
6. It is alleged that each allegation breaches the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of discreditable conduct and amounts individually and collectively to gross misconduct.

7. FPC Kennett denies that any of his conduct has breached the standards of professional behaviour alleged. He states in his Regulation 31 response that the majority of the alleged behaviours did not happen.
8. In his response to caution of 1 May 2024, the FPC Kennett says some of the allegations are *“simply untrue, and some appear to be an attempt in retrospect to elevate inoffensive conduct to something more sinister through the suggestion and influence of others”*. He concludes that the breakdown of his relationship with Officer C has prompted the complaints to be made, to get him away from the team.

## **EVIDENCE**

9. In advance of this hearing the Panel was supplied with the documents in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, which included a copy of the papers served on FPC Kennett in accordance with Regulation 30 and FPC Kennett's response to the AA under Regulation 31.
10. In determining the facts in this case, the Panel had regard to:
  - All documents and materials in the hearing bundle, the Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response, whether they were explicitly referred to or not during the hearing.
  - The oral evidence of Officer A
  - The oral evidence of Officer B
  - The oral evidence of Officer C
  - The oral evidence of FPC Kennett
  - The submissions made on behalf of the AA and FPC Kennett by his Federation Representative
  - The legal advice provided by Ms Ahmed (the LQA)

## THE PANEL'S APPROACH

11. The purpose of professional disciplinary proceedings is to protect the public and to maintain the high standards and good reputation of the profession. It is the role of the Panel to:
  - First, ascertain the facts.
  - Second, to determine, on the basis of those facts, whether FPC Kennett has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as alleged.
  - Third, to determine whether the admitted or otherwise identified breaches amount to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
  - Fourth, to decide on the outcome, if appropriate to do so, having regard to the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings.
  
12. The Panel had regard to a framework of regulations and guidance, in particular:
  - a. The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 and the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in the Schedule 2;
  - b. The Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing Issued by the Home Office (“the 2020 HOG”) – particularly Sections 1 to 3 which detail the Standards and the procedures expected to be followed;
  - c. The College of Policing Code of Ethics (2014);
  - d. The College of Policing’s Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings (2023 edition) (“the Guidance”);
  
13. In considering the facts, the Panel was aware that the burden of proof is on the AA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. In line with the principle derived from

Byrne v General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 2237 (Admin), the Panel recognised that there is only one standard of proof in civil and regulatory cases, namely whether the facts in issue more probably occurred than not. The seriousness of an allegation does not of itself require more cogent evidence. The inherent probability of the relevant conduct is a matter which can be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and in deciding whether the event/conduct occurred; this goes to the quality of evidence.

14. The Panel was also mindful not to assess a witness's credibility exclusively on their demeanour when giving evidence and that their veracity should be tested by reference to objective facts proved independently of their evidence, in particular by reference to the documents in the case. The Panel has also reminded itself that it should make a rounded assessment of a witness's reliability, rather than approaching their reliability in respect of each charge in isolation from the others: R (on the application of Dutta) v GMC [2020] EWHC 1974 (Admin).

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

15. The Panel considered each specified allegation.

### Panel's findings on (i)

16. The AA relies primarily on the evidence of Officers A and B to prove (i), namely that FPC Kennett has approached and/or behaved towards female colleagues on Team A, Sutton, seeking to form sexual relationships with them, both on and off duty.
17. The Panel finds this item proven in respect of Officer B, as the Panel determines that she had received social media messages while she was at her home. The Panel considered these messages to be unwanted and unwarranted.

Panel's findings on (ii) and (iii)

18. The AA relies primarily on the evidence of Officer A to prove the allegations of fact against FPC Kennett in relation to (i) to (iv) . Officer A gave her evidence with the use of screens. In oral evidence, Officer A adopted her statement dated 25 September 2023. Officer A could not be sure whether on the date in question (December 2021), she had shared a taxi with only FPC Kennett, or two other officers, who she identified in her statement dated 25 September 2023. These other officers were not witnesses at the hearing.
19. Officer A gave evidence that the group had been drinking and that it was a common feature to share a taxi back to where FPC Kennett lived at the time, as they did not live far from each other.
20. Whilst at FPC Kennett's address, Officer A expressed she was tired and wanted to lie down. She recalled that she went into FPC Kennett's bedroom, and she lay down on the bed, facing the door as she did. Officer A recalled that FPC Kennett had entered, that he had lain down next to her and slid his hand around her waist. She got up and left the room. She agreed that she could not remember parts of the events that night, but she stated that the incident had '*stuck out*' for her, as it '*should not have happened*' and it was '*not acceptable behaviour*'.
21. Officer A also remembered Z being with her at FPC Kennett's residence on the date in question. The Panel considered the documentary evidence available, in particular the Surrey Police Crime Report. The Panel noted that Z was spoken to by Surrey Police. The Surrey Police Crime Report records that Z does not recall anything of concern

happening that night. Z did not go inside FPC Kennett's address. She doesn't recall Officer A going inside the address either as she believes Officer A and another officer walked off. Z told Surrey Police that she has never been in FPC Kennett's address and never been there with Officer A.

22. During his evidence, FPC Kennett adopted his account at his PACE interview under caution on 24 January 2024, as reiterated in his Regulation 31 response. He maintained that Officer A did not attend his house in or around December 2021. A copy of the transcript of the PACE interview was also produced as part of the bundle before the panel. In May 2021, FPC Kennett accepted that there was an occasion where colleagues, including Officer A, attended his address. However, he maintained she did not enter his bedroom at any point. FPC Kennett stated that he continued to share a positive relationship with Officer A for some time, even after December 2021. He produced a screenshot of a message sent by Officer A on 18 May 2023 enquiring about his welfare, "*Hope you're ok, keep your head up, love ya xxxx*" (referred to at his PACE interview under caution on 24 January 2024).
23. The panel had regard to all the available evidence, including the Surrey Police crime report. Both the officers named by Officer A and FPC Kennett had been spoken to by Surrey Police following the police complaint made by Officer A. The panel noted there were differing accounts from multiple officers and that the officers had been drinking. The panel considered that the prevailing circumstances were that Officer A and FPC Kennett both accepted that on at least one occasion, whether in May or December 2021, they had been drinking alcohol during a group evening of socialising, and that they were in the company of other officers. It was probable that their respective memories were impacted by alcohol. The panel did not find this item to be proven on the balance of probabilities.

24. The panel has reminded itself that the burden of proof rests with the AA at this stage. The panel is not satisfied that the AA has discharged the burden of proof to the requisite standard.

Panel finding on (iv)

25. Officer A also alleged that she had added FPC Kennett on social media and he had become quite flirty. Once, he had sent her a picture of a drinks cabinet with text 'come around for some drinks' with a 'wink' emoji. She had deleted the message. She accepted that she had never blocked FPC Kennett on her social media.
26. FPC Kennett did not recall the specific message but if he did, he stated that this would have been 'innocently meant'. He denied that he had any sexual interest in Officer A. He denied the suggestion that his message contained sexual innuendo.
27. The panel has reminded itself that the burden of proof rests with the AA at this stage. The panel is not satisfied that the AA has discharged the burden of proof to the requisite standard.

Panel finding on (v)

28. The AA relies primarily on the evidence of Officer B to prove the allegations of fact against FPC Kennett in relation to (i) (v)-(viii). Officer B gave her evidence with the use of screens. In oral evidence, Officer B adopted her statements dated 4 September 2023 and 7 January 2025.
29. Officer B gave evidence that on her second night shift with FPC Kennett, he asked her who she found attractive and who she would sleep with on the team. This vein of questioning continued, and he asked her what her sexual preferences were and how many people she had slept with.

30. Officer B reported the matter to APS SR, who made a pocketbook entry and escalated to Inspector MG.
31. FPC Kennett gave evidence and denied making the comments alleged by Officer B in July 2020.
32. The Panel considered that the available contemporaneous documentary evidence corroborated Officer B's account, whereby she relayed the incident to APS SR, and he documented it contemporaneously. The panel considered the notebook supported Officer B's evidence and formed a contemporaneous record of Officer B's account.
33. Inspector MG spoke to FPC Kennett at the time but treated it as an isolated incident. Officer B gave evidence that she felt '*let down*' that her concerns were not treated seriously. Officer B gave evidence that in light of the outcome, she felt like she '*had to get on with it*'. She felt obliged to maintain a good working relationship with FPC Kennett.

Panel finding on (vi)

34. Officer B gave evidence that during the same shift, FPC Kennett had expressed to Officer B that he had an erection and asked if she would 'help him with it'. This same night, the Officer mentioned taking her to a place understood by both Officer B and FPC Kennett as a place visited by people for the purpose of engaging in sexual activity.
35. The panel found Officer B's evidence to be credible.
36. The Panel considered that the available contemporaneous documentary evidence corroborated Officer B's account. APS SR's statement corroborated Officer B's account that she reported the inappropriate conversation, and he documented it

contemporaneously. The panel considered the notebook supported Officer B's evidence and formed a contemporaneous record of Officer B's account.

Panel finding on (vii)

37. Officer B gave evidence that during the inappropriate conversation that same shift in question, he had also placed his hand above her knee/ thigh and asked what she would do if he touched her leg. She replied that she would 'PAVA' [incapacitant spray] him, and he did not continue.
38. FPC Kennett denied making the comments.
39. The panel found Officer B's evidence to be credible.
40. As with (v) and (vi), the Panel considered that the available contemporaneous documentary evidence corroborated Officer B's account. APS SR's statement corroborated Officer B's account that she reported the inappropriate conversation, and he documented it contemporaneously. The panel considered the notebook supported Officer B's evidence and formed a contemporaneous record of Officer B's account.

Panel finding on (viii)

41. Officer B gave evidence that FPC Kennett sent her unwanted and inappropriate sexualised messages.
42. FPC Kennett accepted in his evidence that some conversations happened with Officer B on WhatsApp and he stated that they were '*jokey*' and '*reciprocal*'. At the time, he stated he did not think these messages were inappropriate because of the friendly relationship he and Officer B shared. However, he has reflected, and he would now regard the type of '*jokey messages*' exhibited in the bundle as unprofessional.

43. The Panel gave careful consideration to FPC Kennett's WhatsApp messages with Officer B, including the images, videos and voice notes.
44. The panel found Officer B's evidence to be credible. Her evidence was corroborated by the WhatsApp messages and voice notes. The panel determined that PC Kennett sent inappropriate sexualised messages. The panel recognised from Officer B's account at the hearing that these messages were unwanted.
45. The panel went on to consider the issue of collusion, as suggested in the evidence of FPC Kennett. The panel had regard to the evidence, the legal advice and the submissions from the representatives for the AA and on behalf of FPC Kennett. The Panel determined that there was no evidence to suggest that Officer B had colluded with Officer C. Moreover, there was no evidence that Officer B knew Officer C outside of their occasional work interactions.

#### **BREACH OF STANDARDS**

46. The panel went on to consider whether FPC Kennett had breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to Discreditable Conduct. In determining whether the conduct of FPC Kennett amounted to a breach of those Standards, the Panel considered the facts found proven by the Panel, the submissions made on behalf of the AA and those made by the Federation Representative on behalf of FPC Kennett, and the legal advice provided by Ms Ahmed.
47. The standard provides:

#### 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.”*

48. The panel concluded that by engaging in inappropriate behaviour towards Officer B on her second shift and during the exchange of WhatsApp messages and voice notes, FPC Kennett has clearly breached the standard.

## **GROSS MISCONDUCT OR MISCONDUCT**

49. Having found the breaches of the standard as set out above proved, the Panel carefully considered whether the breaches amount to gross misconduct, misconduct or neither. Misconduct is defined in the Regulations as meaning a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross misconduct is defined as a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.

50. The Panel reminded itself of the circumstances of this case, the breaches of the standard found proved, the need to protect public confidence in, and the reputation of the Police Service, the need to maintain high professional standards and the need to protect the public and officers and staff by preventing similar misconduct in the future.

51. In assessing the seriousness of FPC Kennett’s conduct, the Panel had regard to the outcome guidance which provides that Panels should assess the seriousness of the proven conduct by reference to the officer’s culpability for the misconduct, the harm caused by the misconduct, the existence of any aggravating factors and the existence of any mitigating factors.

52. The Panel determined that the allegations found proved involved unwarranted sexualised behaviour towards Officer B. The Officer's culpability for his actions was high.
53. Harm can be caused in several ways. The guidance emphasises how the public might perceive such behaviour, if it were to become known, is a relevant factor to take into account when deciding on the level of harm. The Panel heard from Officer B on how she had been caused emotional harm, and that the experience had distressed her enough to report the events that occurred on her second shift with FPC Kennett, despite being new to the force.
54. There was also the issue of harm to the public confidence in the profession. Misogyny and VAWG in the police service are issues of local and national concern and have a significant impact and detriment on the standing and reputation of the profession as a whole.
55. The panel therefore concluded that the level of harm in this case was high.
56. The panel also considered that FPC Kennett's behaviour in relation to the time he spent on the shift with Officer B, which the panel found was unwarranted and persistent, continued even after he realised or should have realised that it was improper.
57. In terms of mitigating features, the panel had regard to the Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Hearings. The panel heard evidence from FPC Kennett about his mental health and the impact this may have had on his behaviour. Officer C also gave evidence about FPC Kennett's mental health. The panel noted that FPC Kennett's HR records noted absences from work on account of mental health.
58. In relation to (i), the Panel determines this is **misconduct** (in relation to Officer B only).

59. The Panel concluded that the conduct found proved in relation to (v),(vi) and (vii) amounted to **gross misconduct**.

60. The Panel concluded that the conduct found proved in relation to (viii) amounted to **misconduct**.

## **OUTCOME**

61. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction the panel has had regard to FPC Kennett's service record, the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf of the AA and FPC Kennett, and the legal advice received from the LQA. The Panel applied the three-stage procedure set out in the outcome guidance.

62. The Panel kept in mind at all times the threefold purpose of imposing sanctions, namely: (a) maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; (b) upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; (c) protection of the public. Of these, the maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service is paramount.

63. The Panel assessed the seriousness of the misconduct, keeping in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions and chose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose considering the seriousness of the conduct in question.

64. The Panel had regard to Section 3.31 of the Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Hearings. In the circumstances, the only appropriate sanction in this case, if FPC Kennett had been a serving officer would have been dismissal without notice.

## **REDACTIONS**

65. The Panel invited representations from the parties. It was agreed that redactions should be made to the published report to protect the identity of witnesses and third parties.

Mr Adam Khan (Chair)

Mr Adam Williamson (Independent Panel Member)

Ms Joy Tweed (independent Panel Member)

20 May 2026