

# Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Ameerq Ahmed

Warrant No: P267609

Date of Hearing: 5<sup>th</sup> June 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Confidentiality, Orders and Instructions, Honesty and Integrity

## Findings

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started, along with viewing both the edited and unedited digital material. I am satisfied that the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been served. These are matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.

The hearing was held in **Public**.

PC Ahmed attended the hearing and provided a Regulation 54 response.

PC Ahmed was represented by his federation representative, PC Lisa Hayden. The Appropriate Authority was represented by Counsel, Mr Silas Lee and Case Manager, Ms Melissa Gordedo.

I am satisfied PC Ahmed has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

## The Allegation

Following a routine audit of MPS IT systems, it was identified that you conducted a number of searches on police databases, both whilst on and off duty, without a legitimate policing purpose.

It is alleged that you misused MPS computer systems, namely Connect and the

Police National Computer (PNC), to access information without lawful authority or a valid policing need.

Particulars:

- i) On six occasions (8 February 2025, 9 September 2025, 14 September 2025, 13 October 2025, 18 October 2025, and 28 October 2025), you accessed the MPS Connect system and carried out searches without a legitimate policing purpose. These searches included enquiries relating to yourself, your home address and individuals known to you, including family members and neighbours.
- ii) On 8 December 2025, you accessed the PNC database to conduct a search relating to two family members, again without a legitimate policing purpose.

You did not have any lawful or policing justification for conducting any of the above searches. In doing so, you breached the MPS Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Policy and misused police systems for personal reasons.

## Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that PC Ahmed's actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely:

- Discreditable Conduct
- Confidentiality
- Orders and Instructions
- Honesty and Integrity

In that your conduct may bring the police service into disrepute and damage the relationship of trust and confidence between the police and the public.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, your conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct, and your dismissal may be justified.

## The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Mr Lee and the representations made on behalf of PC Ahmed by PC Hayden.

## Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the allegations against PC Ahmed.

- PC Ahmed misused the computer system Connect on six separate occasions both on and off duty during 2025 – 08/02/25, 09/09/25, 14/09/25, 13/10/25, 18/10/25 and 28/10/25.
- PC Ahmed has used Connect to search for information with no policing purpose relating to himself, his address and people known to him – his father, sister, uncle, aunt, cousin and neighbour.
- On one occasion, PC Ahmed conducted PNCs check on his father and uncle.
- PC Ahmed acted without proper policing purpose and therefore breached MPS ICT Policy.

## Officer's position

- PC Ahmed was interviewed on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026. He explained that he carried out the searches on Connect in an attempt to find the crime reference number relating to a house fire at his home address a few years before. He needed the crime reference number to provide it to the insurance company.
- PC Ahmed accepted that he conducted the checks and that he had no policing purpose when carrying out those checks and only did so out of professional curiosity.
- On behalf of the officer, it is accepted that the standards of discreditable conduct,

confidentiality and orders and instructions have been breached to the level of misconduct.

- PC Ahmed avers that the conduct amounts to misconduct. PC Ahmed does not accept a breach of the standard of honesty and integrity. It is advanced on his behalf that his conduct arises out of good-faith misunderstanding, lack of training or by mistake. It was not deliberate or dishonest conduct.
- PC Ahmed avers that the breaches of MPS policy were as a result of misguided access undertaken in good faith, the access arose from error and misunderstanding of a policing purpose and the lack of training. The officer contends that most of the searches were conducted with a view of locating the crime reference number to the house fire that has significantly impacted him, his wife and family.
- In relation to the PNC checks, the officer contends that they were born out of curiosity and constitute two isolated incidents. PC Ahmed simply failed to recognise or appreciate the impropriety of his conduct.

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether it amounts to breach of the following standards of behaviour:

- **Discreditable Conduct** – Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.
- **Confidentiality** - Police officers treat information with respect and access or disclose it only in the proper course of police duties.
- **Orders and Instructions** - Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders.
- **Honesty and Integrity** - Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

In line with Regulation 61(7) and Regulation 61(8), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority and from those representing PC Ahmed.

## Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary evidence provided to me, including the submissions on behalf of PC Ahmed.

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

## Breach of Professional Standards

I bear in mind that the burden of proving Breach of Standards rests upon the Appropriate Authority and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden and the conduct did breach the standards of professional behaviour as to discreditable conduct, confidentiality, orders and instructions, honesty and integrity.

## Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the *Standards of Professional Behaviour* so serious to justify dismissal. Applying that definition, I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards do amount to gross misconduct.

## Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make an assessment of Seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors. I have applied Regulation 61(15) and 61(16).

I consider the allegations individually and cumulatively. The Appropriate Authority addressed me on seriousness and contend that the conduct amounts to gross misconduct as the conduct is deliberate, intentional and causes serious harm to the police service and public.

I have carefully considered the submissions by the Appropriate Authority, and I have considered the submissions on behalf of PC Ahmed.

**Culpability** is high – PC Ahmed's conduct was intentional and deliberate. He searched Connect with a particular purpose in mind, namely, to locate a crime reference number relating to a house fire.

PC Ahmed's conduct was sustained, over a period of months. He did not seek advice or

declare that he has come across sensitive information.

PC Ahmed made a conscious decision to search for his father and uncle on PNC. PC Ahmed should have been aware of the MPS ICT Policies as required.

PC Ahmed did not act with a policing purpose in mind and therefore compromised his integrity as a police constable.

PC Ahmed did not act with integrity when used the connect system for any other purpose than a policing purpose and he abused his position by searching for confidential information/conducting a PNC check on two of his family members.

**Harm** – is high. PC Ahmed's actions were unprofessional and cause harm to the reputation of the police.

It undermines public confidence in policing at a time when the police and specifically the Metropolitan Police are aiming to demonstrate how seriously it is tackling higher standards over the last few years following highly publicized and damaging incidents.

**Aggravating features** – I have considered that there are no additional aggravating features as I am mindful not to double count or take to consideration any factors that have already featured in my determination of culpability and harm.

**Mitigating features** – PC Ahmed accepted his conduct and made early admissions.

I have been provided with personal mitigation on behalf of PC Ahmed, who has suffered some significant personal losses, including the house fire, which resulted in the family having to temporarily stay in a hotel, before staying temporarily with friends. PC Ahmed asserts he was on medication at the time. It is suggested the medication could have had some effects on him. However, I do not have any medical evidence underlying this contention. PC Ahmed's wife suffered a loss and has recently lost her employment.

I have also been provided with a character bundle, containing 15-character references, which I have carefully considered. PC Ahmed is described as a conscientious officer, hardworking and knowledgeable.

However, I am mindful of the limits to the weight I should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings, and that the interests of the police service, and the protection of the

public, are more important than those of the individual officer.

## Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I bear in mind that the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025 (“The 2025 Regulations”) came into effect on the 28<sup>th</sup> May 2025.

The 2025 Regulations amend Regulations 42 and 62 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (“The PCR”) so that, where gross misconduct is proven against a serving officer, the panel must dismiss the officer unless there are exceptional circumstances.

I have considered the officer’s record of service.

This case is based upon what amounts to irrefutable evidence; the conduct was sustained and deliberate. I have also borne in mind PC Ahmed’s own admissions as to the conduct. I have carefully assessed the seriousness of the conduct, as set out above, and I do not find any exceptional circumstances.

The only available sanction is dismissal without notice and I am satisfied that it is the only appropriate sanction in this case.

## OUTCOME:

Having considered the matter fully and having regard to the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, the sanction I impose is **dismissal without notice** and the officer should be placed on the College of Policing’s **public** barred list.

Commander Andy Brittain  
Metropolitan Police Service  
5<sup>th</sup> June 2026