

THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020
("the Regulations")

BETWEEN

THE APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY OF
THE METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE

("the Authority")

and

PC BENJAMIN PULLEN – P261142

Officer Concerned

("the Officer")

CHAIR'S DETERMINATION

Introduction

1. I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started. I am satisfied that all the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been served: matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.
2. I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority ("AA") by Molly Nairn. PC Pullen appeared with his Federation Representative,

PC Chris Brinsley, who made representations on the Officer's behalf and with the Officer.

3. This written decision uses cyphers for the names of members of the public, as I directed at the end of the hearing.
4. The allegations against PC Pullen are as follows:

"Allegations

1. *On 21st June 2025, you misused your position as a police officer by providing personal contact details to Ms [X], for a non-policing purpose, during a traffic stop,*
2. *During the traffic stop, you deliberately deactivated your BWV in order to engage in conduct you knew, or ought reasonably to have known, was improper, in breach of Body Worn Video policy.*
3. *You went on to engage in an inappropriate personal relationship with Ms [X], whom you met in the course of your duties.*
4. *You failed to declare:*
 - (a) The relationship with Ms [X], formed as a result of your duties;*
 - (b) Your association with Mr [Y], a registered sex offender;*
 - (c) The fact that you were frequenting / residing at an address linked to a registered sex offender.*
5. *You provided a dishonest and misleading account to a supervising officer, regarding the relationship with Ms [X]*
 - (a) Provided a misleading account, stating that you had met Ms [X] in a motorbike shop;*
 - (b) Denied being in a relationship with her;*
 - (c) Failed to make full and proper disclosure of the true nature and origin of the relationship.*
6. *On 8 October 2025, during a 111 call to police, made using Ms [X] s mobile telephone, you:*
 - (a) Failed to properly identify yourself as a police officer;*
 - (b) Initially attempted to avoid providing your name;*
 - (c) Subsequently provided a false name, namely "Ben [X]".*

Standards of Professional Behaviour

*It is alleged that your conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour,
namely:*

- *Honesty and Integrity*
- *Discreditable Conduct*
- *Duties and Responsibilities*
- *Orders and Instructions*

*In that you behaved in a manner likely to bring discredit upon the police service and
undermine public confidence.*

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

The Officer's submissions

5. PC Pullen provided a Regulation 54 Response and accompanying documents. At the hearing, via his Federation Representative, PC Pullen denied Allegations 1, 2 3 and 5 in their entirety, and denied Allegation 6(b). He accepted Allegation 4 save for the clause “a registered sex offender” at 4(b) and 4(c). He accepted Allegations 6(a) and (c).
6. PC Pullen gave live evidence, by answering questions posed by his Federation Representative and by me.
7. On Allegations 1 and 3, he accepted that he met Ms [X] during a traffic stop on 21 June 2025, but denied wrongdoing, saying that there was no malice and by stating that he and Ms [X] have gone on to marry one another. He said that in

hindsight he can see that the circumstances of their meeting were 'not ideal'. His Regulation 54 Response accepts that he gave Ms [X] his personal mobile phone number.

8. On Allegation 2, he accepted that he turned off his Body Worn Video ("BWV") camera, but said that there was nothing evidential to capture.
9. On Allegation 4(b) and (c), he said Mr [Y] lived in the same house as Ms [X], so he could not ignore him, that he knew that he had a conviction, but he did not know that he was a convicted sex offender. I asked him whether he ran a check on Mr [Y] during the traffic stop, and asked him questions about his radio to test whether he had heard about convictions down the airwaves. PC Pullen said that he had his radio on, but it was turned down so he did not hear radio communication.
10. On Allegation 5, PC Pullen's position was that Sgt [REDACTED] – his supervising officer – had mis-recorded parts of their conversation in his MG11 statement, materially that he (PC Pullen) did not say to Sgt [REDACTED] that he met Ms [X] away from the traffic stop at a motorbike shop where they agreed to meet up, but he (PC Pullen) had said that he agreed to show Ms [X] his motorbike. He said that at the time of the conversation with Sgt [REDACTED] he and Ms [X] were not in a committed relationship. He said that he did not intend to mislead his Sergeant.
11. On Allegation 6(b), PC Pullen said that he told the call handler that his surname was '[X]' as he is dyslexic and dyspraxic and cannot multi-task, and Ms [X] was having a panic attack beside him. He said that Ms [X] was spelling her surname to him, and he had intended to give his own surname down the phone. He said that he did not intend to be dishonest.

Factual findings

12. **Allegation 1:** The fact that PC Pullen gave Ms [X] his personal mobile phone number during the traffic stop was admitted by him. The question for me, therefore, is whether PC Pullen misused his position as a police officer by giving his number. I was taken to paragraph 6 of the College of Policing and NPCC

guidance on '*Maintaining a professional boundary between police and members of the public*', which reads:

6. Do not engage in, or pursue, a sexual or improper emotional relationship, on or off duty, with any member of the public who you have come into contact with during the course of your current work or duties.

13. There is also paragraph 7, which reads:

7. While you may find yourself attracted to a member of the public, or find yourself in a situation where someone is attracted to you, it is your responsibility not to act on these feelings. This is to prevent any harm that such actions may cause and to maintain the integrity of the policing profession.

14. Applying that guidance, I find that PC Pullen providing his number while on duty during a traffic stop was inappropriate. The guidance states that this prohibition is in place to maintain the integrity of the policing profession. Although PC Pullen and Ms [X] have gone on to marry, I must bear in mind why the prohibition exists.

15. As such, I find that Allegation 1 is proven.

16. **Allegation 2:** I have watched the BWV footage. I find this allegation proven. There was a vehicle stop involving multiple occupants for which the progress of the stop could not be determined or known and that the role of the supporting officer is to provide both physical presence and support, but also an evidential and procedural support. In turning off the camera, he failed to comply with his duties. The footage shows a conversation that is developing in an unprofessional way and of a personal nature. I find that PC Pullen did turn off the camera to pursue that unprofessional interaction that was developing. He did not shut down that emerging conversation while the camera was still on. It is known from PC Pullen's own admission that that conversation – after the BWV was turned off – resulted in him providing Ms [X] with his personal mobile phone number. I find that he turned off his camera so that developing conversation was not captured. This allegation is proven.

17. **Allegation 3:** The fact of the relationship is admitted. It is the fact that the relationship continued, with multiple interactions including PC Pullen staying at Ms [X]'s home, without PC Pullen disclosing the relationship and how it formed, that was an inappropriate personal relationship. I find this allegation proven.

18. **Allegation 4:** During the traffic stop PC Pullen was partnered with Sgt [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Sgt [REDACTED] MG11 statement records that the driver was Mr [Y], who was a registered sex offender. His statement then records that [REDACTED] checked Mr [Y]'s phone as per his 'requirements', which I read as reference to his sex offender notification requirements or similar. I note from [REDACTED] MG11 statement that Mr [Y] was subject to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order and sex offender notification requirements, which provided a power to police to review his internet enabled devices. Also during the course of the traffic stop, Ms [X] was engaged by the officers as she was required to drive the car away and the driver received a traffic offence report for driving without insurance, so she was engaged with the other officers so that PC Pullen was not at all times only speaking with her. I find it inconceivable that in circumstances where Sgt [REDACTED] and PC [REDACTED] knew that Mr [Y] was a sex offender at the time of the traffic stop that PC Pullen did not. On the balance of probabilities PC Pullen knew at the time of the traffic stop of Mr [Y] being a registered sex offender.

19. In addition, in his oral evidence PC Pullen admitted that he knew that Mr [Y] has a conviction, but he said that he did not know what. This knowledge, even though incomplete and if he is believed, required him to declare his association with the flatmate of his girlfriend whose home he stayed in.

20. I find the contested part of this Allegation 4 proven.

21. **Allegation 5:** Sgt [REDACTED] MG11 statement recounts a conversation where PC Pullen stated that he had met Ms [X] away from the traffic stop and that they had agreed to meet at a motorbike shop. PC Pullen's evidence, i.e. that he told the Sergeant that he agreed to show Ms [X] his motorbike, does not address the allegation. What is clear from Sgt [REDACTED] written evidence and PC Pullen's evidence is that the two officers had a conversation about Ms [X] and

how PC Pullen knew her. It was a material omission for PC Pullen not to tell his Sergeant that he met her during the traffic stop.

22. Paragraph 8 of the College of Policing / NPCC guidance records:

“8. Inform a line manager as soon as is practicable if a member of the public attempts to pursue a sexual or improper emotional relationship with you, so that control measures can be put in place. Treat them politely and considerately and try to re-establish a professional boundary, in addition to informing your line manager. If their behaviour continues, discuss with your manager the most appropriate way for you to respectfully disengage from that individual while a policing response is still provided.”

23. Even if he was unaware of the black letter of this paragraph, it can be seen from Sgt [REDACTED] evidence that PC Pullen misled by omission, him knowing that he was hiding something that he ought to have declared.

24. My finding of wrongdoing by omission is strengthened by PC Pullen having previously had a Reflective Practice Review on 21 July 2023 concerning him obtaining contact details of female members of the public on two occasions while on duty. He was made aware not to obtain personal contact information from the public while on duty.

25. I find allegation 5(a) proven – any reference to the motorbike was incomplete and misleading.

26. On Allegations 5(b) and (c), Sgt [REDACTED] evidence is that in or around July 2025, PC Pullen denied being in a relationship with Ms [X] and was not going to be. That conversation arose because the Sergeant was informed by another officer that PC Pullen was going on a date with a woman who he met during a traffic stop. The hearing bundle, however, contains a card from PC Pullen to Ms [X] saying: *“I truly fell in love with you from that moment we met and haven’t stopped falling for you every day since”*. As such, I find that PC Pullen did deny to Sgt [REDACTED] that he was in a – or at least a developing – relationship and

did fail to make full and proper disclosure of the true nature of the relationship. I find Allegations 5(b) and (c) proven.

27. **Allegation 6:** I have listened to the recording of the 111 call. PC Pullen provides a surname. Allegations 6(a) and (c) were admitted. I do not find 6(b) proven, as he did not attempt to avoid providing his name; he actively provided a false name, Ben [X]. PC Pullen sought to explain giving the wrong name due to his dyslexia and dyspraxia. I do not accept that explanation. During the call he gave his surname as [X] (spelling it using the phonetic alphabet), then gave her surname as [X], and confirmed at least twice that they had the same surname. I find PC Pullen's evidence that he accidentally gave the wrong name as lacking credibility, and I find that he as a witness lacked credibility.

28. My findings on Allegations 4 and 5 are fortified by the findings that I made under Allegation 6 about PC Pullen lacking credibility.

Standards

29. I find the following standards breached under the following allegations:

30. The Honesty & Integrity elements of Honesty & Integrity: Allegation 5(a) to (c) and Allegation 6(a) and (c), by providing false information, including by omission.

31. The Integrity element only of Honesty & Integrity: Allegation 1, Allegation 2 and Allegation 3 due to PC Pullen not doing the right thing by giving his phone number to Ms [X], turning off his BWV when he did this and the conversation moved towards that moment, and for engaging in a relationship that started in this manner without disclosing it. Allegation 3 (again) and Allegation 4(a), (b) and (c) due to PC Pullen not doing the right thing by informing his superiors and/or declaring the relationship with Ms [X] and his association with Mr [Y].

32. Duties & Responsibilities: Allegation 2, Allegation 4(a), (b) and (c) and Allegation 5(a), (b) and (c) due to PC Pullen not adhering to the duty and responsibility to declare the relationship with Ms [X] and the association with Mr [Y].

33. Orders & Instructions: Allegation 5(a), (b) and (c) for not adhering to what amounted to an instruction from Sgt [REDACTED]
34. Discreditable Conduct: taking the conduct as a whole and the breaches found above, I also view PC Pullen's conduct to be discreditable, in that public confidence is undermined and the service discredited by an officer forming a relationship with a member of the public who he met in the course of being on duty and then sought to conceal that.

Misconduct and gross misconduct

35. I have to consider whether I am sufficiently satisfied to make a finding, on the balance of probabilities, of misconduct or gross misconduct. Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious to justify disciplinary action and Gross Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified.
36. In order to determine this question of 'seriousness' I have adopted the approach that is set out in the College of Policing's 'Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings' (2023), at chapter 4:
- "Assess the seriousness of the proven conduct, by reference to:
- 1) the officer's culpability for the misconduct
 - 2) the harm caused by the misconduct
 - 3) the existence of any aggravating factors
 - 4) the existence of any mitigating factors
37. On **culpability**, the College of Policing Guidance at paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10 records:

Culpability

4.9 Culpability denotes the officer's blameworthiness or responsibility for their actions. The more culpable or blameworthy the behaviour in question, the more serious the misconduct and the more severe the likely outcome.

4.10 Conduct which is intentional, deliberate, targeted or planned will generally be more culpable than conduct which has unintended

consequences, although the consequences of an officer's actions will be relevant to the harm caused.

38. I assess the officer's culpability as high. Despite his previous Reflective Practice Review, he gave Ms [X] his phone number. He was in a position of trust at the time. He could have reasonably foreseen the risk of harm to the reputation of policing. He sustained his attempt to conceal including via dishonesty.

39. On **harm**, the Guidance says at paragraph 4.66:

4.66 Harm will likely undermine public confidence in policing. Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual or group to undermine public confidence. Where an officer commits an act that would harm public confidence if the circumstances were known to the public, take this into account. Always take misconduct seriously that undermines discipline and good order within the police service, even if it does not result in harm to individual victims.

40. It goes on to say at paragraph 4.69:

4.69 How such behaviour would be, or has been, perceived by the public will be relevant, whether or not the behaviour was known about at the time.

41. Dishonesty causes serious harm to the standing of the profession as a whole, so does acting with a lack of Integrity. Officers engaging members of the public for personal reasons or sexual reasons is a matter of national concern. Further, the public perception of the police is damaged by an officer concealing his initial wrongdoing. I view the harm in this case as being high.

42. On **mitigating factors**, the officer raised his dyslexia and dyspraxia, but I do not view that as explaining his conduct during the 111 call.

43. On **aggravating factors**, there has been an abuse of trust, and an attempt to conceal as detailed above. Further, PC Pullen continued his concealment when he should have realised that it was improper after his conversation with his Sergeant in July 2025. There was also significant deviation from his responsibility and policy to declare his relationship with Ms [X] and his association with Mr [Y]. He also failed to seek advice as required by the College of Policing / NPCC guidance.

44. Taking the above into account, I assess the conduct as being gross misconduct. My finding is that each Allegation alone amounts to gross misconduct.

Disciplinary Outcome

45. I have already found that PC Pullen's conduct amounted to gross misconduct, and that each allegation alone amounts to gross misconduct. Therefore, there is a presumption of dismissal in Regulation 62(1), unless there are exceptional circumstances, in which case, a final written warning may be imposed.

46. After my finding of gross misconduct, PC Pullen provided some context to his actions, stating that he had just emerged from a traumatic relationship break up. I do not view this as a mitigating factor. He also expressed his view that he has a lot to bring to force. I do not view this as weighing against the gravity of the proven conduct. These points of personal mitigation carry little weight. I have received PC Pullen's HR record, but was not drawn to anything in particular by his representative.

47. My findings on seriousness remain as they were given at Stage 1.

48. I have kept in mind the three-fold purposes of the misconduct regime: to maintain public confidence and the reputation of the police service, to uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct, and to protect the public.

49. I see no 'exceptional circumstances' to deviate from the presumption of dismissal. The conduct was serious, involving dishonesty and a lack of integrity. Public confidence will be maintained and high standards upheld by a

sanction of dismissal without notice. That is my finding in this case. The officer will be placed on the barred list.

50. Further, a lesser outcome would not serve to mark the seriousness of his misconduct, deter others from similar misconduct and fulfil the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

51. Outcome decision will be published. Cyphers applied to Ms [X] and Mr [Y].

OUTCOME: Dismissal without notice and placed on the College of Policing Barred List

Carl Galvin

Deputy Assistant Commissioner

12 June 2026