

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Omar Campedelli

Warrant No: P251457

Date of Hearing: 3rd June 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Use of force, Duties and Responsibilities

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 Campedelli attended the hearing, provided a Regulation 54 response and additional representations.

PC Campedelli was represented by his federation representative, PC Darren Gill. The AA was represented by Counsel, Mr Chris Pataky and Case Manager, Molly Nairn.

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

The Allegation

On 1st December 2025, whilst on duty in uniform, you used excessive and unjustified force on a male detainee, who was detained under section 136 of the Mental Health Act 1983.

Particulars

- i) While on duty, conducting a hospital guard for the male detainee, who was handcuffed and laying on a hospital bed, you forcefully slapped the male across the head with an open hand before shouting “stop spitting at me”.

Your explicit use of force can be seen on the Body Worn Video of another colleague who was also in attendance. The level of force administered, whilst the male was handcuffed to the rear, was wholly disproportionate and unnecessary in the circumstances.

- ii) Further, you failed to report or record the slap to the detainee’s head when completing your use of force form. As a Police Officer, you have a responsibility to uphold your duties and responsibilities, and you failed to accurately report or record your actions.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that PC Campedelli’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
- Use of Force
- Duties and Responsibilities

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 Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Mr Pataky and the representations made on behalf of PC Campedelli by his federation representative, PC Gill.

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 Campedelli.

- PC Campedelli can be seen to slap the male with an open palmed hand across the head. (BWV PC Nicholas at 05:36 on 01.12.2025)
- PC Campedelli used excessive, unreasonable and disproportionate force when he slapped the male, who did not pose an immediate and/or physical threat. His conduct was wholly unnecessary.
- PC Campedelli intended to slap Person A around the head, which is borne out by Person A's positioning on the BWV.
- PC Campedelli was told by his fellow officers to move away from the male after the use of excessive force.
- PC Campedelli did not report the slap on his use of force form, nor did he mention the strike to the head in his statement following the incident.

Officer's position

- PC Campedelli described in his statement following the incident that he slapped the male on his left chest/shoulder not his head.
- PC Campedelli now accepts that his open palm strike went to the head, but he avers the strike did not land where he intended, which was the left chest/shoulder.
- PC Campedelli avers that the use of force was reasonable, necessary and effective. Person A was violent and abusive over one hour and a half.

- PC Campedelli maintains that he acted to stop the male from assaulting his fellow officers and NHS staff.
- PC Campedelli states he had no intention to misrepresent on the use of force form. He completed the form with an adjoined statement where he recalled the events to the best of his recollection.
- PC Campedelli relies on his good character and lack of a disciplinary record.

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.
- **Use of Force** - Police officers only use force to the extent that it is necessary, proportionate and reasonable in all the circumstances.
- **Duties and Responsibilities** - Police officers are diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities.

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

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 Campedelli.

After careful consideration, I have found the facts proven as set out by the Appropriate Authority, outlined above.

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 outlined previously.

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 and having applied Regulation 61(15) and 61(16), 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 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 public.

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

Culpability is high – PC Campedelli’s conduct was intentional and deliberate. The male was restrained and on the BWV it is clear that PC Campedelli did not address his concerns as to the male’s spitting before slapping him across the head with excessive force.

The force used was more than necessary in circumstances where the male was already restrained and not in a position to harm anyone.

PC Campedelli chose to omit the slap to the head from his form and statement post the incident, trying to minimise his actions by describing it as a slap to the shoulder/chest.

Harm – is high. PC Campedelli actions were unprofessional and cause harm to the reputation of the police and the MPS in particular.

PC Campedelli used excessive force against a member of the public, who was in a vulnerable position, clearly intoxicated and detained in hospital.

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 – I do not consider that there are any mitigating features.

However, I have been provided with personal mitigation on behalf of PC Campedelli, in the form of two letters of recognition of the officer's work during two challenging incidents and a reference from DS De Villiers.

In any event, 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 28th 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, including BWV. 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 Paul Trevers
Metropolitan Police Service
3rd June 2026