

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

BETWEEN

THE APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY OF
THE METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE

("the Authority")

and

PC ROMAH MOJHOA – P269509

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 PC Hannah Clark. PC Mojhoa appeared with her Federation

Representative, PC Rhiannon Flury who made representations on the officer's behalf.

3. The allegations against PC Mojhoa are as follows:

"On 27th March 2026, at Willesden Magistrates Court you were found guilty of the following offences:

- *Driving whilst disqualified Contrary to section 103(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.*
- *Using a motor vehicle on a road / public place without third party insurance Contrary to section 143 of, the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to, the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.*

You were therefore convicted of these offences and received 6 points to your driving licence and ordered to pay a fine of £769.

...

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

- (i) Honesty & Integrity (Integrity only)*
- (ii) Discreditable Conduct*

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."

4. Via her Federation Representative, PC Mojhoa accepted that she drove while disqualified and was convicted. She did not challenge those facts. She

accepted that such conduct falls below standards required in terms of Integrity and Discreditable Conduct. She offered an unreserved apology and stated that she was genuinely remorseful. She said that she takes full personal responsibility. She asked me to consider the context in which this lapse occurred. She said that she was experiencing difficulties in her working environment, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] She said that she recognises that regardless of these pressures she should have acted in accordance with the law. She understands the wide implications for public perception. She said that she knows that she should not have allowed pressures to have affected her as they did and should have sought help. I asked whether the pressures [REDACTED] are documented, and I was told that after she fell under investigation she raised [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] but that was after the driving offence had been committed.

Factual findings

5. The Allegation made in the AA's Regulation Notice are proven on admission.

Standards

6. The officer admitted that her conduct breached the Integrity part of the Honesty & Integrity standard and the Discreditable Conduct standard. Those admissions were entirely appropriate. It is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves. Breaking the law demonstrates a lack of integrity and discredits the police service and undermine public confidence in it. I find both standards were breached.

Misconduct and gross misconduct

7. 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.

8. 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

9. 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.

10. At paragraph 4.17 to 4.19 it records:

Conviction or caution for a criminal offence

4.17 It is entirely unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves.

4.18 The level of culpability depends on the seriousness of the offence. The sentence imposed by the criminal court is not necessarily a reliable guide to seriousness in misconduct proceedings, which are principally directed towards maintaining public confidence in the profession. A relatively minor criminal offence may be of the utmost gravity in the professional context.

4.19 The conviction or caution may relate to on or off-duty conduct. While the person(s) conducting the proceedings cannot question the conviction or the sentence imposed, they can consider the circumstances of the offending and form their own view of the gravity of the case.

11. It then says at paragraph 4.21:

4.21 However, any criminal conviction will be serious and likely to have an adverse impact on public confidence in policing. Depending upon the type of offence, an officer's conviction or caution may be disclosed to the prosecution and defence during the course of a criminal trial, with the potential for undermining the investigation and prosecution.

12. I assess the officer's culpability as high. She broke the law, driving a vehicle while disqualified and without insurance. This was not an accident. The officer raised pressures at work [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I do not view work pressures or [REDACTED] as materially reducing culpability.

13. 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.

14. It says 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.

15. Police officers breaking the criminal law, and a consequent conviction, self-evidently undermines public confidence in policing. There was no victim here; the harm is to the public. As such, I assess harm as medium.
16. On **mitigating factors**, I note that the misconduct was confined to a single episode, stress was raised which may have affected the officer's ability to cope with the circumstances in question, and the officer has made an open admissions at an early stage. I also note the officer being genuinely remorseful and accepting of her actions and the consequences of it.
17. On **aggravating factors**, none were raised by the AA. I note that the conduct was deliberate and she continued to drive when she ought to have known that she should not, but I have already counted these factors when considering culpability, so I do not double count them.
18. Taking the above into account, I assess the conduct as being gross misconduct.

Disciplinary Outcome

19. I have already found that PC Mojhoa's conduct amounted 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.
20. After my finding of gross misconduct, PC Mojhoa provided some context to her offending. She said that she is a single mother who she drove her daughter to ballet, as her daughter's bike had a puncture and she had a stomach ache, so they could go into a drop in centre next to ballet but ultimately they did not need to visit this centre. I do not view this as a mitigating factor. The officer decided to drive; she could have stayed at home or used another form of transport. Her reasons do not provide an excuse, material mitigation or an 'exceptional circumstance'. In reality these were points of personal mitigation, to which I

attach little weight. I have received PC Mojhoa's HR record, but was not drawn to anything in particular by her representative.

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

22. 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.

23. I see no 'exceptional circumstances' to deviate from the presumption of dismissal. The conduct was seriousness. 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.

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

25. No submissions were made objecting to publication. I direct that the outcome is published.

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

Carl Galvin

Deputy Assistant Commissioner

12 June 2026