

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Rupert Edwards

Warrant No: P236367

Date of Hearing: 23rd June 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct

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 Edwards has not attended the hearing and was not represented. PC Edwards did not provide a Regulation 54 response. The AA was represented by Case Manager, Ms Molly Nairn. I am satisfied PC Edwards has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

Accordingly, in line with Regulation 57(1) and 57(3)(b), I have determined that the hearing is to proceed in PC Edwards' absence.

The Allegation

On 22 May 2026 at Southwark Crown Court, you were convicted of Rape contrary to Section 1 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

You are due to be sentenced at Southwark Crown Court on 10 July 2026.

Particulars

While off duty following a social gathering on 31 December 2017 you raped a woman who reported the matter to police in 2023.

This conduct represents a serious breach of the standards expected and resulted in criminal conviction.

Professional Standards of Behaviour

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 and 2025, namely:

- Discreditable Conduct

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 Ms Nairn.

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 Edwards.

- On the 31st December 2017, PC Edwards and his colleagues attended an address owned by one of his colleagues.

- They all drank and went out into the back garden to watch some fireworks before heading back inside.
- Female A remembered waking up on the sofa in the flat early hours of the 1st January 2018.
- Female A and PC Edwards shared a taxi home, as they lived near each other.
- Female A had no recollection of how she got into her address. She awoke in the morning, naked, with PC Edwards next to her.
- Female A reported the incident on the 18th October 2023. PC Edwards was arrested on the 29th April 2024.
- On the 19th March 2025, PC Edwards was charged with rape.
- He was tried at Southwark Crown Court on the 11th May 2026. On the 22nd May 2026, following a two-week trial, PC Edwards was found guilty of rape.
- PC Edwards is due to be sentenced on the 10th July 2026.

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.

[Officer's position](#)

- PC Edwards has provided no response to the allegation.

In line with Regulation 61(7), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority.

[Decision on Finding](#)

I have applied Regulation 61(15) and carefully listened to the case presented by the

Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary evidence provided to me.

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

Breach of Professional Standards

In line with Regulation 61(16), 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.

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.

Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I adopt the three-stage process, as outlined in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings to determine the appropriate sanction.

The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the conduct. This is assessed by reference to:

- i. The officer's culpability,
- ii. The harm caused by the misconduct
- iii. The existence of aggravating factors
- iv. The existence of mitigating factors.

The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime. I remind myself that this has three elements:

- i. To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service,
- ii. To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and

iii. To protect the public

I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils that purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.

I start by assessing the seriousness of the conduct:

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

I go on to make an assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors.

The Appropriate Authority addressed me on seriousness and contend that the conduct amounts to gross misconduct, as it is unacceptable for police officers who are responsible for enforcing the law to break the law themselves. PC Edwards committed a serious sexual offence; his actions were deliberate and calculated. He took advantage of a woman who was not able to provide her consent to any sexual interaction. PC Edwards' conduct undoubtedly caused not only serious harm to his victim but also involves a fundamental breach of the public's trust in police officers and brings the profession into dispute.

Culpability is high – PC Edwards committed a serious criminal offence. He targeted a woman who was vulnerable in the circumstances as they presented themselves and raped her. Any form of violence against women and girls perpetrated by a police officer, whether on or off duty will always have a high degree of culpability.

Harm – is high. PC Edwards' conduct is wholly unacceptable. PC Edwards undoubtedly caused serious harm to his victim. It is unacceptable for police officers who are responsible for enforcing the law to break the law themselves. PC Edwards' conduct amounts to fundamental breach of the public's trust in police officers and brings the profession into dispute.

It undermines public confidence in policing at a time when the police are aiming to demonstrate how seriously it is taking violence against women and girls.

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 find that there are any mitigating features.

No personal mitigation has been provided to me on behalf of PC Edwards.

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.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

I have reminded myself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case.

I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

I do acknowledge the risk that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect; accordingly, the outcome should be no more than is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings. Therefore, in deciding the appropriate outcome I shall consider less severe outcomes before more severe outcomes and shall impose the least severe outcome that deals adequately with the issues identified, whilst protecting the public interest.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

I have considered the officers record of service.

I have considered whether a final written warning, or indeed a reduction in rank, would be an appropriate sanction in this case, but owing to the fact that PC Ruperts is a constable, he cannot be reduced in rank.

I considered whether a final written warning would be consistent with the public interest. In my view it would not.

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

Doing so undermines public trust and confidence in policing, as well as the reputation of the MPS. The public could not have confidence in PC Edwards, nor would they have confidence in the Metropolitan Police Service if it appeared not to take law breaking seriously.

I have considered the matter fully, including the nature and severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

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

A lesser outcome would not serve to mark the seriousness of this misconduct or deter others from similar misconduct and fulfil the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

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
23rd June 2026