

IN THE MATTER OF THE MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2024)

BETWEEN

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

and

PC Saqib Kazmi

PANEL FINAL DECISION

Introductions:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for PC Saqib Kazmi (the Officer). The outline of the Panel decisions on facts and outcome was provided to the Officer during the hearing.
2. The Panel was chaired by Commander Jason Prins, with Independent Panel Members Ms Amelia Wright and Mr Clive Manning. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Olivia Kong.
3. The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by Mr John-Paul Waite (AA's representative) and the Officer was represented by Ms Campaspe Lloyd-Jacob (Officer's representative). The Officer was also supported by the Federation Representative Police Sergeant Steve Bradding.
4. The hearing was held from 18 to 21 May 2026 at Palestra House, 197 Blackfriars Road, SE1 8NJ.
5. At the outset of its determinations, and throughout the hearing, the Panel has remained mindful of the overarching purpose of police misconduct proceedings, namely:
 - i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;
 - ii. To uphold high standards of professional conduct and deter misconduct;

- iii. To protect the public.

The Allegations:

6. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of the Officer containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct, namely:

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

Allegation 1

Around March 2024 Mr D was speaking to PC Kazmi in the yard of Ilford police station when he made comments about Female officer A. While he was smoking PC Kazmi said in Urdu 'Us ki marni hai muje ek dafa' which translates as "I'd have sex with her once " but has the connotations of 'I'd smash her once.'

Allegation 2

Around September 2023 and at the cafeteria at Ilford Police Station PC Kazmi made a comment to Mr D about Mr D's wife not cooking. He said in Urdu, 'Bahir se kyun khan khate ho, tumaro biwi khan nahi banati' which translates as, 'Why do you eat from outside, why does your wife not cook.' Mr D replied, 'She works, it's fine'.

Allegation 3

Around May 2024 PC Kazmi made comments to Mr D about female officer B on the team who was in a same sex relationship and was pregnant at the time. PC Kazmi said in Urdu 'Ye pregnant kese ho sakti hai, ye to larkiyan chod ti hai' which translates as, 'How can she be pregnant, she's a lesbian and fucks females and uses dildos.'

Allegation 4

Around February or March 2024 PC Kazmi and Mr D were in the canteen at Ilford Police Station when PC Kazmi made a comment about Mr D's sex life. PC Kazmi said in Urdu 'Tum ne apni biwi kimari nahi thi shadi kiraat' which translates as 'Did you not fuck your wife on your wedding night.' PC Kazmi also said words in Urdu which translated as, 'You fucked your wife, that is why you have a kid.' The Urdu words used were a way of describing Mr D's wife as a prostitute.

Allegation 5

Around March 2024 PC Kazmi and Mr D were in conversation in the canteen at Ilford Police Station. PC Kazmi informed Mr D that Ms E (a member of police staff from LDSS Ilford) had made a complaint about him. PC Kazmi told Mr D that he had asked Ms E to clean a car, and she had said it was not her job and he had replied "yes that's your fucking job and you need to do it". As he was telling me this he called her "Randi ki bachi" in Urdu. This translates as "Daughter of Bitch."

Allegation 6

In May or June 2023 PC Kazmi and Mr D were at Ilford police station on the 2nd floor near the cafeteria. There is a board with pictures of the Senior Leadership Team. Mr D saw a picture of Female Officer C and stated, 'She is the one who put restrictions on me' PC Kazmi replied in Urdu "Usko land passand hai" This translates as, 'She likes dicks. She was with this guy and after she was satisfied, she got him in trouble.'

The above particulars amount to breaches of the following standards of professional behaviour: Authority, Respect and Courtesy; Equality and Diversity; and Discreditable Conduct.

It is alleged that the above particulars, jointly and separately amount to gross misconduct and are serious enough to justify your dismissal.

Preliminary Issues

Admission of bad character evidence

7. On the first day of the hearing, the Appropriate Authority's representative sought to introduce a statement and exhibit, said to relate to a similar complaint made against the Officer.
8. The Officer's representative objected to the application.
9. The Chair refused the application, stating that they had considered the request to admit material said to amount to bad character evidence, together with the submissions made and the legal advice provided.
10. The Chair accepted that the material was relevant to a live issue and that, on its face, it possessed some probative value. However, the Chair noted that relevance alone was insufficient; the panel must also be satisfied that the material was reliable and that its admission would be fair.

11. In this instance, the conduct relied upon was merely alleged. It had not been proved nor been the subject of any prior finding. There was no written account from the person who had made the complaint. No witness was available to speak to the conduct or to be cross-examined. The Chair therefore could not be satisfied that the material was sufficiently reliable to admit.
12. Given the absence of any proven basis for the conduct, and the Officer's inability to test the allegation through cross-examination, the Chair considered that admitting the material would create a real risk of unfairness. The prejudicial effect would outweigh any probative value.
13. For these reasons, the Chair refused the application to admit the proposed bad character evidence.

Admission of additional documents

14. Prior to the opening of the case on the first day of the hearing, the Officer's representative applied to admit a bundle comprising 84 pages of documents. The Appropriate Authority's representative raised no objection to its admission. Exercising the Chair's discretion, and in light of the parties' agreement, the bundle was admitted into evidence.

Factual Error Within the Allegation

15. In relation to Allegation 6, the allegation states that the picture of Female Officer C was located on the second floor. However, both the Officer and Mr D gave evidence that the picture was situated on the ground floor. The Appropriate Authority did not apply to amend the allegation. The Panel considered that the precise location of the picture was immaterial; the issue for determination was whether the alleged conduct occurred. The Panel therefore concluded that the factual error within the allegation did not invalidate it, and the allegation could properly remain in its existing form.

The Panel's Approach

16. The Panel reminded itself of its core responsibilities:
 - a. To assess the facts of the case and make findings in relation to each allegation;
 - b. To determine whether those findings amount to a breach of the relevant Standards of Professional Behaviour;
 - c. To decide whether the conduct found proven constitutes misconduct, gross misconduct, or neither.

17. The Panel remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the AA throughout the proceedings. The applicable standard is the balance of probabilities, that is, whether the alleged conduct is more likely than not to have occurred.
18. In reaching its decisions, the Panel considered the purpose and nature of police misconduct proceedings. The primary aim is not to punish the Officer, but to uphold public confidence in the police service and protect its reputation by ensuring accountability and making clear that improper conduct will not be tolerated. A secondary aim is to affirm and promote high professional standards. A further purpose is to protect the public, the Complainant, and police staff by preventing recurrence of similar misconduct. In doing so, the Panel had regard to the principles established in *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512; *Chief Constable of Dorset v PAT, Salter (Interested Party)* [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin); and *R (Williams) v PAT* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).
19. The Panel also considered the relevant regulatory framework and guidance, including:
- a. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 (“the Regulations”), particularly the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2;
 - b. The 2018 Home Office Guidance (“HOG”), with specific reference to Chapter 1, which summarises the Standards;
 - c. The definition of misconduct under Regulation 3(1): “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour”;
 - d. The definition of gross misconduct under Regulation 3(1): “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified”.
20. The Panel listened carefully to all oral evidence and thoroughly reviewed the documentary evidence. It considered the totality of the evidence and submissions. While it does not propose to address every individual point raised, the Panel sets out its principal findings and conclusions.

Evidence

21. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:
- a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response) consisting of 166 pages;
 - b. AA’s opening note consisting of 5 pages;

- c. The additional agreed bundle of 84 pages;
- d. Two character bundles consisting of 11 and 18 pages respectively.

22. The Panel also heard from the following live witnesses:

- a. Mr D
- b. Female Officer B
- c. The Officer

Case Summary

23. Mr D first came into contact with PC Saqib Kazmi when he was a probationary officer based at Ilford Police Station. At that time, he was experiencing personal difficulties, and PC Kazmi subsequently assumed the role of his welfare officer. In this capacity, PC Kazmi was described by Mr D as supportive and helpful.
24. On 20 May 2024, a report was made that PC Kazmi had been directing inappropriate comments towards Mr D. Three colleagues of Mr D confirmed that he had disclosed these comments to them, although none had witnessed the remarks directly. Following this, Mr D was contacted and confirmed that PC Kazmi had made a series of offensive and discriminatory comments to him, primarily concerning women, including female officers and Mr D's wife.
25. Mr D described multiple incidents occurring between May 2023 and May 2024. He stated that many of the comments were made in Urdu and, due to the passage of time, he was unable to recall precise dates, though he provided approximate months. The comments reported included:
26. A remark about a female officer to the effect that she "likes dicks," and that she had been with a man and, once "satisfied," had subsequently "got him in trouble."
27. Questions directed at Mr D about why he did not bring food from home, accompanied by comments that his wife should be cooking for him and should not be working.
28. Explicit comments regarding Mr D's wife, including questions about whether he had had sexual intercourse with her on their wedding night, and statements implying that the birth of their child was proof of this. Mr D stated that the Urdu terms used amounted to calling his wife a prostitute.
29. A description of an incident involving police staff member Ms E, during which PC Kazmi reportedly told her, "Yes, that's your fucking job and you need to do it," and referred to her as "Randi ki bachi," meaning "daughter of a bitch" in Urdu.

30. Comments about Female Officer B, including, “How can she be pregnant, she’s a lesbian and fucks females and uses dildos.”
31. A further comment in Urdu regarding another female colleague, translated by Mr D as meaning, “I’d have sex with her once,” with the connotation of “I’d smash her once.”

Finding of Facts & Breaches

32. The Panel has carefully considered all the evidence presented during the proceedings, including the agreed hearing bundle, the additional bundle, the character bundle, the oral testimony of Mr D, Female Officer B and the Officer, and the closing submissions of the AA’s representative and the Officer’s representative. The Panel has also followed the legal advice provided throughout the hearing with diligence.
33. In reaching its decision, the Panel has applied the civil standard of proof, namely the balance of probabilities, and has kept firmly in mind that the burden of proof rests with the Appropriate Authority.
34. The Panel heard live evidence from the following witnesses:
 - Mr D
 - Female Officer B
 - The Officer
35. Each witness’s evidence was considered in full, including their written statements, oral testimony, and responses under cross-examination. The Panel also reviewed relevant documents contained within the bundle. Where appropriate, the Panel distinguished between direct evidence and hearsay, and afforded each source of evidence weight commensurate with its reliability, consistency and corroboration.
36. Against that background, the Panel is required to determine, on the basis of the totality of the evidence, whether the conduct alleged in each of the six allegations occurred, if so whether the conduct amounted to a breach of standards, and, if so, whether it amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct, or neither.

Finding of facts

37. It is not in dispute that the Officer acted as Mr D’s welfare officer and provided support to Mr D who was having xxxx xxx xxx xxxxxx xxxxxx. It is further accepted that the Officer and Mr D were in regular contact, typically speaking on the telephone or in person at least once a week, and that they would converse in Urdu and English. The evidence also demonstrates that the Officer would, on occasion, see Mr D whilst on duty and speak with him. The conduct

underpinning Allegations 1 to 6 are said to have arisen during those conversations between May 2023 and May 2024.

Mr D

38. The Panel first considered the relevance of two historic matters concerning Mr D:
 - i. The use of a disabled parking permit; and
 - ii. An allegation of entering incorrect information onto the police system.
39. In respect of the disabled permit incident, the Panel noted that Mr D was candid both at the time when asked about the incident by Inspector Willison, and during cross-examination, and provided a clear and consistent context for what had occurred. His explanation that he voluntarily disclosed the incident to his colleague, PC Linihan, and intended to report it to his manager was accepted. According to his evidence, PC Linihan advised him that there was insufficient time to do so and that he would have to accept a fine. The Panel noted that no further action was taken in relation to this matter.
40. In relation to the allegation of entering incorrect information onto the police system, the Panel noted that although an investigation was opened and a case to answer determination made, Mr D had played no part in the investigation and there had been no finding of misconduct against him.
41. When assessing credibility, the Panel concluded that only minimal weight should be attached to these matters, given that neither resulted in disciplinary action and that Mr D's explanation of the disabled permit incident was logical, consistent and unembellished.
42. The Panel found that Mr D spoke positively about the Officer, saying that he 'help me a lot', was 'very supportive', a 'nice person', and that the 'only thing against' were 'horrible comments about female colleagues and his wife'. The Panel felt that this added to Mr D's credibility. He demonstrated an ability to separate his personal regard for the Officer from his feelings about the comments alleged. He readily acknowledged inconsistencies where they arose, such as the discrepancy between his statement and oral evidence regarding the location of a conversation regarding Allegation 6. He accepted that he had made an error in his statement, and the Panel did not consider this unusual or undermining. He did not claim to remember specific dates and was open about his own shortcomings, including the disabled permit matter. He accepted that although the comments began in 2023, he did not report them until 2024. He explained that he had left Ilford Resource and Demand Team (RADT) in December 2023 and then returned around May 2024, and that the comments from PC Kazmi continued. He explained that this was the tipping point for him reporting the matter. He had not felt able to do so in 2023 as he was focussed on the misconduct investigation into his use of the disabled badge and could

not concentrate on anything else. The Panel felt this was a credible explanation for not reporting earlier.

43. Mr D was able to give clear detail and context in his oral evidence about when the comments were made, and the Panel found the logistics of his account coherent. For example, when questioned about Allegation 2, Mr D said that he was 'very upset' about these comments as his wife works hard and looks after their child. He did not like people talking bad about her as she was trying her best to support the family. When questioned about Allegation 4, Mr D said that PC Kazmi's comments arose through Mr D disclosing to him that he was stressed and struggling to manage the financial situation at home. It was also hard for him as he had to look after his child.
44. Mr D also added detail in his oral evidence that added credibility to his account. For example, when questioned about Allegation 1, Mr D said that he and PC Kazmi were in the smoking area and female officer A was at the entrance door. PC Kazmi said 'who's that'. Mr D responded and PC Kazmi then made the comments alleged.
45. When questioned about Allegation 5, Mr D said that at the time the comments were made by PC Kazmi, Ms E was in the car park chatting to Mr Bryan and then walked to the entrance.
46. Although the Panel regarded it as unusual that he offered to allow the Officer use of his grandmother's parking space, it considered this to be consistent with the longstanding relationship between them, the Officer acting as Mr D's welfare officer, and Mr D continuing to view the Officer as generally helpful, notwithstanding the comments. The Panel drew the inference that he was able to separate his discomfort about the comments from his day to day interactions with the Officer, and it did not regard this as detracting from the reliability of his account. He explained that he was uncertain how to respond to the comments and only reported them after encouragement from colleagues.
47. Taking this in the round, the Panel could discern no obvious motive for Mr D to fabricate these allegations against PC Kazmi. The motive put to him in cross examination was that he made up these allegations to improve his popularity with his team. This is inconsistent with the evidence of Female Officer B, which we come onto, who said that the team liked Mr D. The Panel also noted documentary material showing that other officers had raised concerns with DPS before Mr D made his report, which supported the conclusion that his account was not motivated by malice.

Female Officer B

48. The Panel considered the evidence of Female Officer B and noted that the precise email by which she became aware of the comments made about her was unclear. It regarded this as immaterial; the only material point was that she had knowledge of the comments. Her account of the disclosure of conversations during a lunch break was detailed and consistent, and she demonstrated a clear distinction between matters she directly observed and those relayed to her. She drew on her professional experience of working with victims when describing Mr D's demeanour immediately after he disclosed the comments. She observed that he appeared noticeably relieved following the disclosure, in a manner consistent with individuals she had previously supported, and the Panel considered that this lent additional weight to Mr D's account.

PC Anjum and PC King

49. The Panel also considered the evidence within the bundle from PC Anjum and PC King. Their accounts were not challenged and the Panel was therefore satisfied that it could place weight on them.
50. In an email to the Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS) on 22 May 2024, PC Anjum records that Mr D 'seemed very upset' and that he asked him what was wrong. Mr D told him that PC Kazmi had said to him that 'his wife is a prostitute because she works and mixes with other men'. Mr D also said that PC Kazmi had told him whilst Mr D was eating a take away that 'his wife should not be working and she should be in the kitchen cooking food for him'. PC Anjum records that he told Mr D to report this and Mr D told him that he was worried that PC Kazmi would give him more trouble.
51. In an email to DPS on 23 May 2024, PC King records that 'Mr D has since said to us that there was other things said about his wife and has also about a female officer, however, wouldn't discuss with us what was said'. This email appears to be in response to an email from the DPS following an initial email from PC King to DPS which does not appear in the bundle.

PC Kazmi

52. In contrast, the Panel found aspects of the Officer's evidence to be inconsistent and, at times, self-serving. When asked about his relationship with Mr D, the Officer stated that he did not know him well, had not discussed personal or family matters with him, and only learned that he had a wife and child when the allegations arose.
53. The Panel noted that the Officer's account of his initial interaction with Mr D involved Mr D confiding his xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx xxx xxx-xxxx xxxxxx to the

Officer at their initial meeting in the prayer room. The Panel noted that this interaction resulted in the Officer going to Mr D's line manager and was the basis of the Officer being appointed as Mr D's Welfare Officer.

54. The Panel found the Officer's assertion that he only discussed professional matters, and personal matters limited to Mr D's xxxxxx xxxxxx and sleeping, with Mr D in his role as Welfare Officer wholly implausible given that their initial interaction was between 3 and 4 hours and driven by concerns about Mr D xxx-xxxxx. It was highly likely that family circumstances or support at home would have been discussed in that context. It was accepted evidence that Mr D and the Officer subsequently spoke at least weekly, whilst the Officer was his Welfare Officer.
55. The Panel found it wholly implausible that Mr D did not raise both wider personal and professional issues with the Officer during their multiple conversations and therefore did not accept the Officer's account of their interactions.
56. The Panel noted that when cross examined about Allegation 1, the Officer claimed that he would never say 'who is that' about someone he didn't know, although he accepted that would be a natural thing to do. Again, the Panel found this to be implausible.
57. The Panel also noted inconsistencies between the Officer's written and oral evidence regarding the "Ms E matter". In his written evidence, he stated that he "gave only a general response as with other officers", yet in oral evidence he said he discussed the matter with Mr D to show empathy and reassure him about his own investigation. These inconsistencies undermined the reliability of his account.

Assessment of Oral Evidence

58. In light of the evidence as a whole, the Panel found Mr D's account to be consistent on the central allegations, notwithstanding some variations on peripheral matters. Such variations were not unusual and did not undermine his credibility. The Panel considered him a generally consistent and convincing witness. It found it inherently unlikely that he fabricated the conversations. He was described by Female Officer B as shy and well-liked, and there was no apparent benefit to him in making false allegations. At the time, he was a probationary officer, whereas the Officer was experienced and well-established. Furthermore, Mr D has since left the police service and now lives in another part of the country. The Panel considered it unlikely that he would travel a considerable distance to give evidence unless he felt strongly about the matter.

59. For these reasons, and on the balance of probabilities, the Panel found that Mr D gave a fair and reliable account. The Panel prefers his evidence to that of the Officer and finds that the conversations alleged did take place.

Decisions on Facts

Allegation 1

60. **Around March 2024 Mr D was speaking to PC Kazmi in the yard of Ilford police station when he made comments about Female officer A. While he was smoking PC Kazmi said in Urdu 'Us ki marni hai muje ek dafa' which translates as "I'd have sex with her once " but has the connotations of 'I'd smash her once.'**

61. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Mr D's account to that of the Officer.

62. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 1 proved.

Allegation 2

63. **Around September 2023 and at the cafeteria at Ilford Police Station PC Kazmi made a comment to Mr D about Mr D's wife not cooking. He said in Urdu, 'Bahir se kyun khan khate ho, tumaro biwi khan nahi banati' which translates as, 'Why do you eat from outside, why does your wife not cook.' Mr D replied, 'She works, it's fine'.**

64. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Mr D's account to that of the Officer.

65. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 2 proved.

Allegation 3

66. **Around May 2024 PC Kazmi made comments to Mr D about female officer B on the team who was in a same sex relationship and was pregnant at the time. PC Kazmi said in Urdu 'Ye pregnant kese ho sakti hai, ye to larkiyan chod ti hai' which translates as, 'How can she be pregnant, she's a lesbian and fucks females and uses dildos.'**

67. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Mr D's account to that of the Officer.

68. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 3 proved.

Allegation 4

69. **Around February or March 2024 PC Kazmi and Mr D were in the canteen at Ilford Police Station when PC Kazmi made a comment about Mr D's sex life. PC Kazmi said in Urdu 'Tum ne apni biwi kimari nahi thi shadi kiraat' which translates as 'Did you not fuck your wife on your wedding night.' PC Kazmi also said words in Urdu which translated as, 'You fucked your wife, that is why you have a kid.' The Urdu words used were a way of describing Mr D's wife as a prostitute.**

70. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Mr D's account to that of the Officer.

71. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 4 proved.

Allegation 5

72. **Around March 2024 PC Kazmi and Mr D were in conversation in the canteen at Ilford Police Station. PC Kazmi informed Mr D that Ms E (a member of police staff from LDSS Ilford) had made a complaint about him. PC Kazmi told Mr D that he had asked Ms E to clean a car, and she had said it was not her job and he had replied "yes that's your fucking job and you need to do it". As he was telling me this he called her "Randi ki bachi" in Urdu. This translates as "Daughter of Bitch."**

73. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Mr D's account to that of the Officer.

74. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 5 proved.

Allegation 6

75. **In May or June 2023 PC Kazmi and Mr D were at Ilford police station on the 2nd floor near the cafeteria. There is a board with pictures of the Senior Leadership Team. Mr D saw a picture of Female Officer C and stated, 'She is the one who put restrictions on me' PC Kazmi replied in Urdu "Usko land passand hai" This translates as, 'She likes dicks. She was with this guy and after she was satisfied, she got him in trouble.'**

76. For the reasons set out in the findings of fact above, the Panel preferred Mr D's account to that of the Officer.

77. The Panel therefore finds Allegation 6 proved.

Findings on Breaches of the Standards

78. In light of the above findings, the Panel concluded that the Officer's conduct engaged the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct, Authority, Respect and Courtesy, and Equality and Diversity.

Discreditable Conduct

79. The standard of Discreditable Conduct requires police officers to behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in the police service.
80. The Officer's conduct involved the use of crude, sexualised, degrading, misogynistic, and homophobic language about colleagues and third parties. The remarks included explicit references to sexual acts, derogatory insinuations about women's sexual behaviour, and comments that demeaned the dignity of individuals connected to the workplace. The Officer also used terms in Urdu that amounted to describing a woman in highly offensive and insulting terms. This behaviour is wholly incompatible with the standards expected of a police officer and is conduct capable of bringing discredit upon the police service. The Officer's actions therefore amount to a clear breach of the Standard of Discreditable Conduct.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

81. Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy. They do not abuse their powers or authority and they respect the rights of all individuals.
82. The Officer failed to treat colleagues with the respect, courtesy and professionalism required of a serving police officer. His comments included homophobic remarks about a female colleague, sexually intrusive questions directed at a colleague about his private life, disparaging remarks about a colleague's spouse, and abusive language directed towards a female colleague when recounting a workplace interaction. The Officer's behaviour demonstrated a disregard for the dignity of others. Such conduct falls significantly below the level of respect and courtesy expected and constitutes a breach of this Standard.

Equality and Diversity

83. Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.
84. The Officer's remarks demonstrated discriminatory attitudes and gender based stereotyping. His comments about women appeared to the Panel to be rooted

in prejudicial assumptions about their sexuality, roles, and behaviour, and included language that was demeaning, objectifying, and insulting. The Officer used expressions that were homophobic and misogynistic and reinforced harmful stereotypes. This conduct is inconsistent with the requirement to treat all individuals fairly, impartially and without discrimination. The Officer therefore breached the Standard of Equality and Diversity.

Assessment of Seriousness

85. The Panel carefully considered the circumstances of the case, and the breaches found to assess whether the breaches amount to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
86. Under the *Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings*, gross misconduct is defined as:
 87. *“A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious that dismissal would be justified.”*
88. The Officer’s comments displayed overtly homophobic, sexist and misogynistic attitudes that are wholly incompatible with the standards required of a police officer. In addition, his remarks included derogatory references to a person’s sexual orientation, reflecting discriminatory attitudes that have no place in policing. Language of this nature demonstrates a disregard for the dignity and equality of colleagues and the public and represents a serious departure from the integrity, judgement and respect expected of those in the police service.
89. The gravity of the discriminatory conduct is such that it undermines the trust placed in the Officer and is sufficiently serious that dismissal would be justified. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the conduct found proven amounts to gross misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

90. The panel reminded itself of the three stages to determining outcome; namely:
 - (i) To assess the seriousness of the conduct
 - (ii) Keep in mind the purpose of imposing the sanctions
 - (iii) Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

Stage 1: Assessment of Seriousness

Culpability

91. The Panel assesses the Officer's culpability as **high**, for the following reasons:
92. **The conduct was deliberate.** The conduct involved repeated, deliberate and discriminatory remarks made over a period of time, rather than a single lapse or momentary loss of judgement.
93. **The Officer assumes a specific responsibility to a person by performing a particular role.** The Officer was Mr D's welfare officer. Instead of upholding the trust and support expected in that role, he engaged in conduct that undermined it.
94. **Discrimination towards persons on the basis of their sex.** The Officer's remarks demonstrated discriminatory attitudes towards women, relying on degrading and sexualised stereotypes based on their sex.
95. **Discrimination towards persons on the basis of their sexual orientation.** The Officer's comments included derogatory and prejudicial assumptions about a person's sexual orientation, using it as a basis for ridicule and inappropriate speculation.
96. **Discrimination is conscious and deliberate.** The discriminatory elements of the Officer's remarks were conscious and deliberate, reflecting intentional use of demeaning and prejudicial language rather than inadvertent or careless expression.
97. Taken together, these factors place the Officer's culpability firmly at the higher end of the spectrum.

Harm

98. The Panel assesses the harm as **high** for the following reasons:
99. **Emotional distress.** Both witnesses gave clear and consistent evidence that the Officer's comments caused them emotional distress, including feelings of upset and anger arising from the nature and impact of the remarks.
100. **Risk of undermining public confidence.** The Officer's conduct carried a clear risk of undermining public confidence in the police service, as members of the public are entitled to expect that officers will behave with professionalism, respect and impartiality at all times.

101. **Damage to the reputation of the police service.** Conduct of this nature, if known outside the organisation, would reasonably lead members of the public to question the integrity, culture and values of the service as a whole.

Aggravating factors

- Scale of local / national concern about discriminatory attitudes displayed by police officers

Mitigating factors

- There are no mitigating factors present in this case.

Personal mitigation factors

- Character evidence

102. The Panel noted the extent of the character bundle provided. However, we are careful to caveat that with the reminder that purely personal mitigation is not relevant to the seriousness of the misconduct and thus will have a limited effect on the outcome.

Stage 2: The purpose of imposing sanctions

103. The Panel has taken into account the threefold purpose for imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and protecting the public).

Stage 3: Appropriate sanction

104. The Panel has taken into account the character evidence and personal mitigation. However, the Panel is mindful that the most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole.

105. The Panel considered the full range of available sanctions, escalating in severity:

- i. Final written warning
- ii. Dismissal without notice

106. The Panel considered that a final written warning would not maintain public confidence in policing, uphold high standards, or deter similar misconduct. The only reasonable and proportionate sanction for the severity of the misconduct is dismissal without notice.

107. The Panel orders publication of its outcome pursuant to regulation 43(6) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, subject to the anonymisation of xx xxxxxx (Mr D), xx xxxxxx (Female Officer B) and xx xxxxxx (Ms E)

COLINS

Right of Appeal

108. In accordance with Regulation 43(2), the Appropriate Authority shall provide the Officer with a copy of this report and a notice of the right of appeal. The Officer is reminded he has a right to appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal. ("PAT"). The PAT may increase or decrease any penalty or overturn this decision.

Commander Jason Prins

Amelia Wright

Clive Manning

3 June 2026