

**IN THE MATTER OF MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020**

**Between:**

**THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS**

Appropriate Authority

and

**PC UGAR SUMBUL**

Officer Concerned

---

OUTCOME REPORT OF PANEL'S DECISION

---

**INTRODUCTION**

1. The misconduct hearing for PC Ugar Sumbul was held in public at Patrick Dunne House, Sutton. The hearing was held between 9 and 10 June. The Panel comprised James Hunter as Chair, with Alison McKane and Dr Nigel Westwood as Independent Panel Members.
2. The Appropriate Authority ('the AA') was represented by Ms Nasreen Shah. PC Sumbul was represented by Ms Ella Crine. The Panel was assisted by John Gayer, Legally Qualified Advisor.
3. A notice of hearing was published in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ('the 2020 Regulations').

**PRELIMINARY ISSUES**

4. **Anonymity of the complainant:** the AA applied for anonymity for the complainant. The application was unopposed. This was granted since they were the complainant in a sexual allegation. The Complainant is hereafter referred to as 'Female A'.
5. **Special measures:** an application for special measures was granted by the Chair prior to the hearing, enabling Female A to give her evidence from behind a screen.
6. **Reporting restrictions:** during the hearing, reporting restrictions were also applied to details of another complaint by Female A which is currently awaiting criminal trial. No details of this matter were revealed during the hearing.

**REGULATION 30 NOTICE**

7. On the first day of the hearing, the Panel was referred to the Regulation 30 notice in respect of PC Sumbul, containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct, namely:

*It is alleged that on 2 December 2023 PC Sumbul intentionally touched Female A, the touching was sexual, Female A did not consent to the touching, and PC Sumbul did not reasonably believe that she consented:*

*a. Discreditable Conduct*

*It is contended that, if proven, the conduct below breaches the above Standard of Professional Behaviour. The matters set out above amount to gross misconduct and are so serious as to justify dismissal.*

8. PC Sumbul denied the allegation.

## **PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

9. The allegation came to the AA's attention on 20 June 2025 during an exit interview with Female A on the last day of her service. The Officer was notified and served with a Reg. 17 notice on 14 July 2025 of the gross misconduct investigation against him in relation to the allegation.
10. On 20 March 2026 PC Sumbul was served with a Reg. 30 notice. A preliminary hearing was held on 12 May 2026.
11. The hearing commenced on 9 June 2026. At the hearing there was an agreed Hearing Bundle (HB) and additional evidence was admitted:
  - (a) the character and commendation bundles for PC Sumbul; and
  - (b) the additional statement by Female A dated 9 June 2026.
12. The live witnesses were Female A and PC Bartlett. PC Sumbul also gave evidence.

## **ACCOUNTS AND EVIDENCE**

### *Female A*

13. In her statement dated 31 July 2025 she described attending work team Christmas drinks on 2 December 2023. She was invited by a colleague, "Nick" (known to be former PC Nick Amadou), and the group of colleagues was not large. She named a "Joey" (known to be PC Joseph Jiassemides) as also being present, as well as an officer who had left the team. This officer was PC Sumbul, also known as "Lucky".
14. In the same statement, she describes being in a bar, Be At One located in the City of London. In this bar she went to order a drink and PC Sumbul was also standing at the bar. They exchanged general conversation and when Female A began to leave to go to the toilet she felt someone squeeze her bottom through her clothing. This shocked her and on turning back around saw PC Sumbul and exclaimed "Lucky!", to which he responded with a "cheeky

expression”, shrugging his shoulders. There was no other confrontation, and she only mentioned this to Nick at the time and some friends and family subsequently, before it came to the AA’s attention.

15. A second statement dated 9 June 2026 outlined the group moved onto a third unidentified venue where PC Sumbul invited Female A to dance with him, which she refused.
16. In live evidence Female A maintained her account. She first met PC Sumbul in March 2023 as he was a longstanding member of the team. She was still a probationer. She never worked directly with PC Sumbul.
17. She recalls PC Bartlett warning her about three persons on the team and PC Sumbul was one of them.
18. On joining that team, she found some supportive colleagues. But she was “incredibly bullied” by a group of longstanding officers. She described two incidents with a female officer, but none with PC Sumbul prior to the allegation. In short, this included physical violence for which, when reported to line managers, she was blamed as the instigator and not the victim; and at PC Sumbul’s leaving drinks being told to “go home” as no-one liked her. She also attributed the bullying to [REDACTED] and in part explained her reaction when she shouted at a colleague (later cited by PC Sumbul as an example of unprofessionalism). As a result, she moved teams to Haringey.
19. This treatment was a conscious disincentive to her reporting the sexual assault at the time or afterwards.
20. She mentioned two other officers as being present at a venue which was visited prior to moving on to Be At One on 2 December 2023: officers Lane and Sweeney. At the first venue she only had one or two drinks. At the second venue she sat with Nick and Joey for most of the time and PC Sumbul was the only other member of the group who carried onto the second venue.
21. She described the assault at the bar as a “typical squeeze, grab of the butt cheek”. Her back was to the bar when it happened, and she turned around straight away. She did not see PC Sumbul assault her, but he was facing her and not the bar when she turned around. She exclaimed “Lucky!” and saw PC Sumbul’s reaction as described in her statement. When she returned from the toilet she sat with Nick and Joey; PC Sumbul was talking to other people and not sitting with them.
22. They all went onto another venue where PC Sumbul invited her to dance with him, which she declined, and he accepted this refusal.
23. She did not confront PC Sumbul on the night; when challenged in cross-examination as to why as a police officer she had not done so, she replied she was a “victim in shock, not just an officer”. She did tell Nick, and mentioned the sexual assault when she moved to the Haringey team but did not name PC Sumbul.

24. When challenged in cross-examination that she had made the allegation because she was fed up with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and “lash[ed] out against him” due to strong feelings, she denied this. She explained that it was not personal against him but about his actions against her, and that after a later second allegation of sexual assault against her by a different officer she “could not put up with it anymore”.

*PC Bartlett*

25. PC Bartlett’s statement dated 16 February 2026 set out that he was aware that some of the more experienced officers in the Enfield response team could look down on or avoid supporting probationary police officers and that there was “a culture of mistrust and disdain for probationers”. His role was to support Female A and he advised her and her peer, PC Ashim, to “keep their heads down and not to take to heart any apparent dislike from some of the officers”.
26. He considered PC Sumbul was one of those experienced officers who may view Female A’s jovial attitude to duties as being unprofessional. He subsequently heard from third-hand sources that there were questions about Female A’s professionalism during 2023 and 2024. Third-hand sources also told him it was common knowledge that PC Sumbul and Female A had a mutual dislike for each other.
27. Female A never disclosed to him the alleged incident or any other alleged misconduct she experienced. During his time working with PC Sumbul he never witnessed any bullying or unprofessional behaviour by him that was out of the ordinary response and reactions of police response officers.
28. In live evidence, PC Bartlett added that he transferred into the MPS in February 2022 and was assigned to Enfield response team B. He is now in a public protection team.
29. He did not know Female A before she joined and was assigned to Enfield. He knew and had worked with PC Sumbul. In relation to both of them, he would only have occasional contact in work.
30. Female A’s attitude was overwhelmingly professional, friendly, polite and jovial and she had formed a good friendship with another female officer. “At that point” he had no concerns about her professionalism.
31. Female A asked him about his experience on team B and he told her there were experienced and knowledgeable officers on the team. He explained the dynamics of a response team and that Female A should “not take to heart any abrasiveness” and that there was a culture of “disdain” to newer officers from older and more experienced team members. On this comment, he clarified PC Sumbul was not one of the officers he was describing as showing disdain, but considered PC Sumbul was of a “no nonsense disposition” with high professional expectations and did not appreciate a “jovial” approach.

32. He was aware Female A and PC Sumbul did not like each other and this was “common knowledge”. On reflection his initial assessment was correct and their “personalities were not well suited to each other”.
33. He was aware Female A was unhappy in the Enfield team and was moving to a team in Haringey, and he later heard thirdhand rumours about hand-holding with another officer in public and the discharge of PAVA spray into the face of a colleague. He had no operational concerns about Female A, but never worked with her in an operational role. She did not mention any incident(s) or name any individual(s) to him, but in general mentioned she was not “fitting in” at Enfield.
34. His “warning” to Female A prior to joining the Enfield team was not about the risk of sexual assault and was not specifically about PC Sumbul.

#### *PC Sumbul's evidence*

35. PC Sumbul adopted his Reg. 31 response and PACE criminal interview.
36. In live evidence, PC Sumbul denied the allegation against him. He did not squeeze Female A's bum, and he was never confronted by Female A for doing so.
37. The nickname “Lucky” came from the Turkish meaning for his forename. He was of 15 years' service and became a regular officer in August 2013 having been a special constable for three years. He accepted PC Bartlett's characterisation of him as a “no nonsense” officer as accurate.
38. He joined the Enfield team in 2013 and described the culture as “good” and if officers were willing to work then there were “no issues”. He had no issues with anyone as long as they could work together and be professional whilst in front of the public. Female A joined the team in 2023, which was the first time he met her, and this was two to three months before he was being reassigned to a new team.
39. There was not much of a personal relationship between the two and he viewed her as engaging in “childish behaviour” and “quite unprofessional”. He never worked directly with Female A. They were not friends and he maintained only a professional relationship with Female A.
40. When asked about any specific incidents of unprofessionalism he mentioned two: an incident when Female A was shouting at another officer who was helping her writing a report; and when Female A held hands with another female officer whilst skipping in public which he considered was not the right way to act in front of members of the public and gave a bad impression of the MPS.
41. He avoided Female A in general but if asked he would help her as he considered it was basic professionalism to do so.

42. He recognised that his description of Female A's personality as "disgusting" in interview was, "on reflection", not the best choice of words; but it was a true reflection of his feelings.
43. He was invited back to the social event on 2 December 2023 but did not remember by whom. He still had friends in the team. He met them at Hamilton Hall pub between 18:00 and 19:00. There was a low turnout of 8-10 people. He had one or two drinks before the group moved to the bar Be At One.
44. At Be At One he recalled the group was Nick, Joey, Female A and another person whose name he could not recall. The venue was small and rectangular in shape; he indicated the narrow width which would have accommodated the bar along one length and seating running along the other length opposite to the bar. The length of the venue was described with reference to the witness box, along the length of the Panel's long table to the transcriber's desk at the other end of the long table. There were a "fair few" people in the venue and the serving area was "small".
45. For most of the night he spoke with Nick and Joey. Joey was sober as he was the designated driver. He interacted with Female A very little as he was put off by her unprofessionalism and did not want to socialise with her outside of work as their "characters are not aligned". He did not recognise Female A's account that the group went to a third venue and he had invited Female A to dance with him.
46. He denied squeezing her bum and replied that this was an "absolute lie". He also denied the accusation that he did so because he saw an opportunity to humiliate her, knowing his position as a more experienced officer placed him in a power dynamic where Female A would be scared to speak up. PC Sumbul stated that he would never assault Female A and it did not make sense seeing as he would avoid her as much as possible.

#### *Character and commendations*

47. PC Sumbul has received commendations awarded on 2016, 2018, 2020 and 2022 for bravery as well as teamwork and professionalism. Three other commendations were mentioned in PC Sumbul's live evidence.
48. PC Sumbul submitted nine character references from mainly fellow PCs but also one PS, one Superintendent and a police staff member. These are all positive. Of note, PS Sweeney mentions his trust in PC Sumbul extended to assigning probationers to him and how he saw those probationers develop their skills and confidence under PC Sumbul. This is reinforced by the statement of PC Chrysostomou. Two other female officers speak to PC Sumbul's integrity. PC Jiassemides, who was also part of the group on 2 December 2023, provided a positive character reference, including stating he had never witnessed PC Sumbul conducting himself in a manner akin to the allegation either on or off duty since he first met him in March 2017.

#### **LAW AND GUIDANCE**

49. The Panel had the benefit of the LQA's hearing advice note dated 6 June 2026, which set out the relevant evidential test, standard of professional behaviour and guidance. In addition, the LQA provided closing advice to the Panel on assessing the seriousness of any facts that were considered proven and amounted to a breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour. The Panel was also advised on myths around delay in the reporting of sexual offences, as well as the impact on fairness where evidence is harder to secure or recollect due to delay in reporting.

## **PANEL'S FINDINGS**

50. The Panel carefully considered all the evidence in this case and had the benefit of live evidence from three persons: Female A, PC Bartlett and PC Sumbul.
51. The Panel considered all three to be credible, and their live evidence was consistent with their written statements.
52. PC Sumbul is of good character, and the Panel gave due weight to that, and the inherent probability of an officer of his character conducting himself in the way alleged.
53. In this case, the reasons for the delay in reporting the incident by Female A were accepted by the Panel and the Panel did not give any less weight to her evidence because of the delay.
54. However, the delay had a significant impact on the ability to secure evidence which may have assisted or undermined the AA's case, in particular CCTV footage and eyewitness accounts. It is fair that the Panel also took into account the hindrance this delay caused to PC Sumbul and his ability to recall in his own account the events of that night.
55. The Panel did not infer from this lack of corroborative evidence that Female A's allegation was necessarily false; however, it did hamper the Panel in determining the facts surrounding the allegation, which was consistently denied by PC Sumbul.
56. The Panel noted that the relationship between the two officers was, on the part of PC Sumbul, coldly professional and distant. It is clear to the Panel that PC Sumbul, during his short time in the same team as Female A, did not establish a close or friendly relationship. There is no evidence of PC Sumbul showing any sexual interest in Female A prior to the alleged incident.
57. In fact, the opposite appeared to be the case: PC Sumbul recognised that his description of Female A's personality as "disgusting" whilst under criminal interview might have been a poor choice of words, but it did reflect his true feelings.
58. The Panel placed little adverse weight on the late evidence of Female A that PC Sumbul encouraged her to dance with him at a third venue, and that he respected her refusal. PC Sumbul did not recall any third venue being visited and the Panel had little opportunity to test this evidence further.

59. The Panel noted the character statement of “Joey”, also one of the officers who attended the social gathering on 2 December 2023 and remained sober as the designated driver. Female A in evidence said she spent most of the night talking with Joey or Nick. In his character statement, Joey observed he had never seen PC Sumbul exhibit any unprofessional behaviour akin to the allegation, when either they worked or socialised together since he met him in March 2017.
60. Female A gave evidence to the Panel that, during her time as an officer, she had experienced bullying by other colleagues, and that her experience as an officer in the MPS was not a positive one. The Panel accepted Female A’s evidence in this regard, but these other complaints by Female A were not for this Panel to decide.
61. The Panel was presented with no accusation of bullying behaviour by PC Sumbul against Female A. At most he was described in the hearing by PC Bartlett as a “no nonsense” officer who always remained professional and expected high standards of behaviour.
62. There was no dispute between the accounts of Female A and PC Sumbul that they were both at Be At One on 2 December 2023 and that at one point they were standing together, away from the other officers in the group, at the bar’s serving counter ordering drinks,. The venue was small, fairly busy and the bar was along one length of the venue. Both had consumed alcohol, but it was not the AA’s case that either party was intoxicated.
63. The two points of dispute were that PC Sumbul squeezed Female A’s bottom and that Female A in any way reacted or confronted PC Sumbul.
64. Female A’s evidence was that PC Sumbul squeezed her bottom as she turned her back to him; she turned back around and exclaimed “Lucky!” (the Officer’s nickname) at him, to which he reacted with a shrug and a “cheeky grin”.
65. The Officer stated that neither of these things happened, not even any accidental touching of Female A. Although Female A stated she turned around as soon as she felt the assault, she did not see who did it, but concluded that the perpetrator was the PC Sumbul due to his reaction when she turned to face him.
66. To reiterate, the Panel had no independent evidence to corroborate or rebut either account, whether via eyewitness testimony, CCTV or from accounts given by Female A to third parties at the time or shortly after the alleged incident.
67. The Panel reminded itself that the test is the civil standard of proof, i.e. that it is more likely than not that PC Sumbul did sexually assault Female A and in doing so breached the Discreditable Conduct standard of professional behaviour.
68. The Panel determined that, in this case, there was insufficient evidence to reach the standard of proof and therefore the Appropriate Authority has not proved its case.

69. It follows that PC Sumbul did not breach the Discreditable Conduct standard of professional behaviour.

**Chair**  
**Mr James Hunter**  
**June 2026**