

IN THE MATTER BEFORE THE MISCONDUCT HEARING  
UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED)

COMMISSIONER FOR THE METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE

Appropriate Authority

- V -

PC JAYDEN WOOD

The Officer

---

OUTCOME REPORT

---

**All references to:**

**“the Regulations” is to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (SI 2020/4) (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 (SI 2024/521) unless otherwise stated.**

**“HOG” is to the Home Office, Conduct Efficiency and Effectiveness: Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing (v.1.0)**

**“Outcome Guidance” is to the College of Policing, Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023).**

In accordance with regs. 41(15) to (17); 42(1), (3) and (13) and 43 of the Regulations the following outcome report and decisions as issued.

**The Panel**

1. The Panel consisted of Chair Cmdr Andrew Brittain and IPMs Ms Ojinnaka and Mr Bowman.

## **Anonymity and reporting restrictions directions**

2. None were sought.

## **Allegation**

3. There was only one allegation of gross misconduct before the Panel:

### Allegation 1

On 22nd February 2024 PC Jayden Wood failed to act with honesty and integrity, in that he informed PS Hopkins that he had completed the JRFT on 24th July 2023.

## **Procedural Background**

4. The Officer was notified and served with a Reg. 17 notice on 8 May 2024 of the gross misconduct investigation against him in relation to the allegation he lied about completing the JRFT. The allegation came to the AA's attention on 15 April 2024.
5. On 22 August 2025 the Officer was served with a Reg. 30 notice.
6. A pre-hearing was held on 22 OCTOBER 2025.
7. On 6 February 2026 the second allegation against the Officer was withdrawn by the AA and played no evidential role in the panels finding.
8. A hearing was held on 9 February 2026. At the hearing there was an agreed Hearing Bundle (HB) with the evidence relevant to the withdrawn allegation 2 redacted and additional evidence was admitted:
  - (a) the training record of PC Wood, and
  - (b) the MG11 of Inspector McDonald dated 24 February 2025 [sic].
9. At the hearing the Officer made two applications:
  - (a) that the hearing could not continue with the remaining allegation after the withdrawal of the second allegation; and
  - (b) Due to the late amendment of the hearing bundle, he required more time to prepare.

10. Both applications were opposed by the AA. The remaining allegation still stood despite the withdrawal of the second allegation. And the hearing bundle had only been redacted to remove evidence relevant to the second withdrawn allegation. The material relevant to the remaining allegation had been served on the Officer in September 2025, and no new material had been added.

11. The Chair rejected both of the Officer's applications:

- (a) The remaining allegation had always been stated on the Reg. 30 notice and subject of referral to misconduct proceedings. It was a stand-alone allegation for which there was a case to answer determination by the AA. It was premature to make an application of no case to answer to the Panel at the beginning of the hearing. There was no unfairness in proceeding with the remaining allegation.
- (b) As no new evidence had been included in the hearing bundle there was no unfairness in the hearing proceeding. The Officer has had sufficient time to consider the evidence relied upon for the allegation.

It was noted that as the withdrawn allegation was also one of honesty and integrity, its withdrawal could be seen as a comment on the Officer's honesty in relation to that allegation which the Panel were prepared to consider when questioning his honesty under the remaining allegation. The Officer was free to seek the re-introduction of any evidence recently redacted which would go to his propensity for honesty. The AA indicated it had no objection to agreeing to the re-introduction of any of the evidence it had redacted out of the hearing bundle. The Officer made no such application during the hearing.

12. The only live witness was PS Hopkins who was allowed to give evidence remotely due to [REDACTED].

13. The Officer also gave evidence.

## **Accounts and evidence**

### *PS Hopkins*

14. In her statement dated 11 March 2024 she set out her suspicion that PC Wood had been dishonest. On 15 February 2024 Inspector Boyle emailed line managers to check that their officers had completed the Job-Related Fitness Test (JRFT). She checked the LMS and PSOP systems. The LMS showed the PPST course had been completed on 23 July and 1 November 2023. However, there was no completion shown for the JRFT.

15. On 16 February 2024 she emailed PC Wood about completion of the JRFT. There was no reply so on 22 February 2024 she spoke to PC Wood in person in the Sgt room in front of two other witnesses. She asked PC Wood to produce his “white card” – his personal training record- which he did. This did not show any completion of the JRFT.
16. Seeing only three PPST sessions on the card PC Wood was asked during which one he completed the JRFT, at which he pointed to the 24 July 2023 session at Heathrow. PS Hopkins was to check with Heathrow and advised PC Wood to hold off taking the JRFT until she had heard back. PS Hopkins made a note of this discussion on 22 February 2024.
17. In an email exchange with the Heathrow training facility on 23 February 2023, she learnt that no JRFT had been completed on 24 July 2023.
18. In a supplemental statement dated 17 December 2024 she denies ever believing PC Wood. She accepted she had spoken to him about his appearance but denied making comments about how a victim of sexual violence would react if they saw PC Wood’s appearance.
19. In live evidence she adopted her previous statements and maintained her account. She had never made an occupational health referral for PC Wood in relation to his physical fitness. She acknowledged that at the time of the incident he was not deployable as he did not have the required PPE.

#### *PC Hewing*

20. His statement dated 28 November 2025 was uncontested. He acted as PC Wood’s welfare officer and recalled the meeting where PS Hopkins spoke to PC Wood about his dishevelled appearance. He noted PC Wood had a lot of ongoing investigations.

#### *Training sign in sheet- PPST course on 24 July 2023 [HB-51]*

21. This showed PC Wood signing in and out of the course [entry 10] and a “/” in the JRFT column. The preamble on the form states by signing in the an officer agrees they are fit to complete the JRFT and will be required to do so unless they can show the course instructor evidence that a JRFT has been passed in the previous 12 months or an occupational health exemption.

#### *ROTI of PC Wood*

22. During interview PC Wood gave the following answers in relation to his interactions with PS Hopkins:

**“[WOOD] ...I never directly said on this date I certainly completed that JRFT, I was asked to the best of your knowledge out of these three dates I’d completed what’s it called, PPS ... PPST, Public Safety which one would you have done it on and I said ah I think if I’ve done it on any it would be that one and I pointed to it, she said okay and as (inaudible) called me into the office a few days after, a few weeks after and said you didn’t do it on that day there’s no record of you doing it on that date so you’re gated for now, when can you run it and I then went and run it I think the next day or the day after. [HB-147]**

....

“WOOD She pulled me into the Governor’s office and I said I haven’t got a clue to be honest, I think if I would have done it, it would have been on one of these three, she asked which of these three would you have done it on and I said the date, was it the 21st of the 7th something like that, the middle one on my JRFT card ...

“PC AYRES 24th of the 7th.

“WOOD 24th of the 7th, she said okay that’s no worries we’ll check and see if you’ve done it or not, it was then checked. They said no you haven’t done it and this was a couple of days after I want to say, this was another conversation in the Governor’s office and Sergeant HOPKINS turned to me and said I don’t think you’re lying, those are the exact words, I don’t think you’re lying, see if you can get down to the ESB, the Empire State Building and run it as quickly as possible and then on the following shift I went to the Empire State Building run it. [HB 148]

....

“WOOD No after she checked, so after she checked she said that oh you’ll never shown ... on LMS I’m never shown as doing one so even at like after the end of my OST on your last day I was shown as never doing one if that makes sense ...

“PC AYRES (Inaudible).

“WOOD There’s no record of me ever doing a Job Related Fitness Test. [HB-150]

...

“WOOD “My argument being that I have to have to have done a JRFT ‘coz my passed my OST so I was ...

“PC AYRES Okay.

“WOOD I was signed off as Operational.

“PC AYRES Okay. [HB-151]

...

“PC AYRES Okay. So then they’ve asked you or sorry Sergeant HOPKINS has asked you can you point out the date of your JRFT?

“WOOD Yeah.

“PC AYRES Yeah and you’ve pointed out the 24th of July yeah.

“WOOD Yeah.

“PC AYRES PC WOOD stated he had definitely done it in July and that he didn’t realise it should

have a stamp that said JRFT. Now for Sergeant HOPKINS to say you definitely have done it because that's what you've said to you going 'not sure if I have, not sure if I hadn't' ...

"WOOD Mhm.

"PC AYRES You can understand they're two different right ...

"WOOD Yeah.

**"PC AYRES And you must have portrayed some sort of characteristic behaviour, some sort of verbal cue to make Sergeant HOPKINS think that you had definitely done it on that day. [HB-153 to 154]**

...

**"WOOD "I don't think there's need to be any kind of characteristic or ... I would argue that first of all I definitely didn't use the word definitely um I was asked to the best of my knowledge if you had done your JRFT which of these days would it have been done on and I said I think this one...." [HB-155]" (emphasis added)**

23. When asked why he had not responded to PS Hopkins's email:

"AYRES "Why would you not reply to it?"

"WOOD (Stammers) Admin to be honest, slipped my mind amongst everything else." [HB-153]

24. On when he had taken the JRFT PC Wood said:

"WOOD "I have run it on ... so at the end of my 8 day OST course that you do at Hendon

...

"PC DALE Right so (inaudible) so when you joined the job ...

"WOOD Yeah.

"PC DALE Okay.

"WOOD And I run it again after this a couple of days after it was found that I hadn't done it on the 24th of the 7th.

**"PC DALE Okay so you know that you run it, you'd run it when you joined the job and you say you know what a Job Related Fitness Test is ...**

**"WOOD Yeah, yeah." [HB-156] (emphasis added)**

25. On PC Wood's perception of the effect of not doing the JRFT:

**"WOOD Yeah, no of course and I was already on MIST so I was already in part gate ... I believe I was already NANO at the time so been gated as a result of not doing my Job Related Fitness Test would have made no difference to my life so why would I then go and lie about not doing the JRFT it makes zero sense." [HB-159] (emphasis added)**

26. As to why he responded by indicating the 24 July 2023 training:

“WOOD The reason for making that comment is I’m trying to save people time and effort ‘coz she said she was going to make enquiries as to whether or not it was done on that day. **In my head not thinking oh well this might be brought up as an honesty and integrity allegation go well I might as well just go and run it because it’s no stress, it’s no skin off my teeth doing a Job Related Fitness Test**, take 20 minutes, saves you emailing and getting people to send you stuff back, makes no difference to my life, I’ll just go and run it again.

“PC AYRES But you can see how that would look from a different ...

“WOOD What in a sense ...

“PC AYRES **Different opinion might say well you’ve just said that because you know you haven’t done it and you now know you need to do it so you’re just going to go and do it.**

“WOOD **At the same time it would be as simple to go oh no I haven’t done it I’ll go and run it as quickly as possible, why would I in the first place lie about it and say oh yeah I run it on this date in hope of what not having to spend an hour at ESB and run a 5.4, no I don’t ... I don’t think so.**” [HB-160] (emphasis added)

27. When shown the course sign in sheet:

“WOOD That’s me, that’s me to be fair I obviously botched up my prefix, that’s my warrant number or attempt at writing it ‘coz my handwriting’s terrible, rank, borough. I would have signed that and I would have signed that, I believe the staff signed the JRFT and the day pass fail (inaudible). [HB-162]

...

“WOOD “Okay yeah, no of course I only fill up to the signature in and signature out boxes don’t touch the JRFT level and I don’t touch the pass bit is my understanding of those forms so I didn’t put in a dash in there although I would have obviously if they put in dash in there, they would have asked me do you need to run a JRFT and I would have said no on the day but I don’t remember putting a dash in that box, I don’t think that was me.

“PC AYRES Okay fine.

“WOOD **But I’m not disputing whether or not a JRFT was run on that day just to make it clear, I’m not saying oh no I did run one that day and the system, the record keeper’s wrong, I completely believe that I didn’t run it.** [HB-164]” (emphasis added)

*PC Wood’s Reg. 31 response*

28. In response to the Reg. 30 notice PC Wood states he did not lie and gave the best answer that he could. He felt unsafe in the workplace after returning from a month of [REDACTED] being spread in his personal locker. He considered the effect of being in time or not with the JRFT was negligible as he was not on operational deployment as his MetVest had been in his locker and seized after the nut incident.

29. He admitted his failure to answer PS Hopkins's email was unacceptable performance.

*PC Wood's live evidence*

30. In evidence PC Wood disputed he had been "adamant" in his answers to PS Hopkins. He continued the claim he was answering in a general sense based on the options presented to him by PS Hopkins.

31. As context, at the time he believed that he was one of seven other team members who were in the same position with the JRFT. He repeated the limited impact on his operational circumstances the JRFT would have had.

32. He pointed to the nut incident which he referred to as "attempted murder". He was extremely distressed and considered he had returned to work too soon. At the time of the conduct he described experiencing [REDACTED] complete breakdown in trust with his line manager and more senior officers. All of which contributed to his actions. He repeated his view that because he was not the only one out of time with JRFT compliance and the fact he was off front line operational duties; the significance of whether he had completed the JRFT or not was negligible. He also pointed to the fact that since the conduct he has completed the JRFT on three other occasions.

33. When questioned about the last time he had completed the JRFT he evaded the question and tried to reframe his answer around the narrative that he had been asked to indicate a date he completed the JRFT from a choice of three.

34. He admitted it was his responsibility to maintain his JRFT compliance and training records.

*Character statement by Insp. McDonald dated 24 February 2025[sic]*

35. PC Wood's current Inspector provided a reference based on his time in the RADT which can be summarised as PC Wood being a "professional, courteous, and respectful" officer who "...has clearly learned from his previous mistakes, and based on his conduct,.... would be an unnecessary loss to the organisation."

**Law and Guidance**

36. The standard of proof to be applied is on the balance of probabilities meaning that the allegation is more likely than not to have occurred [reg. 41(15) of the Regulations].

37. The burden of proof remains on the AA to prove an allegation.

38. The decision before the Panel remains whether or not there has been a breach of the Professional Standards of Behaviour that amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct [see regs. 2(1) and 42(15) and (16) of and Schedule 2 to the Regulations].
39. Misconduct: "...means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action." [Reg. 2(1) of the Regulations]
40. Gross misconduct: "...means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal,..." [Reg. 2(1) of the Regulations]
41. The relevant professional standard is:

Honesty and Integrity – Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

[Schedule 2 to the Regulations]

42. It is noted that as the allegation is a pre-commencement allegation for transitional purposes, i.e. it came to the attention of the AA before 28 May 2025, the amendment to Reg. 42(3)(b) of the Regulations that requires a finding of dismissal without notice unless exceptional circumstances are shown for a lesser sanction is not in effect in this case [see regs. 15(3)(b), 64(1) and 67 of the Police (Conduct, Performance, Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025 (SI 2025/558)]

*HOG*

43. The standard of proof is reiterated as the civil standard and there is no sliding scale [The *HOG* at paras. 9.10 and 9.11.]

*Honesty and integrity*

44. The Panel applied the test under *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd (trading as Crockfords)* [2017] UKSC 67 per Lord Hughes SCJ at para. 74:

“When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of his belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be

reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest.”

### *Outcome Guidance*

45. The Panel had regard to the *Outcome Guidance* but it does not override the discretion the Panel have to assess each case on its individual facts [*OG* at 1.6] and [*HOG* at 11.118].
46. The process set out under the *Outcome Guidance* is a guide where considerations may overlap and is not a structure approach which must be followed. The Panel must consider the substance of the matters contained in the *Outcome Guidance* when considering the case before it. [see *R (on the application of Kristina O’connor) v Panel Chair (Police Misconduct Panel)* [2025] EWCA Civ 27 per Davies LJ at paras. 41 to 43.]
47. The *Outcome Guidance* broadly sets out the three stages to determining the appropriate sanction:
  1. assess the seriousness;
  2. keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions; and
  3. choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils the purpose of the proceedings and seriousness of the conduct. [4.2] [see also *Fuglers LLP & Ors v Solicitors Regulatory Authority* [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin)]
48. In assessing whether the conduct amounts to misconduct or gross misconduct the Panel did consider Stage 1.

#### Stage 1

49. Under stage 1, the seriousness of the proven conduct should be assessed with reference to:
  - (a) the officer’s culpability;
  - (b) the harm caused;
  - (c) aggravating factors; and
  - (d) mitigating factors. [*OG* at 4.3]

#### Officer culpability

50. The greater the intentional targeting, planned or deliberate nature of the conduct the greater the culpability and this includes if the Officer could “reasonably have foreseen the risk of harm”. [OG at 4.10- 4.11]

51. The allegation is one of honesty and integrity and would be considered very serious if proven. Although it was not an instance of operational dishonesty, it still goes to a fundamental value of being a police officer [see OG at 5.2 and 5.3; see also *Salter v The Chief Constable of Dorset* [2012] EWCA Civ 1047 per Maurice Kay LJ (VP) at paras. 17 and 21 at para. 21 and *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512]

### Harm

52. Harm is assessed after the determination of the facts and if the conduct breaches a standard of professional behaviour being either misconduct or gross misconduct [OG at 4.72].

53. The types of harm are listed under para. 4.64 of the *Outcome Guidance* but in these proceedings only reputational harm is a concern.

54. Harm is assessed on the Panel’s knowledge and experience [OG at at 4.71].

55. The Panel can consider the depth of national or local concern but objective evidence of harm should be distinguished from subjective media commentary [OG at 4.70].

### Aggravating factors

56. The *Outcome Guidance* lists factors that can be considered aggravating so to indicate a higher level of culpability or harm [OG at 4.76].

### Mitigating factors

57. This is different to personal mitigation as it goes to the actual conduct [OG at 4.67].

58. A non-exhaustive list of mitigating factors are set out at para. 4.81, but only one arose in the course of proceedings: misconduct confined to a single episode or brief duration (allegation 1) [OG at 4.81].

## Stage 2

59. The purpose of the misconduct proceedings take precedence and are:
- (a) to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
  - (b) to uphold standards in policing and deter misconduct; and
  - (c) to protect the public. [OG at 2.3]

## Stage 3

60. The Panel in considering outcomes must look at the least severe option that “adequately deals with the issues identified whilst protecting the public interest” [OG at 2.8].
61. Personal mitigation must be considered after assessing the seriousness of the conduct [OG at 4.5]. However, there might be an overlap between mitigating factors and personal mitigation depending on the conduct before the Panel.
62. The impact of personal mitigation is limited as the aim of these proceedings is the protection of the public and public confidence in the police, and not the punitive sanction of the Officer. [OG at 4.4, 6.1 and 6.5; see also *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512 and *Salter*]
63. This applies not only to cases of honesty and integrity but all forms of gross misconduct. [R (*Williams*) v Police Appeals Tribunal & Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin), [2017] ICR 235]

## **Panel’s findings**

### *Is the allegation proven?*

64. The Panel’s note that the JRFT is a common and well-known test- alternatively known to the public as a “bleep test”.
65. The Panel have established that the Officer was also familiar with the JRFT and he knew its importance to operational officers.
66. He also knew at the time that he had not completed the JRFT since his OST training at the end of his police basic training as admitted in his ROTI interview and during evidence before the Panel.

67. The Panel consider it is PC Wood's genuine belief that the consequences from taking the JRFT were minor and that other team members were in the same situation.
68. We accept that at the time of the conversation with PS Hopkins PC Wood had only recently returned to work and the working environment was not a place where he felt comfortable with colleagues and senior staff.
69. PC Wood claimed his discomfort was so significant that he could not remember whether he had completed the JRFT or not. In addition, he disagrees that he was adamant in his response to the questions put to him by PS Hopkins.
70. The Panel have seen the training record for PC Wood and it is clear that he had not completed a JRFT at the time of PS Hopkins's email or conversation with him since he left basic training in early 2023. The Panel do note PC Wood was open in providing his "white card" training record which lacked the necessary recording of the JRFT, to PS Hopkins at the time they spoke in person in February 2024.
71. The JRFT is a well known and distinct test that Officers have to engage in regularly. Even taking account the passage of time and the recent period of sick leave, the Panel consider it is such a unique event that PC Wood should have been able to recall taking the JRFT, even if not the specific date.
72. By PC Wood's standards he may consider a general and non-specific response to be acceptable, especially to a question which may have had no real operational impact on him. It is clear from the ROTI and his evidence that the lack of clarity in his answer is acceptable and maintains his honesty.
73. The Panel consider an ordinary reasonable person would not objectively agree. By email and in person he was asked a simple question which required no nuance.
74. He did not come across to the Panel as a credible live witness of his interactions with PS Hopkins. He was purposefully evasive in his answers to the direct question of: when was the last time had he completed the JRFT between basic training and the incident? Purposefully evasive to the point of dishonesty.
75. He now claims that his [REDACTED] that his cognitive recall was inhibited. No evidence of his [REDACTED] was presented to the Panel. The Panel observed that when it came to the Officer's account of the conduct his recall on points that he considered went in his favour were clear.

76. PC Wood clearly created the perception to PS Hopkins that he had completed the JRFT and specifically on the July date. That perception was a lie and dishonest. In the ROTI he recognised that the matter could become an honesty and integrity issue (see para. 26 above).
77. The Panel have considered his character reference for propensity as well as any exceptional circumstances. The Panel have no evidence to show PC Wood's health effected his ability to discern truth.
78. Although not operational dishonesty, it is a breach of the honesty and integrity standard of professional behaviour. A breach of honesty and integrity is so serious that usually gross misconduct is the only determination that fits the conduct.
79. The honesty of officers is a foundation stone of their role in upholding the King's peace and their role within the criminal justice system.
80. The actions of PC Wood were completely his own.
81. We note the working environment for PC Wood was challenging. It was clear there had been a break down in trust between the Officer and others in his team and even his line manager. The dishonesty was also over an exercise test which in itself is routine and minor. No clear motive was put forward as to why PC Wood would be dishonest, although the circumstances suggest an officer already struggling in the role of probationer and keen to avoid criticism. He gained the very short term advantage of not undertaking the JRFT.
82. However, the Panel still consider the act of lying even over a minor issue of little direct consequence is still serious. If an officer's honesty cannot be maintained over a minor issue, how can it be maintained when faced with a more serious challenge or consequence? Their role demands the highest standards of honesty in order to protect public safety and maintain the reputation of the service.
83. The Panel find the allegation against PC Wood is proven and the conduct amounts to a breach of the honesty and integrity standard of professional behaviour as to be gross misconduct.

*Outcome decision*

84. Culpability is high- the decision was that of his own. At the time he intended to deceive his superior. The only apparent motivation appears to be based on self-interest and avoiding potential criticism.

85. Harm caused – no significant harm beyond the reputational damage to the service of retaining an officer who has been dishonest. The public expect the highest standards.
86. Aggravating factors- beyond that mentioned under culpability there are no other aggravating circumstances.
87. Mitigation- Although a probationer (a 5 September 2022 entry) this is limited mitigation due to the nature of the conduct. Being honest should not be a skill gained by experience.
88. We have considered his [REDACTED] but again there is limited evidence of its impact on the conduct at the time, and no [REDACTED] assessment.
89. Purpose of misconduct hearings- We have taken into account the three purposes of the misconduct proceedings. In particular upholding police standards and maintaining public confidence.
90. Finally, we have considered the least severe outcome that adequately deals with the issues.
91. Personal mitigation- We have looked at his sole character reference and note the diligence he has applied to his current role. We have also considered his good record so far and his clean disciplinary record before this allegation. However, personal mitigation has little weight.
92. Final written warning- as an honesty and integrity issues we cannot see how public confidence can be maintained or the officer being able to continue as a constable.
93. Due to the seriousness of the conduct and it going to the heart of what it means to be an officer serving the public dismissal without notice is the only sanction that fits with a deliberate breach of the honesty and integrity standard.

**Chair**  
**Cmdr A Brittain**  
**20 February 2026**