

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

BETWEEN

**THE COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS**

APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY

**AND**

**PC KIERAN GRANT**

OFFICER CONCERNED

1. This hearing has been listed between the 5-7 January 2026 at Empress State Building, London. The Panel consisted of Deputy Director Melanie Williams (Chair) and Ms Lorna Beckford and Dr Nigel Westwood, Independent Panel Members. Ms Dale Simon was the Legally Qualified Advisor (LQA) to the Panel.
2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Mr Zander Goss and PC Grant was represented by Mr Tom Daniel.
3. The allegations facing PC Grant are set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon him under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. These are:

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

1. At the relevant times you were on an emergency response team out of Central South BCU. You were trained to undertake pre-planned and initial phase police pursuits. You were driving an unmarked police vehicle VRM NK68.
2. On 17 May 2024 you were crewed with PC Gregory Sloan and PC Connor McCarthy. You responded to reports of youths on bicycles trying to steal items from passersby on or near the Surrey Canal Path.

3. PC Sloan exited the car and spotted a young male ('A') on a Lime hire bike who matched the description provided, but A made off on the bike. PC Sloan got back into the car, and you followed A with your lights and siren activated. You caught up to A as he exited a construction area with temporary lights where the traffic was confined to a single lane.
4. As the front left of your vehicle came alongside the rear right of A's bike, both you and A were travelling straight ahead.
5. You then deliberately turned your vehicle to the left into collision with A.
6. Only after you began the manoeuvre steering to the left did A look over his right shoulder.
7. The collision caused A to fall to the ground. PC Sloan exited the vehicle and detained A for a stop and search before A was subsequently arrested.
8. You reported the collision to the control room. Your account was recorded as follows:

*WHILST DRIVING AFTER A ROBBERY SUSPECT - THE SUSP HAS  
FALLEN OFF HIS BIKE AND THE BIUKE [sic] HAS MADE CONTACT WITH  
THE POLICE VEH - NO DAMAGE CAUSED*

9. After the incident, you drove the vehicle to Catford Police Garage, where you gave an account to PS Jody Carson to the effect of:

*'the police car went through the temporary set of lights and was behind the lime cyclist who then looked over his right should and turn into the police car clipping his back wheel on the front bumper, he then fell of and ran away, he was chased and detained'*

10. Your accounts to the control room and to PS Carson were dishonest in that the collision was caused by your steering to the left into A and/or you omitted to

disclose that material fact and/or you falsely suggested that the collision was caused by A turning to the right.

11. When you were subsequently interviewed on 5 December 2024, you alleged for the first time that your manoeuvre steering to the left was for A's own safety.

#### **STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOUR BREACHED**

12. Your behaviour above breached the following Standard of Professional Behaviour:

##### **Honesty and Integrity**

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

#### **ASSESSMENT OF BREACH**

13. Your actions described above, taken individually or cumulatively, are so serious as to justify dismissal. Accordingly, your breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour amount to gross misconduct.

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

4. On 17 May 2024 PC Grant was on duty driving an unmarked police vehicle, in the vehicle with him were PC Gregory Sloan and PC Connor McCarthy. The officers responded to reports of youths on bicycles trying to steal items from passersby near the Surrey Canal Path. PC McCarthy had alighted from the car when PC Sloan spotted "A" on a Lime hire bike and noted that he matched the description of an alleged offender. Under "blues and twos" (blue lights and two-tone siren), PC Grant pursued and caught up with A, just as they came to the end of a construction area where traffic was narrowed and diverted by a contraflow into the opposing lane. A was in front and just to the left of PC Grant's car immediately before a collision occurred. The pursuit was captured by the body worn video (BWV) camera of PC Sloan, who was in the front passenger seat of the vehicle driven by PC Grant at that

time.

5. Based on the BWV the AA contends that PC Grant began turning his steering wheel to the left, towards A, fractions of a second before they collided. It is alleged that the left turn was 'substantial' and that A was still looking straight ahead when PC Grant made this turn.
6. It is alleged that the collision caused A to fall to the ground, and following a short pursuit he was detained and searched by PC Sloan. After alighting from the car PC Grant's BWV captures PC Grant approaching an officer who is dealing with the toppled Lime bike and muttering "*stupid prick*" evidently in relation to A. PC Grant then walked to PC Sloan and A, and assisted with the detention and search of the suspect.
7. It is alleged by the AA that PC Grant's use of the words "*stupid prick*" suggests that he was experiencing 'red mist' when he allegedly deliberately turned his steering wheel to the left into a collision with A.
8. PC Grant reported the collision to the control room, which recorded his account as:  
*"WHILST DRIVING AFTER A ROBBERY SUSPECT – THE SUSP HAS FALLEN OFF HIS BIKE AND THE BIUKE [sic] HAS MADE CONTACT WITH THE POLICE VEH – NO DAMAGE CAUSED"*
9. PC Grant then drove the car to Catford Police Garage, where he gave a further account of the collision to PS Jody Carson which she recorded as:  
*'the police car went through the temporary set of lights and was behind the lime cyclist who then looked over his right should[er] and turn[ed] into the police car clipping his back wheel on the front bumper, he then fell of[f] and ran away, he was chased and detained'.*
10. It is alleged that PC Grant's accounts to the control room and PS Carson falsely give the impression that the collision was caused by A turning towards the police car when the BWV appears to show that the collision was

caused by PC Grant turning his wheel to the left and towards A. It is further alleged that PC Grant must have known that his accounts were false in that regard. Accordingly, it is alleged that PC Grant was dishonest when he reported what had occurred, and that he thereby breached the standard of Honesty and Integrity.

11. . PC Grant denies that he breached the standard of Honesty and Integrity and states in his Regulation 31 response that:

*‘The material part of the incident happened over about a second or two. The officer’s reports were not dishonest; they were his recollection at the time of an incident that occurred very quickly. The officer did not have the benefit of hindsight or the footage when recounting a fast-moving incident’.*

## FINDINGS OF FACT

12. In advance of this hearing the Panel was supplied with the documents in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 which included a copy of the papers served on PC Grant in accordance with Regulation 30 and PC Grant’s response to the AA under Regulation 31. In determining the facts in this case, the panel had regard to:

- All documents and materials in the hearing bundle, the Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response whether they were explicitly referred to or not during the hearing.
- The oral evidence of PC Grant.
- The BWV from PC Sloan and PC Grant.
- The bundle of character references submitted on behalf of PC Grant which consisted of 59 testimonials from police officers and retired officers of various ranks, including seven Inspectors, and a RAF officer cadet.
- The submissions made on behalf of the AA and PC Grant.
- The legal advice provided by the LQA

13. In considering the facts, the Panel was aware that the burden of proof is on the AA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. This means that the panel must be satisfied that it is more likely than not that a fact is true before they can find it to be true. In line with the principle derived from *Byrne v General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 2237 (Admin)*, the Panel recognised that there is only one standard of proof in civil and regulatory cases, namely whether the facts in issue more probably occurred than not. The seriousness of an allegation does not of itself require more cogent evidence. The inherent probability of the alleged conduct is a matter which can be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and in deciding whether the event/conduct occurred; this goes to the quality of evidence.
14. In considering whether the burden of proof has been satisfied in this case the panel also had regard to the character references submitted on behalf of PC Grant and his previous good character which positively support a lack of propensity to act dishonestly and without integrity. The testimonials provided speak highly of PC Grant's honesty and integrity as well as his professionalism and dedication, the character bundle also included copies of three commendations conferred upon PC Grant between 2008 and 2025. Counsel for the AA drew attention to PC Grant's admitted breach of policy in respect of pursuing A and submitted that this undermines those testimonials that attest to PC Grant's high standard of procedural compliance. The Panel accepted this as a valid observation by the AA, but nevertheless found that the testimonials were overwhelmingly positive and contained many examples of when PC Grant had exhibited his good character and professionalism.
15. The Panel was provided with a schedule of the allegations of facts admitted by PC Grant. The allegations of fact in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 11 are admitted in their entirety. However, in respect of paragraph 11 it was submitted (and accepted by the AA) that this was the first time that PC Grant had been asked to provide an account of the collision under caution. Therefore, no adverse inference could be drawn from this fact. The Panel, therefore, found these allegations of fact proved by way of admission.

16. The Panel considered each of the disputed facts in turn.
17. **Allegation of fact 4:** *As the front left of your vehicle came alongside the rear right of A's bike, both you and A were travelling straight ahead.*
18. The AA relies on the contents of PC Sloan's BWV to prove this allegation of fact. The Panel found this allegation of fact not proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
19. In his Regulation 31 response PC Grant states that at this point A was looking to the right and moved to the right. PC Grant re-stated this account in his oral evidence.
20. The Panel found PC Grant to be a credible witness in that he provided full, clear and plausible responses to questions put to him. He was not evasive or defensive and accepted that there were some differences between his recollection of the incident and PC Sloan's BWV, but maintained that any inconsistencies were as a result of his genuine and honest recollection of how the incident had occurred. The Panel found his credibility as a witness was also supported by the positive character references which specifically referenced his honesty and integrity.
21. The Panel considered the content of the BWV and found that PC Grant's car comes alongside A's bike at 0.22 seconds. At this point Person A clearly looks over his shoulder to the right and the bike appears to be steering slightly to the right, as evidenced by the fact that the front basket of the bike comes into view at this point.
22. The Panel determined that the images captured on the BWV did not support the allegation of fact made by the AA and more closely aligned with the account provided by PC Grant. The Panel therefore concluded that the AA had failed to prove this allegation of fact on the balance of probabilities.
23. **Allegation of fact 5:** *You then deliberately turned your vehicle to the left into collision with A.*

24. The AA also relies on the contents of PC Sloan's BWV to prove this allegation of fact.
25. PC Grant states in his Regulation 31 response, "In the split-second after the suspect looking over his right shoulder, the officer reacted by moving slightly to the left as he was concerned that the suspect would be dragged under the wheels of the car". This is also the explanation PC Grant gave when interviewed under caution on 5 December 2024. In oral evidence PC Grant stated that he was very familiar with the area and that it was commonly used to target victims because of the railway arches and the fact that cars had restricted access due to the cycle path in the road. He also confirmed that he had dealt with many similar incidents previously. He stated that his intention in turning left was to avoid a collision given the narrowness of the road (due to the roadworks) and the fact that A appeared to be about to veer right in front of the car.
26. The Panel determined that the AA is alleging in this paragraph that it was not only the act of turning left that was deliberate but also that it was executed with the deliberate intention of precipitating the collision that then occurred. There is no dispute that PC Grant turned his steering wheel to the left and that the bike and the car collided. The video does not assist the Panel at determining precisely when the collision occurred; or whether the bike collided with the car, or the car collided with the bike.
27. The Panel determined that the explanation provided by PC Grant for making the manoeuvre was plausible in the circumstances that he was faced with. The Panel was also mindful that the incident had been examined separately, and the only criticism of PC Grant's driving was that he had breached driving policy by pursuing a cyclist without TPAC training.
28. The Panel concluded that the AA had failed to establish to the required standard of proof that PC Grant had deliberately turned his vehicle with the intention of causing a collision. The Panel therefore found this allegation not proved on the balance of probabilities.

29. **Allegation of fact 6:** *Only after you began the manoeuvre steering to the left did A look over his right shoulder.*
30. The AA relies on the BWV of PC Sloan to prove this allegation of fact also.
31. PC Grant denies this allegation. He maintained in his Regulation 31 response and in his oral evidence that the BWV shows that A looked over his right shoulder at 00.20, 00.21 and 00.22 before the collision at 00.23.
32. The Panel found that the BWV shows A making movements with his head that are consistent with glancing over his shoulder prior to 0.22 seconds. At 0.22 seconds the right side of A's face is becomes visible fractionally before PC Grant steers to the left. The Panel therefore concluded that the AA had failed to prove this allegation of fact on the balance of probabilities.
33. **Allegation of fact 10:** *Your accounts to the control room and to PS Carson were dishonest in that the collision was caused by your steering to the left into A and/or you omitted to disclose that material fact and/or you falsely suggested that the collision was caused by A turning to the right.*
34. The AA relies on the PC Sloan's BWV, the CAD record and the evidence of PS Carson to prove this allegation. The Panel found this allegation of fact not proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.
35. The Panel found that this allegation of fact relies on a presumption that the collision between PC Grant's car and A's bike was caused by PC Grant steering to the left. As referenced above, the Panel found that the point of collision and as such the cause of the collision is not captured on the BWV. The Panel also noted when PC Grant was being questioned under caution and gave his account of the collision the interviewer, PC Maqueira, stated: "Okay, let's not talk about hitting because we cannot really see what's going on". In other words, the DPS investigator found, as do this Panel, that PC Sloan's BWV does not assist the AA in establishing whether A's bike hit PC Grant's car or whether PC Grant's car hit A's bike.

36. In the absence of any direct evidence establishing the cause of the collision the panel found that this allegation of fact could not be proved. Nevertheless, the Panel determined that even if the AA had established that the collision had been caused by PC Grant steering to the left the AA had not established that PC Grant believed this to be the case and as such had acted dishonestly when he reported the collision.
37. In considering whether PC Grant had acted dishonestly the Panel applied the test for dishonesty set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos UK Limited [2017] UKSC 67*. The Panel first considered what PC Grant's actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts was when he reported the collision to the control room and to PS Carson. The panel then asked itself whether PC Grant's conduct in the light of his knowledge or belief was dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people. The first stage of the test is subjective, and the second stage is objective, both stages must be determined on the balance of probabilities.
38. In relation to Grant's state of mind, the panel concluded that there was less than a second between PC Grant getting close to A and the collision. PC Grant's memory of that fleeting event was formed in the context of a complex scenario; A was suspected of having committed a serious crime and PC Grant was naturally concentrating on not losing sight of the suspect. A was riding at speed and in an unpredictable manner to evade detention and in doing so was placing members of the public at risk of harm.
39. Of note, the road was reduced to a single lane due to roadworks, with a contraflow in place and cones to the left. PC Grant had to avoid oncoming traffic in order to maintain the pursuit. The Panel find that navigating the road safely under these conditions, with siren and lights activated, would have taken a good deal of PC Grant's cognitive load (working memory) at this time.
40. When PC Grant reported the incident, he had not seen the BWV. The Panel noted that even with the benefit of viewing the BWV in real time and in slow motion on several occasions there was still dispute between the parties as to how the collision occurred. The CAD record and PS Carson's records were not written by PC Grant

and although he accepts that they were made on the basis of what he had said, he was not asked by those who wrote those records to check them for accuracy.

41. In light of the above, the Panel found that when PC Grant reported the incident, his account reflected his genuinely held belief as to the cause of the collision. In applying the second limb of the test for dishonesty the Panel found that PC Grant's conduct in the light of his knowledge or belief would not be considered dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people.

#### BREACH OF STANDARDS

42. Having found the allegations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 11 proved by admission. The Panel went on to consider whether any of the admitted facts breached the standard of Honesty and Integrity as alleged by the AA.

43. The Standard provides: **Honesty and Integrity**

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

45. The Panel found that the allegations of fact in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 relate to matters of context which are not capable of breaching the standard Honesty and Integrity. In relation to the admissions of fact in respect of paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 the Panel found that these facts do not support a finding that PC Grant breached the standard of Honesty and Integrity, not least because the Panel has found allegations 5, 6 and 10 not proved. Finally in respect of allegation of fact 11 the Panel found that as it was accepted by the AA that no adverse inference should be drawn from this fact as this was the first time that PC Grant had been asked to provide his account of the collision under caution. There was therefore no basis for finding that PC Grant had acted dishonestly or without integrity: on the contrary, although PC Grant was entitled to make no comment during his interview, he had chosen to answer all of the questions put to him fully and frankly.

46. Having found no breaches of the standards of professional behaviour alleged this concludes the Panel's deliberations in this case.