

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 - Appropriate Authority

AND

Officer A - Officer Concerned

REGULATION 43 REPORT:

NOTIFICATION OF OUTCOME OF MISCONDUCT HEARING

INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 1 December 2025, a misconduct hearing was convened to deal with allegations against Officer A which the Appropriate Authority (AA) assessed as amounting to gross misconduct.

1.2 The hearing was held in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (PCR 2020) as amended by Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024.

1.3 It was held at Palaestra House, Southwark. The hearing was audio recorded and concluded on 6 December 2025.

1.4 The hearing Panel consisted of the Chair, Mr Jeremy Foot, and two Independent Panel Members (IPM), Mr Vincent Canning and Ms Bernadette Leverton.

1.5 The Panel was supported throughout the hearing by Ms Salma Yousef, the appointed independent legal adviser or Legally Qualified Person (LQP).

1.6 The Appropriate Authority was represented by Mr Janick Fielding, Counsel and Ms Claire Robinson, Counsel appeared for the defence. PC Shaun Robinson was also present as a Police Federation Representative for the Officer.

1.7 Prior to the hearing the Panel was provided with a bundle of documents relevant to the case which they considered.

BACKGROUND

2.1 The complainant is the former partner of Officer A, the subject officer.

2.2 The allegations, contained within the Regulation 30 notice, include breaches of the standards of professional behaviour, namely; the requirement to show courtesy and respect, and (refrain from) discreditable conduct.

2.3 Both Ms B and the subject officer were serving police officers at the material time.

2.4 Ms B joined the MPS in June 2014. She had no supervisory responsibilities to Officer A, who joined the MPS in 2017.

2.5 The two officers were in an on-off relationship for approximately eight months, from the end of November 2022 to August 2023. The relationship was not a smooth one and there were periods during which they were separated.

2.6 It was, after the ending of the relationship, reported by Ms B that Officer A had sent multiple messages to B on multiple platforms, including through work emails.

2.7 Ms B had wanted this behaviour to stop and asked Officer A to stop on several occasions and blocked him on a number of platforms, however he continued his attempts to communicate with her.

2.8 Following contact with B's line management, a crime report was created and investigated by the AS Safeguarding team. Whilst the criminal investigation did not result in any charges, an internal investigation was commenced which resulted in the present misconduct proceedings.

THE ALLEGATIONS

3.1 There were 11 allegations before the panel. The breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour (SPB) alleged are set out in a Regulation 30 (PCR 2020) Notice of Allegations as follows:

Allegation 1:

That between 15th April 2023 and the end of April 2023, you invaded and disregarded the privacy of Ms B, refused to abide by decisions she had made clearly regarding whether or not she wanted to see or have contact with you and refused to leave her premises when she told you to leave, thus behaving toward Ms B in a manner that demonstrated a lack of **courtesy and respect.**

Particulars:

Between 15th April 2023 and the end of April 2023, Ms B having been persuaded to resume a relationship with you that she had previously ended, you invaded her privacy by accessing and investigating private material on her mobile phone and then quizzing her about it. You did this on at least two occasions.

When she required you to leave her home, you refused and remained despite her clear wishes that you leave.

During this period, you behaved in a manner that was variously offensive, obnoxious and controlling.

Allegation 2:

That between 15th April 2023 and the end of April 2023, you invaded and disregarded the privacy of Ms B, refused to abide by decisions she had made clearly regarding whether or not

she wanted to see or have contact with you and refused to leave her premises when she told you to leave, thus behaving toward Ms B in a manner that amounted to discreditable conduct.

Particulars:

As per Allegation 1.

Allegation 3:

That between May 2023 and August 10th 2023, you pressured Ms B into seeing and spending time with you when she did not want to, ignoring her wishes to be given space and time away from you. During this period you harassed her to the point where she had to take steps to block your routes of communication with her, and even then you found ways to persist, knowing that your attentions were unwanted, thus behaving toward Ms B in a manner that demonstrated a lack of **courtesy and respect**.

Particulars:

In May 2023, Ms B returned from an overseas trip, wanting to see and spend time with her terminally ill dog which lived at her parents address and to which she was very attached. Despite her wishes to be alone with her pet, you pressured her into allowing you to come with her. Despite her surrender to your pressuring of her, she later asked you, as a result of your behaviour, to leave her parents' address.

Ms B having thereafter ended your relationship again, you applied various forms of pressure to have her change her mind. These tactics included but were not limited to you finding ways to communicate with her when you knew she did not want to communicate with you, visiting her home address when she did not want to see you, refusing to leave despite her repeated requirements that you did, following her and placing yourself in close contact with her, touching her and generally wearing her down until she was too exhausted by your controlling and insistent behaviour to object to your conduct any longer.

Your behaviour frustrated, irritated, upset and degraded her. You invaded her space, took up her time and refused to abide by her wishes. Your behaviour ultimately resulted in her allowing you to recommence your relationship with her, albeit this was a relationship she had wanted to end.

Allegation 4:

That between May 2023 and August 10th 2023, you pressured Ms B into seeing and spending time with you when she did not want to, ignoring her wishes to be given space and time away from you. During this period, you harassed her to the point where she had to take steps to block your routes of communication with her, and even then, you found ways to persist, knowing that your attentions were unwanted, thus behaving toward Ms B in a manner that amounted to **discreditable conduct**.

Particulars:

As per allegation 3.

Allegation 5:

Between August 11th 2023 and 3rd September 2023, having been told clearly by Ms B that your relationship with her was over, you repeatedly harassed her by communicating and / or trying to communicate with her in a variety of ways when you knew or ought to have known that your attentions were unwanted and unwelcome. This was harassing behaviour that you ought

not to have engaged in, the same causing upset and distress to Ms B. Your behaviour amounted to a lack of **courtesy and respect**.

Particulars:

Following your being informed by Ms B that your relationship with her was over, you proceeded to try and pressure her into allowing you to come to her home address and to speak with her, when you knew that she did not want any form of contact with you, save obligatory professional contact at work.

The WhatsApp messaging thread evidences your persistent attempts to contact Ms B, at a time when she had made it clear to you that she did not want to meet with you and latterly, on account of your unwanted persistence, did not want to have any contact with you. This was harassing behaviour that you ought not to have engaged in. It was clear to you that Ms B had made a decision that she wanted nothing more to do with you in her personal life, albeit she realised that due to your work connection some onward contact would professionally be required. Repeatedly and unreasonably, you pressed her to meet with you, refusing to accept the answers she gave you or the decision she had made.

Even after Ms B's position was made clear to you on 11th August 2023 on WhatsApp, you tried again to pressure her into seeing you by sending her a message following morning on Facebook. In the circumstances this was and further contributed to your harassment of her.

You also applied pressure to her when she was at work with a view to maintaining contact with you that you knew she did not want. You sent sexual messages that were unwanted and upsetting to her.

Your conduct during this period was harassing of Ms B and in direct contravention of her wishes that you leave her alone.

Allegation 6:

Between August 11th 2023 and 3rd September 2023, having been told clearly by Ms B that your relationship with her was over, you repeatedly harassed her by communicating and / or trying to communicate with her in a variety of ways when you knew or ought to have known that your attentions were unwanted and unwelcome, such that your behaviour amounted to **discreditable conduct**.

Particulars:

As per allegation 5.

Allegation 7:

That on or about 12th August 2023 you sent a sexual message to Ms B, knowing at the time that it would be unwanted and that it would be upsetting to her, the same amounting to a lack of **respect and courtesy**.

Particulars:

On or about 12th August 2023, at a time when you were aware the relationship was over and that Ms B wanted no more contact with you, you sent to Ms B a sexual request asking for sexual interaction with yourself and sexual interaction with third parties to occur as soon as the Complainant was 'done with the [REDACTED]' (p219/255), knowing that the Complainant was going to have a difficult time dealing with her [REDACTED] and that this message would, in the circumstances existing, be especially upsetting to her.

Allegation 8:

That on or about 12th August 2023 you sent a sexual message to Ms B, knowing at the time that it would be unwanted and that it would be upsetting to her, the same amounting to discreditable conduct.

Particulars:

As per allegation 7.

Allegation 9:

On 12th August 2023, after 07:00 in the morning, you sent Ms B an offensive message, intending to cause her upset and hurt as a result thereof.

In the circumstances existing at the time, this behaviour amounts to discreditable conduct.

Particulars:

In the morning of 12th August 2023, you sent Ms B a message which read, '[REDACTED] the second one probably wasn't even mine'.

The message was a nastily made assertion that the second [REDACTED] pregnancy that Ms B had endured whilst in a relationship with you was in fact conceived by her following intercourse with another man, the allegation implicit in the assertion being that she had been unfaithful to you and had acted then and thereafter in a deceitful manner.

By your own admission in a subsequent message sent later on that same morning, you confessed to Ms B that you had sent the message whilst intoxicated, that the message was sent whilst you were angry, that it was a snide message and that the implicit allegation was in fact a dishonest one. You further admitted that you had sent the message with the intention of causing Ms B hurt.

For the avoidance of doubt, it is the position of the Appropriate Authority that your self-induced intoxication, if correct (and no acceptance is given in relation to your assertion), does not amount to any form of excuse for your behaviour and does not amount to any mitigation of your conduct.

Allegation 10:

That on or about 27th August 2023 you sent a sexual message to Ms B, knowing at the time that it would be unwanted and that it would be upsetting to her, the same amounting to a lack of respect and courtesy.

Particulars:

On or about 27th August 2023 (p157/255), you sent a sexually explicit message designed to upset and humiliate Ms B, at a time when he (sic) knew or ought to have known that such a message would be unwanted and would have that effect upon her.

Allegation 11:

That on or about 27th August 2023 you sent a sexual message to Ms B, knowing at the time that it would be unwanted and that it would be upsetting to her, the same amounting to **discreditable conduct**.

Particulars:

As per allegation 10.

THE OFFICER'S RESPONSE

4.1 After being served with the Regulation 30 notice of allegations, Officer A served his formal written response as required by Regulation 31 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

4.2 Officer A admitted certain aspects of the factual allegations and denied others; with regards to Allegations 1, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11 he admitted breaching the SPB but only to the level of misconduct. In regard to Allegations 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 he denied breaching any of the SPB's.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Hearing in private

5.1 Prior to the hearing, an application was made for it to be held in private, given the very personal content of messages which form part of the allegations. The application was granted on 14 June 2025.

Special Measures

5.2 Permission was granted for Ms B to give evidence by video link. Additional screens were also granted for Ms B.

Equality Act 2010

5.3 There were no Equality Act issues raised by either party.

THE EVIDENCE

6.1 The Panel was provided with the following documents:

- a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice) consisting of 257 pages
- b. AA's opening note consisting of 30 pages
- c. The character bundle.

6.2 As part of the case presented by the Appropriate Authority, oral evidence was given by Ms B and the interviewing officer.

6.3 After the conclusion of the AA's case, Officer A gave oral evidence to the Panel.

FINDINGS

7.1 Before the beginning of the Panel's deliberations, counsel for the AA and for the officer made closing submissions. These need not be repeated here as they were captured on the audio recording but were carefully considered by the Panel.

7.2 The Panel also received legal advice from the LQP on how it must approach its task. The Panel had regard to the legal advice when deliberating on the allegations.

Factual Findings (Stage 1)

8.1 The Panel considered all of the evidence presented to it in the round and made the following findings in regard to the factual allegations as particularised in the Regulation 30 Notice.

The SPB (Stage 2)

9.1 The Panel went on to determine whether the proven factual allegations amounted to breaches of the SPB.

9.2 As set out above, the two standards alleged to have been breached were:

Authority, Respect and Courtesy
Discreditable Conduct

9.3 Interpretation of ‘Discreditable Conduct’

9.4 This case relates to the standards of behaviour exhibited by a serving officer in the context of their personal and private relationships. The relationship which forms the basis of the present case was between two serving officers. The allegations are of both “Lack of Respect and Courtesy” and “Discreditable Conduct”. While the meaning of “Lack of Respect and Courtesy” is clear, the panel felt it necessary to determine how “Discreditable Conduct” would be interpreted in the context of the allegations and the hearing.

9.5 The Guidelines state that Discreditable Conduct refers to the impact on the perception of the MPS and the profession of policing, in the public eye, and whether that conduct would be to the detriment of policing. That the hearing is held in private is of no consequence in this definition.

9.6 Recent cases have shown that the public is alarmed by the culture within the Metropolitan Police Service. Part of that culture is closely tied to issues of consent and privacy. It also relates to the long-term behaviour of officers towards each other and the language used. In finding an allegation of Discreditable Conduct, the panel has determined how the behaviour at the heart of the present allegations would be viewed in the public eye, and if that behaviour reflected what the public would judge as normal in that situation or whether, either: the higher standard to which office-holders are held had been breached, or the behaviour might be judged to have a significant potential to affect policing outcomes.

9.7 Where behaviour and actions would undermine public confidence in the MPS’s handling of partner abuse in various forms, the panel determined that this would constitute Discreditable Conduct.

9.8 Allegation 1.

Finding – The panel found that Officer A invaded and disregarded the privacy of Ms B which amounted to a lack of courtesy and respect.

It was asserted by Ms B in her statement, and again in her cross examination that Officer A accessed her phone without her knowledge or consent, on two occasions, over a 24-hour period whilst he was at her address. Officer A confirmed in evidence that he did this. Whilst there was a different account given as to how exactly Officer A managed to get into the phone; whether he had previously been given the pin or otherwise, this was not material to the panel's overall findings. The key issue was that he had invaded her privacy.

In acknowledging he had accessed the phone, Officer A stated he regretted doing so. He said Ms B had said she was going for a drink with an ex-partner and he had wondered why time was being made for someone else. He was driven by his insecurities in this regard. He told her straight away that he had accessed her phone. Officer A accepted the following morning he looked at her phone again when he saw messages pop up from a male friend that was coming to stay the night. After looking at the phone, he again told her he had done so.

There were differing accounts presented about whether Officer A had said he would leave at this point, or when Ms B requested this. The panel found no clear evidence to support either narrative on this point. The standard of proof was not met for this particular aspect of the allegation.

That notwithstanding, the panel found the accepted behaviour amounted to a lack of courtesy and respect.

9.9 Allegation 2.

Findings – In relation to allegation 2 which was founded on the same facts, the panel considered discreditable conduct, namely whether this behaviour would discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it.

The panel felt accessing Ms B's phone on two occasions without her consent was particularly serious and that such behaviour would undermine public confidence in a police officer and therefore amounted to discreditable conduct.

9.10 Allegation 3.

Findings

The AA had presented a number of incidents as part of this allegation over an extensive period of time. Much of the evidence was unchallenged insofar as the content and quantity of the messages was concerned.

In respect of Ms B's instruction to leave and the conversation at the door of her home, the panel found on a balance of probabilities that Ms B's account was more consistent and credible. They found that it was an argument lasting above 20 minutes with a heated exchange and a repeated instruction for Officer A to leave.

Whilst Ms B presented a credible account, the panel also found Officer A's account clear and cogent in parts. The panel did not find every single particular was made however given the failure to accede to repeated instruction to leave Ms B's home and the evasion of Ms B's blocks on communication, the panel found that taking the allegation as a whole the breach was established and there was a lack of courtesy and respect.

9.11 Allegation 4

Findings - The panel also found that this amounted to discreditable conduct.

9.12 Allegation 5

The panel was provided with extensive evidence in the bundle and heard directly from Ms B.

It found the messages from Ms B stating that the conversation was complete did not reasonably imply permission for the continued exchange of messages or an expectation that a reply would be made.

The fact that Ms B. Responded to some messages did not reasonably imply a wish to continue the exchange as claimed by Officer A or that a reply would be made.

The use of alternate channels to continue the exchange after previous channels were blocked amounted to harassment of Ms B and was in direct contravention of her wishes for him to leave her alone. The panel found that that this showed a lack of courtesy and respect in its entirety and found the breach proved.

9.13 Allegation 6

Findings - On the same basis as allegation 5, the panel found that it was not possible to reconcile the duty to maintain public trust and confidence in the police service and behave in this way, and therefore also found this to be a breach of the standard of discreditable conduct.

9.14 Allegation 7

Findings – the panel found this breach proved. Again, whilst not going into each particular, taken as a whole the panel agreed that in the context of the conversation expressed in the exchange of messages, the text would be unwanted and that any reasonable person reading the text would anticipate it would be upsetting to the recipient given that Ms B was then recovering from a medical procedure.

The panel found this amounted to a lack of courtesy and respect.

9.15 Allegation 8

Findings - as per allegation 7 the panel found the facts of this allegation proved and given the nature of the conduct the panel found this amounted to discreditable conduct.

9.16 Allegation 9

Findings – Officer A admitted this breach and accepted it was snide. He acknowledged it was intended to cause upset. However, the panel did not find this amounted to discreditable conduct.

The panel found it was unwanted but occurred in the context of an exchange of insults between two parties and was not solely one-sided.

9.17 Allegation 10

Finding – Officer A admitted this breach and the panel found it proved. The panel found that Officer A would have known it was unwanted and this amounted to a lack of courtesy and respect.

9.18 Allegation 11

Finding – Officer A admitted this breach and the panel found it proved. The panel found that Officer A would have known it was unwanted and this amounted to a lack of courtesy and respect.

Misconduct, Gross Misconduct or Neither (Stage 3)

10.1 The Panel considered carefully whether the breaches amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct. It also considered the admissions made in this case.

10.2 Misconduct means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action.

10.3 Gross misconduct means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.

10.4 These are objective standards, and the standard of proof is the balance of probability.

Allegation 1 - The panel found that this amounted to misconduct.

Allegation 2 - The panel found this amounted to misconduct.

Allegation 3 - The panel found this amounted to gross misconduct.

Allegation 4 - The panel found this amounted to gross misconduct.

Allegation 5 - The panel found this amounted to gross misconduct.

Allegation 6 - The panel found this amounted to gross misconduct.

Allegation 7 - The panel found this amounted to misconduct.

Allegation 8 - The panel found this amounted to misconduct.

Allegation 9 – the panel did not find this proved.

Allegation 10 - The panel found this amounted to gross misconduct.

Allegation 11 - The panel found this amounted to gross misconduct.

PANEL DETERMINATION OF OUTCOME AND REASONS

11.1 Having made its determination on the facts of the case and on finding misconduct for four allegations and gross misconduct for six allegations, the panel moved on to the determination of outcome.

11.2 Mr Fielding made submissions on outcome for the AA. He stated that this was a case which fell into the category of Violence Against Women & Girls (VAWG). Mr Fielding also submitted that Officer A's actions and behaviour were coercive and sustained, amounting to harassment, and that the only suitable outcome in this case was one of dismissal without notice.

11.3 Ms Robinson submitted that the facts of this case were not so serious as to justify dismissal.

11.4 The LQP provided the Panel with written legal advice on how it should decide outcome, following the 3-stage approach laid down in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes. The hearing was then adjourned for the Panel to deliberate.

11.5 The Panel reminded itself that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect, therefore it should be no more than is necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings. It reminded itself that it must consider less severe outcomes first before considering more severe outcomes, always choosing the least severe outcome which deals adequately with the issues identified, whilst protecting the public interest. The Panel understood that if an outcome is

necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings, it must impose it even where this would lead to difficulties for the individual officer or former officer.

11.6 The Panel followed the three-stage approach as follows:

Stage 1: Assess Seriousness.

Stage 2: Remind itself of the purpose of the Police Misconduct regime.

Stage 3: Determine the sanction most appropriate to the purpose.

Seriousness

12.1 The Panel accepted that any case of misconduct which comes before a police misconduct hearing is to be considered a serious matter. But the Panel was reminded that its function is to decide how serious the misconduct was in this case.

12.2 The Panel assessed the level of seriousness by following the four-step approach as laid down in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes.

Step 1: Assess Culpability.

Step 2: Assess Harm.

Step 3: Consider Aggravating Factors.

Step 4: Consider Mitigating Factors.

Culpability

12.3 Culpability was determined by considering the non-exhaustive list of culpability sub-factors in the Guidance on Outcomes and any others it deemed to be relevant.

12.4 The Panel first considered whether Officer A acted intentionally and deliberately. It found this was the case in these allegations; Officer A knew what he was doing. He consciously chose to treat Ms B in the manner he did, and it was obviously foreseeable that his behaviour would cause her some degree of emotional upset.

12.5 The Panel did not consider the allegations fell within the scope of VAWG, contrary to the AA's submissions. To classify his behaviour as VAWG was an exaggeration. Officer A's behaviour was unpleasant, and he took advantage of the fact that Ms B was a woman and perhaps in many respects [REDACTED]. At times his behaviour was persistent and coercive but it did not amount to violence. Although he used some degree of pressure towards Ms B it did not amount to violence.

12.6 The Panel chose to adopt a scale of low, medium or high when considering and articulating its findings on culpability.

12.7 Taking this into account, the deliberate nature and the number of incidents, the panel found Officer A's culpability in regard to Allegations 1-11 combined was most accurately described as medium-high.

Harm

12.8 The Panel referred itself to the harm factors suggested in the Guidance.

12.9 When looking at harm, particular consideration was given to human rights, the right of privacy and to a private life. The panel felt Ms B's personal space had been invaded however not to the degree of causing psychological harm.

12.10 The Panel found that some emotional harm was caused to Ms B by Officer A's actions. The allegations taken together amounted to a course of conduct and made her feel a sense of helplessness at times and which had a negative impact on her confidence as a police officer.

12.11 The panel did not find that the evidence revealed any inherent prejudice or misogyny which would inevitably cause greater harm to the force's reputation.

12.12 Having considered the above factors, the Panel decided that harm or potential harm was best described as moderate, having caused Ms. B significant distress but having fallen short of physical or lasting psychological harm.

Seriousness Starting Point

12.13 Having assessed culpability and harm, the Panel decided that the seriousness starting point was somewhere between the two levels and was best described as Moderate, having caused Ms. B significant distress but fallen short of physical or lasting psychological harm.

Aggravating factors

12.14 The panel then moved to consider aggravating features. This was a series of breaches which involved the invasion of Ms B's privacy over a period of time. Officer A made admissions to these and recognised his behaviour, but the panel also found in the course of the relationship, where he apologised and then repeated the same behaviour, this aggravated the misconduct. It was also observed that Officer A was aware of the patterns of behaviour associated with harassment and abuse, including re-contacting a victim on different channels. Officer A alluded to this knowledge in the email of the 12th of August. The Panel also reminded itself that Officer A was an Evidence Officer.

Mitigating factors

12.15 In terms of mitigation, the panel noted Officer A's early admissions and the detailed prepared statement provided in his disciplinary interview. It found his account credible in parts. It also considered his genuine remorse and the apologies he had made in certain messages. It felt there may have been an element of provocation insofar as Ms B did make what could be interpreted as inconsistent and encouraging comments and remarks to Officer A.

The panel had also been asked to consider his (self-induced intoxication). It was clear in his evidence that the alcohol was not an excuse. It was the panel's view that this was no defence to his actions; however, it did provide some explanation for them and it noticed a clear difference in his style of communication when under the influence of alcohol, leading to a distinct loss of inhibition in his manner of speech at this point.

It was the panel's view that the incidents which formed the basis for the breaches were opportunistic, with no pre-planning and forethought.

The panel had regard to the many positive character references produced in support of Officer A together with his previous good conduct (having been a police officer for 8 years).

Overall Assessment of Seriousness

12.16 Having assessed aggravating factors and mitigating factors, the Panel decided that overall level of seriousness should be assessed as high.

The Purpose

13.1 Having assessed seriousness as high, the Panel reminded itself of the purpose of the police misconduct regime before deciding on the appropriate sanction. The threefold purpose is as follows:

- Maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the Police Service.
- Upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct.
- Protecting the public.

Deciding Outcome

14.1 As required by the Guidance on Outcomes, the Panel moved to the third stage of the decision. Following the 2020 Regulations, the Panel considered outcomes in ascending degree of seriousness taking account of the threefold purpose of the misconduct regime. It started at the least possible sanction in the scope of the finding and determined if the Good of the Service would be served by that sanction. The panel further reminded itself that its function was not to impose a punitive sanction.

14.2 The least serious sanction available was a Final Written Warning and the Panel considered whether this would satisfy the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

14.3 The Panel considered Officer A's risk to the public or to colleagues. It considered if a written warning was given, how long such a warning would need to remain on his record in order to maintain public confidence, uphold high standards and deter others from similar misconduct.

14.4 The Panel considered that a Final Written Warning for the maximum period did not adequately reflect the seriousness of his actions.

14.5 The panel then considered whether a reduction in rank was appropriate. As the Officer's substantive rank was that of PC, this was not an outcome available to the panel.

14.6 The panel then moved to consider dismissal without notice.

The Guidance states at 4.13 that "It is not possible to categorise all types of cases where dismissal will be appropriate because the circumstances of the individual case must be considered. Many acts have the potential to damage public confidence in the police service."

However, at 4.14 it states that the types of misconduct given in certain sections should be considered especially serious. A number of non-exhaustive factors are outlined, which include so far as is relevant in this case: 'Violence, intimidation or sexual impropriety'. The panel noted that this case involved harassment of a partner who also happened to be a colleague.

14.7 The Panel carefully considered the question of reputational harm to the Metropolitan Police Service.

Given the period over which it happened it considered the behaviour to be so grave as to significantly undermine public trust and confidence in the police.

It concluded that the well informed, rational and objective member of the public would disapprove of Officer A's behaviour and would expect serious disciplinary action to be taken.

The Panel, in the circumstances, found that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction would be that of dismissal without notice.

While no issues were raised by any party under the Equality Act 2020, the Panel nonetheless considered its duties under that Act. The Panel considered the appropriateness of the outcome in line with the principle of proportionality and weighing the interests of the public with those of the officer. The Panel find that the outcome of dismissal without notice is a necessary and proportionate step taking into account the findings of fact made and the seriousness of the conduct concerned

The panel orders publication pursuant to regulation 43 (6) of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Right of Appeal

15.1 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.

Mr Jeremy Foot – Chair
Bernadette Leverton – IPM
Mr Vincent Canning – IPM