

IN THE POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING

PURSUANT TO THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024

IN THE MATTER OF:

PC BRENDAN JONES

DECISION OF THE PANEL

Commander Andy Brittain (Chair), Ms Bernadette Leverton (Independent Panel Member) and Mr Clive Manning (Independent Panel Member).

INTRODUCTION

The misconduct hearing for PC Brendan Jones (The Officer) was held in public between 16-19 February 2026 at Palestra House, London. A notice of hearing was published in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (“the 2020 Regulations”).

THE ALLEGATIONS

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

It is alleged that the following conduct has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour, and the matter has been referred to a misconduct hearing:

- (1) PC BRENDAN JONES, it is alleged that whilst on duty on 2nd and 3rd May 2024, you made discriminatory remarks whilst in the presence of colleagues.

(2) PC BRENDAN JONES, it is further alleged that whilst off duty on 15th August 2024, you expressed discriminatory views during a telephone conversation with a university coach.

It is alleged that this behaviour amounts to unacceptable behaviour and constitutes a breach of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

a) Discreditable conduct

b) Equality and Diversity

It is further alleged that this conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

REPRESENTATION

The Appropriate Authority (“the AA”) was represented by Mr Santos-Costa of counsel. PC Jones was represented by Mr Kevin Baumber of counsel.

The Panel thanks the representatives for their assistance throughout the case, including the provision of the AA’s opening note.

The Panel was assisted by Maurice Cohen, Legally Qualified Advisor.

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

On the first morning of the hearing the Regulation 30 Notice, as set out above, was read out. The notice was read out by AA counsel and entered into evidence.

PC Jones denied both Allegations.

THE PANEL'S APPROACH

The Panel reminded itself it was: -

- a. Required to consider the facts of the case and to make its findings of fact in relation to the allegation.
- b. To determine whether those findings of fact found constitute a breach of the relevant standards.
- c. To determine whether the conduct found proven against the Complainant amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct.

The Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof is on the AA throughout and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities, namely 'what is more likely than not'.

The Panel approached its decision-making by keeping in mind the purpose of police misconduct proceedings. The primary purpose is not to punish the officer but to protect public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service by holding officers accountable and making clear that improper behaviour will not be left unchecked. A second purpose is to declare high professional standards and the third purpose is to protect the public, which includes fellow officers and police staff, by preventing similar misconduct recurring in the future.

The Panel had regard to **Bolton v Law Society [1993] EWCA Civ 32; Chief Constable of Dorset v PAT, Salter Interested Party [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin) and R (Williams) v PAT [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin)**.

The Panel also had regard to the following regulations and guidance:

- a. The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (amended) (the "Regulations"), including the Standards of Professional Behaviour at Schedule 2;
- b. Home Office Guidance: Police Officer Misconduct... (2018) ("HOG"), including Chapter 1, Guidance on Standards of Professional Behaviour;

- c. The definition of misconduct given at regulation 2(1) of the Regulations: “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action”;
- d. The definition of gross misconduct given at regulation 2(1) of the Regulations: “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious to justify dismissal”, College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023).

The Panel listened carefully to the oral evidence and carefully considered all other evidence before it. It considered the totality of the evidence and submissions made. The Panel does not propose to deal with each and every aspect of the evidence or submissions made but states its main conclusions. The Panel heard submissions from both parties and received legal advice from the Legally Qualified Advisor.

EVIDENCE

The Panel was provided with the following documents:

Regulation 30 Bundle, comprising, inter alia, the Regulation 30 allegations, IO’s Report, PC Jones’ Regulation 31 response, officer’s witness statements (x2); witness statement of PC Brad Martin; witness statement of PC Michael Hawkesford; witness statement of PCSO Matthew Brown; witness statement of PCSO Georgi Piperkov; witness statement of Shirin Diaz; contemporaneous note from Shirin Diaz; email chain between Inspector James George and Constable Jodie Masters; interview plan for failed interview; emails passing between David Garside and officers providing witness statements; election unit briefing; completed polling information form and witness statement of PC Richard Apsey.

Applications

Day 1

Mr Baumber applied to admit the evidence of PCSO Georgi Piperkov for whom there was a late witness statement. He submitted that the evidence was relevant and it was

fair that it be considered by the panel. Mr Santos-Costa opposed the same. The evidence was submitted late and there had been inadequate time to consider the same. The chair, having received legal advice, deemed the evidence relevant and that it was fair and just to admit it for consideration by the panel.

Mr Baumber also applied for PC Apsey to be called as a witness on the basis that his evidence was relevant to the issues being considered by the panel. Mr Santos-Costa opposed the application as it wasn't relevant. The chair considered that PC Apsey's evidence was relevant and decided to admit him as a witness.

Day 2

Mr Baumber applied to admit the evidence of PC Apsey who would not be attending. The application was considered by the panel. It was argued that the evidence touched upon numerous aspects of the case before the panel. The Panel was a professional one and could attach such weight that it deemed fit to that evidence. Mr Santos-Costa opposed the application. He submitted that he would not have the opportunity to test the evidence by way of cross-examination. The Panel, having received legal advice deemed it appropriate to admit this evidence and indicating that it was an experienced and professional panel would attach such weight to it as it deemed fit having heard all the evidence.

The Panel was additionally provided with an opening note on behalf of the Appropriate Authority (AA).

Background

Broadly speaking, it is alleged that on 2nd May 2024, 3rd May 2024 and 15th August 2024 PC Jones has made comments that were racially prejudicial.

Specifically, it is alleged that on 2nd and 3rd May 2024, PC Jones was tasked with conducting visits to polling stations in the local area. He was with several colleagues. He is reported to have made a number of prejudicial remarks, such as, "Sadiq Khan

has links to terrorism”, “Islamists are taking over”, “Fucking off to Rwanda you go”, and “out of 19 venues, look how many English names are on there”.

On 15th August 2024, PC Jones said to his university coach, Ms Diaz, that he was being targeted as a white man in respect of the misconduct investigation, and that he has “no country to go back to”.

Evidence

PC Martin

PC Martin gave evidence before the panel. He indicated that he had not known PC Jones for long. He had been assigned to the team for approximately one month at the time of the incident. They worked together for 2 days on a set across the same shift. They had a purely professional relationship. He could not recall the nature of the list (of polling stations/presiding officers) that they were working from. He may have seen the list. On 2 May 2024, PC Jones allegedly made the comment: “*There’s not a single English name on the list*”. He was slightly shocked by the same at the time. He challenged PC Jones but could not remember if PC Jones responded to that.

PC Jones allegedly made another remark along the lines of, “*with names like these, Sadiq Khan will be re-elected*”. He could not recall when that remark was made. He and PCSO Brown looked at each other when that remark was made but nothing was said.

On 3 May 2024, he was in a police car with PC Jones and PC Hawkesford. They were driving in the vicinity of Feltham High Street. A bus in front of them turned left without indicating. PC Hawkesford said, “*I should stick them on for that*”, meaning that he should give them a ticket. PC Jones is alleged to have said, “*off to Rwanda you go*”. Later during the shift, they were running a PNC check against vehicles, and the registered owner of one vehicle had a long and difficult to pronounce west African name. He stated that PC Jones said, “*that name was on the list*”, referring to the list of polling station officials from the previous day. PC Hawkesford responded indicating that the name was not on the list as you would remember a name like that.

After they had returned to Feltham Police Station, PCSO Brown approached PC Martin and said that he (Brown) had told PS Khalil about what was said in the van on the previous day and that PS Khalil wanted to speak to PC Martin about it. He then went to speak to PS Khalil about the events on both days.

PC Martin could not recall if on a previous occasion, he had engaged in high jinks with PC Jones at Greggs whereby he had sought to turn PC Jones BWV on. He denied that PC Jones parried his hand away or that he had any umbrage with him.

PC Martin could not speak in detail concerning events on the day of the polling station tour. He could not recall exactly where in the van individuals were sitting. The atmosphere in the van after PC Jones comments was slightly tense. There was concern over his remarks. There were no challenges to PC Jones' comments. He conceded that no one in the police car could see the bus driver when the bus turned without indicating. He did not discuss events of 3rd May with PCSO Brown.

PC Martin denied that there was a clique in the unit headed by PC Hawkesford and him. He denied that PC Jones had challenged him at Greggs and that he bore a grudge against him. He conceded that on occasions he would jokingly turn on people's BWV. He could not recall if PC Jones excluded himself from their 'banter'.

PC Hawkesford

PC Hawkesford gave his account of events in the van on the 2 May and in the police car on the following day. He conceded that there would be high jinks and "banter" amongst team members. He did not know PC Jones well and bore him no animosity. He could not remember the nature of the list of polling stations/officials. Hawkesford maintained that there was a paper list of names which all officers in the van had sight of. Hawkesford stated that PC Jones said that he was not a fan of Sadiq Khan and that he "*was bound to get back in due to names on the list not being English names*" Hawkesford stated that he had challenged Jones on this

He also stated that he heard PC Jones say 'Off to Rwanda you go' on the 3 May but he conceded that no one could see the bus driver. He denied there being a clique amongst the team and that he was the head of any such clique. He indicated that on one occasion he had clipped PCSO Brown around the head and made an inappropriate remark to him. He had subsequently realised that he had been out of order and very shortly thereafter, apologized to PCSO Brown in front of all other members of the team for his behaviour. He had recently had a meeting in respect of the same and the matter had been dealt with.

PCSO Brown

PCSO Brown indicated that PC Jones made comments to him on a day that they were on patrol leading up to the mayoral elections on 2 May 2024. PC Jones had indicated that racism did not exist anymore and that people should stop playing the race card. PCSO Brown challenged these remarks and was concerned by them. The Panel noted that these comments were alleged to have been made on a date outside the scope of the Regulation 30

Brown was on the van on 2 May 2024. He did not hear PC Jones making any inappropriate remarks on that day but was informed about them by others subsequently. In his statement he said that other officers on the bus had challenged the remarks and he believed that he was attending Sparrow Farm Polling Station at the time the alleged comments were made. On being challenged by the Panel he conceded that he did not witness the challenge, was only told after the event of the challenge and could not say when or if it was made.

On 3 May 2024, he was on foot patrol with PC Jones discussing a television series they had both watched about doomsday preppers who were preparing for the end of the world. PC Jones indicated that it had already started happening and that, "*the Muslims were taking over, and people are blind to it*". PCSO Brown felt very uncomfortable with that comment. Less than one hour later on the patrol he saw PC Martin who asked him if PC Jones had made any other concerning comments as PC Martin was contemplating speaking to a sergeant regarding concerning remarks. Brown responded that he had and on returning to the station made Sergeant Khalil

aware of PC Jones' concerning behaviour and remarks. He was concerned that PC Jones was fixated on "*these ideas*" and that it would impact his judgement if he had to deal with any sort of hate crime. He was concerned that PC Jones ideology was not in alignment with MPS values.

PCSO Brown also denied that there was a clique on the team at Feltham and that he felt pressurised by either PC Hawkesford or PC Martin in any way. He indicated that he had cause to report a matter involving PC Hawkesford and that it had been dealt with. PC Hawkesford had apologised to him. There had been misconduct proceedings.

PCSO Piperkov

PCSO Piperkov gave evidence as to being posted on the police van on 2 May 2024, tasked with attending various polling stations in the Feltham area in order to ensure that there were no issues on polling day. One or more individuals were tasked with entering the polling station and identifying the Presiding Officer, noting the details and checking that there were no issues.

Some of the individuals, including PC Hawkesford, would adopt a light-hearted manner and joke with each other. PCSO Piperkov was not interested in politics. If there were any political discussions, he would tune out of them and therefore did not hear anything of concern on the day. He confirmed that he had not noticed a tense atmosphere in the bus. He always found PC Jones to be helpful towards him.

Ms Shirin Diaz

MS Shirin Diaz was PC Jones' Performance and Development Coach in respect of his Police Now posting. She was aware that he was subject to misconduct proceedings and presumed that he had done something wrong. She knew that he had made comments on a posting which had been deemed discriminatory. She indicated that PC Jones frequently tried to talk to her about the investigation. He made reference to Rishi Sunak. He referred to the misconduct matter as, "*silliness*". He felt that he was being picked upon as a white male. She gave other examples of officers that she

coached who were not under investigation and he responded that white men were being targeted. She indicated that people from ethnic minorities had struggled with feeling singled out for years and he responded that it was different for them because, *"I have no country to go back to"*. She was shocked by this comment. She subsequently felt very angry and upset. She questioned if she was safe. She was told to make a note of everything that had been said which she did.

Ms Diaz denied that she may have misinterpreted what PC Jones had said. She did not realise that he had South African heritage which he may have been referencing with his remark. She indicated that she believed that a black officer would be treated more harshly in the misconduct process than a white officer. She referenced the propensity of ethnic minority officers to find themselves subject to misconduct proceedings.

PC Brendan Jones

PC Jones gave evidence before the panel. He denied making inappropriate remarks to PCSO Brown. He indicated that they may have had political discussions as it was a time of the mayoral elections. PCSO Brown was interested in sci-fi and doomsday preppers program was the kind that he would have been likely to watch and which they may have discussed.

PC Jones indicated that they may have been having general political discussions on the van. He was not interested in politics. His only involvement or input would have been his personal grudge in having been fined in respect of the ULEZ scheme when he drove from Bristol to London in respect of his Police Now recruitment and received a fine. Also, around the time, David Cameron had made remarks indicating that Rishi Sunak had links to ISIS which he had referenced.

He was asked in his evidence in chief if there was ever a list of names and responded that he did not remember a list of names. The Panel noted that in his Statement under caution on 15 March 2025 he stated, "from memory there were many names on the list". He had attended some of the polling stations himself and input details onto a tablet although he did not remember the details.

PC Jones indicated that he felt targeted as a white male officer of a certain age in the MPS, particularly after the Baroness Casey report. This occurred both because the organisation was deemed institutionally racist and because of concerns raised by “rogue officers”.

PC Jones gave evidence concerning the profound effects of having to leave South Africa as a result of the effect of apartheid and dissent in the country at the age of 4 had upon him and the negative effects that it had upon his family, causing his parents to separate and for his mother to bring him to the UK, where he was raised, with his brother by a single parent in difficult financial circumstances. He indicated that his mother had worked as a social worker and that he grew up in a diverse area in Bristol and had a mixed, multi-ethnic friendship group. He had spent extensive periods travelling and working abroad. PC Jones stated that he had previously told Ms Diaz of his South African background

On multiple occasions during the course of his evidence, PC Jones appeared to struggle with questions asked of him. He frequently paused for extensive periods of time before answering. He routinely gave similar answers, particularly referencing his ULEZ fine and the David Cameron remarks.

Panel analysis

The Panel did not find PC Martin to be a particularly credible witness. There were discrepancies or gaps in his evidence. He indicated that there was a list on the van, implying that it was a printed list, but this appeared to be discrepant with the evidence of other witnesses and of evidence put before the panel showing that details were input onto a form populated on a tablet and no actual list of preprinted presiding officers existed. In the light of this, the panel had cause to question PC Martin’s evidence concerning remarks made by PC Jones which in context made no sense.

The panel noted discrepancies in PC Martin’s evidence concerning claimed events on the van. He indicated that the mood on the van was tense after PC Jones’ alleged remarks, whereas PCSO Brown and PCSO Piperkov denied that this was the case.

Neither claim to have heard any remarks made by PC Jones. PC Martin indicated that after the second comment attributed to PC Jones, he and PCSO Brown made eye contact with each other and rolled their eyes which was directly discrepant with the evidence of PCSO Brown who denied even hearing the comment and therefore reacting to it in any way.

Furthermore, the Panel noted that PC Martin's evidence concerning the circumstances in which PC Jones alleged behaviour came to be reported was discrepant with that of PCSO Brown. He indicated that he saw PCSO Brown when he and PC Hawkesford returned to Feltham Police Station on 3 May 2024 and were advised by him that he had reported matters to PS Khalil. This is discrepant with the evidence of PCSO Brown who indicated that he bumped into PC Martin and PC Hawkesford on patrol and that PC Martin indicated that he was contemplating reporting PC Jones in respect of his behaviour and that he was asked if he had encountered any other incidents that needed to be reported which incentivised him to report matters himself. The panel preferred the account given by PCSO Brown to that of PC Martin.

In the light of the above factors, the Panel attached very limited weight to the evidence of PC Martin.

PC Hawkesford gave evidence concerning tensions on the van following PC Jones alleged remarks which was discrepant with the evidence of PCSOs Brown and Piperkov.

PC Hawkesford's evidence concerning the list of presiding officers was discrepant with the evidence put before the panel relating to how the list was generated and input utilising a tablet.

PC Hawkesford's evidence concerning the circumstances in which he became aware of PCSO Brown having reported matters to PS Khalil was discrepant with PCSO Brown's account, which the panel preferred.

The panel additionally noted evidence heard concerning PC Hawkesford's behaviour on the team in which he had frequently acted in an inappropriate, unprofessional and jocular manner and bullied and discriminated against colleagues, including PCSO Brown, which ultimately led to misconduct proceedings against him.

Although PC Hawkesford conceded this behaviour when challenged in cross examination, in the light of these factors, the Panel attached limited weight to the evidence of PC Hawkesford.

The Panel found PCSO Brown and PCSO Piperkov both to be credible and straightforward witnesses who gave evidence in a reliable manner. The panel attached significant weight to their evidence.

The panel noted that Ms Diaz appeared to labour under the misapprehension that if PC Jones was being investigated for the alleged misconduct matters then he was in fact guilty of them and had therefore acted in a discriminatory matter. Furthermore, she indicated that she was unaware of the fact that PC Jones had South African heritage and so may have misinterpreted his remark concerning having no country to go back to. Ms Diaz additionally, appeared to have personal, strongly held beliefs in respect of the effect of discrimination within the MPS, which may have tainted her interpretations of comments made by PC Jones. The Panel noted that Ms Diaz was very clear in her oral evidence that she had no knowledge of the nature of the investigation into PC Jones but in her note of the telecon noted that "*his case was linked to some comments he had made to one or more ethnic minority officers in a police van which were deemed discriminatory*",

In light of the above factors, the Panel, whilst having no reason to disbelieve the genuine interpretations made by Ms Diaz of comments made and attitudes held by PC Jones, nonetheless find that she may have misinterpreted the same. In the circumstances, the Panel attached limited weight to her evidence.

The manner in which PC Jones gave evidence before the panel, frequently pausing for extensive periods of time; indicating that he did not understand seemingly straightforward questions that were asked of him and requesting that the same be

repeated in a simpler manner and routinely providing the same responses as if by rote, caused the panel significant concern. He frequently made reference to false memories, which he appeared to rely upon in order to seemingly avoid answering questions put to him and seeking to claim that he did not remember events that occurred at the time.

PC Jones appeared to hold some deep-seated, troubling beliefs. He indicated to the panel that he believed that he had been targeted as a white man of a certain age in the MPS. He was unable to provide a response concerning whether a comment that Muslims were already taking over the country was discriminatory or not. He indicated his belief that white males in modern Britain were stereotyped as having right wing ideology which was untrue.

PC Jones appeared to harbour a disproportionate grudge after being fined for driving his car in a ULEZ zone in London which had prompted him to do research into Sadiq Khan. The only aspect of this research which he recalled was a Daily Telegraph article in which David Cameron had referenced Sadiq Khan having links to ISIS. Jones conceded that "it was not unlikely" that on 2 May he spoke about David Cameron saying that Sadiq Khan had links to ISIS.

Additionally, the Panel found elements of PC Jones' evidence to lack credibility. He attempted to claim to have little or no interest in politics and to be unaware of EDL riots at the time of the Southport stabbings and yet demonstrated a detailed knowledge of other aspects of political events at the time including of David Cameron receiving widespread criticism for an attack on Sadiq Khan.

The Panel was concerned with aspects of PC Jones' evidence which indicated that he held discriminatory beliefs which were inconsistent with MPS values. The Panel did not find that he was a frank and open witness who was genuinely willing to answer questions put to him.

Findings

Allegation 1

The Panel reminded itself that the burden rests with the AA and the standard of proof is the civil standard being the balance of probabilities.

The Panel noted that the Appropriate Authority had not particularised the details of the discriminatory language alleged to have been used by PC Jones within the allegations. The Panel reminded itself it should not seek to remedy defects in the Appropriate Authority's pleadings and that it could not itself particularise the allegation. It did however consider that it would be fair to the officer to make findings in respect of the specific words and phrases which had been formally put to him under caution in the Form 163 (Pg. 21) and to which he had responded in his MG 14 (P 26). It therefore considered the following to be the discriminatory phrases on which the AA sought to rely being:

- 'Sadiq Khan has links to terrorism'
- 'Islamists are taking over'
- "Fucking off to Rwanda you go"
- 'The Prime Minister and Mayor only have their roles due to their ethnicity.'
- 'Out of 19 venues, look how many English names are on there.'

Taking each phrase in turn the Panel made the following findings:

'Sadiq Khan has links to terrorism'

This phrase did not appear in any of the witness statements tendered in evidence. Nor was it referenced in oral evidence by any of the live witnesses. Since the AA had offered no evidence to support alleged statement, the Panel did not find that the Officer had made the remark alleged.

In his own evidence the Officer stated that as a result of receiving a ULEZ charge he had done some research on Sadiq Khan. He stated on a number of occasions that he

had noted an article in which David Cameron had accused Sadiq Khan of having links to ISIS. He maintains that he had raised the issue in the context of the ULEZ charge.

In respect of discussions on 2nd May, PC Jones indicated that it was not unlikely that he spoke about David Cameron saying that Sadiq Khan had links to ISIS.

In considering remarks made in the minibus on 2nd May the Panel took into account that both PCSO's Piperkov and Brown asserted that nothing of concern had occurred. The Panel therefore finds that PC Jones did reference Sadiq Khan having links to terrorism, although this was in the context of the David Cameron article.

'Islamists are taking over'

This specific phrase did not appear in any of the witness statements tendered in evidence. Nor was this alleged comment referenced in oral evidence by any of the live witnesses. The Panel considered the alleged remark referenced by PCSO Brown in his statement which he asserts was made on 3rd May : *'It's already happening mate. The Muslims are taking over and people are blind to it.'* Having found PCSO Brown to be a straightforward and credible witness the Panel preferred his evidence to that of PC Jones. The Panel reminded itself that PCSO Brown went to PS Khalil the same day to report his concerns about PC Jones which reinforced its view that PC Jones had made the comment. The Panel therefore finds that this remark was made by PC Jones.

"Fucking off to Rwanda you go"

This specific phrase did not appear in any of the witness statements tendered in evidence. Nor was it referenced in oral evidence by any of the live witnesses. Both PC Hawkesford and PC Martin gave evidence that the phrase *"off to Rwanda you go"* was used by PC Jones on the 3rd of May. It was common ground that PC Hawkesford was the driver of the vehicle, PC Martin was in the front seat and PC Jones was sat in the rear seat. PC Hawkesford and PC Martin agree that the alleged remark was made immediately after a bus which the police vehicle was following turned left without indicating

Both PC Hawkesford and PC Martin concede that they could not see or therefore make out the ethnicity of the bus driver from the front seat and that therefore PC Jones could not have done so from his position in the rear seat.

The Panel considered the inherent likelihood of PC Jones referencing a proposed immigration policy in respect of the actions of a bus driver whose ethnicity he could not have known. Taking into account the limited weight the Panel was able to place on the evidence of PCs Hawkesford and Martin and being of the view that it was inherently improbable that Rwanda would be mentioned in the context of a person whose ethnicity was unknown, the Panel finds that this remark was not made by PC Jones.

‘The Prime Minister and Mayor only have their roles due to their ethnicity.’

PCSO Brown was clear in his evidence that any discussion about Rishi Sunak and Sadiq Khan took place around two weeks before the 2 May. The Panel reminded itself that Allegation 1 was specific to discriminatory language used on the 2nd and 3rd of May and that it could not properly find that any alleged remarks made two weeks earlier were within the scope of Allegation 1.

PC Hawkesford states that on 2nd May whilst driving between these polling stations PC Jones mentioned that he was not a fan of the current mayor, Sadiq Khan and that he was *‘bound to get voted back in due to the names of the people on the list not being English’*. The Panel notes from its findings above, that there were significant discrepancies in respect of the nature of the list, but the Panel accepts that there was some form of list of presiding officers in existence on the van on 2 May 2024. Both PCSOs Piperkov and Brown maintain that they did not hear any such comments made. Although PC Hawkesford and PC Martin do assert that comments were made, for the reasons regarding credibility referred to above, the Panel has preferred the evidence of the two PCSOs and therefore finds that this remark was not made by PC Jones.

‘Out of 19 venues, look how many English names are on there.’

This phrase did not appear in any of the witness statements tendered in evidence. Nor was it referenced in oral evidence by any of the live witnesses. Since the AA had offered no evidence to support the alleged statement, the Panel did not find that the Officer had made the remark alleged.

In the light of its findings above, the panel find that the majority of the remarks attributed to PC Jones as having been said on 2nd and 3 May 2024 cannot be attributed to him and particularly noting that the burden of proof rests upon the AA, find that it has not been proved on the balance of probabilities, that PC Jones made most of the alleged discriminatory remarks.

As noted above, the Panel found PCSO Brown to be a reliable and credible witness. He had no “axe to grind” in respect of PC Jones. He gave evidence concerning remarks made by PC Jones prior to the date referenced in the allegations and which therefore fall outside the scope of the panel’s findings. However, given PCSO Brown’s credibility the Panel considered they would give weight to this evidence when considering PC Jones’ propensity to make discriminatory remarks. PCSO Brown gives evidence of PC Jones remarking on 3 May 2024 in respect of the discussion concerning doomsday preppers, that *“it’s already happening mate. The Muslims are taking over and people are blind to it”*. Whilst PC Jones denies making this comment, the Panel prefers the evidence of PCSO Brown to that of PC Jones. The Panel further notes the nature of PC Jones’ evidence before them in which he appeared to lack insight into the fact that such comments against Muslims could be perceived to be discriminatory. In the light of these factors, and the fact that PCSO Brown was sufficiently concerned by these comments about Muslims to report them immediately to PS Khalil, the Panel finds that PC Jones did make this statement and that it was in its nature discriminatory.

The Panel therefore finds Allegation 1 proven solely in respect of this comment.

Allegation 2

Although the remarks by PC Jones reference sex and ethnicity, they were referencing his own protected characteristics and that he himself was the alleged victim of discrimination. The Panel found that the remarks were a genuinely held belief of PC Jones but could not be taken to be discriminatory toward Ms Diaz. In respect of Allegation 2, the Panel notes its observations above in respect of potential misapprehensions made by Ms Diaz and potential misinterpretations made by her of comments expressed by PC Jones and in the light of the same, finds this Allegation not proved.

Breaches of Professional Standards.

In the light of its findings above, the panel finds the comment made by PC Jones to PCSO Brown was seriously offensive including it being racially offensive and insulting in nature. It was in breach of the standards of professional behaviour to be adhered to and including:

Discreditable Conduct

- Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

Equality and diversity

- Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.

The Panel's Decision on Misconduct/Gross Misconduct

The Panel next considered whether the allegation found proved amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct.

In making this assessment, the Panel had regard to the College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023). Thus, the Panel assessed the seriousness of the proven conduct by analysing PC Jones's culpability for that conduct and the harm caused by that conduct.

Culpability

In respect of making the discriminatory remarks, PC Jones was entirely responsible for his own actions. He was unprovoked. There was no cause for him doing so. He appears to hold some troubling beliefs and attitudes.

PC Jones was solely responsible for his own actions.

The panel notes that discrimination towards persons on the basis of any protected characteristic is never acceptable and is always serious. Discrimination may be conscious or unconscious. Even unconscious discrimination can be serious and is likely to have a significant impact on public confidence in policing.

In the light of these factors, the panel considers culpability to be high in this case.

Harm

The panel notes in respect of harm that the main harm concerned was reputational harm.

Reputational harm is considered to be actual and significant.

The public, and particularly Muslim members of London's population would be appalled to learn that a serving MPS officer held the beliefs and attitudes expressed by PC Jones. They would not feel confident in his ability to adequately police them. All sectors of society would be likely to lack confidence in PC Jones investigating any matters concerning discrimination or hate crime.

In the light of the above, the panel considers the harm caused in this case to be high.

In the light of these factors, the panel finds that in respect of the allegation found proved against PC Jones relating to allegation one, this amounts to gross misconduct in that it is so serious as to potentially justify dismissal.

Outcome

In considering outcome the Panel has taken account of the College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023). The Panel has borne in mind that the purpose of police misconduct proceedings is threefold:

- To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service.
- To uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.
- To protect the public.

The panel has already addressed culpability and harm in its assessment of severity, but for the sake of clarity repeats its findings below.

Culpability

In respect of making the discriminatory remarks, PC Jones was entirely responsible for his own actions. He was unprovoked. There was no cause for him doing so. He appears to hold some troubling beliefs and attitudes.

PC Jones was solely responsible for his own actions.

The panel notes that discrimination towards persons on the basis of any protected characteristic is never acceptable and is always serious. Discrimination may be

conscious or unconscious. Even unconscious discrimination can be serious and is likely to have a significant impact on public confidence in policing.

In the light of these factors, the panel considers culpability to be high in this case.

Harm

The panel notes in respect of harm that the main harm concerned was reputational harm.

In addition to its previous findings on harm the panel however finds actual harm was caused to PCSO Brown when the remarks were made to him. He indicated that he was shocked that PC Jones was making these remarks. They did not express views that he would expect a police officer to hold. They made him feel very uncomfortable.

With regard to reputational harm the public, and particularly Muslim members of London's population would be appalled to learn that a serving MPS officer held the beliefs and attitudes expressed by PC Jones. They would not feel confident in his ability to adequately police them. All sectors of society would be likely to lack confidence in PC Jones investigating any matters concerning discrimination or hate crime.

In the light of the above, the panel considers the harm caused in this case to be high.

Aggravating Factors

In relation to aggravating factors. PC Jones failed to demonstrate any insight into the inappropriateness of his expressed views at the time. He was asked in cross-examination whether a comment that Muslims were already taking over the country was discriminatory or not and was unable to reply. He had been earlier challenged by PCSO Brown of the inappropriateness of making discriminatory remarks several weeks earlier and yet repeated this behaviour.

Mr Baumber submitted that PC Jones attitudes and behaviour could be remedied by education as his behaviour was driven by ignorance. The panel however finds that he has had time and opportunities to reflect upon and address his attitudes and behaviour but appears as yet to have failed to do so.

Noting its findings above, the panel finds in respect of his apparent deep-seated attitudes that despite being given opportunities to mend his ways and address his behaviour, that PC Jones appears to be unable to do so. These factors indicate that it was not just on one day where PC Jones held these views.

Mitigating Factors

In respect of mitigating factors, the panel acknowledge that this was a single allegation relating to only one utterance on one day which has been proved.

Choosing the most appropriate sanction

The Panel considered the outcomes in ascending order of seriousness. The outcome should be the least severe that adequately deals with the issues identified, while protecting the public interest.

In respect of sanction the panel finds that there is limited mitigation in this case. The panel has noted above the seeming inability of PC Jones to address or change his fixed beliefs. He lacks any insight into his behaviour and attitudes. In the light of these factors, the panel does not find that a written warning or final written warning would adequately address the behaviour found proved in this case. The panel does not find that PC Jones is capable of addressing or amending his deeply held beliefs and attitudes. In those circumstances, it is considered that the risk of repetition is high and that the public concerns relating to racism existing in the MPS and amongst its officers would continue.

In the circumstances, the panel find that the only appropriate proportionate outcome in this case is dismissal without notice.

No submissions were made in relation to publication.

Commander Andy Brittain

26 February 2026