

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 IAN WILLIAMS

DECISION OF THE PANEL

Commander Jason Prins (Chair), Placida Ojinnaka (Independent Panel Member) and Martin Pike (Independent Panel Member).

A: INTRODUCTION

The misconduct hearing for PC Williams was held in public between 26/01/2026 and 30/01/2026 at Palestra House, London. A notice of hearing was published in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ("the 2020 Regulations").

B: THE ALLEGATIONS

The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of PC Williams ("The Officer"), containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct, namely:

Allegations

Being a member of the Metropolitan Police Service

- 1. On at least one occasion in 2011 you sexually assaulted Ms A by intentionally penetrating her vagina with your finger, she not consenting to such penetration, you not reasonably believing that she consented*
- 2. On at least one occasion between 2012 and 2013 you sexually assaulted Ms A by intentionally penetrating her vagina with your finger, she not consenting to such penetration, you not reasonably believing that she consented*
- 3. On 1st January 2014 you sexually assaulted Ms A by intentionally penetrating her vagina with your finger, she not consenting to such penetration, you not reasonably believing that she consented*
- 4. On a least one occasion between 2011 and 2013 you sexually assaulted Ms A by intentionally penetrating her anus with your finger, she not consenting to such penetration, you not reasonably believing that she consented*
- 5. On at least one occasion in 2017 you sexually assaulted Ms A by intentionally penetrating her vagina with your finger, she not consenting to such penetration, you not reasonably believing that she consented*
- 6. On at least one occasion in 2017 you sexually assaulted Ms A by intentionally penetrating her anus with your finger, she not consenting to such*

penetration, you not reasonably believing that she consented

7. On an occasion in about July 2017 you unlawfully assaulted Ms A by

a. grabbing her hair, and/or

b. pulling her by the hair along the floor, and/or

c. dragging her by the foot along the floor

8. On an occasion in about the summer of 2017 you unlawfully attempted to assault Ms A by trying to push her down a flight of stairs

9. On an occasion in about October 2017 you unlawfully assaulted Ms A by

a. twisting her arm, and/or

b. pushing her on to the sofa, and/or

c. pushing her on the chest so she fell and her head struck the wall

10. On an occasion in 2018 you unlawfully assaulted Ms A by hitting her on the head at a time when she was pregnant

11. On an occasion or occasions between about 2011 and 2017 you unlawfully assaulted Ms A by

a. Throwing a bottle at her, and/or

b. Slamming a drawer on her hand

12. On two occasions between about 2nd October 2014 and the 5th October 2014 you accessed the Find My Phone account of Ms A's iPhone when

a. You were not authorised to access such account, and/or

b. You knew that you were not authorised to access such account, and/or

c. You did so with the intention of improperly attempting to locate her whereabouts without her knowledge and/or consent

Breaches of Standards

1. By reason of the matters above, individually or collectively, your behaviour did not meet the standards required by the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as to Discreditable Conduct, namely that you behaved in a manner which discredited the police service and/or undermined public confidence in it, whether on or off duty

2. Your behaviour amounts to gross misconduct.

C: REPRESENTATION

1. The Appropriate Authority ("the AA") was represented by Julian Waters of Counsel. PC Williams (the Officer) was represented by Amanda Bostock of Counsel.

2. The Panel would like to thank the representatives for their assistance throughout the case, including the provision of an opening note.
3. The Panel were assisted by Maurice Cohen, Legally Qualified Advisor.

D: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

4. During the course of the hearing, the panel identified two areas in which it appeared that documentation may be missing. The representatives considered appropriate documentation and advised the Chair that they were satisfied that no further documentation needed to be put before the panel.

E: REGULATION 30 NOTICE

5. On the first morning of the hearing the Regulation 30 Notice, as set out above, was read out.
6. The Officer was in attendance and denied the allegations, save for the allegation relating to "Find My Phone" (Allegation 12), and his response was set out in the Regulation 31 response.

F: THE PANEL'S APPROACH

7. 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 allegations;
 - b. Determine whether the findings of fact found constitute a breach of the relevant standard;
 - c. Determine whether the conduct found proven amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct.
8. 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'.
9. The Panel has approached its decision making by keeping in mind the purpose and character of police misconduct proceedings. The primary purpose being not to punish PC Williams 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 secondary purpose is to be declaratory of high professional standards and a final purpose is to protect the public and the Complainant and staff by preventing similar misconduct recurring in the future. The Panel has had regard to *Bolton v Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512*; *Chief Constable of Dorset v PAT, Salter Interested Party [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin)* and *R (Williams) v PAT [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin)*.
10. The Panel also had regard to a framework of regulations and guidance, in particular:
 - a. The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (amended) (the "Regulations"), including the Standards of Professional Behaviour at Schedule 2;
 - b. Home Office Guidance: Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness (2020) ("HOG"), including Chapter 2, 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"

- e. the College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023)
11. The Panel listened carefully to all of the oral evidence. They read and carefully considered every item of the other evidence before them. They considered the totality of the evidence and submissions made. They do not propose to deal with each and every aspect of the evidence or submissions made, but they state their main conclusions.

G: EVIDENCE

12. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:
- a. Regulation 30 Bundle comprising of 196 pages which included the Regulation 31 Response and officer's response under caution.
 - b. Addendum bundle-comprising initial account of the complainant-Ms A comprising 64 pages.
 - c. The AA's opening note.
 - d. PC Williams character bundle of 25 pages.
 - e. PC Williams video interview record.
13. The Panel heard live evidence from two witnesses: -
- a. Ms A
 - b. PC Williams

H: THE BACKGROUND

14. PC Williams has been a serving police officer for approximately 22 years. He started to work as a response officer before joining the Territorial Support Group where he worked for 8 years. In 2016, he joined covert surveillance, where he remained and worked at the time of the allegations.
15. PC Williams met Ms A and they started dating in February 2010. He subsequently moved into her property sometime later. They separated in January 2014 and remained in touch. They both had subsequent relationships. They reunited again in 2017 and conceived a child together who was born in October 2018. They separated in the summer of 2022 but remained living in the home that they jointly owned together. There were issues in respect of Ms A and PC Williams agreeing on appropriate actions in respect of the division of the house and repayment to PC Williams of his share of the same.
16. The situation between the parties became increasingly hostile. Ms A sought legal advice and was [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] her first account was given to Hertfordshire Police on a date which is not recorded, but which is believed to be on 11 January 2023. Ms A was advised at the outset of the same that it was not an interview. What appears to have occurred was the officer taking sufficient facts/information from Ms A in order to undertake a risk assessment.
17. Ms A gave an account on various occasions including to Hertfordshire Police referred to above; to her [REDACTED], and in her MG11 witness statement in which she accused PC Williams of digitally penetrating her vagina and on occasions her anus, while she was asleep and without her consent; assaulting her on a number of occasions; and whilst they were separated, and again without her knowledge or consent, activating her Find My Phone app in order to track her movements.

18. Ms A indicated to Hertfordshire Police that she would not support a criminal prosecution. Ms A additionally declined to provide a witness statement in respect of these proceedings but subsequently changed her mind.

19. Included in the evidence before the panel are various WhatsApp exchanges between Ms A and PC Williams which touch upon the allegations. The panel in particular had regard to the following personal messages:

19 March 2018 0953

'I want my own opinion? Not one sorry. Believe me I do not want to feel sexually assaulted and worthless and good for nobody but a pervert. Believe me this is not me wanting my own option. I want to be able to sleep to have someone who cares about me n wouldn't dream of performing sexual acts on me in my sleep. U made me a nervous wreck before. U've started to again. And u have no remorse even when I'm hysterically crying [p.46]

19 March 2018 0957

If I'm feeling like this you have remorse? U should have felt this and got ur sexual fetishes to force sexual acts on ur girlfriend while she's sound asleep years ago, not get remorse today as I've got rock bottom. It's affecting my mind, my physical body, my appetite, my work, my relationships [p.48]

0959 (reply from PC Williams)

I don't gourde (sic) sexual acts on you while you are asleep. This is ridiculous, I thought you was awake ... if I was forcing it why did you carry on having sex with me. I thought you was awake, I didn't know you was asleep [p.47]

1002

No I didn't. U and I had done stuff, we said goodnight, I woke up to you fingering me. We never had sex at all [p.50]

1003

Y would I make that or any of this up. I am aware it's ur word against mine and that frightens me!!! [p.51]

1038

Ms A sends screen shot of sexual assault article [p.52]

19 March 2018 1040

How many times will I have to endure ur assault until u own up that ur not well? How many excuses?? One incident u thought I was asleep, Is perhaps forgivable/workable, but it led me to walk out and as far away from u as possible back in 2014. And this time round u start it, with the same excuses again? I'm not daft Ian and clearly neither r u [p.96]

24 March 2018 (no time)

Stop with me overthinking. Ur a pervert forcing ur fingers on me wen I'm asleep. Making plausible excuses up. Must be about 20 times now ian [p.102]

20. The panel was additionally provided with a handwritten note discovered in a suitcase in the loft by Ms A, after PC Williams had moved out of the home, which PC Williams accepts is written by him, in which the following is recorded [pgs. 74 & 67]:

Aware

Sexual urge - we don't have sex so on my mind a lot!!!

Do not ~~always~~ recall how it starts

Seems like a dream state

After drinking or stress

Realisation does kick in after a few min and I stop or Ms A wakes up!!

Not aware

No recollection in the morning

Do not know how it starts

I'm Disgusting

Do I have a problem

HATE MYSELF FOR IT

NOT ACCEPTABLE

[REDACTED] DOES NOT DESERVE IT

HATE HURTING HER

NO! NO! NO!

MAKE HER FEEL BETTER

MAKE HER FEEL SAFE

Violated

Used

Scared

No trust

Trapped

(hate)

Worried

Whats it to stop

Blames herself

21. PC Williams prepared a statement under caution. He described his relationship with Ms A as being volatile, argumentative, disruptive and unhealthy. They both at times lost their tempers with each other. He stated at no point did he have any recollection of sexually assaulting Ms A and that he had cause to doubt the reliability of what she had told him. He indicated that Ms A had accused him of sexually assaulting her whilst she was

asleep. He had believed her. He wrote the above note whilst trying to work through and compute what he was being told. He could not recall when he wrote the note. He had believed Ms A and underwent [REDACTED] accordingly. He however states that on a later occasion that he and Ms A had consensual sex twice, on the 2nd occasion Ms A was moaning in pleasure and at one juncture was on top of him. She later claimed to have been asleep/unaware of having sex on the 2nd occasion and therefore of consenting. He knew this to be untrue and it caused him to question what Ms A had told him on other occasions about him sexually touching her in her sleep.

22. PC Williams denied physically assaulting Ms A on any occasion. To the contrary, he provides details of her hitting, scratching and punching him and breaking his belongings.
23. He indicates that they clashed over plans in respect of him being paid off for his equity in their jointly owned property and that she threatened him with appropriate action unless he moved out. PC Williams refers to a message from Ms A on 12 January 2023 in which she states:
“Ilan, are you willing to move out for example at the weekend to ensure a happier home for [our child] Mortgage halved, solicitor can draw up an agreement I think. If not, I’ll progress for you to leave by other means.” [p.87]
PC Williams stated that it seemed to him that the timing of Ms A’s allegations coincided with their physical separation and the need to make financial and access decisions. He suspected that these allegations had been made to assist her in securing full custody of their child.
24. The [REDACTED] notes from [REDACTED] in 2018 have been exhibited. This includes a reference from Ms A indicating that at some juncture, they stopped being intimate with each other and that as a result, PC Williams got on top of her during the night and that when she woke up, she screamed and found that she had no clothes on her bottom half. There is also reference in the notes to ‘talk through the grabbing’.
25. Elsewhere in the evidence, both Ms A and PC Williams make accusations in respect of the other having an affair/continuing a previous relationship once they had entered into a relationship with each other.
26. Amongst the character evidence submitted by PC Williams are statements from two subsequent partners, one relationship being of a very short-term nature and the other longer. In the statements, both ex-partners indicate that PC Williams had never demonstrated any of the alleged behaviours with them in respect of sexual abuse or otherwise. All sexual conduct had been fully consensual. In addition, the longer-term partner stated that PC Williams had told her about being accused of digitally penetrating Ms A in her sleep when they were together. PC Williams had told the longer-term ex-partner to tell him if she ever suspected that he had done something like that to her.

I: EVIDENCE

27. The Panel heard evidence from Ms A together with the subject officer, it is not repeated here in full, but a general summary given. Ms A adopted her witness statement as part of her evidence in chief.

Ms A

28. Ms A indicated that she either slept in pyjamas or a nightie. On the occasions when she discovered PC Williams digitally penetrating her having woken from her sleep, she found

that her pyjama bottoms had been removed. She told him to stop “grabbing” her. This was her term for the active digital penetration. On occasions he digitally penetrated her anus. In one of these occasions she had [REDACTED] and it was uncomfortable. She did not consent to any of this behaviour. She regarded it as disgusting. She challenged PC Williams about his behaviour and told him not to repeat the same, but did not do this immediately, normally doing so in the morning. She begged him to make sure that she was awake before he touched her.

29. Ms A stated that when she challenged PC Williams about his behaviour, he always said he thought she was awake. Under cross examination, she accepted that he may have said on occasions ‘I don’t remember’.
30. She did not report the assaults earlier. She did not recall exactly when all of the various assaults occurred.
31. Ms A gave details of the claimed physical assaults, including PC Williams attempting to push her down the stairs and throwing a baby bottle at her.
32. Ms A denied giving her password to PC Williams or consenting to him using her Apple desktop computer at home.

PC Williams

33. PC Williams indicated that he initially believed that he had been touching Ms A whilst he was in his sleep. He believed what she told him as he had no recollection of the incidents. He later had cause to question this belief after the March 2018 incident.
34. PC Williams denied all allegations of assault. On the occasion when he was accused of pushing Ms A back onto a sofa, with a wall behind which she said caused her to hit her head and suffer a nosebleed, he responded that he did not know if she had hit her head or not. He did not recall seeing any blood. He was acting in self-defence since she had attacked him and he had photographed his injuries on that occasion which were before the panel.
35. He admitted activating the Find My Phone facility in respect of Ms A’s iPhone when he was on holiday in Dubai without her consent and did this because he was missing her. He remembered her password at the time because he had been given access to the same in order to use her desktop at home.

J: Panel analysis

36. After analysing her evidence, the panel found Ms A to largely be credible, consistent and believable. The panel noted the following factors:
 - (i) **Admissions in respect of gaps in her recollection.** Ms A freely indicated in respect of numerous questions that she did not recall exact details of when some of the alleged sexual assaults occurred. Also, Ms A said that PC Williams initially denied the phone tracking and did not accept it until a week later, when it was clear from the phone messages that he admitted it as soon as he was confronted. The Panel do not find that minor inconsistencies in her account after so many years are damaging to her credibility.
 - (ii) **Compelling level of detail given.** The panel found that in respect of elements of her evidence, that Ms A gave a compelling level of detail, which it found to be

indicative of the fact that she was a truthful witness. Examples of this included embarrassing personal information such as of one occasion when she alleges that PC Williams digitally penetrated her anus, that she had [REDACTED] which he played with, and that it was uncomfortable and that she regarded it as disgusting.

- (iii) **Early realisation and notification.** The panel note that Ms A first raised the issue of PC Williams digitally penetrating her whilst she was asleep with him in 2011. This was very early in the parties relationship. Both parties agreed that at that juncture, the relationship was good. The panel found that Ms A had no reason or motivation to fabricate such an allegation at the time and found this highly persuasive in respect of allegations 1, 2 and 3.
- (iv) **New Year's Day incident 2014.** It is clear from the evidence that both parties considered that something serious had occurred. It was of such significance that both agreed to an immediate separation and PC Williams moved out of Ms A's property the same day. The panel again finds this to be highly significant evidence and indicative of the fact that PC Williams undertook the acts of digital penetration on Ms A whilst she was asleep, and without her consent on multiple occasions, including at this time.
- (v) **Further compelling details in respect of 2014 New Year's Day account.** The panel notes again that Ms A gives a compelling and cohesive account of this incident. She states that when she woke, PC Williams had his full index finger inside her vagina and was moving it in an up and down motion for approximately 10 seconds. She pushed him off her. PC Williams smiled, looked at her and licked his index finger. Ms A got out of bed and sat on the floor. PC Williams pulled the quilt over his face with his eyes peering over and asked if she was ok. PC Williams agrees that Ms A was on the floor and that he asked her if she was okay. The panel finds the level of detail provided by Ms A in her account on this occasion is again indicative of the fact that she is a witness of truth in respect of the same.
- (vi) **2017.** The Panel note that both parties are in agreement that Ms A raised the issue of PC Williams touching her sexually in her sleep with him, prior to rekindling their relationship in 2017
- (vii) **2018 incident.** The panel find it highly significant that in their subsequent WhatsApp exchange following this incident, that PC Williams states that he, "thought you were awake", rather than that he was certain she was awake. PC Williams has described Ms A's eyes as being open, her moving position including being on top of him, and claims she was making noises. One would expect a degree of indignation on the part of PC Williams to Ms A's accusation that she was asleep, rather than the response that he actually gives. Furthermore, the panel notes that PC Williams' response is in line with what Ms A said was his usual response when she confronted him in respect of the sexual assaults.
- (viii) **Now retrospectively viewing all previous conduct in the worst light.** The panel considered that whilst Ms A was generally a consistent and credible witness, that there were some inconsistencies in her evidence, particularly in respect of the frequency of occurrences of the digital penetration which in some places she stated was as high as weekly. The panel note that Ms A told Hertfordshire Police that it happened a few times and in WhatsApp messages to PC Williams about 20 times. The panel found that she did not mean this to be taken literally and instead was indicating that it occurred on a frequent basis. The panel did not take this to detract from her credibility.

- (ix) **Failure to report earlier.** The panel are extremely cognisant of the nature of reporting on the part of victims of sexual abuse. There are many reasons for which matters may not be reported contemporaneously including denial; embarrassment; feelings for the abusing party; and denigration of the seriousness of the conduct. In the circumstances, the panel do not find the delay in Ms A reporting these matters to be damaging to her credibility.
- (x) **Earlier reference to events.** The panel found it highly significant that elements of Ms A's account were substantiated by text messages exchanged between Ms A and PC Williams during the relationship. She additionally refers to them in her [REDACTED]. The panel found this to be highly indicative of the fact that the claimed events occurred.
- (xi) **Ms A's Motives.** The panel considered PC Williams' suggestion as to Ms A's motivation behind the timing of these allegations but decided that this did not undermine the credibility of Ms A's account of events.

PC Williams' evidence

- (i) **Interpretation of the handwritten note.** The panel did not find PC Williams attempt to distance himself from the comments/confessions in the handwritten note to be credible. He sought to direct the comments to what had been said by Ms A when clearly they only made sense when written from his perspective. This included, for example, him stating that he "did not ~~always~~ recall how it starts". Whilst the panel acknowledge that the word always was struck through, it was present nonetheless. There was a clear implication that PC Williams was aware of his conduct since he was sometimes aware of how it would start. Furthermore, he stated that "realisation does kick in after a few min and I stop or Ms A wakes up". (PC Williams asserted in his oral evidence that this note states 'and I stop and Ms A wakes up'. This is incorrect as the note clearly states 'and I stop or Ms A wakes up'). Again, the panel find that this comment only makes sense from PC Williams own perspective and further indicates that he did have a realisation of what he was doing at the time. The panel found these comments to be indicative of the fact that PC Williams did, on occasions, act in the manner alleged and had knowledge and appreciation of his acts.
- (ii) **Possible defence of acts being undertaken whilst asleep.** The panel found this to be an implied defence that was not developed before them. There was no medical evidence whatsoever to substantiate this potential defence. The panel found this to be inherently unlikely and attached very little weight to it.
- (iii) **Reasoning in respect of cause to doubt Ms A's account.** PC Williams states that in respect of the 2018 incident he knew that Ms A was awake on this occasion due to her actions and responses whilst they were having sex. He states that this caused him to question what she had told him in respect of previous incidents. The panel however have noted above PC Williams response at the time, which was not, as one might expect in those circumstances, that you were awake, but instead that I thought you were awake. The panel finds the response given at the time to be damaging to PC Williams' subsequent defence and claims, and in turn damaging to his credibility.

K: Findings of Fact

Allegation 1

37. The panel prefer the evidence of Ms A to that of PC Williams for the reasons outlined above.
38. Furthermore, the panel note that Ms A provided an account of this incident in her statement. PC Williams accepted in his oral evidence before the panel that Ms A first informed him of unwanted sexual touching in the night about 18 months into their relationship. The panel additionally note from its findings above that at this juncture the relationship was new and that Ms A had no reason to fabricate a claim that PC Williams had assaulted her in this manner.
39. In the light of its findings above, the panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 2

40. The panel again preferred the evidence of Ms A to that of PC Williams in respect of this Allegation.
41. The panel again notes the evidence provided by Ms A in respect of PC Williams assaulting her at this time. The panel further notes the evidence of PC Williams that the 2nd incident occurred about a year after the first incident in 2011.
42. In the light of the above, and noting its findings under panel analysis, the panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 3

43. The panel again preferred the evidence of Ms A to that of PC Williams in respect of this Allegation.
44. The panel further note its observations above in respect of the 2014 incident which was of such significance that both parties agree that it led to the end of their relationship on the same day.
45. In the light of the above, the panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 4

46. In respect of this allegation, the panel does not find that there is corroborating evidence of the assault having occurred at the time claimed.
47. The burden of proof rests with the Appropriate Authority and the panel find in respect of this allegation that it has not been discharged.
48. In the light of the above, the panel find this allegation not proved.

Allegation 5

49. The panel again preferred the evidence of Ms A to that of PC Williams in respect of this allegation.

50. The panel notes that Ms A has given a consistent account of this incident, including in her witness statement.

51. In the light of the above, the panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 6

52. The panel again preferred the evidence of Ms A to that of PC Williams in respect of this allegation.

53. The panel notes that Ms A has given a consistent account of this incident, including in her witness statement.

54. In the light of the above, the panel find this allegation proved.

Allegation 7

55. In respect of this claim, the panel neither preferred the account given by Ms A or by PC Williams.

56. The burden of proof lies with the Appropriate Authority and the panel find it has not been discharged in respect of this allegation.

57. In the light of its findings above, the panel find this allegation not proved.

Allegation 8

58. In respect of this claim, the panel neither preferred the account given by Ms A or by PC Williams.

59. The burden of proof lies with the Appropriate Authority and the panel find it has not been discharged in respect of this allegation.

60. In the light of its findings above, the panel find this allegation not proved.

Allegation 9

61. In respect of this claim, the panel neither preferred the account given by Ms A or by PC Williams.

62. The burden of proof lies with the Appropriate Authority and the panel find it has not been discharged in respect of this allegation.

63. In the light of its findings above, the panel find this allegation not proved.

Allegation 10

64. In respect of this claim, the panel neither preferred the account given by Ms A or by PC Williams.

65. The burden of proof lies with the Appropriate Authority and the panel find it has not been discharged in respect of this allegation.

66. In the light of its findings above, the panel find this allegation not proved.

Allegation 11

67. In respect of this claim, the panel neither preferred the account given by Ms A or by PC Williams.

68. The burden of proof lies with the Appropriate Authority and the panel find it has not been discharged in respect of this allegation.

69. In the light of its findings above, the panel find this allegation not proved.

Allegation 12

Allegation 12 a, b and c

70. This allegation is admitted by PC Williams.

71. The realisation by Ms A that someone, without her knowledge or consent, had activated the Find My Phone app for her iPhone, was conveyed by her to PC Williams. He subsequently accepts in a detailed text message that it was done by him. He was not authorised to access her account. He knew that he was not authorised to do so. He did so with the intention of improperly attempting to locate Ms A's whereabouts without her knowledge and/or consent. Whilst he states that he did so without malicious intent and merely because he was missing Ms A, this does not detract from the effect that it had on her of being anxious upon learning that someone had activated this facility and their possible motivation for so doing.

72. Even upon learning that this act was undertaken by PC Williams, it still caused Ms A anxiety and concern, because, as she states in her witness statement [Pg. 128],

"I have no idea how he accessed my Apple ID so hence why I asked him if he had. I was scared as to how he accessed it in the first place and worried what else he was accessing".

73. In the light of its findings above, the panel finds this allegation proved.

L: Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

74. The panel has made findings in respect of PC Williams sexually assaulting Ms A on multiple occasions and of enabling the Find My Phone application on Ms A's iPhone in order to improperly attempt to locate her whereabouts without her knowledge and/or consent on 3 occasions.

75. The panel find in respect of the allegations found proved collectively, that PC Williams

breached the following standard of professional behaviour:

Discreditable Conduct in that your conduct was plainly inappropriate and would not be expected of a police officer by members of the public.

Misconduct

76. The Panel next considered whether the allegations found proved amount to misconduct or gross misconduct.

77. 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 Williams' culpability for that conduct and the harm caused by that conduct. The panel had regard to the following areas of the guidance:

78. In respect of Culpability, the panel finds that PC Williams actions were intentional, deliberate and targeted. The panel note from the outcomes guidance that allegations of the following nature are to be regarded as especially serious;

4.14 and 4.20 Offences of sexual offences ... are particularly serious and likely to terminate an officer's career. Such offending involves a fundamental breach of the public's trust in police officers and inevitably brings the profession into disrepute

4.23 If the conduct found proven in the misconduct proceedings is criminal in nature, take this into account when considering the culpability of the officer, notwithstanding the absence of a criminal conviction

4.40 – Misconduct involving sexual impropriety is serious and can significantly undermine public trust in the profession

4.62 - Violence against women and girls perpetrated by a police officer, whether on-duty or off-duty, will always have a high degree of culpability, with the likely outcome being severe.

In the light of its findings above and the nature of the allegations found proved, the panel find that culpability in this case is high.

Harm - The allegations found proved include those in respect of sexual abuse. They had a significant effect on Ms A indicated from her statements. She suffered psychological harm.

The potential reputational harm is also high. The public are concerned in respect of the behaviour of serving police officers in particular in connection with acts of violence and sexual abuse against women and girls. The public would be appalled to learn of the sexual abuse undertaken by PC Williams against Ms A in this case.

Harm in this case is assessed as being high.

79. In the light of the above, the Panel find that PC Williams actions found proved cumulatively are so serious as to amount to gross misconduct, in that they could justify his dismissal.

L: DECISION ON OUTCOME

80. Regulation 42 (14) procedure provides that when considering the question of disciplinary action, before any such question is determined, the panel:

- a. Must have regard to the record of police service of the officer concerned.
- b. May receive evidence from any witness whose evidence would, in their opinion, assist in determining the question; and
- c. Must give the officer concerned, his police friend or lawyer, and the appropriate authority, an opportunity to make oral or written representations.

81. The Panel heard submissions from Mr Waters and Ms Bostock as to the appropriate outcome. The Panel also had sight of the Officer's character bundle previously provided.

82. The Panel had regard to the Outcomes Guidance and reminded itself that in reaching its decision on outcome the Panel must have regard to the public interest, which includes the need to protect the public, to maintain confidence in the police service, and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour. References to paragraphs below are references to the Outcomes Guidance. The Panel approached its decision on outcome in three stages to determine the appropriate sanction:

Stage 1: Assess the seriousness of the misconduct.

Stage 2: Keep in mind the purpose of disciplinary action

Stage 3: Choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

83. In assessing the seriousness of the conduct found proven the panel has had regard to four issues namely

- a. The Officer's culpability
- b. The harm caused by the misconduct
- c. The existence of any aggravating factors
- d. The existence of any mitigating factors

Stage 1: Seriousness of misconduct

Culpability

84. The panel firstly considered seriousness.

85. In respect of Culpability, the panel finds that PC Williams actions were intentional, deliberate and targeted. The panel note from the College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings that allegations of the following nature are to be regarded as especially serious;

4.14 and 4.20 Offences of sexual offences ... are particularly serious and likely to terminate an officer's career. Such offending involves a fundamental breach of the public's trust in police officers and inevitably brings the profession into disrepute

4.23 If the conduct found proven in the misconduct proceedings is criminal in nature, take this into account when considering the culpability of the officer, notwithstanding the absence of a criminal conviction

4.40 - Misconduct involving sexual impropriety is serious and can significantly undermine public trust in the profession

4.62 - Violence against women and girls perpetrated by a police officer, whether on-duty or off-duty, will always have a high degree of culpability, with the likely outcome being severe.

In the light of its findings above and the nature of the allegations found proved, the panel find that PC Williams' culpability in this case is **high**.

Harm

The allegations found proved include those in respect of sexual abuse. They had a significant effect on Ms A indicated from her statements. She suffered psychological harm.

The potential reputational harm is also high. The public are concerned in respect of the behaviour of serving police officers in particular in connection with acts of violence and sexual abuse against women and girls. The public would be appalled to learn of the sexual abuse undertaken by PC Williams against Ms A in this case.

86. In these circumstances, the panel considers the harm to be **high** in this case.

Aggravating features

87. In respect of aggravating features, the panel noted that PC Williams conduct was repeated in nature. He did not stop his behaviour despite complaints from Ms A extending over a period of time, asking him to do so and repeatedly advising that she did not consent to his actions and advising that they caused her upset.

88. The panel find the above amounts to significant aggravating features in this case.

Mitigating features

89. The panel acknowledge that there was some degree of admission, apology and regret solely in respect of the Find My Phone allegation.

90. The panel does not find that there is significant mitigation in this case.

91. The panel acknowledge that PC Williams is a good officer who received notable commendations during the course of his service and acknowledge the character statements. However, the panel note the outcomes guidance at 6.4 that 'due to the nature and purpose of disciplinary proceedings, the weight of personal mitigation will necessarily be limited, particularly where serious misconduct has been proven'.

Stage 2: Keep in mind the purpose of disciplinary action

92. In considering the outcome, the Panel also bore in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime which is threefold:
- (a) To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service.
 - (b) To uphold high standards in policing and deter misconduct.
 - (c) To protect the public.

Stage 3: Choose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

93. The panel was fully aware that its duty was not to punish PC Williams but was to impose the least severe outcome necessary in order to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the Metropolitan Police Service and maintain proper standards of behaviour and conduct.
94. The panel must consider outcomes in ascending degree of seriousness. Reduction in rank was not an option in this case. It considered its findings above, including of culpability and the harm caused being high, of there being significant aggravating features, and there being limited mitigation. The panel further noted the nature of the offending which is an area of significant concern both locally and nationally in respect of the reputation of the police service. In the light of its findings above, the panel finds that public interest in this case would not be served by either a written warning or final written warning. The allegations found proved are very serious in nature.
95. The panel, in the circumstances, find that the appropriate proportionate sanction is that of dismissal without notice. The panel finds that this is the only outcome that it can reach in respect of this case.
96. The panel orders publication pursuant to regulation 43 (6) of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

**Commander Jason Prins
Placida Ojinnaka
Martin Pike**

10 February 2026