

# Misconduct Hearing Outcome of PC Lucas Collins P256400 held on 11th February 2026

## **DECISION OF THE PANEL**

The following represents the Panel's findings in respect of the Metropolitan Police Misconduct hearing held at Palestra House, London, between the 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2026 and the 11<sup>th</sup> February 2026. The Panel was chaired by Commander Stephen Clayman, with Independent Panel Members Ms Margie Leong and Mr Pradeep Agrawal. The Legally Qualified Advisor was Mr Christopher McKay.

## **Preliminary Matters**

1. The Panel was provided with 4 bundles prior to the commencement of the hearing. The main bundle consisted of 459 pages. There was an addendum bundle of 8 sections. The Defence provided a bundle which included the Regulation 31 Response. There were a number of video recordings from body worn video (BWV) cameras and Local Authority CCTV. The Panel was able to consider this evidence in preparation for the hearing. During the hearing the Defence provided a bundle of 14 character references amounting to 28 pages.
  
2. At the start of the hearing the Panel considered an application from Defence Counsel, Ms Dyer, for a report from a use of force expert, Mr Carvalho, to be admitted in evidence. This application was resisted by the Appropriate Authority (AA). The Panel decided to refuse the Defence application. The reasons for its decision are as follows:

Prior to the hearing commencing, the panel heard submissions from those representing the officers for the late admission of evidence from an expert witness relating to officer safety techniques. This was over and above the joint expert that had been instructed following the prehearing on the 24<sup>th</sup> September 2025.

The Panel took into account the submissions of behalf of the AA, those representing the officers, along with the advice of the LQA.

The Panel as advised by the LQA, considered two principal issues:

1. Relevance of Mr Carvalho's statement
2. Is it fair to admit this evidence at such a late stage, taking into account the potential prejudice to any of the parties and the principles of fairness and natural justice?

In respect of point 1, The Panel feels that the report is certainly relevant as it pertains to the use of force and is most relevant to that used by PC Collins in respect of his Level 2 Public Order Training.

In respect of point 2, the Panel note the pre-hearing directions and correspondence between the parties relating to the joint expert, particularly over the agreement about the basis on which the joint expert would be instructed. The fact that paragraph 12 (j) relating to the instructions of the expert was ultimately removed, at the insistence of the Defence representatives, is important and the Panel feels that any deviation from the joint instruction should have been a decision for the Chair, certainly post any Regulation 31 response from the officers, given the provisions in Regulation 41(11).

It is understood that the single joint expert report was awaited prior to the Defence deciding whether to use Mr Carvahlo's report, which was received by the Defence solicitors on 11<sup>th</sup> January. However, the Defence failed to notify the AA about their intention to use the report until the 28<sup>th</sup> January. This was particularly late, being only 2 working days before the start of the misconduct hearing, thereby putting the AA at a significant disadvantage. There was an opportunity after the 13<sup>th</sup> January 2026, when the joint expert report was shared, for the Defence to promptly inform the AA and the Chair of the desire to use Mr Carvahlo's report. This was not done.

It is therefore the decision of the Panel to not allow the expert evidence of Mr Carvalho at this stage given the lateness of service. Where evidence is obtained, after the service of the Reg 31 notice, its admission should be approved by the Chair.

However, this position may be subject to review following the evidence of Mr Philipson, who should now be called to give evidence.

3. The Panel should also have access to the L2 Public Order training manual, highlighting the specific sections that it should take into account.

#### **4. Allegations (Regulation 30 Notice)**

The allegations against you are that you used force that was not necessary, proportionate and reasonable in all the circumstances as follows:

- (i) You drew your baton at a time when it was not necessary, proportionate or reasonable;

- (ii) You ran into the crowd of onlookers shouting ‘Get Back’ but gave the crowd no reasonable opportunity to comply with your instruction;
- (iii) You forcefully pushed members of the crowd and caused up to three people to fall to the ground;
- (iv) You delivered up to three baton strikes (one to a girl standing in the crowd and two to Mr Wallace lying on the pavement).

The allegations, individually or cumulatively, are alleged to amount to gross misconduct.

## **5. Background**

In the early hours of 19 February 2023, Metropolitan Police units attended the area around The Book Club nightclub in Shoreditch, East London, following reports of disorder. The events that followed were captured on a combination of Local Authority CCTV, mobile phone footage and extensive Body Worn Video footage from police officers and local council enforcement officers present.

PC Lucas Collins was one of the first officers to arrive on foot and engaged directly with both Mr King Tshikeva and his then partner, Mr Dior Wallace. During this initial phase, Mr Tshikeva, who had recently been ejected from the nightclub and appeared distressed and agitated, explained to officers, including PC Collins, that he had been subjected to homophobic abuse inside the venue.

PC Collins spoke calmly with him, asking what had happened and gathering information. At this point, PC Collins did not consider Mr Tshikeva a suspect and made no physical contact. Whilst Mr Wallace was more agitated, his interaction with Mr Wallace was similarly calm and conversational, with Wallace supporting his partner’s

account. PC Collins' role at this stage was limited to observation and inquiry; neither complainant was being detained, directed, or treated as a threat, and no force was used.

Whilst dealing with the two complainants, another group passed by and a male made a homophobic remark towards them. As a result of this PC Collins and two other officers, stopped the group and spoke with the male who had made the abusive remark. He left Mr Tshikeva and his group with other officers.

The male was subsequently issued with a Dispersal Notice, warned about his conduct and his details were obtained. Whilst PC Collins was dealing with this group, he was unaware that Mr Tshikeva had walked off from his colleagues along Phipp Street, where he came across PC Toolis and PC Lordan, also responding to the same incident.

6. As Mr Tshikeva approached PC Toolis, a colleague further up the street pointed towards him, which PC Toolis took to mean to stop him, as he may have been involved in the earlier fight.

The subsequent interaction between PC Toolis and PC Lordan with Mr Tshikeva drew the attention of nearby members of the public, causing a large crowd to gather and increasing tension at the scene, which was developing into a public order situation. The actions of these officers are now subject to a separate hearing.

PC Collins noted that the incident between Mr Tshikeva and the other officers had now intensified, and he could hear the disturbance, quickly returning to where the crowd was. He focused on managing the crowd that had formed around the officers struggling

with Mr Tshikeva. Many members of the public were filming the incident on their mobile phones and shouting concerns about the officers' actions and moved closer to the officers trying to detain Mr Tshikeva. The crowd was now pushing at other officers who were trying to maintain distance.

As PC Collins approached, he drew his baton and moved into the crowd issuing repeated commands for people to "get back". His actions to create an effective cordon around the detaining officers resulted in him pushing several individuals, including Mr Wallace, a female and a police officer, causing them to fall.

He then delivered a number of baton strikes: one towards a female member of the public and two in the direction of Mr Wallace, while he was on ground with his legs towards PC Collins, and the officer claimed, had kicked him.

The significant public order incident which erupted when Mr Tshikeva was detained, drew a vocal and at times, aggressive crowd towards attending officers, formed a significant backdrop to assessing Collins' decisions and actions during this phase of the incident.

#### 7. Officer's response to allegations

**PC Collins** denied any misconduct, stating that he drew his baton and used force only because the crowd was hostile, ignoring commands, and pushing towards officers who were struggling with an arrest. He argued his actions—including pushing people back and delivering limited baton strikes—were necessary, reasonable, and proportionate to

create a safe space and respond to individuals who were advancing on officers or kicking him.

## **8. The Hearing**

The Panel heard oral evidence from Mr King George Tshikeva, Mr Dior Randall Wallace, PC Kabro Eid and PC Manku who were all called as witnesses by the Appropriate Authority (AA). The Panel then heard from PC Christopher Phillipson, a use of force expert, who had been jointly instructed by the AA and the Defence. Before his evidence had concluded, Mr Hill, Defence Counsel who was representing PC Toolis and PC Lordan, was taken ill and the hearing was adjourned. That happened on the 3rd day of the hearing, Wednesday 4th February. Mr Hill has not been well enough to attend the hearing subsequently on the 5th, 6th, 10th or 11th February. The Panel therefore decided to sever the 2 officers represented by Mr Hill from the 3rd officer, PC Collins who is represented by Ms Dyer. The Panel decided to carry on with the case against PC Collins on the 10th and 11th February. The case against PC Toolis and PC Lordan was adjourned to 3 days in May 2026. The Panel decided to deal with the case against PC Collins separately because his involvement was distinct from that of PC Toolis and PC Lordan in that they dealt with the detention of Mr Tshikeva, while PC Collins was involved with creating a safe cordon between the public and the arresting officers. PC Toolis and PC Lordan agreed to this course which was designed to make the best use of the time available. PC Collins was keen for the case against him to be concluded. He gave oral evidence to the Panel on the 10th February.

## **9. The Relevant Law**

In considering the allegations against PC Collins the Panel bore in mind that the burden of proof is on the AA. The standard of proof is the balance of probability. This means that the Panel must be satisfied that it is more likely than not that the allegation is true before it can find it proved. The Panel accepted the advice of the Legally Qualified Adviser (LQA) that PC Collins is of good character because he has no criminal convictions and has no disciplinary findings against his name. Being of good character is not a defence to the allegations but is relevant in two ways. First, he has given oral evidence and has made a number of written statements prior to the hearing. His good character supports his credibility. It is a positive feature which the Panel should take into account when considering whether they accept his evidence. Second, the fact that PC Collins has no previous convictions or adverse disciplinary findings may mean that he is less likely to have committed the misconduct alleged against him. The Panel also took into account the bundle of references and testimonials provided in support of PC Collins which provided further evidence of his good character. PC Collins is consistently described as a professional, ethical, and calm officer, trusted to exercise sound judgement in high-pressure situations.

## **10. Findings of the Panel**

The Panel approached its assessment by firstly considering the context of PC Collins' involvement in the incident. This assisted in establishing what his honestly held belief was when using the force described in the allegations.

This included the following elements:

- What information he had received on the police radio about a fight occurring near the nightclub?
- PC Collins' experience of policing the night-time economy in Shoreditch and risks associated with this, where he was aware that spontaneous violence and assault were not uncommon
- The comments by the Hackney Enforcement Officer at their arrival pointing out Mr Tshikeva and Mr Wallace had been involved in a fight.
- The behaviour, appearance and actions of Mr Tshikeva and Mr Wallace during their initial interactions with PC Collins.
- The dynamics and provocation between the complainants and the group of males that shouted homophobic comments at them
- The officer hearing the disturbance getting louder whilst dealing with the group shouting homophobic comments
- Other officers calling for more units over the police radio
- His initial scene assessment as he approached the group of officers trying to detain Mr Tshikeva
- His application of the National Decision Model in a fast paced, spontaneous and developing public order situation
- The impact of his training as a Level 2 Public Order trained officer and how this influenced his tactical decision-making

11. The Panel has had the opportunity to view the extensive CCTV, BWV and mobile phone footage which greatly assisted its assessment, as this is the most contemporaneous account available to the panel. However, the Panel has taken care to recognise that whilst it has the ability to view, slow down and repeat its viewing, the officer was dealing with a real time situation that required rapid decision making.

The Panel did recognise that PC Collins' initial interaction with Mr Tshikeva and Mr Wallace was calm and professional, despite their demeanour and the provocation, at times, by their friends. He explained that he was trying to establish the facts. This is evident on the BWV footage when he was speaking to another female present.

12. When assessing each allegation, the Panel had to view them first as a whole, as each one presented a continuing sequence of events once he arrived on the scene.

The Panel has considered the credibility of those involved in providing evidence.

Turning first to Mr Tshikeva, he is considered by the Panel to be a credible witness in this case and sets the scene for the whole incident leading up to the public order situation. However, he makes no mention whatsoever of the preceding interaction with PC Collins and he did not feel able to watch any CCTV or BWV footage that may have assisted his overall recollection, during the hearing. In addition to this, the Panel has recognised that much of his evidence therefore related to matters concerning the other two officers subject now to a separate misconduct hearing and has therefore not taken that into account when considering the case of PC Collins.

The Panel felt that Mr Wallace was less credible because he was inconsistent in his overall evidence. The Panel felt he was prone to exaggeration; for example, saying things like “all officers were attacking them” and “he was fighting for his life”. He also gave clearly misleading evidence when said that he had been “curled up in a ball when on the floor” and that “PC Collins was swinging his baton wildly”. Whilst it is accepted that this would have been a very stressful situation, his account is not borne out by the video footage.

The Panel also heard from PC Kabro Eid who, perhaps as a result of the passage of time, provided limited evidence in terms of the force used by PC Collins.

PC Manku relied heavily on her statement of 11<sup>th</sup> May 2023 and detailed Mr Wallace’s overall irate and unstable demeanour and the crowd becoming more hostile. At some point, she was pushed to the floor. There was also a point when she herself drew her baton as a deterrent and this is also captured on video footage.

Both officers were considered to be credible witnesses by the Panel.

13. The Panel then heard from PC Phillipson, who had been instructed by both parties to provide expert witness evidence on how officers are trained in the use of force. He explained how Public and Personal Safety Training (PPST) is delivered across the MPS and it was established that PC Collins would have undertaken a 5-day initial foundation training course with an annual refresher.

He explained in detail how the National Decision Model (NDM) worked, along with the guiding principles that any use of force must be Proportionate, Legal, Accountable, Necessary and the Least Intrusive method.

He further explained that there were stages to applying different levels of force, starting with tactical communication and rising to other tactics, such as use of handcuffs, baton, PAVA and Taser.

Officers are also taught the underpinning legislation that supports any use of force and must be recorded to account for its use.

In this case, the only matter to consider was the use of force under Common Law, which is defined as follows at p14 of PC Phillipson statement:

“However, Common Law also gives the power to use force to defend oneself or another. This "any person power" states that if you have a genuine, honestly held belief that you or another are in imminent danger, you may use such force as is reasonable and necessary to avert danger. This may include the use of a pre-emptive strike, whereby the law states that a person does not have to wait for the first blow to be struck before using any necessary force to defend themselves or another.”

PC Phillipson explained that when assessing threat, an officer is entitled to use the following factors relating to Person, Object and Place. This includes a perception of non-verbal behaviour and level of resistance. In addition to this an officer may refer to their past experiences, instinct and all the information gathered at that time.

As PC Phillipson only trains on PPST, he offered no evidence on Public Order training, which uses different tactics for crowd control. The Panel was taken to sections of the Public Order Training Manual by counsel during the hearing.

14. PC Collins was considered to be a credible witness. In coming to this conclusion, the Panel took into account what PC Collins had said in his written statements made in March 2023 and in July 2023. The AA had highlighted a number of inconsistencies between them. For example, in his March statement, there was no clarity on the overall chronology, as to when he drew his baton and where on his body he was allegedly kicked. The Panel did also ask PC Collins why he had not made any earlier statement dealing with his use of force, as the only record on the day of the incident was the Use of Force form which is used as an administrative tool and does not contain sufficient detail to properly justify its use. This was something that PC Phillipson explained was necessary over and above that form.

PC Collins explained that he had requested to view the BWV footage a couple of days after the incident and he was unable to do this because of the subsequent misconduct investigation involving his colleagues. He was later advised by a supervisor to write the statement in March 2023, but relying on his recollection only. He said that this is why the subsequent statement in July was more accurate as he had by then had an opportunity to view his BWV.

The Panel does not make any adverse findings about this but does feel that PC Collins should have made some contemporaneous notes on the day, despite having been on an

extended tour of duty. These notes would have assisted him greatly in his later statement and are considered by the Panel to be very important.

In relation to the remainder of his evidence, he gave a cogent explanation as to how he applied his overall training and experience to this incident. The Panel noted that he was only one of two Level 2 trained officers present at the incident. As a result of this, he applied this specific training when assessing what he saw when he arrived in Phipp Street, after dealing with the separate matter relating to the homophobic comments. He had not seen how the incident escalated so quickly, albeit he could hear the disturbance in the background and was aware that more units had been requested.

In his evidence, he described the necessity to protect the officer detaining Mr Tshikeva, those surrounding them and the public who were present. In order to achieve this, he maintained that he needed to create a cordon and a sterile space between the public and those officers. The Panel was taken to the Public Order Training Manual where the use of such a cordon was described, when officers were against a wall, and PC Collins described that this is the tactic he used.

15. In light of these findings, the Panel has taken each allegation in turn to assess whether the force used was necessary, proportionate and reasonable:

- (i) **You drew your baton at a time when it was not necessary, proportionate or reasonable;**

The Panel heard from PC Collins that prior to arriving at the scene of the emerging public order incident, he had heard the commotion getting louder and officers asking for more

units. Upon arrival he slowed down from a run to a brisk walk (observed on his BWV) when he arrived at the scene, which according to PC Collins allowed him to observe what was happening. He stated he had a better perception of the crowd from a distance than officers would have had in the midst of it as they were focussed on their immediate view in front of them. The Panel finds that he did observe that the crowd was encroaching on the officers who were trying to push back. He said that the crowd was not responding to the commands of officers to get back and that someone had grabbed PC Kabro Eid. He said there was a risk of a crush.

This is confirmed by the Council CCTV, along with PC Collins' BWV and those of the other police officers and Hackney Council enforcement officers present.

He stated that he had deemed the use of Pava and Taser as not appropriate given the crowd and risk of injury. The Council CCTV shows that he drew his baton and held it across his front with one hand at each end, using this to push the crowd ahead of him with the intention to create space. He stated that his intention was not to push anyone over and that it was not ideal that anyone fell.

The Panel finds that the use of the baton in these circumstances to achieve the goal of creating a sterile corridor for the safety of the officers and public present was necessary, proportionate and reasonable.

This allegation is not proved.

- (ii) You ran into the crowd of onlookers shouting 'Get Back' but gave the crowd no reasonable opportunity to comply with your instruction;**

The AA highlighted that PC Collins did not give members of the public any time to react to his verbal commands before moving to the next tactical level. Whilst the training does teach that there are steps to levels of force, the Panel felt it was necessary to apply this to a fast moving dynamic situation which was happening in real time. In addition to this, the Panel has heard evidence from PC Collins that he said that the crowd was not responding to the commands from other officers to “get back” and that someone had grabbed PC Kabro Eid and that there was a risk of a crush.

The Panel finds that the limited use of tactical communication by PC Collins was justified given the circumstances to achieve the goal of creating a sterile corridor for the safety of the officers and public present was necessary, proportionate and reasonable.

This allegation is not proved.

**(iii) You forcefully pushed members of the crowd and caused up to three people to fall to the ground;**

The Panel has watched the relevant video evidence and heard from Mr Wallace, PC Manku and PC Collins.

Mr Wallace described falling to the ground, although did not describe how he ended up there. PC Manku also describes being pushed to the floor but also does not mention how. The Panel is assisted by the video evidence which shows PC Collins working his way through the advancing crowd using his baton across his front to push back. Mr Wallace remained on the floor momentarily and the other two females, including PC Manku immediately stood up.

As described above, the Panel accepts that PC Collins used his baton in the manner described to create the sterile cordon, and his intention was not to push people to the ground. It is noteworthy that this tactic did prove successful as borne out by the video evidence which shows that this cordon was then in place.

The AA has described PC Collins' actions as that of a "bull in a china shop" and that it was an unnecessary use of force resulting in people falling to the ground. Whilst a casual observer may deem his actions excessive, the Panel, having access to all the material find that this is not the case. Using his Level 2 training, which others did not have, PC Collins had a purpose to create a safe cordon to allow the detaining officers to continue their work safely. The Panel did not feel that he was out of control as video footage demonstrated that, before and after he pushed members of the crowd back, his behaviour was measured and was designed to put him in control of a very difficult, escalating and potentially dangerous situation.

As a result, the Panel finds that his actions were necessary, proportionate and reasonable in these circumstances.

This allegation is not proved.

- (iv) You delivered up to three baton strikes (one to a girl standing in the crowd and two to Mr Wallace lying on the pavement).**

The Panel has watched the relevant video evidence and heard from Mr Wallace and PC Collins.

The Panel has had to consider whether PC Collins has justified his use of several baton strikes, which is considered a higher escalation tactic due to the risk of injury.

Mr Wallace stated in evidence that when he fell to the floor, he curled up into a ball, although he did demonstrate in the hearing that his legs were stretched out. This is borne out by the video evidence. He claimed that PC Collins was swinging his baton wildly.

PC Collins described that he felt Mr Wallace's foot on his leg, pushing it away with his hand, but he kept raising his feet towards his waist and hip. Again, this is borne out by the video footage. It is difficult to assess the level of force used by Mr Wallace when he is making contact with his feet. By this time, the other two women had got to their feet.

According to PC Collins, he struck at Mr Wallace a second time as the first strike has not been effective in stopping him. PC Collins described striking towards the chest area and not the head.

The video evidence also shows an unknown female (wearing a red/black chequered shirt) and friend of Mr Wallace reaching out towards PC Collins. This is confirmed on the CCTV as she moves her hand towards him on more than one occasion. PC Collins described this and how he used a baton strike towards her collar bone to prevent her taking hold of him. It is unclear whether the baton strike made contact and PC Collins stated that the strikes were not delivered at full force due to the close proximity of those around.

The Panel also noted that no injuries were reported by those struck, following the baton strikes. The whole incident from the moment PC Collins arrived and entered the area to create the cordon, to the time when the baton strikes have ended is approximately a 17 second period. In less than a minute, some form of order is achieved by PC Collins' actions.

In view of this, the Panel finds that his actions were necessary, proportionate and reasonable in these circumstances.

The allegation is not proved.

16. All the allegations against PC Collins are found not proved and the case against him is dismissed.

17. In relation to the forthcoming misconduct hearing on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2026 for PCs Toolis and Lordan, I direct that transcripts of the initial 6 days of the hearing shall be provided to the Panel, the Defence representatives and the LQA at least 14 days before the hearing.