

IN THE MATTER OF A MISCONDUCT HEARING
B E T W E E N:

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS
Appropriate Authority

-and-

Former TDC Marcello Carreira
Subject Officer

NOTICE OF OUTCOME OF POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING
(REGULATION 43(1) POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020)

Officer concerned: **Former TDC Marcello Carreira P267566** (the officer”).

Appropriate Authority: The Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis (“AA”).

Date of scheduled hearing: 5th May -12th May 2026

Chair: Commander Andy Brittain

Panel members: Commander Brittain (Chair), Bernadette Leverton and Janine Ellul
(IPMs) - (“the Panel”).

Legally Qualified Advisor (LQA): Judith Seaborne.

Legal counsel for the AA: Mr Janick Fielding

Federation Representative for the former Officer: None.

Relevant regulations: The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (“2020 Regulations”).

Summary of Hearing

1. The misconduct alleged was set out in full in the Regulations 30 notices and in general terms related to incidents during the course of TDC Carreira’s training to become a detective constable, between June and July 2023 and specifically on 14th July 2023 at the Stargazer public house, when it was alleged his conduct, words and actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour.
2. TDC Carreira submitted a resignation letter, dated 3rd April 2026. For the purposes of this hearing the subject Officer is now a Former Officer and will be referred to throughout as Former TDC Carreira.

3. Having found a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, the Panel carefully considered whether the breach amounted to Misconduct, Gross misconduct or neither (*Regulation 41(15) as modified*); *para 11.115 HOG*). The Panel found that Former TDC Carreira breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely, **Authority, Respect and Courtesy** and **Discreditable Conduct** on the balance of probabilities having regard to all the evidence, circumstances and submissions made to them over the course of the proceedings.

4. Having considered all the issues, including the three-fold purpose of sanctions as explained in the *Outcomes Guidance* and the serious nature of the misconduct, the Panel determined that the outcome that appropriately fulfilled the purpose of these principles was **dismissal without notice, had the former officer still been serving.**

5. **Preliminary Issues**

This hearing was conducted in public pursuant to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct)(Amendment) Regulations 2024.

The Panel heard no submissions to the contrary and directed that witness Officer Y would be referred to in any publication of outcome by the cypher applied and her name should not be reported in accordance with Regulation reg. 39(3) (c).

At the third pre-hearing, on 7th April 2026, and following the former Officer's resignation, it became apparent that the former Officer had disengaged with the proceedings and was no longer legally represented.

Faced with the reality that the AA were likely to make an application in due course to hear the proceedings in the absence of the former Officer if he did not attend and with ten witnesses fully bound to attend (as requested by the former Officer's previously instructed counsel), the Chair wrote to the former Officer directly on 15th April 2026 to request he address the position of the witnesses and clarify which witnesses he required. No response or acknowledgement was received.

Again, to pre-empt the potential non-attendance of the former Officer, and to ensure fairness of the proceedings in his absence, the Chair arranged a meeting with the

appointed IPM's to enquire if they (having considered the final hearing bundle) wanted to hear from any witnesses or wished any witnesses to be called to give live evidence for questions to be put to them. The Chair was mindful of the denials made by the former Officer in his Regulation 31 responses, the statement of Wesley Dye dated 25th August 2023 and indeed that further allegations had arisen following appointment of counsel for the AA, which the former Officer had not been interviewed about. (He had however submitted a further Regulation 31 response dated 4th September 2025 addressing the additional allegations, as set out in the Regulation 30 notices dated 10th August 2025 and 28th October 2025). The meeting between the Chair and the IPM's took place on Thursday 23rd April 2026, whereupon the situation was discussed and a decision reached that no witnesses should be de-warned at this stage and a final decision as to witness requirements would be made once it was clear if the former Officer presented himself at the final hearing.

On 5th May 2026 (first day of the scheduled final hearing) the subject former Officer did not attend. The AA made an application in writing dated 4th May 2026 to proceed in absence. The Panel considered the application in detail and in the absence of any application by the former Officer for the hearing to be adjourned.

The Chair satisfied himself that the former officer was aware of the hearing date, had absented himself voluntarily, was aware the hearing could proceed in his absence, was aware he was entitled to give evidence on his own behalf had he attended the hearing and was aware of the possible outcomes and consequences of the hearing. The Panel was aware of recent communication between the former Officer and a Federation Representative Mr Steve Davies (not in attendance), in which it had been confirmed the former officer had no intention of engaging with or attending the hearing. In these circumstances the Panel decided there was a clear public interest in the hearing proceeding without any unreasonable delay. [See *General Medical Council v Adeogba*, *General Medical Council v Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162]

Representation

6. Throughout the misconduct proceedings and hearing, the AA was represented by Mr Janick Fielding (counsel). Throughout the misconduct proceedings and hearing, the officer was not legally represented and not present.

7. Prior to the hearing the Panel received a bundle of documents, provided by the AA.
8. The Final Bundle was agreed evidence, in the absence of any objection or instruction from the subject Officer to the contrary. Officer Y and PC Ione Jennett gave live evidence, at the request of the Panel. The AA called DC Thorniley to give live evidence at the hearing. The former Officer did not attend the hearing.
9. In addition to the Final Bundle, the Panel received a statement from DC Thorniley dated 16.3.2026, an Opening Note from the AA, Regulation 30 notices dated 12.3.2025 and 28.10.2025, a Regulation 17 notice dated 6.10.2025 together with the former Officer's Regulation responses dated 22.7.2025 and 4.9.2025.
10. The Appropriate Authority presented this case in respect of the former Officer as a breach of the standards of professional behaviour relating to **Authority Respect and Courtesy, and Discreditable Conduct**.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy- *Police Officers should act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.*

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. Police officers report any action taken against them for a criminal offence, any conditions imposed on them by a court or the receipt of any penalty notice'*

11. The misconduct alleged was set out in full in the Regulation 30 notices as supplied to the former Officer, but in summary related to incidents during the course of his training to become a detective constable, between June and July 2023 and specifically on 14th July 2023 at the Stargazer public house.

The Factual Allegations

12. The Panel was referred to the Regulation 30 notice wherein it was alleged in respect of Former **TDC Carreira** as below.

13. The allegations pursuant to Regulation 30(1)(a)(ii) are as follows.

Allegation 1.

During the course of your training to become a detective constable, between June and July 2023, you deliberately behaved towards your fellow officers in a manner that was unacceptable and wholly inappropriate given the role you were training for.

The same amounts to a breach of **Discreditable Conduct**.

Particulars:

During the course of your training, you variously:

- i. Made inappropriate sexualized remarks to or about other students.
 - T/DC Khan- You would make sexualised jokes about girls in the class.
 - T/DC Mannoukas-You made a sexualized and flirtatious remark to T/DC Mannoukas when she was drinking from a water bottle.
 - T/DC D'Aqui- During a demonstration of a strangulation exercise, you walked towards T/DC D'Aqui and asked, "*Do you like to strangle your boyfriend in bed*" and then laughed. Having been ignored, you repeated the question.
- ii. Made comments that you knew or ought to have known would be offensive to other students, and,
 - T/DC Khan-and T/DC Mannoukas. You would sexualize things and make sexual comments in class and generally.
 - T/DC Khan-You would make nasty jokes in class.
 - T/DC Mannoukas/T/DC Landen -You made an inappropriate and upsetting comment about domestic violence and T/DC Jennet (is likely echoing this incident or otherwise is referencing a separate one)

- iii. Conducted yourself in a manner designed deliberately to upset, intimidate or unnerve fellow students.
- T/DC Mannoukas and T/DC Jennet. During PPST you were overly aggressive with other classmates.
 - T/DC Bird- You would deliberately prevent T/DC Bird having conversations with other male students.
 - T/DC Bird- On one occasion you stood behind T/DC Bird and stared at her from very close range, ignoring her requests to desist and persisting despite it being obvious that his attention was unwarranted.

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contended that his actions, as set out above, individually or in combination, breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct)(Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely **Discreditable Conduct**, in that he behaved in a manner which discredited the police service and/or undermined public confidence in it.

Allegation 2.

During the course of your training to become a detective constable, between June and July 2023, whilst in the company of your fellow students, you made deeply upsetting and offensive remarks about prisoners who had previously been in your charge as a prison officer.

The same amounts to a breach of Discreditable Conduct.

Particulars:

Whilst engaged in class discussion about self-harm, it being known that you had previously been a prison officer, you were asked about your experience of dealing with prisoners who had self-harmed.

You laughed and then told your teacher and fellow students how you and colleagues would watch and allow the prisoners to self-harm until they required hospitalisation.

You also said you would encourage them to harm themselves.

If this was a lie told to shock, then this was a description of deliberate criminal behaviour which was inappropriate, upsetting and discreditable.

If this was true, this was utterly egregious and very serious criminal behaviour.

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contended that his actions, as set out above, individually or in combination, breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct)(Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely **Discreditable Conduct**, in that he behaved in a manner which discredited the police service and/or undermined public confidence in it.

Allegation 3.

During the course of your training to become a detective constable, between June and July 2023, you insisted on referring to T/DC Bird as 'Bird', despite her telling you repeatedly not to do so. You addressing her in this way amounts to a lack of courtesy and respect.

The same amounts to a breach of Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

Particulars:

During the course of your training, you would refer to T/DC Emily Bird as 'bird' intending by so doing to be noticeably derogatory and/or in your own mind, funny.

T/DC Emily Bird had made it clear to the whole class that she did not like to be called 'Bird' as it was derogatory to women. She invited people to address her as Emily or by her nickname 'Birdie'.

Despite this, you insisted repeatedly on calling her 'Bird'.

On numerous occasions, T/DC Emily Bird explained to you that she did not like to be addressed in this way, but you ignored her and continued to offend and irritate her by referring to her as 'Bird'.

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contended that his actions, as set out above, individually or in combination, breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct)(Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely **Authority, Respect and Courtesy**, in that he behaved in a manner which discredited the police service and/or undermined public confidence in it.

Allegation 4.

On 14th July 2023, whilst in the company of Officer Y, you sexually assaulted her, made inappropriate sexual comments to her and/or behaved towards her in a manner that demonstrated a lack of expected and required respect and courtesy.

The same amounts to a breach of Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

Particulars:

On 14th July 2023, you, together with others from your class, attended the Stargazer Public House.

Whilst there, you touched, without permission, Officer Y. It is alleged that the touching was sexual in nature and wholly unwanted. In the alternative, even if the touching was not sexual, it was without the permission of Officer Y.

At all material times you ought to have realised that Officer Y did not want physical contact with you.

In addition to the touching, you made inappropriate comments and suggestions to Officer Y, including referring to her as your wife and asserting that she was in a relationship with you. You also began to discuss your foot fetish. All of this was conversation that Officer Y did not want to participate in, and you ought to have known this.

You then invited yourself to go on from the Stargazer pub to a restaurant that Officer Y and others had decided to attend. During the journey to the restaurant and whilst at the restaurant your inappropriate and unacceptable behaviour of a similar and unacceptable nature to that aforementioned, continued.

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contended that his actions, as set out above, individually or in combination, breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct)(Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely **Authority, Respect and Courtesy**, in that he behaved without appropriate self-control and without expected respect and courtesy for Officer Y.

Allegation 5.

On 14th July 2023 whilst in the company of Officer Y, you sexually assaulted her, made inappropriate sexual comments to her and/or behaved towards her in a manner that amounts to discreditable conduct.

The same amounts to a breach of Discreditable Conduct.

Particulars:

The factual matrix of this allegation is as per allegation 4.

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contended that his actions, as set out above, individually or in combination, breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct)(Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely **Discreditable Conduct**, in that he behaved in a manner which discredited the police service and/or undermined public confidence in it.

14. Evidence

15. The Panel carefully considered the key evidence which was pertinent information to assist in assessing the specific allegations.

The Panel was referred to a bundle of documentary evidence consisting of 160 pages.

Additionally, the Panel received an addendum bundle consisting of 71 pages, a statement from DC Thorniley dated 16.3.2026, an Opening Note from the AA, Regulation 30 notices dated 12.3.2025 and 28.10.2025, a Regulation 17 notice dated 6.10.2025 together with the former Officer's Regulation responses dated 22.7.2025 and 4.9.2025.

16. In coming to its conclusions, the Panel reminded itself that the burden of proof remains on the AA throughout and the standard of proof is on the balance of probabilities. All decisions made by the Panel have been made in accordance with this standard of proof.

17. The Panel considered the evidence presented in this case, the accounts provided in the final written bundle, the live evidence and by submission by the AA as part of the hearing.

18. **The Panel's Findings.**

FINDINGS OF FACT

The breakdown of the Panel's findings is as follows. All findings were made on the balance of probabilities i.e. more likely than not to have occurred.

19. **Allegation 1(i)**

The Panel found this allegation **proven** on the balance of probabilities, taking the AA's presented evidence, specifically based upon the statements of TDC Mannoukas and TDC D'Aqui who recalled instances and examples of sexualised comments made.

The Panel accepted the evidence of TDC Mannoukas and found the 'drinking' comment as described by this Officer was more likely than not to be a sexual innuendo and was unacceptable and inappropriate.

"I was drinking water from my bottle, and TDC Carreira stated "*Ooh someone is thirsty*". I felt this was said in a flirtatious manner, suggesting an innuendo, and I challenged him on this saying "*Ugh don't say that*". (Page 114)

The Panel rejected the former Officer's assertion in his Regulation 31 response dated 4.9.2025, that he did not recall saying "*Ooh someone is thirsty*" but if the remark was made it was not intended to be sexual in nature.

The Panel accepted the evidence of TDC D'Aqui and found the question asked 'Do you like to strangle your boyfriend in bed' more likely than not to be deliberately provocative, designed to invoke a reaction and imbuing sexual overtones.

"Marcello walked towards me and asked me something along the lines of "*Do you like to strangle your boyfriend in bed*" and laughed. I remember ignoring him and he

repeated the same question one more time. I looked at him, but I walked away and did not answer as I thought it was inappropriate and unprofessional.” (Page 119)

The Panel rejected the former Officer’s denial in his Regulation 31 response dated 4.9.2025 that he ever made this comment.

20. Allegation 1(ii)

The Panel found the lack of specificity in the comments made to support this allegation meant that the Panel was not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this allegation was proven. The Panel found this allegation **not proven**.

The Panel noted that TDC Khan gave no examples of the nasty jokes in class relied upon.

“In general, he made nasty jokes even in class.....This is all I can recall” (Page 45)

The Panel received no details as to the inappropriate and upsetting comment about domestic violence, made by the former Officer. It did accept the live evidence of TDC Jennett that the comment about domestic violence did result in her colleague becoming upset. There was however insufficient evidence to show that this upset resulted directly from the comment as opposed to the triggering of a previous experience, and consequently the Panel was unable to determine if the former Officer knew or ought to have known his comment would be offensive to other students.

TDC Mannoukas “Another situation I vaguely remember was an inappropriate comment made referencing domestic violence. I do not remember the comment, but I remember it made me feel upset.....” (Page 114)

TDC Landen “There was an incident in the classroom where he made a comment to another officer TDC Mannoukas, that upset her. I cannot remember the actual comment, just that she was upset after....” (Page 122)

21. Allegation 1(iii)

The Panel accepted the evidence of TDC Mannoukas, TDC Jennet and TDC Bird.

The Panel found this allegation **proven**, specifically bullets 1 and 3, having had the advantage of hearing TDC Jennet give live evidence.

In respect of bullet 1, TDC Jennet gave evidence to the hearing that during PPST she was scared of him. She described how during 'pad' training he pushed his partner forcibly into a wall. She recounted that the former Officer was very opinionated and explained that he had come from the prison service to the police service to get more use of force powers and there was no ambiguity in her mind that his behaviour was unacceptable.

In respect of bullet 3, the Panel accepted the evidence of TDC Bird.

"I turned my head to see that Marcello was stood very close behind me, less than 30 cm and he was staring intently at me. As I noticed how close he was stood behind me, I told him to move back because he was making me feel uncomfortable, however he did not move and continued to stare at me. His face was very rigid and had his eyes slightly straining open. He was blinking extremely slowly and was staring directly into my eyes. This made me feel violated and gross." *(Page 116)*

The Panel found the description by TDC Bird of the details supporting bullet point 2 were too vague for the Panel to make a determination on the balance of probabilities.

"He sometimes even prevented conversations between myself and some of the men as I tried to speak with everyone in the class. He would make them walk away or talk over me" *(Pages 15-116)*

22. Allegation 2

The Panel accepted the evidence of TDC's Semark and Bird.

TDC Semark stated "I recall TDC Carreira making comments about how he used to work in a prison and would encourage and then leave the inmates to self-harm as he believed they deserved it," *(Page 118)*

TDC Bird recalled "He laughed and told the class that they would watch and allow the prisoners to self-harm till they required hospitalisation" *(Page 117)*

The Panel found this allegation **proven** on the balance of probabilities.

23. Allegation 3

The Panel accepted the evidence of TDC Bird.

TDC Bird stated “I suggested that if people did not want to call me Emily that they could call me BIRDIE, as this was a nickname that I had at university. Despite this, Marcello only called me BIRD” (*Pages116-117*)

The Panel found this allegation **proven** on the balance of probabilities.

24. Allegations 4 and 5

The Panel had the advantage of seeing and hearing Officer Y give evidence to the hearing.

The Panel found the witness to be credible and authentic. The Panel found from Officer Y’s body language and demeanour that the former Officer’s touching of her was unwanted. From the CCTV footage, the Panel noted that Officer Y had her arms crossed, gesticulated a ‘no’ with her finger at him and brushed his arm away on occasions.

The Panel was conscious that others noticed the inappropriateness of the former Officer’s behaviour towards Officer Y and the effect that it was having on her. The Panel found that the former Officer appeared to target Officer Y, appeared to pressurise her to go home with him, and discussed his foot fetish.

The Panel was aware that Officer Y became distressed upon viewing the CCTV evidence at the hearing, clearly affected by its depiction.

The Panel rejected the assertions made by the former Officer in his Regulation 31 responses and considered them as an avoidance of responsibility and an indulgence in victim blaming.

The Panel found both allegations **proven** on the balance of probabilities and both standards breached as a consequence of the proven conduct.

The Panel found breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely Discreditable Conduct and Authority, Respect and Courtesy in respect of all proven conduct as alleged by the AA.

25. **Misconduct, Gross Misconduct or neither**

26. Having found breaches of the Standards as set out above, the Panel carefully considered whether the breaches amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither (Reg. 41(15) (as modified), para. 11.115 HOG).

27. The Panel had to be satisfied on the balance of probabilities, that the conduct amounted to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither, with each term defined as follows –

— Misconduct: *“a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is not so serious that the officer concerned would have been dismissed if the officer had not ceased to be a member of a police force”.*

— Gross misconduct: *“a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious that the officer concerned would have been dismissed if the officer had not ceased to be a member of a police force”.*

28. The Panel noted that the purpose of disciplinary proceedings was 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.

29. The AA submitted that the Officer’s conduct amounted to **Gross Misconduct**. It was conduct so serious that the Officer’s dismissal would be justified. That did not mean that dismissal must inevitably follow at the outcome stage.

30. The Panel reminded itself of the full circumstances of the case and the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour found.

31. **CONCLUSION**

Having found a breach of the Standards, the Panel carefully considered whether the breach amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct. (*Regulation 41(15) as modified*); *para 11.115 HOG*). The Panel considered *the College of Policing's guidance on outcomes in misconduct proceedings [COP]*. The Panel made a preliminary finding based on the proven conduct to assist them in determining whether the conduct amounted to Misconduct or Gross Misconduct. The Panel was extremely mindful, cautious and careful not to engage in double counting when assessing the seriousness of the misconduct found proven.

The factors considered by the Panel were as follows:

Harm – COP

COP 4.63 *The harm caused by an officer's actions can be considered in various ways, including the following.*

COP 4.63- 4.64 *The types of harm caused or risked by different types of police misconduct are diverse. Victims may suffer physical injury, sexual abuse, financial loss, damage to health, psychological distress, reputational harm, loss of liberty, infringement of human rights.*

COP 4.66- *Harm will likely undermining public confidence in policing. Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual or group to undermine public confidence. When an officer commits an act that would harm public confidence, if the circumstances were known to the public, take this into account. Always take misconduct seriously that undermines discipline and good order within the policing service, even if it does not result in harm to individual victims.*

COP 4.69- *How such behaviour would be or has been perceived by the public will be relevant, whether or not the behaviour was known about at the time.*

COP 4.70-4.71- *If applicable, consider the scale and depth of local or national concern about the behaviour in question.*

COP 4.74- *For example, violence against women and girls perpetrated by a police officer, whether on or off duty, will always harm public confidence in policing since this is inimical to the values of modern policing and the standards of professional behaviour.*

The Panel found the overall harm was high.

Culpability-COP

The factors considered by the Panel were as follows:

COP 4.79- *The more culpable or blameworthy the behaviour in question, the more serious the misconduct and the more severe the likely outcome.*

COP 4.10- *Conduct that is deliberate, intentional and targeted will generally be more culpable than conduct that has unintended consequences, although the consequences of an Officer's actions will be relevant to the harm caused.*

COP 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.*

COP 4.40- *Misconduct involving violence, intimidation or sexual impropriety is serious and can significantly undermine public trust in the profession*

COP 4.41- *This includes cases involving bullying or harassment, either in the police service or towards members of the public.*

COP 4.42- *If the matter involves sexual harassment, consider whether the behaviour has been driven by misogyny which will increase the assessed seriousness.*

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

The Panel found the overall culpability was high.

Aggravating Factors – COP 4.76

COP 4.76 *Factors that indicate a higher level of culpability or harm include.....*

In relation to **aggravating factors** the Panel found the following factors (*Paragraph 4.76 of the COP Guidance*) were engaged and aggravated the conduct found proven.

- *Malign intent such as sexual gratification or personal advantage*
- *Deliberate or gratuitous violence.*
- *Attempting to blame others.*
- *Regular, repeated or sustained behaviour over a period of time.*

- *Continuing the behaviour after the officer realised or ought to have realised that it was improper.*
- *Serious psychological impact on the victim*
- *Multiple victims*
- *Multiple proven allegations and breaches of the standards of professional behaviour.*

Mitigating Factors- COP4.79

COP 4.79 – *Mitigating factors are those tending to reduce the seriousness of the misconduct.*

The Panel found no mitigating factors.

32. The Panel determined that the **seriousness of the misconduct was high** based on the culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating factors considered. The Panel found that Former TDC Carreira's conduct amounted to **Gross Misconduct** on the balance of probabilities having regard to all the evidence and submissions made to it over the course of the proceedings so far. The Panel was extremely mindful, cautious and careful not to engage in double counting when assessing the seriousness of the misconduct found proven.

33. **Finding on Outcome**

In reaching its decision regarding the disciplinary outcome of this case, The Panel gave due consideration to all the evidence and information put before it. The Panel also considered the following:

34. **Parties' material**

- The Officer's record of service from PSD.
- Submissions made on behalf of the AA
- The nature of the allegation
- The interests of the Public

- v. The interests of the Metropolitan Police Service.
35. The Panel's findings
36. The Panel's task was to decide on the appropriate sanction in the light of the findings that former TDC Carreira's conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct. The Panel's considerations as to outcome should be viewed in the context of the decisions as to the facts and conduct referred to above.
37. As the officer is a former officer, and if there was a finding of gross misconduct, the Panel could only consider two potential outcomes (para. 20.66(d) HOG):
- i. Disciplinary action.
 - ii. No disciplinary action.
38. The only disciplinary action that could be imposed is to find that the former officer would have been dismissed had he had still been a member of a police force. Where a Panel determined that the matter did not justify dismissal, no action would be taken, and the finding of gross misconduct would be recorded (para. 20.66(e) HOG).
39. The purpose of the police misconduct regime is unequivocally identified in the *Outcomes Guidance*:
- "Police officers exercise significant powers. The misconduct regime is a key part of the accountability framework for the use of these powers. Outcomes should be sufficient to demonstrate the individual accountability for any abuse or misuse of police powers if public confidence in the police service is to be maintained. They must also be imposed fairly and proportionately."*
40. The three-fold purpose of sanctions is explained in the *Outcomes Guidance* as:
- i. Maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
 - ii. Upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct
 - iii. Protecting the public
41. Availability of outcome sanctions upon a Panel finding of Gross Misconduct.

42. The Panel finally, having reminded itself of the purpose of these proceedings, was required to determine, given the finding of Gross Misconduct, whether or not disciplinary action should be imposed. Where the finding is Gross Misconduct and disciplinary action is imposed, this can only be that the former Officer would have been dismissed if still serving.
43. The impropriety of a single officer can tarnish the reputation of a force and the service as a whole and undermine the trust and confidence that members of the public have in the Metropolitan Police Service.
44. The public have a right to expect that when an officer sexually assaults a fellow Officer, that such behaviour will be challenged and dealt with to ensure that public trust and confidence in the behaviour of officers is maintained.
45. The Panel considered whether or not in the circumstances of this case, it was appropriate to impose disciplinary action and determined that, given the Panel's findings of Gross Misconduct, disciplinary action must be imposed.
46. In order to avoid any discrimination arising from the subject Officer being a 'former Officer' the Panel considered available sanctions had he still been serving in ascending order of severity. The Panel concluded that the conduct found proven was not conducive to the expected professional behaviour of a serving police Officer and therefore dismissed the imposition of a final warning as appropriate in the circumstances of its findings. The Panel recognised that demotion of the former Officer was not a viable consideration and concluded that dismissal was the only appropriate sanction available to it.
47. The Panel found that the former Officer **would have been dismissed if still serving**.
48. This sanction is a proportionate means of achieving the legitimate aims of these proceedings, which are the purposes of the police disciplinary process as set out in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings.'

Commander Brittain (Chair)

Bernadette Leverton and Janine Ellul (IPMs)

10th May 2026