

Heading 1

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and

Outcome

Officer Name: FPC Mohammad Bilal Raza

Warrant No: P261403

Date of Hearing: 15th May 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Confidentiality

Findings

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started, along with viewing both the edited and unedited digital material. I am satisfied that the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been served. These are matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.

The hearing was held in **Public**.

FPC Raza did not attend the hearing. He is currently a serving prisoner at [REDACTED]. However, he is represented by his federation representative, Barry Rookard. I am satisfied FPC Raza has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

The AA was represented by Case Manager, Victoria Male. FPC Raza did provide Regulation 54 response.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Miss Male and the representations made on behalf of FPC Raza by Mr Rookard.

The Allegation

It is alleged that you contacted two suspects of driving offences in April 2022, stating you had access to information relating to their arrest and provided specific details, as

Heading 1

confirmed in the Body Worn Footage. You outlined that they could end the ongoing criminal proceedings if they paid £10,000 in Crypto Currency. There was also a threat that should they not pay, the matter could get worse, with them receiving a custodial sentence.

On Friday 27th February 2026, Former Police Constable Mohammed RAZA was sentenced to 4 years 6 months for Blackmail (Contrary to section 21(1) of the Theft Act 1968) and 4 years 6 months for Misconduct in a Public Office (Common Law) to run concurrently having been found guilty on Thursday 29th January 2026 following a trial at Southwark Crown Court.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that FPC Raza's actions 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
- Confidentiality

In that your conduct may bring the police service into disrepute and damage the relationship of trust and confidence between the police and the public.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, your conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct, and your dismissal may have been justified had you still been serving.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the allegations against FPC Raza.

- In April 2022, FPC Raza contacted two suspects of driving offences, stating that

Heading 1

he had access to information relating to their arrest and provided specific details, as confirmed in the Body Worn Footage.

- FPC Raza outlined that they could end their ongoing criminal proceedings if they paid £10,000 in Crypto Currency. He threatened them, should they not pay, the matter could get worse, with them receiving a custodial sentence.
- On the 29th January 2026, FPC Raza was found guilty, after trial, at Southwark Crown Court of Blackmail and Misconduct in a Public Office.
- On the 27th February 2026, FPC Raza was sentenced to 4 years 6 months' imprisonment (concurrently) for Blackmail and Misconduct in a Public Office .

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether it amounts to breach of the following standards of behaviour:

- **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
- **Confidentiality** – Police officers treat information with respect and access or disclose it only in the proper course of police duties.

In line with Regulation 61(7) and Regulation 61(8), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority and those representing FPC Raza.

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary provided to me. I have also carefully considered the submissions made on behalf of FPC Raza, including additional personal information and excerpts of the letter FPC Raza wrote to the Judge in the criminal proceedings.

Accordingly, I have found the facts proven as outlined above.

Breach of Professional Standards

Heading 1

I bear in mind that the burden of proving Breach of Standards rests upon the AA and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

I am satisfied that the AA has discharged that burden and the conduct did breach the standards of professional behaviour as outlined previously.

Provisional Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make a provisional assessment of Seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors. I have applied Regulation 61(15) and 61(16).

I consider the allegations individually and cumulatively. The Appropriate Authority addressed me on seriousness and contend that the conduct amounts to gross misconduct as the conduct is deliberate, intentional and causes serious harm to the public.

I have carefully considered the submissions by both parties. I find that FPC Raza's conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

Culpability is high – FPC Raza's conduct was intentional and deliberate. It was planned and calculated. FPC Raza willfully misused his office as a police officer to access confidential information on police systems to extort members of the public.

Harm – is high. FPC Raza caused direct harm to members of the public, placing them under undue distress, threatening them by misusing his office as a police officer.

Aggravating features – I have considered that there are no additional aggravating features as I am mindful not to double count or take to consideration any factors that have already featured in my determination of culpability and harm.

Mitigating features – I acknowledge that FPC Raza expressed remorse at his actions and acknowledge the underlying pressures he faced in his personal life.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the *Standards of Professional Behaviour* so serious to justify dismissal. Applying that definition, I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards do amount to gross misconduct.

Heading 1

Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I bear in mind that the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025 (“The 2025 Regulations”) came into effect on the 28th May 2025.

The 2025 Regulations amend Regulations 42 and 62 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (“The PCR”) so that, where gross misconduct is proven against a serving officer, the panel must dismiss the officer unless there are exceptional circumstances.

I have considered the officer’s record of service.

This case is based upon what amounts to irrefutable evidence from the facts as outlined by the Appropriate Authority and the certificate of conviction.

The only available sanction is dismissal without notice. I am satisfied had the officer still been serving he would have been dismissed without notice.

OUTCOME:

Having considered the matter fully and having regard to the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, had FPC Raza still been a serving police officer, he would have been **dismissed without notice** and is to be placed on the College of Policing’s barred list.

Commander Andy Brittain
Metropolitan Police Service
15th May 2026