

**Accelerated Misconduct Hearing of Police Constable Mohammed Rahi P268993
held on 14th May 2025**

Introduction

1. I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started. I am satisfied that all the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been served: matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.
2. I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by PC Hannah Clark. PC Rahi has provided a Regulation 54 response to the allegations.
3. The allegations against PC Rahi are as follows:

“

Allegation 1: *On 19th February 2026 at Snaresbrook Crown Court, you pled guilty to assault by beating battery, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. You were therefore convicted of this offence.*

Allegation 2: *On 10th October 2025 you arrived late for work and were subject to a with cause breath test based on information that you had been drinking heavily the previous evening, during which you provided two breath samples that recorded readings of 32mg and 29mg to 100ml of breath. The limit for fitness to work is 13mg to 100ml of breath, making you unfit for duty.*

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that your actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in the Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely:

- (i) *Discreditable Conduct*
- (ii) *Fitness for Duty*

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 be justified.

“

4. PC Rahi accepts both allegations. He explained that he was shocked and not expecting to be called and told he was late for work. He did not realise he would be over the limit. He apologises for this. He denies that what he did was misconduct.

Factual Background

5. I understand that the burden of proving the facts rests at all times on the AA, and the standard of proof is on a balance of probabilities.
6. On 9th October 2025, officers from ██████████ attended the venue, ██████████ Brick Lane E1 6RU, as part of a team social night out. PC Rahi was one of these.
7. The team went to a pub, and then went to ██████████ Brick Lane E1. The team were given a very long table on the left side of the restaurant. There were approximately 24 of the team members in attendance. ██████████ at on the second table the opposite end to both ██████████ and PC Rahi.
8. ██████████ reports that after ordering food, PC Rahi ordered more food for the table which cost him a considerable amount of money. ██████████ reports that PC Rahi was quite drunk as he was wobbly on his feet and wrapping his arms around male colleagues.
9. ██████████ reports that Ms ██████████ was sat next to her, PC Rahi was seen to call out across the table stating her loved her and that her boyfriend was the

lucky one in the relationship. She thanked him but did not engage in a conversation.

10. ██████████ stated she noticed PC Rahi speaking to the waiter throughout the meal, attempting to get a discount.
11. ██████████ stated the team collectively decided to pay for their meal around 21:45. At this stage it became apparent PC Rahi was consistently asking the waiter to put a discount on the bill as they were police officers. The waiter spoke to a colleague and asked if PC Rahi could stop asking for a discount as one had been applied and they had a business to run.
12. Officers reported concerns with PC Rahi's behaviour upon leaving the restaurant, where he was described grabbing a colleague, ██████████ by wrapping his arms around her and pulling her face towards his and kissing her on the cheek.
13. On 10th October 2025, ██████████ started duty with colleagues and realised that PC Rahi had not turned up for work. ██████████ then reported the sexual assault and raised concerns over how much alcohol PC Rahi had consumed the night before.
14. PC Rahi arrived at work 1 hour and 45 minutes late, a with cause breath test was requested from him. He provided 2 readings of 32 mg/100ml and 29 mg/100ml of breath. These readings were done at 2 intervals with time in between.
15. PC Rahi then pleaded guilty on 19th February 2026 to assault by beating at Snaresbrook Crown Court. He was sentenced to a 12 community order with a requirement for 140 hours of unpaid work, and was required to pay £250 compensation.
16. PC Rahi gave evidence before me. He set out how the MPS saving his life motivated him to join the MPS, to help people in the same way as they helped him. He explained that he had pleaded guilty to the offence and was remorseful.

He thought that it was a spare day the following day where he could work from home.

Misconduct and gross misconduct

17. I have to consider whether I am sufficiently satisfied to make a finding, on the balance of probabilities, of misconduct or gross misconduct. Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour and Gross Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified.

18. I am grateful to [REDACTED] for making submissions as to whether this is misconduct or not.

19. On the evidence presented, I am wholly satisfied that PC Rahi has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Schedule 2 to the *Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020* in relation to all allegations. In particular, I conclude that PC Rahi breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that:

- i. **Discreditable conduct:** PC Rahi acted in a manner which discredited the police service and/or undermined the public confidence in committing battery, and in so doing, broke the law. It is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves. PC Rahi did not act with self-control that is required by serving police officers.
- ii. **Fitness for duty:** Police officers when on duty or presenting themselves for duty are fit to carry out their responsibilities. PC Rahi breached this by being over twice the fitness to work alcohol limit. A spare day is not a day off; this was on duty gross misconduct.

20. Consequently, I find the matter of fitness for duty and discreditable conduct proven at the severity of gross misconduct.

Outcome Decision

21. Following the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes, I adopt a three-staged approach in order to determine the appropriate sanction.

22. The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the conduct. This is assessed by reference to:

- i. The officer's culpability;
- ii. The harm caused by the misconduct;
- iii. The existence of aggravating factors;
- iv. The existence of mitigating factors.

23. The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime. I remind myself that this has three elements:

- i. To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service;
- ii. To uphold high standards and deter misconduct; and
- iii. To protect the public.

24. I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers - it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

25. The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils the purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.

26. In doing so, I remind myself that each case must be considered and determined on its own merits. In adopting the three-staged approach outlined above, I bear in mind PC Rahi's record of service.

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

Culpability

27. In considering PC Rahi's culpability, I consider that this was reckless behaviour to drink so heavily on a work night out, especially when required for duty the next day.

28. It is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves.

29. Accordingly, I find culpability at a high level.

Harm

30. As per 4.66 of the Guidance, "harm will likely undermine public confidence in policing. Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual or group to undermine public confidence. Where an officer commits an act that would harm public confidence if the circumstances were known to the public, take this into account". I consider that all of PC Rahi's actions would undermine confidence in the MPS. It is unacceptable for police officers to break the law.

31. Moreover, there is a substantial risk of reputational harm should the public become aware of the circumstances of these incidents. It would undermine public confidence in PC Rahi's decision-making and policing.

32. Accordingly, I consider the harm to be high level.

Aggravating factors

33. I do not find any additional aggravating factors.

Mitigating Factors

34. I note PC Rahi's personal mitigation and references. However, in these proceedings, personal mitigation is less relevant than in a criminal trial, and is dependent upon the extent to which the PC Rahi's misconduct threatens public confidence.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

35. I have reminded myself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case, and I am satisfied that all elements are engaged in my considerations.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

36. It is entirely unacceptable for police officers to break the law. PC Rahi's actions undermine public trust and confidence in policing as well as our reputation. The public could have no confidence in PC Rahi to act with due respect to protect them in enforcing the law, given that he himself broke it.

37. This is a case where the 2025 Regulations are engaged, and there is a presumption of dismissal without notice unless there are exceptional circumstances not to. PC Rahi has not put forward any exceptional circumstances, and so I am bound to find the outcome dismissal without notice.

38. The gravity of PC Rahi's behaviour means that I do not consider any sanction less than dismissal without notice is justified. All three elements of the police misconduct regime are engaged in this case.

39. A lesser outcome would not serve to mark the seriousness of his misconduct, deter others from similar misconduct and fulfil the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

40. Therefore, the only outcome I consider appropriate is dismissal without notice.

OUTCOME: Dismissal without notice and placed on the College of Policing Barred List

Carl Galvin

Deputy Assistant Commissioner

14th May 2026