

**Accelerated Misconduct Hearing of Former Police Constable Shyam Bhangu
P241724 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. FPC Bhangu has resigned from his post, with his last day of service being yesterday (13th May 2026).
3. I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Ms Hannah Clark. FPC Bhangu has provided a Regulation 54 response to the allegations, but has chosen not to attend.
4. The allegation against FPC Bhangu is as follows:

“

On 24th September 2025, whilst on duty, you were selected to undergo a random drug test administered by officers from the Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS).

The urine sample you provided was subsequently submitted to Eurofins for analytical screening.

The laboratory results confirmed the presence of a controlled substance, namely benzoylcegonine, which is an indicator of cocaine use. The results showed a quantitative result of 190ng per ml of urine. The confirmation cut off for a positive sample is 100ng per ml. You therefore tested positive for cocaine, a class A drug.

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) *Fitness for Duty*

(ii) *Discreditable Conduct*

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.

“

5. FPC Bhangu does not accept any conduct amounts to gross misconduct, and disputes the allegation in its entirety. He accepts that his urine sample returned a positive result for benzoylecgonine, but disputes having consumed cocaine. He says he never knowingly taken drugs. He cannot exclude the possibility of contamination. He notes evidential issues with the AA's case.

Factual Background

6. 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.
7. The facts of the matter are brief. FPC Bhangu was subject to a random drug test conducted by DPS officers at Kensington Police Station on 24th September 2025.
8. The urine sample provided was subsequently screened by Eurofins. The sample showed a positive indicator for both cocaine and benzoylecgonine, which is a byproduct of recreational cocaine use.
9. Mr [REDACTED] of Eurofins considered that due to the level returned, it is his opinion that the substance would have been used within 72 hours prior to the test being conducted. This was corroborated by Dr [REDACTED]

Misconduct and gross misconduct

10. 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.

11. On the evidence presented, I am wholly satisfied that FPC Bhangu 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 FPC Bhangu breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in that:

- i. **Fitness for duty:** Police officers when on duty or presenting themselves for duty are fit to carry out their responsibilities. FPC Bhangu breached this by testing positive for having consumed cocaine.
- ii. **Discreditable conduct:** FPC Bhangu acted in a manner which discredited the police service and/or undermined the public confidence in it consuming illicit Class A drugs, 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. FPC Bhangu did not act with self-control that is required by serving police officers.

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

Outcome Decision

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

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

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

18. 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 FPC Bhangu record of service.

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

Culpability

19. In considering FPC Bhangu's culpability, I consider that this was intentional and deliberate behaviour use drugs. It is unacceptable for police officers, who are responsible for enforcing the law, to break the law themselves.

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

Harm

21. 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 FPC Bhangu's actions would undermine confidence in the MPS. It is unacceptable for police officers to break the law.

22. 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 FPC Bhangu's decision-making and policing.

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

Aggravating factors

24. I do not find any additional aggravating factors.

Mitigating Factors

25. I note FPC Bhangu'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 FPC Bhangu's misconduct threatens public confidence.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

26. 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

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

28. This is case where the 2025 Regulations are engaged, and there is a presumption of dismissal without notice if he were still a serving officer unless there are exceptional circumstances not to. FPC Bhangu has not put forward any exceptional circumstances, and so I am bound to find the outcome dismissal without notice were he still a serving officer.

29. The gravity of FPC Bhangu's behaviour means that I do not consider any sanction less than dismissal without notice were he still a serving officer is justified. All three elements of the police misconduct regime are engaged in this case.

30. 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.

31. Therefore, the only outcome I consider appropriate is dismissal without notice were he still a serving officer.

OUTCOME: Dismissal without notice were he still a serving officer and placed on the College of Policing Barred List

Carl Galvin

Deputy Assistant Commissioner

14th May 2026