

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Dion Arnold

Warrant No: P241911

Date of Hearing: 7th May 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct

Findings

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started. 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**.

PC Dion Arnold did not attend the hearing and was not represented. I am satisfied that he was aware of this hearing; he was served the required notice of hearing on the 22nd April 2026 [REDACTED].

The AA was represented by Case Manager, Aaryan Sattani.

No Regulation 54 response was submitted on behalf of PC Arnold and he made no response when served the hearing papers.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Aaryan Sattani. As stated already, PC Arnold did not attend the hearing.

In determining whether to proceed in the absence of PC Arnold, I had regard to the purpose of police misconduct hearings, the overall interests of justice and fairness to PC Arnold and the AA, the circumstances of the case, and the legal advice from the LQA. The Officer had not asked for the case to be adjourned. I considered it unlikely that any adjournment would lead to PC Arnold's / a representative's attendance. I concluded that it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the hearing in his absence.

The Allegation

On the 30th March 2025, PC Arnold was arrested by Surrey Police for rape and sexual assault following an allegation by Ms A that PC Arnold had raped and sexually assaulted her on several occasions between June 2024 and March 2025. Following his interview the same day, he was charged and remanded in custody. On the 31st March 2025, PC Arnold was suspended from the office of Constable.

During the course of the investigation, Surrey Police identified four further complainants. The sexual offending taking place between 2023 and 2025. PC Arnold was charged in relation to Ms B, Ms C and Ms D with rape and sexual assault.

PC Arnold stood trial for the allegations on the 2nd March 2026 at Guildford Crown Court. He faced 17 counts. On the 16th April 2026, PC Arnold was convicted of eight counts as follows;

In relation to Ms A, PC Arnold was convicted of one count of assault by penetration and one count of sexual assault.

In relation to Ms B, PC Arnold was convicted of one count of rape.

In relation to Ms C, PC Arnold was convicted of two counts of rape, one count of assault by penetration and one count of sexual assault.

In relation to Ms D, PC Arnold was convicted of one count of rape.

PC Arnold's sentencing hearing is due to take place on the 22nd June 2026 at Guildford Crown Court.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that PC Arnold'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 and 2025, namely:

- Discreditable Conduct

In that his conduct may discredit the police service and undermine public confidence.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, PC Arnold's conduct amounts to gross misconduct, and his dismissal may be justified.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide are whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the allegations against PC Arnold.

- PC Arnold was convicted of serious sexual offences against four women whilst a serving police officer.

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether it amounts to a breach of the following standard 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

In line with Regulation 61(7), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority.

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary provided to me, in particular the 'Trial indictment with verdicts' and the statement from the criminal investigating officer, DC Wasley.

I have found the facts proven as outlined above.

Breach of Professional Standards

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 standard of professional behaviour of discreditable conduct, 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 PC Arnold's conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

Culpability is high – PC Arnold's conduct was intentional and deliberate. He was a serving police officer when he committed these heinous acts against four women over a sustained period of time. His conduct was persistent. He has been convicted of multiple serious offences.

Harm – is high. PC Arnold caused direct and serious harm to four women, PC Arnold's actions cause harm to the reputation of the police. It undermines public confidence in policing at a time when the police, and specifically the Metropolitan Police, are aiming to demonstrate how seriously it is tackling violence against women and girls, setting high standards over the last few years following highly publicized and damaging incidents.

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

Mitigating features – I do not consider that there are any mitigating features present.

Gross Misconduct

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

Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I adopt the three-stage process, as outlined in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings to determine the appropriate sanction.

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

The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

I remind myself 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.

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.

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

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

I start by assessing the seriousness of the conduct. As previously stated, I found these provisionally as above and adopt them herein but in summary

Culpability is high – PC Arnold's conduct was intentional and deliberate. He was a serving police officer when he committed these heinous acts against four women over a sustained period of time. His conduct was persistent. He has been convicted of multiple serious offences

Harm – is high. PC Arnold caused direct and serious harm to four women. PC Arnold's actions cause harm to the reputation of the police. It undermines public confidence in policing at a time when the police, and specifically the Metropolitan Police, are aiming to demonstrate how seriously tackling violence against women and girls is taken, setting high standards over the last few years following highly publicized and damaging incidents.

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

Mitigating features – I do not consider that there are any mitigating features present.

Conclusion on Seriousness

Taking all these matters into consideration, I assess the seriousness of the conduct as

high.

Personal Mitigation

No personal mitigation is advanced on behalf of PC Arnold. In any event, I am mindful of the limits to the weight I should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings, and that the interests of the police service, and the protection of the public, are more important than those of the individual officer.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

I have reminded myself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case.

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.

I do acknowledge that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect: accordingly, the outcome should be no more than necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

I have considered the officer's record of service.

In relation to Ms A, the matter falls under the 2020 Regulations as amended by the 2024 Regulations. Therefore, I have reminded myself to consider the least punitive outcome first.

In relation to Ms B, C and D, those matters fall under the 2020 Regulations as amended by the 2024 and 2025, Regulations. Accordingly, there is a presumption of dismissal without notice, or if I am satisfied exceptional circumstances apply, I may consider a final written warning.

This case is based upon PC Arnold's conviction in relation to extremely serious offences committed against four women.

Overall, in relation to Ms A, due to the seriousness of the misconduct, a final written warning would not do justice to the criminal behaviour by the Officer. Dismissal without notice is the only appropriate sanction.

In relation to Ms B, C and D, there are no exceptional circumstances. The only appropriate sanction is dismissal 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, the sanction I impose is **dismissal without notice** and the officer should be placed on the College of Policing's **public** barred list.

Commander Jason Prins
Metropolitan Police Service
7th May 2026

