

IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED)

BETWEEN:

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

Appropriate Authority

and

POLICE CONSTABLE KEVIN BEEDEL

Officer Concerned

The hearing has been held between 14 - 17 April 2026 at Palestra House, in public.

1. The Panel consisted of Commander Jason Prins (Chair) and Leslie Bowman and Michael Guthrie (Independent Panel Members). Ron Cheriyan was the Legally Qualified Advisor to the Panel.
2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Mr. Julien Waters. PC Beedel was represented by Mr. Michael Rawlinson.
3. The allegation facing PC Beedel is set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon him under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended). This is:

“1. On 12 December 2018, PC Kevin Beedel whilst at a work Christmas event held at Aldenham Country Park in Hertfordshire, harassed and caused distress and embarrassment to PC A by repeatedly touching PC A’s bottom, placing his hands on her backside in full view of colleagues. He then followed her around the venue whilst she made efforts to distance herself.

2. This action was unwarranted and unwanted, and constituted a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely Discreditable Conduct and Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

3. *The Appropriate Authority asserts that this conduct is so serious as to justify dismissal, amounting to gross misconduct.”*
4. The purpose of professional disciplinary proceedings is to protect the public and to maintain the high standards and good reputation of the profession. It is the role of the Panel to:
- First, ascertain the facts.
 - Second, to determine, on the basis of those facts, whether PC Beedel has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as alleged.
 - Third, to determine whether the admitted or otherwise identified breaches amount to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.
 - Fourth, to decide on the outcome, if appropriate to do so, having regard to the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings.

PRELIMINARY APPLICATIONS

Application to admit Dissemination Report dated 4 February 2025

5. Counsel for PC Beedel applied for permission to admit the following into evidence:
- Dissemination Report dated 4 February 2025.
6. Counsel for the AA did not object to the application.
7. The Chair granted the application.

Application for PC Santana Luiz to give evidence by video link from abroad

8. Counsel for the AA applied for permission for PC Santana Luiz to give evidence by video link from Brazil. Counsel for the Officer did not object to the application.
9. The Chair granted the application on the grounds that it was necessary for the witness to do so in the interests of justice.

CASE SUMMARY

10. On 3 February 2025, PC A contacted the Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS) to report an incident at a Christmas Party held on 12 December 2018.
11. It is alleged that during that evening, PC Kevin Beedel, a colleague from PC A's team, repeatedly put his hand on her bottom and stroked it. PC A walked away from PC Beedel but he persisted in following her and repeatedly placed his hand on her bottom.
12. PC A reported the incident in 2025 after PC Beedel returned to work in the same office that she was working in.
13. On 13 February 2025, PC Beedel was served with a Regulation 17 Notice, detailing the allegation of sexual assault.
14. In his Regulation 31 response, PC Beedel denies misconduct or gross misconduct and denies breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to Discreditable Conduct and Authority, Respect and Courtesy. PC Beedel asserts in his Regulation 31 response that his memory/account of the events in question, bearing in mind the period of time that has lapsed since the alleged event, is minimal. PC Beedel states that, had he engaged in the behaviour that he is accused of, on the basis of honesty and integrity, he would fully admit and apologise for any such behaviour or any detrimental effects that it would have caused anyone. PC Beedel states that he notes from the statements provided by the witnesses that PC A was being flirty and that the photograph provided by her would appear to indicate this. PC Beedel states that he is concerned that there appear to be multiple inconsistencies in the statements made against him.

FINDINGS OF FACTS

15. In advance of this hearing, the Panel was supplied with the documents in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended), which included a copy of the papers served on PC Beedel in accordance with Regulation 30 and PC Beedel's response to the AA under Regulation 31. In determining the facts in this case, the Panel had regard to:

- All documents and materials in the Regulation 30 bundle, whether or not they were explicitly referred to during the hearing;
- Witness statement of PC A dated 27 February 2025;
- Witness statement of Mr B dated 22 April 2025;
- Witness statement of Sergeant Stephen Luu dated 2 March 2024;
- Witness statement of PC Mish Grabowski dated 27 February 2025;
- Witness statement of Sergeant Asher dated 12 March 2025;
- Witness statement of PC Amy Tansill dated 21 March 2025;
- Witness statement of PC Thomas Butterworth dated 19 April 2025;
- Witness statement of PC Felipe Diego Santana Luiz dated 8 May 2025;
- Witness statement of Jo Elliott dated 22 January 2026
- Record of Taped Interview of PC Beedel’s Criminal Interview dated 19 June 2025;
- The live evidence from PC Beedel;
- The live evidence from PC A;
- The live evidence from Mr B;
- The live evidence from Sergeant Stephen Luu;
- The live evidence from PC Mish Grabowski;
- The live evidence from PC Felipe Diego Santana Luiz;
- The character bundle submitted to the Panel on behalf of PC Beedel, comprised of;
 - i. Twelve positive character references.
 - ii. Eighteen letters/emails of good work.
 - iii. One MPS Commendation.
- Dissemination Report dated 4 February 2025
- The submissions made on behalf of the AA and PC Beedel; and
- The legal advice provided by Mr. Cheriyan.

16. In considering the facts, the Panel is aware that the burden of proof is on the AA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. This means that the Panel must be satisfied that it is more likely than not that a fact is true before they can find it to be true. The seriousness of an allegation does not, of itself, require more cogent evidence. The Panel also had regard to the character references submitted on behalf of PC Beedel and his previous good character in its assessment of PC Beedel’s credibility and his propensity to commit the misconduct alleged.

17. The Panel considered the allegation against PC Beedel, determining first whether the facts alleged were admitted by PC Beedel or proved on the balance of probabilities, and then going on to determine whether any facts found admitted or proved, collectively or individually, breached the standards alleged.

Allegation

18. The AA relies primarily on the evidence of the witness statements of PC A, Mr B, Sergeant Luu, PC Grabowski and PC Santana Luiz.

19. PC Beedel denies all facts relied on by the AA in support of the allegation, except the following:

- PC Beedel accepts that, on 12 December 2018, he attended the Christmas party at Aldenham Country Park in Hertfordshire, which PC A also attended.

20. The Panel heard evidence from five witnesses. Their evidence is not repeated here in full, but a general summary provided. The five AA witnesses adopted their witness statements as evidence in chief.

PC A

21. PC A explained that she helped to organise the Christmas party in 2018. She stated that she did not have any significant issues with PC Beedel before the event although she thought he was a bit creepy and that he would sometimes stare at her.

22. She stated that the incident took place at around 8.00 pm and that she knew this because the photo of her and PC Beedel was taken at 7.34 pm. PC A confirmed that she took this selfie on her phone.

23. PC A explained that she was standing with PC Beedel and PC Grabowski at the casino table, with PC Beedel being in the middle. She stated that, whilst she was standing there, PC Beedel had a glass in his left hand. She explained that she then felt a hand on her left bottom cheek. She stated that she was shocked and she turned and saw that PC Beedel had his hand on her bottom. The touching was not consensual. PC A

explained that she said something like “Don’t do that” to which PC Beedel replied “I’m just being friendly.”

24. PC A stated that she removed PC Beedel’s hand several times from her bottom but it was placed back there by him. She stated that she was shocked because she was aware that PC Beedel had just got married. PC A explained that she shuffled to the right around the casino table to try to get away from him. She saw a group of her male colleagues behind her at the bar and one of the group had his phone out and they were laughing. PC A confirmed that she approached the group to enquire as to what they were doing but then they tried to hide the phone from her.
25. PC A explained that she remembers speaking to Sergeant Luu at the time, who was in the group, and that he was also laughing. She stated that Sergeant Luu called PC Beedel a pervert. She stated that she believed she also spoke to PC Santana Luiz on the night of the incident and told him that PC Beedel had groped her bottom, but she could not remember what he said in response.
26. PC A stated that at the time of the touching, PC Grabowski was still to the side of PC Beedel. PC A stated that she noticed that PC Grabowski started speaking to PC Beedel more during the incident. She explained that PC Grabowski was a friend. PC A stated that she did not know if PC Grabowski had seen the incident but clarified that, had she seen it, she would have expected her to intervene. She explained that she was very upset that PC Grabowski and her team had not intervened, and the fact that no one did anything was an added layer of upset and surprise for her.
27. PC A stated that she suspected that there could have been a video of the incident flying about. PC A stated that she was aware that people knew about the incident. She confirmed that she asked two people in a splinter WhatsApp group the following week about whether there was a video that was “doing the rounds.”
28. PC A explained that she did not report the incident because she felt that due to the culture on the team, had she reported it, she would have been ostracised. She stated that there was a laddish culture on the team, with sexual innuendos being made about female officers. She explained that, whilst the Metropolitan Police was a large organisation, anything that happened to a police officer followed them around.
29. PC A confirmed that for nine or ten months after the incident, whilst PC Beedel remained on the team, there was always a risk of her being crewed up with him. She

accepted that she took no steps to prevent that occurrence from happening. She explained that she was trying to deal with what was happening but she knew that if she reported it, she felt that it would get brushed under the carpet, and she didn't want it to affect her career.

30. PC A stated that she found out about PC Beedel's return to the office she worked in through a colleague. She stated that she initially felt extremely uncomfortable about it. For the first few weeks after PC Beedel's return she did not report the incident and had some interactions with him, although she would avoid being in the office if she knew that PC Beedel was there. She remembered the massive impact the incident had on her and she reported the incident after a conversation with Mr B because she could not work in the way that she wanted to.

31. PC A stated that prior to this incident in 2018, PC Beedel had liked old photos of her on Instagram, including pictures of her in bikinis from years ago. She considered this inappropriate and thought there was something sinister in it.

Mr B

32. Mr B stated he was in a relationship with PC A. PC A had spoken about her experiences on D Response team and he explained that it was overwhelmingly negative. He explained that he believed that PC A had issues of trust with D Response team. He stated that PC A had explained to him that PC Beedel had started working in her office, and that it made her feel uncomfortable as he had grabbed her buttocks multiple times on a work night out many years ago, and that the incident had been recorded. He stated that PC A had become seriously upset and that the decision to report had been PC A's alone, and he supported her in that decision.

Sergeant Luu (PC at the time of the incident)

33. Sergeant Luu explained that he was one of PC A's best friends on the shift. He had seen PC Beedel's hand on PC A's bottom for a few minutes and had a clear and unobstructed view. He stated that he would have stepped in if he had seen anything inappropriate. He confirmed that he would have been well placed, by reason of his relationship with PC A, to determine whether or not PC A was uncomfortable with the

touching. He stated that he would class the incident as flirting because, from where he was standing at the time, PC A and PC Beedel appeared to be laughing and smiling. He added that he believed that it was a case of two consenting adults flirting. He did not see PC A trying to walk away. He confirmed that the incident went on in full public glare and in a very public place which was full of police officers. He denied calling PC Beedel a pervert to PC A following the incident and stated that PC A had not raised the incident at all with him, either on the evening or following.

34. Sergeant Luu stated that he had not thought about the Christmas party in 2018 until preparing his witness statement for these misconduct proceedings. He explained that this was because the Christmas party in 2018 was just like any other Christmas party and did not stand out for him. He stated that, before he wrote his witness statement, someone had told him that there was an allegation of bottom touching relating to PC A.

35. Sergeant Luu did not agree that there was a culture of inappropriate behaviour on the shift. He confirmed that, had he approached the D Response team supervisors and relayed that he did not want to be paired with someone, that request was something that the supervisors would accommodate, provided it was within their resources to do so. Sergeant Luu added that the D Response team supervisors were fairly approachable, were welfare driven, and were open to listening to others' grievances.

PC Grabowski

36. PC Grabowski stated that she shared a room with PC A on the evening of the Christmas party in 2018. She stated that she did not remember casino tables at the venue but she acknowledged that there may have been casino tables, and that she may have spoken to PC A at the casino tables.

37. Other officers drew her attention to the bar area and PC Grabowski was aware of PC Beedel's right hand on PC A's bottom for a few seconds. She did not know if the touching was consensual or deliberate. DC Grabowski clarified that the incident was a long time ago and that she had not discussed it with anyone. She explained that, at the time, PC A did not appear to be distressed or upset and it did not appear to her that PC A was trying to get away from PC Beedel. PC Grabowski stated that, given her

relationship with PC A, she would have been well placed to spot if PC A had been distressed.

38. PC Grabowski stated that she did not see anyone filming the incident and she was not aware of a video “doing the rounds.” She stated that PC A had not mentioned the incident to her, either on the night or subsequently.

39. PC Grabowski stated that she would not have had any issues about making any concerns known to the D Response team supervisors and there was no general issue about not being able to raise concerns with supervisors.

PC Santana Luiz

40. PC Santana Luiz explained that he did not know what happened that night and he explained that he did not remember seeing anything. PC Santana Luiz stated that he remembered people talking about the incident and that he heard someone say that they saw someone touching PC A’s bum. He stated that, for him, it was not a significant incident and he did not talk about it with PC A that night. PC Santana Luiz was asked to clarify what he meant by “it” in the sentence “I believe I saw it happening”, as contained in his witness statement. PC Santana Luiz explained that this was said in the context of a hug and that “it” referred to a hug between PC A and PC Beedel, which PC Santana Luiz confirmed he saw on the night of the Christmas party in 2018.

41. PC Santana Luiz explained that he later met PC A for coffee and that, prior to this meeting, PC A had not mentioned the incident to him. He explained that he thought this meeting had taken place in January or February 2025. PC Santana Luiz stated that he thought during this meeting, PC A had mentioned to him that she was uncomfortable about working with PC Beedel because of an episode that happened at the Christmas do in 2018.

42. In response to questions from the Panel, PC Santana Luiz referred to Q4 of his witness statement where he had stated, in relation to the incident, “I believe I saw it happening.” PC Santana Luiz explained that he did not see it happening and clarified that he did not see PC Beedel’s hands or what he was doing. PC Santana Luiz explained that it was such a long time ago and stated that there were a lot of male

colleagues present. PC Santana Luiz stated that he remembered that guys had been gossiping that something had happened between PC Beedel and PC A.

43. PC Santana Luiz stated that, if anyone in D Response team did not feel comfortable working with someone, they could always go to their supervisors and tell them they did not want to work with that person. He stated that PC A had a good relationship with the supervisors on the team. He described the environment on the team as very toxic. He stated that people in D Response team could approach their supervisors about matters but clarified that this could jeopardise their career progression.

PC Beedel

44. PC Beedel stated that PC A was a colleague with whom he got on with. He respected her as an officer but had no romantic interest in her. He stated that he had never intentionally sexually assaulted PC A and he was 100% sure of this because it is something that he would never do.
45. PC Beedel stated that he had a vague recollection of seeing PC A and speaking to her at the Christmas party. There was nothing that stood out to him about the way PC A was acting that night. He stated that he did not remember being near PC Grabowski and PC A at the roulette table, and confirmed that he did not touch PC A deliberately, intentionally, or sexually. He had no recollection of PC A saying to him “Don’t do that.”
46. PC Beedel stated that he did not place his hand on PC A’s bottom and he did not stroke her bottom in any way whilst at the casino table. PC Beedel denied that he had his hand on her bottom for a number of minutes. He stated that people do come up and take selfies with him. He stated that he could have hugged PC A and there was a possibility that his hand had been round PC A’s waist and that this had been misconstrued. PC Beedel explained that he would not have intentionally touched PC A, in any way, on her backside.
47. In response to Re-examination, PC Beedel accepted that there was a possibility that there may have been accidental touching between himself and PC A. PC Beedel stated that he would not have touched PC A on her bottom but he may have put his hand on her waist. PC Beedel stated that, had he accidentally touched her or grazed her, it would not have stood out for him. PC Beedel stated that people at the

Christmas party may have seen things from the wrong angle and from a distance, especially in a dimly lit and large venue.

48. PC Beedel stated that he could not recall how soon he was back at work after the Christmas party. He explained that PC A did not block him on social media after the party and he was not told of any rumours or issues that had occurred, or anything relating to a video of the incident.
49. PC Beedel stated that he did not have any specific memories of working with PC A after the party, but he would have done so as he was one of the few Response drivers and it was thus highly likely that he would have worked with PC A. He stayed at D Response team for nine to ten months after the incident, before moving away from the team to another role. PC Beedel explained that, during that time, PC A did not show any signs that she did not want to work with him.
50. PC Beedel explained that he would still see PC A once he had left D response team as the team he moved to was based upstairs in the same Police Station. He remembered bumping into PC A on one occasion when on the Safer Transport Team and they exchanged pleasantries.
51. PC Beedel confirmed that he knew of no specific reason why PC A or Sergeant Luu would make a false allegation against him. He believed that Sergeant Luu and PC Grabowski were misconstrued in what they had seen.
52. PC Beedel accepted that he may have “liked” social media posts occasionally if the poster looked as though they had been on holiday. PC Beedel stated that, with regard to social media posts, he would not look at old photos. PC Beedel stated that he was not attracted to PC A, and he denied identifying photographs of her in a bikini. He acknowledged that he “liked” some of PC A’s photos. PC Beedel stated that if a photo of PC A popped up, he would not have “liked” it specifically because she was wearing a bikini. PC Beedel denied sending emojis of hearts to PC A.

Panel Decision

53. The Panel considered PC A to be a credible witness. She was able to give clear and detailed evidence and her answers were consistent with her witness statement. This remained the case even under rigorous cross examination.

54. The Panel found that there was deliberate touching of PC A by PC Beedel. The Panel noted that, despite the significant passage of time (seven years), Sergeant Luu and PC Grabowski could both recall PC Beedel touching PC A's bottom at the Christmas party in 2018.
55. The Panel found that there was "sexual" touching of PC A by PC Beedel. The Panel considered that the act of repeatedly touching a woman's bottom might, by its nature, be "sexual" touching. The Panel considered that the touching of PC A by PC Beedel was not horseplay, and was done in pursuit of sexual gratification. The Panel noted that PC A was not friends with PC Beedel and they were not in a relationship. The Panel considered the circumstances in which the touching occurred, at a Christmas party, to be relevant. The Panel found that because of its nature, the touching might be sexual, and in view of the circumstances, the touching was in fact sexual.
56. The Panel found that PC A did not, at the time, consent to the touching by PC Beedel. The Panel noted that PC A had confirmed in her live evidence that she did not, at the time, consent to the touching. The Panel considered PC A to be a credible witness. The Panel noted that Sergeant Luu had stated in evidence that he believed the touching was consensual. However, the Panel considered PC A's evidence to be more compelling as it recognised that Sergeant Luu could only provide his interpretation on whether the touching was consensual.
57. The Panel found that PC Beedel did not reasonably believe that PC A consented to the touching. The Panel noted that PC A had indicated on a number of occasions that she did not want to be touched in that manner, either by saying so or by removing his hand. PC Beedel was not friends with PC A and they were not in a relationship. The Panel considered PC A to be a credible witness.
58. The Panel noted that there were some inconsistencies between PC A's evidence and the evidence of other witnesses. The Panel recognised that the evidence of Sergeant Luu and PC Grabowski did not corroborate PC A's account that her supervisors could not be approached. It was advanced on behalf of the officer that PC A's characterisation of the culture of Response Team D, corroborated by PC Santana Luiz, in contrast to some other witnesses, undermined her credibility. The panel observed that this conflict in evidence was unsurprising as people experience professional cultures differently, depending on their place within them.

59. The Panel accepted that there was no corroborative evidence which confirmed PC A's account that she was standing at the casino table with PC Grabowski at the time of the incident. The Panel also acknowledged that there was no corroborative evidence to support PC A's evidence that PC Beedel followed her around the venue whilst she made efforts to distance herself. However, having taken these inconsistencies into account, the Panel remained of the view that PC A was a credible witness and it considered that, in relation to the central issue of whether PC Beedel touched PC A's bottom, the evidence of all the witnesses was consistent. The Panel noted also that there were wider discussions about the touching that occurred involving other colleagues at the Christmas party.
60. It was advanced on behalf of the officer that PC A's behaviour immediately after the incident, and in the years after, including not reporting the officer's behaviour until some years later, was inconsistent with the significant personal impact she now reports. The panel concluded that people react to traumatic events differently and PC A has provided a clear explanation as to why she had not previously made a report and why she felt compelled to do so in 2025.
61. The Panel recognised that PC A's delay in reporting the incident may have prejudiced PC Beedel and the Panel took this into account, insofar as it has impacted PC Beedel's ability to respond to the allegation. However, the Panel considered PC A's explanation for the delay in reporting the incident and found this to be plausible. The Panel also took into account the wider impact on public confidence in policing if serious allegations are not pursued.
62. The Panel considered the evidence of PC Beedel and his assertion that he did not touch PC A's bottom at the event. However, the Panel considered PC A's evidence to be more persuasive as it found PC A to be a clear and credible witness, and her account was corroborated by the evidence of Sergeant Luu, PC Grabowski, and PC Santana Luiz. Sergeant Luu described the touching lasting for a few minutes, whilst PC Grabowski observed it for a few seconds. PC Grabowski, in her witness statement, described other colleagues commenting on PC Beedel touching PC A with comments such as "What is Beedel doing?"

63. The Panel had regard to PC Beedel's previous good character in its assessment of his credibility and propensity to commit the conduct that is the subject of the Regulation 30 Notice.

64. The Panel note that PC A and PC Beedel gave evidence about PC Beedel allegedly liking photos of PC A on social media. This did not form part of the allegations before the Panel and the Panel make no findings about it.

BREACH OF STANDARDS

65. The Panel went on to consider whether PC Beedel had breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to Discreditable Conduct and Authority, Respect and Courtesy. In determining whether the conduct of PC Beedel amounted to a breach of those Standards, the Panel considered the facts found proven by the Panel, the submissions made on behalf of the AA and PC Beedel, and the legal advice provided by Mr Cheriyan.

66. The narrative for the Standards of Professional Behaviour in Schedule 2 to the Police Conduct Regulations 2020 (as amended) that applies in this case is:

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

67. Having heard all the evidence and having considered PC Beedel's character bundle, the Panel concluded that PC Beedel had breached the Professional Standards of Discreditable Conduct and Authority, Respect and Courtesy. The Panel found that the standard of Discreditable Conduct had been breached because of the potential impact of PC Beedel's conduct on public confidence in policing. The Panel found that the standard of Authority, Respect and Courtesy had been breached because, in deliberately and repeatedly touching PC A's bottom in a sexual manner and without her consent, PC Beedel did not treat PC A with respect and courtesy.

MISCONDUCT/ GROSS MISCONDUCT

68. Having found that PC Beedel's conduct had breached the Standards of Discreditable Conduct and Authority, Respect and Courtesy, the Panel carefully considered whether on the balance of probabilities, the breaches, individually or collectively, amounted to gross misconduct, misconduct or neither. Gross misconduct is defined in the Police Conduct Regulations 2020 (as amended) as meaning a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious that dismissal would be justified. Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action.
69. The Panel reminded itself of the need to protect public confidence in and the reputation of the police service, the need to maintain high professional standards, and the need to protect the public, police officers and staff by preventing similar misconduct in the future.
70. In an initial assessment of seriousness, the Panel determined that PC Beedel's actions amounted to gross misconduct for the following reasons:
- PC Beedel's conduct was intentional, deliberate and targeted towards PC A.
 - PC Beedel's conduct was criminal in nature, notwithstanding the absence of a criminal conviction.
 - PC Beedel's conduct involved sexual impropriety, which is serious, and significantly undermines public trust in the profession.
 - PC Beedel's conduct had a significant impact on PC A as it caused her distress and trauma.
 - PC Beedel's conduct, if known about, would have a significant impact on public confidence in policing.

OUTCOME

71. In determining the appropriate sanction, the Panel had regard to PC Beedel's record of service, the facts and breaches found proved, and the submissions made on behalf of the AA and PC Beedel. The Panel applied the three-stage procedure set out in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings. The Panel assessed the seriousness of the misconduct, kept in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions, and chose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose in the light of the seriousness of PC Beedel's conduct.

Seriousness of the Misconduct

72. In assessing the seriousness of the misconduct, the Panel considered:

- The officer's culpability for the misconduct.
- The harm caused by the misconduct.
- The existence of any aggravating factors.
- The existence of any mitigating factors.

73. Culpability is defined as the blameworthiness or responsibility of the officer for their actions. The Panel determined that the level of PC Beedel's culpability was high. The Panel noted that PC Beedel's conduct was targeted, intentional and deliberate and involved sexual impropriety, which is an especially serious type of misconduct. The Panel also found that PC Beedel's conduct was criminal in nature, notwithstanding the absence of a criminal conviction.

74. The Panel determined that PC Beedel's conduct had caused a high level of harm to PC A and found that PC A had suffered psychological distress. During her evidence, PC A stated that the impact upon her had been huge and that she still found it traumatic. The Panel was mindful of the national concerns regarding Violence against Women and Girls and found that the circumstances of PC Beedel's conduct would diminish public confidence in the police. The conduct would harm the reputation of the Metropolitan Police Service and the reputation of policing more generally. The Panel determined that harm was high.

75. The Panel determined that the following aggravating factors existed in this case:

- There were multiple breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.
- PC Beedel continued the behaviour after he realised or should have realised that it was improper.

76. The Panel determined that the following mitigating factors existed in this case:

- The misconduct was confined to a brief duration.

The Panel gave due account to the officer's conduct in the intervening years when he performed his duties to a high standard.

Purpose of the Sanction

77. The Panel had regard to the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime, namely:

- To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of the police service.
- To uphold high standards in policing, and to deter misconduct; and
- To protect the public.

Choosing the most Appropriate Sanction

78. The Panel considered the purpose of the misconduct regime and, having had regard to all the circumstances, including the risk of undermining public confidence in the police service, the Panel considered this to be a serious breach of professional standards.

79. The Panel had regard to the purpose of outcomes and that they are not intended primarily to be punitive. The Panel also had regard to the need for outcomes to be proportionate.

80. The Panel had regard to PC Beedel's record of service and the bundle of character references and gave them due weight, noting the positive reports regarding PC Beedel's performance.

81. However, the Panel concluded that PC Beedel's personal mitigation cannot outweigh the need to set and maintain high standards in policing, and to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service.

82. Based on the assessment of seriousness that had been carried out, the Panel determined that imposing a final written warning would not be sufficient to uphold public confidence in and respect for the police service. The Panel determined that imposing a final written warning would also not provide a clear message to serving police officers that this type of conduct is unacceptable.

83. The Panel concluded that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is dismissal without notice.

Commander Jason Prins - Chair

Leslie Bowman – Independent Panel Member

Michael Guthrie – Independent Panel Member

30th April 2026