

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Syed Omar Ali

Warrant No: P252990

Date of Hearing: 14th May 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Honesty and Integrity

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**.

PC Ali attended the hearing and is represented by Counsel, Mr Baraclough. Also present is PC Ali's federation representative, PC Joseph Farrell. I am satisfied PC Ali 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 Counsel, Ms Osborne and Case Manager, Shane Hanna.

A Regulation 54 response was submitted on behalf of PC Ali and I carefully considered the representations in advance of the hearing.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Ms Osborne and the representations made on behalf of PC Ali by Mr Baraclough.

The Allegation

It is alleged that in July 2022, you dishonestly appropriated a pair of Apple AirPods Pro from Windmill Road Custody Centre, knowing or believing that the property did not belong to you. Device tracking data indicates that the AirPods Pro were subsequently located in your possession, throughout April and May 2025, across various locations.

It is further alleged that, having come into possession of the item, you made no reasonable attempt to identify or notify the lawful owner, nor did you take steps to surrender the property to an appropriate authority. Instead, you retained the item and only booked it into the property store at Brixton Police Station on 24 July 2025, following direction from the OIC.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that PC Ali'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

Honesty and Integrity

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.

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 PC Ali.

PC Ali took effective ownership of a set of Apple AirPods Pro which he found while at work in a police building.

Mr G enabled the lost mode function on his iPhone in relation to the air pods on the 25th July 2022. However, he received no communication for 33 months.

On the 30th April 2025, Mr G noticed that the location of the air pods was set as Brixton Police Station.

Mr G monitored the locations of the air pods. These locations were all subsequently linked to PC Ali.

Mr G reported the matter to the police on the 8th June 2025.

PC Ali admitted to being in possession of the air pods, awaiting contact from the owner.

PC Ali booked the air pods into the property store at Brixton Police Station on the 24th July 2025, following advice from the OIC.

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

Honesty and Integrity – Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

The Officer's Position

PC Ali does not accept the conduct alleged.

PC Ali was at the custody center to deal with two prisoners. His usual place of work is Brixton Police Station. He saw the air pods on top of a table in the writing room, when he was writing up interview plans.

He connected the air pods to the phone to check if they were indeed air pods and check if they were lost property.

He also connected the air pods to try and locate the person who had left the air pods. He expected he would receive a message from the rightful owner as to return the air pods.

PC Ali did not ask anyone at the station if the air pods belonged to them nor did he email any of the teams.

PC Ali would get messages 3-4 times a day, every day, confirming that the owner can track the air pods, but no message with details that would enable him to locate or contact the owner.

PC Ali did not think about booking them into the custody center.

PC Ali was aware of the generic policy on booking lost property.

PC Ali was concerned that the property would be lost, damaged or sold if he handed to property storage. So, he decided keeping them charged so the owner can track them was the better option.

PC Ali kept the air pods for three years as he believed he would get contact from the owner or police. He remains of the view had he booked them in they could have been lost or auctioned off.

PC Ali kept the air pods with him, knowing they could be tracked and kept them charged to enable the owner to keep tracking them.

PC Ali did not use the air pods; he had his own headphones. He even bought his own pair of air pods.

PC Ali does accept with hindsight that he could have acted differently

In line with Regulation 61(7) and Regulation 61(8), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority and Mr Baraclough on behalf of PC Ali.

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary provided to me, including the evidence of PC Ali and submissions on his behalf.

I do find that PC Ali breached the standards of professional behaviour as to discreditable conduct and honesty and integrity. I am not persuaded by PC Ali's explanation or reasoning that he took the air pods so as to enable the owner to track him. There is no good reason for PC Ali to have removed the air pods from their original location as the owner would have been in a position to locate them through location services. Also, PC Ali did express he was aware of the MET policy as to booking in lost property, yet he did not do so, nor did he inform anyone of the air pods for three years. From the imagery provided to me in the bundle, it appears to me that the air pods have been used by PC Ali. Accordingly, I find that PC Ali acted dishonestly in taking, using and retaining the air pods for three years. I also find that overall, his conduct amounts to discreditable conduct.

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 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 PC Ali's conduct amounts to gross misconduct.

Culpability is high – PC Ali's conduct was intentional and deliberate. It was criminal in nature. He took the air pods, used them and kept them for three years.

Harm – is high. PC Ali's caused direct harm to a former colleague, who lost property of value to him. PC Ali's actions cause harm to the reputation of the police.

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 accept there is no operational dishonesty or abuse of a position of authority. I accept that the officer cooperated throughout the proceedings.

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.

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 Mr G and indeed PC Ali himself. I do not find any exceptional circumstances.

The only available sanction is dismissal without notice and I am satisfied that it is the only appropriate sanction in this case.

OUTCOME:

Having considered the matter fully and having regard to the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, as well as the mitigation and representations on exceptional circumstances, the sanction I impose is **dismissal without notice** and the officer should be placed on the College of Policing's **public** barred list.

Commander Andy Brittain

Metropolitan Police Service

14th May 2026

