

IN THE MATTER OF MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE
(CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

CM/19/26

BETWEEN:

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

The Appropriate Authority

-and-

PS PABLO ROBINS

The Officer Concerned

**NOTICE OF OUTCOME ACCELERATED POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING
(REGULATION 63 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020)**

Officer concerned: Police Sergeant Pablo Robins

Date of hearing: 2nd April 2026

Name of person chairing: Commander Jason Prins

[References in this decision to the Conduct Regulations are to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 and the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025. The Appropriate Authority is referred to as AA].

The Decisions of the Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Summary

1. The Allegations were found proved. It was determined that PS Robins' conduct had fallen below the standards expected of a serving police officer such as to contravene the Standards of Professional Behaviour and to amount to gross misconduct. It was determined that the only viable outcome in PS Robins' case is dismissal without notice and entry on the barring list.

Attendees

• PS Robins attended and was represented by Mr Craig Rush (counsel) and PC Leighton Gurney (Federation Representative). He was supported by PC Ian Charlwood, Welfare Support Officer.

- The AA's case was presented by Miss Nasreen Shah. The AA case manager, Hannah Clark, was also in attendance.
- I was assisted with applicable procedure/law and drafting by a lawyer, Miss Elisabeth Acker. However, all decisions (including on the allegations, gross misconduct and outcome) were mine alone.

Evidence and documentation

2. I had been provided with the following evidence and documentation:

From the AA:

- (a) Special Case Certificate – signed 30/01/2026
- (b) Allegations F3355D
- (c) Investigating Officer's Report
- (d) MG11 DC Kate Brant dated 14/01/2026
- (e) SM/2 - Form 163 – PS Pablo Robins signed 13/01/2026
- (f) SM1 – F5020A – signed 06/01/2026
- (g) SM3 – Exhibit JRC2 - WhatsApp Messages
- (h) SM/5 - Prepared Statement – PS Pablo Robins dated 13/01/2026
- (i) SM/8 – Transcription of Interview for PS Pablo Robins

From or on behalf of PS Robins:

- (a) Final Regulation 54 Response
- (b) 68 page bundle (served in 3 parts) encompassing character statement [REDACTED]
evidence
- (c) Additional Character bundle dated 01.04.26

Allegations

3. The allegations against PS Robins were as follows:

Between November 2022 and September 2023, you engaged in the sending and receiving of WhatsApp communications that included grossly offensive, discriminatory, and derogatory content. These communications were exchanged using a telephone number attributed to you.

Professional Standards of Behaviour

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) Equality & Diversity*
- ii) Challenging & Reporting Improper Conduct*
- iii) Authority, Respect & Courtesy*
- iv) 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.

Preliminary matters

Private proceedings:

4. I confirmed that in advance of the proceedings, I had been supplied with the hearing documents in accordance with Regulation 56 of the Police Conduct Regulations 2020 (as amended) and considered representations from both sides, before determining that the hearing ought to be held in Private.

Notice:

5. I was satisfied the misconduct papers were served on 17th March 2026 and that PS Robins has responded under Regulation 54 Police (Conduct) Regulations.

Background

6. Police had reason to interrogate the mobile telephone of a [REDACTED] (now deceased) and therein found a Whatsapp conversation with a telephone number police were able to attribute to another serving Metropolitan police officer (PS Pablo Robins). Messages from both sides (i.e. from [REDACTED] and from PS Robins) contained statements which were derogatory on the grounds of ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation and gender. They also included threats to kill other officers, which whether said in earnest or to communicate a degree of anger/frustration, were of concern.
7. The matter was referred to the Discrimination Investigation Unit on 8th January 2026 and allocated to DC Kate Brant for investigation on 8th January 2026. Alongside the

AA misconduct investigation, a criminal investigation in relation to offences of malicious communications and misconduct in public office is underway.

8. The AA rely on the messages themselves, produced from a download of [REDACTED] telephone, and PS Robins' account in his police interview under caution.
9. On 13th January 2026 PS Robins attended a police interview under caution (accompanied by a solicitor but not his Federation Representative). PS Robins provided police with a prepared statement as follows:

"I have been presented with disclosure of extracts of WhatsApp messages with [REDACTED] from November 2022 to September 2023. I am shocked and disgusted with what I've written. These messages do not reflect my true thoughts or ethics and values in the slightest. The background context was that [REDACTED] and I were both subject of a gross misconduct investigation which was malicious and eventually concluded with no misconduct for either of us, [REDACTED]

Within that context my messages reflect me venting to someone who was going through a similar situation to myself but I nevertheless deeply regret making these comments.

I come from a mixed race background and am in no way racist and in my role as a line manager have supported many officers of different backgrounds and religions. Many colleagues would be in a position to confirm that my views do not reflect those in some of the messages."

10. PS Robins was provided with a Form 163 attached to a letter dated 12th January 2026. He and DC Kate Brant signed acknowledging receipt of it on 13th January 2026. PS Robins endorsed the form "no comments" and signed it again.
11. PS Robins provided a final Regulation 54 response dated 26th March 2026. In it, PS Robins accepted the messages between him and [REDACTED] and that his conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour amounting to Gross Misconduct.

"I accept that I communicated with [REDACTED] via WhatsApp including during the period November 2022 to September 2023. The WhatsApp messages listed in the allegations were between me and [REDACTED]

Reading the messages leaves me numb. I am shocked and appalled at their content. It is embarrassing that I was part of those communications. I do not try and use the following as an excuse (there are no excuses for the content of the messages) but to try and explain the context.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. He sent so many texts I don't think I read most of them, quite erratically. Nonetheless, I let [REDACTED] vent, replying in kind on some occasions. The last thing I would want was for him to get another complaint [REDACTED]. None of this communication should have taken place, both from me and from him. Looking back, I feel that my responses were to placate [REDACTED] anger and also as a means for me to vent. [REDACTED]. Again, I do not say this as an attempt to excuse the messages.”

12. PS Robins has engaged with this investigation and proceedings. He accepts the messages attributed to him and Gross Misconduct.

Findings on the facts

13. Per Regulation 61(5), at the beginning of the hearing, I gave PS Robins the opportunity to say whether he accepted his conduct amounted to gross misconduct. PS Robins accepted his conduct amounted to gross misconduct.
14. I clarified whether PS Robins accepted breaches of the four standards pleaded by the Appropriate Authority: *i) Equality & Diversity, ii) Challenging & Reporting Improper Conduct, iii) Authority, Respect & Courtesy, and iv) Discreditable Conduct*. It was confirmed he did.
15. The Legal Adviser advised that the standard of proof with regards the factual particulars is the civil standard. I was reminded that the burden of proof rests with the AA.
16. I was advised that no finding could be made that the alleged conduct amounted to gross misconduct unless I was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this was the case, or the officer accepted Gross Misconduct, per Regulation 61(16).
17. Advice was further provided in relation to the statutory definition of ‘gross misconduct’ by reference to Regulation 2(1) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended) – “*“gross misconduct” means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal*”.

Findings on the facts alleged and on Gross Misconduct

18. Careful consideration was given to all of the documentary material from the AA and PS Robins, together with the brief submissions made on behalf of the AA and PS Robins, and the advice provided by the Legal Adviser.
19. I had considered all the documentation carefully in advance of the hearing. I noted the Whatsapp messages recovered from [REDACTED] telephone and produced by the AA as evidence in this hearing, and PS Robins' acceptance in his criminal caution interview (and throughout) that the messages were properly attributable to him. I was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that PS Robins had sent and received the Whatsapp messages. I was further satisfied the messages included material that was grossly offensive, discriminatory, and derogatory.
20. I noted PS Robins acceptance his conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct and found it did under Regulation 61(16). I observed that had this not been accepted by PS Robins, I was myself satisfied on the balance of probabilities that PS Robins conduct amounted to Gross Misconduct and the four cited standards had been breached.

Breach of standards

21. I was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the actions of PS Robins breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:
 - i) *Equality & Diversity: Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.* The language used and general content in relation to police colleagues and others' ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation clearly breached this standard. I noted messages sent by PS Robins, including (quotes not in sequential order): "have you seen the Japanese squad...fishheads", "Fuck them. 2 words: Burma railway", "I think it's just no alcohol, no pork, wear big rucksacks on the tube, shoe bombs on the train. And be nice to people a couple months of the year during ramjam and be a sanctimonious cunt the rest of the year.", "rugmuncher", "gay mafia", and "X's just popping out sprogs these days"

- ii) *Challenging & Reporting Improper Conduct: Police officers report, challenge or take action against the conduct of colleagues which has fallen below the Standards of Professional Behaviour.* PS Robins did not challenge [REDACTED] or report him in relation to the content of his messages.
- iii) *Authority, Respect & Courtesy: Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy. Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.* These messages show a failure in self-control and tolerance. This was not an acceptable response to the pressure he was under. Wishing further cancer on a colleague's husband and other examples lacks basic human courtesy and respect. I noted the following (quotes not in sequential order): "If I could get away with it, I'd kill them all", "I might kill [REDACTED] "I hate specials", "I really want to smash their heads in", "I was also thinking of sending her malcoms", "what can I Rightline her about? I hate her", "I'm still hoping [REDACTED] will die at some point", "no idea, but if I were to touch someone up, it wouldn't be [REDACTED] "Is that [REDACTED] a cunt?" and "hopefully her husband has more cancer".
- iv) *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.* This sort of talk with another officer is bound to denigrate PS Robins as an officer in the eyes of the public, but also through him to undermine the service as a whole.

Gross misconduct

50. I reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious as to justify dismissal. Applying that definition, I was satisfied that the breaches of the standards in this case were sufficiently serious to amount to gross misconduct.
51. In terms of seriousness, I considered PS Robins' culpability. I noted PS Robins and [REDACTED] engaged in messages of an offensive and derogatory nature for an extended period. I was provided with evidence of multiple messages of a nature amounting to gross misconduct over the course of almost a year. I considered PS

██████████ sent more of the messages, however, I was satisfied PS Robins also sent numerous messages of an offensive nature.

52. I considered PS Robins' position he just let ██████████ vent and did not engage with all he said, and did not challenge or report ██████████ for fear of the impact on ██████████ ██████████. However, I considered there were multiple examples where PS Robins wrote expressly offensive things himself and/or directly engaged and encouraged the same from ██████████
53. Under seriousness, I also considered harm. The language used and comments made were deeply offensive and hurtful. Speaking this way about anyone brings with it a risk of emotional harm to them personally but also a risk of significant harm to public confidence and the reputation of policing.

Findings on outcome

54. A copy of PS Robins' service record was provided by the Appropriate Authority.
55. Bundles of character ██████████ were provided by PS Robins.
56. I received the advice of the Legal Adviser to consider the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings. I was advised to adopt the 'three stage process' as outlined within the College of Policing Guidance, namely, to assess the seriousness of the misconduct; to keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions; and to consider the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.
57. I was also advised as to the wording of Regulation 62 of the Police Conduct Regulations 2020 (after amendment, this case incepted after the relevant date).

Decision on Outcome

58. Careful consideration was given to all of the documentary materials together with the submissions made by the Appropriate Authority and PS Robins, and advice provided by the Legal Adviser. In making my decision on outcome, I adopted the three-stage process, as outlined in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes.
59. *Seriousness*: I bore in mind that the first stage in determining the appropriate outcome 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.

60. *The purpose of the police misconduct regime*: The second stage requires me to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime. I reminded 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 to deter misconduct, and (iii) to protect the public. I further reminded 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.
61. *Appropriate Sanction*: The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils that purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.
62. I was advised of the dicta of Holroyde J at para 64 in R (on the application of Darren Williams) v Police Appeals Tribunal [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin):
“the purpose of the sanction is not primarily punitive, and often not punitive at all: the purpose is to maintain public confidence in and respect for the police service or the profession concerned. Personal mitigation which may provide a ground for reducing the punishment which would otherwise be imposed for a criminal offence cannot therefore have the same effect in disciplinary proceedings which have a different, and wholly or largely non-punitive, purpose. The second is that in criminal proceedings, a defendant’s personal mitigation may enable him to distinguish himself from others convicted of similar offences, and so to demonstrate that the normal punishment for his offence would be unduly severe in his case. In contrast, a defaulting police officer or professional person will usually be able to adduce evidence of good character and to point to very severe consequences if dismissed or excluded from his or her profession”.

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

63. **Culpability**: I noted PS Robins and ██████████ engaged in messages of an offensive and derogatory nature for an extended period. I had been provided with evidence of multiple messages of a nature amounting to gross misconduct over the course of almost a year. I considered ██████████ sent more of the messages, however I was satisfied PS Robins also sent numerous messages of an offensive nature.
64. I considered the position that PS Robins just let ██████████ vent and did not engage with all he said, and did not challenge or report ██████████ for fear of the impact on ██████████ ██████████. However, I considered there were multiple examples where PS Robins wrote expressly offensive things himself and/or directly engaged and encouraged the same from ██████████

65. I had in mind what is said about discrimination in the guidance on outcomes, 'discrimination towards persons on the basis of any protected characteristics is never acceptable and always serious'. I considered the protected characteristics engaged here are race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity.
66. I found culpability was high.
67. **Harm:** The language used and comments made were deeply offensive and hurtful. Speaking this way about colleagues brings with it a risk of emotional harm to them personally, but also to the reputation of policing. Public confidence would be severely undermined if the public were aware of the messages that had been sent and received by PS Robins.
68. I found harm was high.
69. **Aggravating Factors:** I did not identify any additional aggravating factors.
70. **Mitigating Factors:** I noted PS Robins' acceptance of his misconduct in his criminal caution interview, and in his responses to the AA before and at this hearing. [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
71. I noted PS Robins' personal mitigation [REDACTED] the volume and content of the character statements. but 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.
72. **Conclusion on Seriousness:** Taking all these matters into consideration, I assessed the seriousness of the conduct as high.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

73. I considered the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case. The police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers; it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole. It is to uphold standards and to ensure that the public is protected.
74. Protecting the public: members of the public would be rightly concerned about reporting matters and communicating with police officers who hold the attitudes communicated in these messages. It goes without saying the population of victims of

crime, suspects, and witnesses include the groups unacceptably slurred by PS Robins and [REDACTED]

75. Maintaining public confidence: This sort of language used and attitudes expressed seriously undermine public confidence in policing.

76. Upholding standards of behaviour: PS Robins' actions represent a serious and deliberate, ongoing departure from the expected standards of a serving police officer. A departure from the requisite standards of conduct requires an appropriate response to uphold standards of behaviour.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

77. I considered PS Robins' record of service, Regulation 54 Response [REDACTED] and character evidence, as well as the submissions of the AA and PS Robins.

78. I considered the wording of Regulation 62 which mandates dismissal unless exceptional circumstances apply.

79. I noted what was said about PS Robins by others [REDACTED] as mitigating. I was of the view there appear to be two sides to PS Robins: how he communicated to [REDACTED] in private, and how he presented to others at work/in public. In any event, I considered PS Robins' mitigation does not change the fact there has been a serious breach of the standards which requires a regulatory outcome that adequately meets that breach and restores confidence in the profession.

80. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] However, in December 2022 these proceedings were dismissed and PS Robins resumed duties, but the messaging persisted.

81. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

82. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

83. I was not satisfied there were exceptional circumstances that justify departing from dismissal.

84. Having considered the nature and seriousness of PS Robins' conduct together with the severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, I was satisfied that no lesser sanction than dismissal without notice would be appropriate. I considered no lesser sanction would meet the seriousness of the conduct and redeclare and uphold the standards of policing in the eyes of members of the public who would be appalled by the content of the Officer's messaging,

85. The sanction was dismissal without notice and the Appropriate Authority was directed to inform the College of Policing that PS Robins name should be recorded on the private police barred list.

[REDACTED]

Chairperson's signature: Commander Jason Prins

Date: 10 April 2026

Right of Appeal

A police officer has a right of appeal against any disciplinary finding and/or disciplinary outcome imposed at an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing held under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended). Notification of this right of appeal is provided in accordance with Regulation 63(2) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended).