Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: DC Mike (Mandeep) Dari

Warrant No: P223886

Date of Hearing: 3rd November 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Orders and Instructions, Integrity, Duties and Responsibilities

Findings

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started, including the Lawful Business Monitoring (LBM) audit report and the full extract of the communications.

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.

DC Dari attended the hearing and was supported by his federation representative, PC Mark Scrutton. DC Dari provided a Regulation 54 response.

The AA was represented by Case Manager, Gurpajan Singh. I am satisfied DC Dari has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

The Allegation

Allegation 1

It is alleged that, between 12 March 2026 and 27 March 2026, whilst serving as a police officer, you used a Metropolitan Police Service-issued mobile device for non-policing purposes by engaging in personal and/or inappropriate text message exchanges with a member of the public.

Those communications were identified during a Lawful Business Monitoring (LBM) audit, and your use of the device was contrary to the Metropolitan Police Service Use of Met ICT Systems Policy and the Smartphones – Conditions of Use Policy.

Allegation 2

It is further alleged that you misused your position as a police officer by engaging in personal communications with Female A, the daughter of Male A, a suspect in a criminal investigation in which you had an operational involvement. It is alleged that your communications with Female A were inappropriate and served no legitimate policing purpose.

Particulars:

a. You were the Officer in the Case (OIC) for a criminal investigation involving Male A, who was under investigation in connection with alleged drugs and firearms offences.

b. A Lawful Business Monitoring (LBM) audit identified that you had exchanged messages with Female A, the daughter of Male A, using your Metropolitan Police Service-issued mobile device. The audit reviewed communications sent between 1 October 2025 and 31 March 2026.

c. The audit identified that, between 12 March 2026 and 27 March 2026, you exchanged a series of messages with Female A, the content and nature of which were personal, inappropriate and suggestive of a relationship developing beyond a professional context.

d. The messages exchanged conveyed a mutual personal interest and a willingness to pursue a romantic relationship had circumstances permitted.

e. The exchange included telephone calls and arrangements to speak over the phone.

f. Throughout the exchange, you continued to engage in the communications and did not take any meaningful steps to bring them to an end. You did not seek supervisory guidance or report the developing personal relationship to a supervisor or line manager.

g. By engaging in, and seeking to develop, a personal relationship with Female A, you failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries expected of a police officer.

h. By engaging in personal communications with the daughter of an individual connected to an investigation for which you were the OIC, you placed yourself in a position where your personal interests had the potential to conflict with your professional duties.

i. Your conduct created, or had the potential to create, a perception that your professional judgment, impartiality and integrity could be influenced by that personal relationship.

j. Throughout the exchange, you continued to engage in the communications and did not take any meaningful steps to bring them to an end. You did not seek supervisory guidance or disclose the developing personal contact to a supervisor or line manager.

Professional Standards of Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends the conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour under Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024), namely:

i) Discreditable Conduct

ii) Orders and Instructions

iii) Integrity

iv) Duties and Responsibilities

In that the 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 dismissal may be justified.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Ms Singh and the submissions on behalf of DC Dari by PC Scrutton.

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 DC Dari. I set out the relevant facts below.

DC Dari is an officer of 20 years' service. He was the OIC of an investigation into Male A, who was arrested for possession with intent to supply Class A drugs and possession of firearms offences. Female A is Male A's daughter.

An LBM audit covering the period the 1st October 2025 to the 31st March 2026 identified that DC Dari had been communicating, via his MPS-issued mobile device, with a number linked to Female A. The contact arose from a legitimate policing purpose, namely the location and return of property belonging to Female A's family seized during the investigation.

Between the 12th March 2026 and 27th March 2026, the exchanges moved beyond that purpose. Female A sent messages expressing a personal and, at times, sexual interest in DC Dari, including "I'm not playing. I'd like to know you" and "I find you attractive, and I was basically expressing that" (12th March 2026). DC Dari responded, "No need to be sorry, possible to drop off the phone to you on Monday in person and I can explain?", "I appreciate your honesty", "I would have preferred a face to face chat" and "No need to feel silly, I would like to see you and have a chat."

On the 16th March 2026, DC Dari wrote, "I don't feel comfortable with this conversation. Best to keep it professional really." Later that evening, at 22:40, Female A asked whether he wanted to have sex with her. The LBM audit records DC Dari stating he would call her, and two calls followed, after which he sent, "As stated, let keep it professional. Thanks for understanding." He then wrote, "Not a question of liking someone. Have to remain professional. That's all."

On the 26th March 2026, after three days' absence, DC Dari initiated contact, asking twice, "What did you delete?" In response to Female A stating, "You like that I'm

interested in you…", DC Dari replied, "That is not the case. If different situation I would 100% Be interested." He went on to ask, "Can we speak again?", clarified "I meant in person", and wrote, "Only so much I can say on here" and "We'll meet again I'm sure." He asked Female A, "When is your brothers sentencing?", adding "Just thinking ahead." He asked about her gym and work schedule, asked her to "Delete those messages pls", stated "This is a work phone", and asked, "Do you live with your family?" When Female A asked, "Why are you scared?", he replied "Yes of where it's going", and later, "Shall I call you now". When Female A made a sexually explicit remark, DC Dari responded, "Not appropriate!" and twice, "Appropriate on here."

There is no evidence that DC Dari reported the contact to a supervisor or line manager at any stage. DC Dari did not provide a response to the Regulation 17 notice served on the 4th August 2026.

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether they amount to a 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.
>
> **Orders and Instructions** – Police officers only give and carry out lawful orders and instructions. Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders.
>
> **Integrity** – Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.
>
> **Duties and Responsibilities** – Police officers are diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities.

Officer's position

DC Dari has provided a response under Regulation 54 and in large adopted that response in his evidence in chief, expanding on the background of his interactions with Female A.

In his Regulation 54 response, DC Dari admits misconduct, but not gross misconduct. He acknowledges that his handling of the communications fell below the standards expected of a police officer.

DC Dari states that the contact arose entirely from a legitimate policing purpose, namely the return of property, which had been stored at various locations and in some instances had not been logged on the property system. He states that he did not initiate the personal conversations and had no intention of pursuing a romantic or sexual relationship. He relies on the messages in which he sought to redirect the conversation, such as "Best to keep it professional really", "Have to remain

professional” and “Not appropriate!”, and submits that there is not one flirtatious message on his part.

DC Dari explains that he continued the contact because he perceived Female A’s behaviour to be erratic and was concerned that ending the contact abruptly might escalate matters or lead to a complaint regarding the property. He states that his comment “If different situation I would 100% Be interested” was intended to let her down politely by reference to his being happily married. He states that, in respect of meeting face to face, he intended to take a witnessing officer. He states that “This is a work phone” and “Appropriate on here” were intended to convey the seriousness of the situation, not that the conversation should continue on another platform, and that he did not delete the chat.

DC Dari highlights a screenshot which he provided, that he avers shows that Female A deleted multiple messages, which demonstrates that his role as OIC had finished and he had seized engaging with her.

DC Dari asked Female A to delete messages that made unwarranted accusations and he did not want them on his work phone.

DC Dari maintains the sole purpose of engaging with her was to return property.

DC Dari accepts that he exercised poor judgement, that he should have reported the matter to his supervisor at the earliest opportunity, limited communication strictly to the policing purpose and brought the contact to an end much sooner.

In line with Regulation 61(7) and Regulation 61(8), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority and from those representing DC Dari.

Decision on Finding

I have applied Regulation 61(15) and carefully listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary evidence provided to me. I have also carefully considered the evidence of DC Dari, his Regulation 54 response, and the representations made on his behalf.

The content of the messages is not in dispute. The LBM audit amounts to incontrovertible evidence of what was said. The issue for me is the proper characterisation of DC Dari’s conduct.

I accept that the contact began for a legitimate policing purpose and that Female A initiated and drove the majority of the romantic and sexual content. I also accept that there are messages in which DC Dari sought to redirect the conversation. I take those matters into account. However, I do not accept DC Dari’s account that his engagement was confined to managing a difficult interaction and letting Female A down politely. In my view, that account is not borne out by the messages as a whole.

On the 12th March 2026, after Female A expressed that she found him attractive, DC Dari did not end the personal exchange. He proposed meeting her in person to “explain”, told her he appreciated her honesty, and stated, “I would like to see you

and have a chat", at a time when arrangements for the property had already been made through her father. On the 26th March 2026, it was DC Dari who resumed contact and pressed Female A as to what she had deleted. He told her that in a different situation he "would 100%" be interested, asked to speak again in person, and stated, "We'll meet again I'm sure." None of these messages served any policing purpose.

I do not accept that the comment "If different situation I would 100% Be interested" can be read as a polite rejection. On its plain meaning, it conveys a reciprocated personal interest constrained only by circumstance. Similarly, the messages "Only so much I can say on here", "This is a work phone", "Appropriate on here" and his request that Female A delete messages give the clear impression that DC Dari's concern was the forum and the record of the conversation, rather than the nature of the conversation itself. I note DC Dari's explanation that he did not delete the chat, but that does not answer why he asked Female A to delete messages.

Whilst the content of the telephone calls remains unknown, I note that on the 16th March 2026 a sexually explicit message was followed by DC Dari stating he would call Female A. I do not draw any conclusion as to the content of any calls, if they were made at all. However, the choice suggesting a move to telephone contact at that point, rather than terminating the contact and reporting it, is inconsistent with an officer seeking to maintain professional boundaries.

Of particular concern is DC Dari's question, "When is your brothers sentencing?", followed by "Just thinking ahead", in the midst of an exchange of a personal nature with a family member of a suspect in his investigation. Whatever DC Dari's intention, it illustrates precisely the blurring of his professional role and his personal interest which the allegation describes.

I have considered DC Dari's account that he intended to take a witnessing officer to any face-to-face meeting. There is no reference to this in the messages. In any event, DC Dari did not record, report or seek supervisory advice about the contact at any stage. DC Dari is an officer of 20 years' experience who had been acting up as a Detective Sergeant managing his own team. He would have been well aware of the need to declare such contact and the risk it posed to the integrity of his investigation.

In respect of Allegation 1, the MPS Smartphone – Conditions of Use provides that personal use is strictly limited as described in the Use of ICT Systems Policy. Section 4 of that policy makes clear that personal use is a concession, not a right, and that MPS telephony should only be used for primary policing purposes. DC Dari's exchanges with Female A, beyond the arrangements for the return of property, were personal communications with no policing purpose. DC Dari accepted that he was aware that "everything in the job is monitored". I find Allegation 1 proven.

In respect of Allegation 2, I am satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that DC Dari engaged in and sought to continue personal communications with Female A, a person related to a suspect in an investigation for which he was the OIC, that those

communications were inappropriate and served no legitimate policing purpose, and that he did not take meaningful steps to bring them to an end or report them. In doing so, he placed himself in a position where his personal interests had the potential to conflict with his professional duties. Taking into account the submissions from both parties and all of the above, I find Allegation 2 proven.

Breach of Professional Standards

In line with Regulation 61(16), I bear in mind that the burden of proving a Breach of Standards rests upon the Appropriate Authority and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden and the conduct did breach the standards of professional behaviour as to:

i) **Discreditable Conduct**, in that a police officer engaging in personal communications of this nature with a family member of a suspect in his own investigation would discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it.

ii) **Orders and Instructions**, in that DC Dari used his MPS-issued device for non-policing purposes, contrary to the Use of Met ICT Systems Policy and the Smartphone – Conditions of Use.

iii) **Integrity**, in that DC Dari compromised his position as OIC by engaging in, and seeking to continue, a personal relationship with Female A, creating a real risk that his impartiality and professional judgement could be called into question.

iv) **Duties and Responsibilities**, in that DC Dari failed to report the contact, seek supervisory guidance or bring the communication to an end, and put his personal interests above his responsibilities as an investigating officer.

Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make an assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors. I have carefully considered the submissions on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and the representations on behalf of DC Dari during the course of this hearing.

Culpability is high – DC Dari was responsible for his own actions. Whilst he did not initiate the personal content, his continued engagement was deliberate and sustained over a period of over two weeks. He resumed contact himself on the 26th March 2026, he expressed a conditional interest in Female A, sought to meet her in person and moved the communication to telephone calls. He was aware that the communications presented a professional risk, as is clear from his own messages, yet he chose not to report them. He was the OIC and an experienced officer.

Harm is high – The conduct created a real risk to the integrity of a criminal investigation into serious drugs and firearms offences, and potentially to related

criminal proceedings. In my view, it also causes serious harm to the reputation of the police service. DC Dari's conduct 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 higher standards over the last few years following highly publicised and damaging incidents.

Aggravating features – I am mindful not to double count or take into consideration any factors that have already featured in my determination of culpability and harm. I do record as an aggravating feature the failure to comply with force policy and the failure to seek advice or raise concerns with a senior officer.

Mitigating features – I take into account that the contact arose from a legitimate policing purpose, that Female A initiated and drove the majority of the romantic and sexual content, that DC Dari did not send sexual messages himself, and that on several occasions he sought to redirect the conversation. I also take into account his partial admission and the reflection set out in his Regulation 54 response, although in my view his insight into the nature of his own messages is limited.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious to justify dismissal. I have considered DC Dari's admission that his conduct amounts to misconduct only. Applying that definition and in line with Regulation 61(15), I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards do amou nt to gross misconduct.

Following my findings, I have gone on to carry out another full assessment of seriousness (as per the assessment above).

Personal mitigation

I have been provided with personal mitigation on behalf of DC Dari, in particular his 20 years' service, his work at gangs and organised crime, MIT and Trident, his period acting as a Detective Sergeant, his passing of the Sergeants' exam, and the difficult family circumstances he describes, including the loss of his father and the health of his children. I have also carefully considered the five-character references provided.

However, 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.

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 Regulation 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 in the form of the LBM audit. I have carefully assessed the seriousness of the conduct and the mitigation advanced, as set out above, and I do not find any exceptional circumstances. Therefore, 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, the sanction I impose is dismissal without notice and the officer should be placed on the College of Policing’s barred list.

Deputy Assistant Commissioner Carl Galvin

Metropolitan Police Service

3rd November 2026