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

CM/

BETWEEN:

THE COMISIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

The Appropriate Authority

-and-

DC Timothy Fory

The Officer Concerned

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

Officer concerned: DC Timothy Fory

Date of hearing: 9th October 2026

Name of person chairing: Former 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 DC Fory's conduct had fallen below the standards expected of a serving police officer such as to contravene the Standards of Professional Behaviour (Discreditable Conduct) and amount to gross misconduct. It was determined that DC Fory should be dismissed without notice.

Attendees

• DC Fory attended with his Federation Representative DC Simon Guy.
• The AA's case was presented by Molly Nairn
• I was assisted by a legally qualified adviser, Miss Elisabeth Acker.
(She confirmed her role was to advise as to the law and assist with drafting the Chair's decisions, but to take no part in decision making.)

Evidence and documentation

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

From the AA:

a) Special Case Certificate
b) Form 3355D – Allegations
c) Investigation report
d) Regulation 17 Notice – signed 20/09/2024
e) Certificate of Conviction
f) Community Order issued to DC Timothy Fory – dated 10/08/2026
g) CPS Orders – Restraining Order issued to DC Timothy Fory – dated 10/08/2026
h) Notice of Financial Penalty issued to DC Timothy Fory – dated 10/08/2026
i) MG11 of DC Hollie Jenkins – Statement of AMH Suitability – dated 10/07/2026

From or on behalf of DC Fory:

(a) Regulation 54 response completed by DC Fory, signed and dated 29th September 2026

Allegations

3. The allegations against DC Fory were as follows:

"On 10 July 2026, at City of London Magistrates' Court you were convicted of the Criminal Offence of stalking, contrary to section 2A of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

On 10 August 2026, at Westminster Magistrates Court, you were sentenced to a Community Order consisting of 150 hours of unpaid work, 15 days of rehabilitation activity and to pay victim surcharge and costs totalling £889.

The court imposed a restraining order to last until 10 August 2031 preventing you from contacting the victim directly or indirectly by any means.

Particulars

Between 15/07/2024 and 09/09/2024 you pursued a course of conduct which amounted to the stalking of Ms A and which you knew or ought to have known amounted to the harassment of her in that you persistently contacted Ms A over social media platforms, physically followed Ms A at a social event, found Ms A's ex-partner on Instagram and sent him a malicious message

Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that your actions breached 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 and 2025, namely:

1. Discreditable conduct

In that you behaved in a manner likely to bring discredit upon the police service and undermine public confidence. As a result of that stated herein, if proven, your conduct amounts to gross misconduct and your dismissal may be justified."

Preliminary matters

Public proceedings:

4. I confirmed that in advance of the proceedings, I was supplied with the hearing documents in accordance with Regulation 56 of the Police Conduct Regulations 2020 (as amended) and determined that the hearing ought to be held in Public.

Advice on facts and gross misconduct

5. Regulation 61 does not separately address deciding on the facts of the allegation and deciding on whether those facts found amount to misconduct.[1]
6. It is matter of natural justice that the chair must first decide whether they are satisfied of the facts. The standard of proof is the civil standard. The burden of proof rests with the AA. DC Fory's acceptance of the facts in this case is something I may have in mind.

[1] *61(15) The person conducting or chairing the accelerated misconduct hearing must review the facts of the case and decide whether or not the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to gross misconduct.*

7. I was advised that at the outset of the hearing I must give the officer the opportunity to confirm whether they accepted gross misconduct.[2] DC Fory accepted the allegation, the breach of the professional standard of discreditable conduct, and that this amounted to gross misconduct.
8. I was advised that no finding could be made that the alleged conduct amounted to gross misconduct unless I was either satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this was the case or the officer admitted it was the case, per Regulation 61(16). [3]

Background

9. DC Fory joined the Metropolitan Police Service on 27th April 2020 until his suspension on 7th February 2025 after being charged with the offence that is the subject of these proceedings.
10. At Westminster Magistrates' Court on 10th July 2026 he was convicted (after trial) of stalking. Upon conviction a restraining order was imposed. On 10th August 2026 he was sentenced to a community order.

Findings of fact

11. I had sight of the certificate of conviction. I also bore in mind that DC Fory accepted the conviction in his Regulation 54 response.
12. I found the factual particulars of the allegation proven: *"On 10 July 2026, at City of London Magistrates' Court you were convicted of the Criminal Offence of stalking, contrary to section 2A of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997. On 10 August 2026, at Westminster Magistrates Court, you were sentenced to a Community Order consisting of 150 hours of unpaid work, 15 days of rehabilitation activity and to pay victim surcharge and costs totalling £889. The court imposed a restraining order to last until from contacting the victim directly or indirectly by any means."*

---

[2] *(5) At the beginning of the accelerated misconduct hearing, the person conducting or chairing the accelerated misconduct hearing must give the officer the opportunity to say whether or not the officer accepts that the officer's conduct amounts to gross misconduct.*

[3] *(16) The person conducting or chairing the accelerated misconduct hearing must not find that the conduct of the officer concerned amounts to gross misconduct unless—*

(a)they are satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this is the case, or

(b)the officer admits it is the case.

Breach of standards

13. I was satisfied the actions of DC Fory breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour (Discreditable Conduct).
14. For a police office to commit a criminal offence and be charged, investigated and then convicted after trial, all while a serving officer, is clearly discreditable to the police and likely to undermine public confidence in the service.

Gross misconduct

15. I was reminded "*"gross misconduct" means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal, and for the purposes of these Regulations conduct which has resulted in conviction of an indictable-only offence is to be taken to constitute such a breach"*
16. I was advised harassment is not an indictable only offence, so I had a discretion as to whether the DC Fory's conviction amounted to gross misconduct. The decision for me was whether the breach was so serious as to justify dismissal – if it did it was gross misconduct, if it did not it was not.
17. In terms of seriousness, I considered DC Fory's culpability. I noted DC Fory had harassed his victim over a period, from 15th July to 9th September 2024. DC Fory's criminal conduct was not an isolated incident – he persistently contacted the victim on social media, physically followed her at a social event, and sent malicious messages to her ex-partner on social media. He did so when he knew or ought to have known his contact was unwanted. These actions were intentional, deliberate, and targeted.
18. An officer convicted of a criminal offence is an especially serious type of misconduct.
19. This was a criminal offence against a female who was his ex-partner, and therefore this criminal offence amounts to abuse that engages para 4.60 of the Guidance (regarding violence / abuse against women and girls).
20. I consider culpability to be high.
21. Under seriousness, I also considered harm. The most serious harm here is to the victim of harassment. I bore in mind the victim had reported DC Fory's conduct and attended trial. I also note that DC Fory's criminal conduct encompassed her ex-partner as well.
22. There is also damage to public confidence and reputational harm to the police service in a serving officer engaging in criminal behaviour, here behaviour against a former

partner made to feel unsafe. Violence and abuse against women and girls by male police officers is of particular local and national concern.

23. I consider harm to be high.
24. I am satisfied the actions of DC Fory amount to gross misconduct.

Findings on outcome

25. A copy of DC Fory's service record was provided by the Appropriate Authority.
26. 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 have in mind 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.
27. I was also advised as to the wording of Regulation 62 of the Police Conduct Regulations 2020 (as amended).

The Chair's Decision on Outcome

28. Careful consideration was given to all of the documentary materials together with the submissions made by the Appropriate Authority, submissions made on behalf of the officer, 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.
29. *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.
30. *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.

31. *Appropriate Sanction*: 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

32. ***Culpability***: as above, I considered DC Fory's culpability.
33. ***Harm***: as above, I considered the harm.
34. ***Aggravating Factors***: None
35. ***Mitigating Factors***: DC Fory now accepts his conduct and that it amounts to gross misconduct and shows remorse.
36. **Conclusion on Seriousness**: Taking all these matters into consideration, I assess the seriousness of the conduct as high. DC Fory's behaviour was harmful to his victim and criminal, it was not an isolated incident. The reputational damage and impact upon public confidence of police of officers committing crimes is self-evidently very high.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

37. 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.
38. Protecting the public: harm was caused to the victim of DC Fory's harassment.
39. Maintaining public confidence: criminal conduct by serving officers especially of this nature is highly likely to damage public confidence in the police.
40. Upholding standards of behaviour: DC Fory's criminal conduct seriously departs from the expected standards. A departure from the requisite standards of conduct requires an appropriate response to uphold standards of behaviour.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

41. I considered the officer's record of service.
42. I considered the wording of Regulation 62 (as amended) that makes clear that in a case where gross misconduct has already been established, unless the decision maker is satisfied that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a different outcome, a sanction of dismissal without notice is required.

43. Having considered this case carefully, I was unable to identify any exceptional circumstances to justify a different outcome. My decision therefore is that DC Fory's dismissal without notice is the only viable option in his case.
44. In any event, having considered the nature and seriousness of DC Fory's conduct together with the severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, I am satisfied that no lesser sanction than dismissal would be appropriate.
45. The Appropriate Authority is directed to inform the College of Policing that DC Fory's name should be recorded on the police barred list.

Decision on Publication

46. Having further considered the submissions on publication from the AA, it is further directed that this decision shall be published in accordance with Regulation 63(5) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended).

Chairperson's signature: Former Commander Jason Prins

Date: 15 October 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).