Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020

Regulation 43 Outcome of Police Misconduct Hearing
In the matter of :
PC Alan PAGE
(Metropolitan Police Service P238042)

Panel: Ms Katie Lilburn (chair), Mr Adam Williamson, Mr Steven Hearn
Legally Qualified Advisor ("LQA"): Remi Alabi
Hearing: Public hearing held on 20 - 22 October 2026
Appropriate Authority ("AA"): represented by Mr Rupert Beloff, Counsel
Officer: in attendance and represented by Federation Representative PC Barry Edwards

OUTCOME: The allegations of gross misconduct were proved, and the Officer was dismissed without notice.

A: The Allegations

1. It is alleged that PC Alan Page sent numerous inappropriate sexual and harassing messages and photographs to female colleagues including:
    a. To Officer B in or about 2020
    b. To Officer A in or about 2023 to 2025, who was vulnerable and trusted him believing him to be a welfare support officer on the team.

2. The Appropriate Authority alleges that by reason of the matters above, either individually or collectively, PC Page's behaviour does not meet the standards required in the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, specifically in respect of the following standards:

    i. Discreditable Conduct
    ii. Authority Respect and Courtesy

3. As a result of PC Page's behaviour as set out above, his conduct singularly or in its totality amounts to gross misconduct in that they are so serious as to justify dismissal.

B: The Hearing

The misconduct hearing was heard over 3 days; from 20th to 22 October 2026. It was heard in public and in person at the Empress State Building, Lille Road West Brompton, London SW6 1TR.

1. The Panel consisted of Former Police Commander Katie Lilburn as Chair, Mr Adam Williamson and Mr Steven Hearn as Independent Panel Members. Mrs Remi Alabi sat as the Legally Qualified Advisor (LQA). PC Page (the Officer) was present. He was represented by a Federation Representative (the Federation); PC Barry Edwards. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by counsel; Mr Rupert Beloff.

2. The live witnesses had been granted anonymity at the case management stage and are referred as Officers A, B and C.

3. There were no preliminary matters.

4. The allegation was put to the Officer and he denied it in its entirety, save that he admitted his interactions with Officer B breached the standard of discreditable conduct, but contended that his behaviour amounted to misconduct, but not gross misconduct.

C: Background to the Allegation

5. At the time of the incidences, the Officer, and Officers A, B and C were members on the Emergency Response Team C at Bromley. Officers A and B are the complainants, albeit they officially reported the alleged conduct after being approached by a line manager.

6. Officer B initially saw the Officer as a work colleague and friend having worked with him for a number of years. She reported that she had a good working professional relationship with the Officer and they would have a laugh and a joke from time to time.

7. During the COVID-19 lockdown period the team were isolating. Officer B and the Officer were assigned to work remotely via Teams to manage mispers (missing people enquiries). Officer B reported that the Officer's first opening written message on a Teams chat channel to her was "*HEY SEXY BUM*" and her response was something along the lines of "*ALAN REALLY? SEXY BUM PLEASE DON'T*".

8. Officer B reports that the Officer had previously sent her an inappropriate message which she no longer has. In respect of the previous messages, she told him something along the lines of not to contact her unless it was work related. The Officer subsequently apologised.

9. Officer B remembered that one of such messages was a personal radio call during which the Officer asked her what underwear she was wearing. She immediately terminated the call.

10. Officer B felt disappointed, frustrated and concerned about the Officer's behaviour.

11. Officer B disclosed the incidence to a fellow member of the team, Officer C, around the time it occurred sharing a screenshot of the Team channel comment and a WhatsApp message she had received from the Officer. Officer B later reported the matter to Inspector Jones when she was approached directly about whether the Officer had ever sent her inappropriate messages. Notwithstanding she considered the messages inappropriate, Officer B thought she had personally dealt with the issues directly with the Officer.

12. Officer A reported that shortly after she joined the team as a new probationer, whilst still unfamiliar with the Officer, she received a recommended friend suggestions on her Instagram page. In response, she sent the Officer (along with other team members) a friend request. The Officer initially declined the invitation, saying to her he can't have female friends as he would be questioned by his partner. Officer A said a short time later, she was sent a message by the Officer – totally out of the blue - that was sexual

in nature. She cannot remember the exact contents of that message but recalled it was sexual and it made her feel uncomfortable and she immediately deleted the message.

13. Following this, Officer A and the Officer did not have much contact until late in 2023. She believed that the Officer was the Welfare Support Officer on the team which meant that he was there to help members of the team

14. Officer A confided in him about her personal work struggles and asked him for guidance on how to improve. He provided guidance. Officer A's confidence in the Officer grew over time during which she told him about her personal domestic relationship struggles with her past and present partner and her family.

15. The Officer was initially encouraging but this progressed from friendly to sexual messages. The message included asking what she was wearing and whether she wanted to have some fun.

16. At first Officer A was taken aback by the Officer's sexual messages which she ignored and deleted. She did not challenge the Officer or disclose the messages to anyone.

17. The messages would stop only to resume after a few weeks and increasing in sexualised intensity. Officer A continued to ignore the sexualised messages but would send occasional neutral responses.

18. Officer A recalls that once whist at work, the Officer told her he was in the men's toilet masturbating and asked her to help him "get off". On another occasion, after his shift whist using the disabled shower (which was near the female changing room) he asked her to join him in the shower or come to his changing room. She said no on all occasions.

19. Officer A felt awkward working with the Officer especially as he acted like nothing was happening during work shifts. She did ask him once why he would act like nothing happened and he said that he was more confident through a screen than face to face.

20. During one conversation the Officer told Officer A that he was having relationship problems, **[REDACTED]** and that he had always been addicted to sex and had a high sex drive, along with needing to feel wanted.

21. In response, Officer A would occasionally ask him how things were at home, he would go into more detail and she would try to help by telling him to speak to his partner about the issues.

22. The Officer's sexualised requests like asking her to send him pictures of her playing with herself persisted. She would politely refuse but the requests made her very uncomfortable.

23. Mid 2024, Officer A's personal relationship struggles worsened and at this point she started responding the Officer's messages telling him what he wanted to hear. She at first ignored his requests to send him sexualised pictures of her but later gave in.

24. Officer A sent the Officer a few nude pictures of herself on a timer so they could only be seen once and then would be automatically deleted. In evidence she said that she

had sent them of her own free will but felt compelled as he was so persistent and relentless.

25. Officer A told the Officer that she wanted the messages to stop but he threatened her by saying he had stuff on her. She started to panic at this stage, but due to previous relationship issues, she felt stuck and compelled to please him to prevent the messages and images leaking to others.

26. On 08 January 2025 Officer A received a message from the Officer's partner (out of the blue). The message had a photo of three children saying "You are a mum do you have no shame! I hope you can look into the face of my children knowing you have destroyed their family and taken away from them the person they love the most"

27. On 09 January 2025, the Officer's partner also sent a message to Officer A's partner (Officer C) suggesting that Officer A was having an affair with the Officer.

28. Later that month, the Officer was signed off sick from work due to stress relating to the breakdown of his relationship with his partner.

29. Officer A was in fear, confused, low in spirit and was eventually signed off work due to depression by her GP.

30. On 19 February 2025, the Officer disclosed to his line manager PS Barnes that his partner had found messages on his phone which he had sent to two females. The Officer told PS Barnes that one of these females was Officer A. The DPS then approached Officers A and C, where the disclosures were then made.

31. An investigation was started during which Inspector Jones spoke to Officer B to enquire whether the Officer had ever sent her messages. It was at this stage that Officer B disclosed the inappropriate messages she had also received from the Officer to Inspector Jones.

32. During the investigation, the Officer was interviewed. He provided a a written statement denying taking advantage of Officer A. He said their messages were consensual. He denied initiating the sexual content or asking Officer A to assist him whilst masturbating at work.

33. In relation to Officer B, he maintained that they had a jokey friendly relationship at work and the MS Teams message (*Sexy bum comment*) was sent within that context.

34. He also denied ever sending any sexual messages to any other females.

D: The Evidence

35. Prior to the Hearing, the Panel received a 93 paged Misconduct Hearing bundle of documentary evidence which included
    - The reg 30 Notice of allegations
    - The police investigation report
    - The Reg 17 notice
    - The Officer's response to the Reg 17 Notice

- A statements from Officer A dated 16 July 2025
- A statement from Officer B dated 09 August 2025 together with exhibited messages
- A statement from Officer C dated 20 June 2025
- A statement from DC Skelton dated 13 August 2025 exhibiting screenshots of messages referred to by Officer C in her statement and instagram conversations between officer A, Officer C and the Officer's partner.
- Various emails
- A transcript of the office's misconduct interview and
- The office's regulation 31 response

33. In addition to the written evidence mentioned above, the Panel also heard oral evidence from Officer's A, B, C and the Officer.

34. The AA opened its case and called Officers A B and C who gave live evidence.

E: Oral Evidence of Officer A

35. Officer A gave evidence behind screens and adopted her witness statement dated 16.07.25 as her evidence in chief.

36. She further explained that she first met the Officer in 2021 when she joined the team. Shortly afterwards, she sent him a friend request on Instagram, which he declined, explaining that his partner did not want him to have female friends on social media. Officer A accepted this.

37. Officer A went on to explain that she had received one random sexualised message from the Officer shortly after the declined Instagram invite, which she immediately deleted. She said she did nothing about this, including not telling anyone, despite feeling uncomfortable about it.

38. In explaining how she felt about this first sexualised message received via Instagram in 2021, Officer A explained that she was shocked. It was received while at home with her then partner. She said she had deleted it and could not recall its exact wording or say whether it had been intentionally directed at her.

39. Officer A stated that she had limited contact with the Officer after the first sexualised message until 2023 when they were both back working on the same Emergency Response Team. By that stage, she regarded him as a supportive colleague and mentor, particularly because he assisted her with work-related matters and he occasionally acted up as the Team "Skipper". She understood the Officer to be the team welfare officer and felt comfortable approaching him for professional guidance and trusted him as an experienced member of the team

40. She recalled that sometime in 2023, they were partnered together on a shift. After attending an operational incident, as they were sat in a police vehicle together, she confided in him about personal and professional difficulties because she felt that she could trust him. At that stage, apart from an isolated sexualised message in 2021, she had received no other sexualised communication from the Officer.

41. She recalled receiving no further sexualised messages until approximately the end of 2023, when the communications resumed via WhatsApp and continued for around a year. The messages were sporadic but were at times persistent if she did not respond.

42. Officer A explained that, following their discussions about her personal and work-related difficulties, the Officer began sending her casual WhatsApp messages, initially asking about her well-being and family. These communications subsequently developed into sexual messages concerning her clothing and his sexual fantasies.

43. Officer A initially regarded the sexual messages as inappropriate and told the Officer so. She stated that she, however, began responding in a similar sexual manner around mid-2024, during a period when her personal circumstances and mental health were deteriorating. Although she acknowledged participating in the exchanges, she explained that she did not want the Officer to communicate with her in this manner but felt compelled to respond. She hoped that replying to his messages in a like manner would cause the messages to stop, but they continued. She also described being triggered by comments such as "*I know you don't want to rep*ly", which reminded her of previous abusive relationships that had undermined her confidence. She accepted, however, that the Officer never physically forced her to respond and that she had not experienced him behaving threateningly towards her.

44. Officer A stated that she panicked when the Officer told her that he had "stuff on" her, which she understood as a reference to their messages. She explained that this made her feel even more compelled to respond to the messages because she feared the consequences of not doing so. She explained the Officer had previously reassured her by telling her not to worry about the messages between them because he had a partner and that nobody would discover the messages.

45. Officer A said that she deleted the communications because she felt ashamed. She did not report the situation at the time because she was embarrassed and had previously felt targeted and unsupported by workplace supervisors. She maintained that, although some earlier general conversations had been consensual, her later sexual responses were influenced by her vulnerable circumstances and the pressure she perceived from the Officer.

46. Officer A explained that the difficulties she experienced with her workplace supervisors arose from her relationship with Officer C, with whom she had been in a relationship since approximately the end of 2023. She explained that supervisors had wrongly accused her of being in a relationship with Officer C when she and C were initially just friends and she was married to someone else. Officer A said she felt that she had been treated unfairly and pressured into disclosing her sexuality while she was still coming to terms with it. These experiences left her feeling unsupported, victimised and isolated at work. Her mental health subsequently deteriorated, and she struggled to manage the situation. She stated that the Officer had provided support during this period, which contributed to her trust in him.

47. She stated that she disclosed her involvement with the Officer to her partner Officer C (after his partner had contacted both herself and Officer C via Instagram) who was upset and distraught. This disclosure affected their relationship, and they briefly separated for approximately two days before reconciling.

48. During cross-examination, Officer A acknowledged that she had been in a relationship with Officer C during her involvement with the Officer and after she had received a message from the Officer's partner. Officer A said she was concerned that after Officer

C found out, she would confront the Officer. She was initially uncertain whether Officer C had also been contacted by the Officer's partner.

49. Officer A reiterated that she had been shocked by the initial sexualised communications and had not wanted them to continue. She also accepted that the Officer had helped her through her difficulties and had generally remained professional at work, behaving as though nothing was happening between them. She also accepted that there had been no suggestion from the Officer that they should meet to engage in any sexual activity, and even when they travelled home alone in the same vehicle, the messages were not discussed.

50. Regarding an incident noted in her written statement, Officer A described this as an isolated incident in which, while on duty, the Officer messaged her asking her to help him "get off". With regards to the masturbation in the shower messages, she said she did not respond or take any action, even though the incident had surprised her.

51. In response to questions from the panel, Officer A clarified the chronology of the communications, distinguishing the isolated Instagram message in 2021 from the subsequent period of sexualised WhatsApp messages beginning around 2023. She explained that the later communications developed after she had confided in the Officer and viewed him as a trusted work mentor. She confirmed that they were not Instagram friends but had each other's personal WhatsApp numbers through exchanging numbers at work.

52. She also explained that the shower-related incident occurred while they were on duty, when colleagues were attempting to contact the Officer by radio and he was not responding. The Officer then messaged her requesting assistance to "get himself off".

53. Finally, she accepted that they had worked together during the Notting Hill Carnival and believed that the team had informally paired themselves with colleagues, she believed that on that occasion, the Officer had paired with another officer rather than with her.

54. Overall, she described a progression from professional trust to unwanted sexualised communications, followed by her sexual participation that she attributed to vulnerability, shame and perceived pressure, while acknowledging the absence of physical force or explicit threats.

F: Oral Evidence of Officer B.

55. Officer B gave evidence behind screens and adopted her witness statement dated 9 August 2025, together with her exhibit of Teams messages and WhatsApp messages as evidence-in-chief. She stated that during the COVID-19 period, around 2020, she received several inappropriate sexualised messages from the Officer. She expressly told him to stop and made clear that the messages were inappropriate and unwelcome.

56. Officer B further described an incident in which the Officer privately called her (using the private dial mode) on a work radio when she was on duty and in the police constables' writing room where other officers were present. During that call, he asked her what underwear she was wearing. She remembered that she immediately ended the call. She said that she knew the other officers in the room heard, as it provoked an

eye rolling response from them, accompanied with the response ‘for goodness sake when he is going to learn’.

57. She explained that this incident was particularly significant because it followed earlier inappropriate communications and contributed to her frustration with his behaviour.

58. Officer B had known the Officer as a member of her team for some time before receiving the messages. She believed the radio message described was not the first inappropriate communication she had received from him. Despite these incidents, she tried to maintain a professional working relationship with him. She stated that the Officer should have understood that his conduct was unwelcome because she had repeatedly objected to it, was openly a lesbian, and had a wife which was well known within the Team.

59. During cross-examination, Officer B accepted that she was a friendly, approachable person who spoke openly with colleagues and was comfortable being herself. She explained that she discussed her wife and everyday personal matters with the Officer in the same way she did with other team members. However, she maintained that her general friendliness and willingness to engage in ordinary workplace conversations did not indicate consent to his inappropriate messages or diminish the objections she had raised.

60. Officer B explained that, during a wedding of a colleague, someone had taken a photograph of her that appeared as a silhouette and was considered revealing by other colleagues, including the Officer. She also recalled a conversation she had with female colleagues about dresses they were planning to wear to the team Christmas function; this prompted the Officer to ask her whether she would be wearing a small bra underneath the dress.

61. She also described wider inappropriate workplace comments, made by the Officer including remarks suggesting that she had wasted money undergoing **[REDACTED].** He also said that he “could turn her” referencing her sexuality. Officer B evidenced that the Officer’s personal and sexual messages were made in an open workplace environment and they crossed acceptable boundaries.

62. Officer B stated that she had repeatedly told the Officer to stop sending the inappropriate messages and that he had apologised on one occasion.

63. In response to questions from the panel, she clarified that the apology followed the WhatsApp message where he enquired ‘what undies do you have on’ (screenshot in bundle). She then specifically asked him not to contact her unless the communication was work-related. She maintained that she believed this was clear notice that his conduct was unwelcome, both through her direct objections and her subsequent request for the Officer to restrict contact to professional matters.

64. Officer B confirmed that some of the messages from the Officer were sent as individual WhatsApp conversations rather than group chats, with some additional face-to-face interactions occurring in passing. She said that she had showed the messages to her wife and ignored some of them because she had already told the Officer to stop sending them. She admitted that she did not always respond to some of the messages by expressly repeating her objection, she sometimes used an expression of frustration,

such as a fed-up emoji, which she understood to convey that the messages were unwelcome. She also informed Officer C about these messages and shared some screenshots – both the MS Teams and WhatsApp message.

65. Officer B accepted that she and the Officer had been randomly paired together during an officer safety course, which involved some physical contact for training purposes. However, she rejected the suggestion that they had become particularly up close and personal during the physical exercises. She confirmed that the Officer had behaved respectfully towards her during the training. She distinguished this professional interaction from his inappropriate messages and earlier inappropriate radio call.

66. Overall, she evidenced that she had consistently sought to maintain professional boundaries, had expressly communicated that the messages were unwanted, and considered the Officer's continued conduct to have gone beyond acceptable workplace interaction despite her repeated objections and his eventual apology.

G: Oral evidence of Officer C

67. Officer C gave evidence behind screens and adopted her statement dated 20 June 2025 as her evidence-in-chief. She confirmed that she and Officer B had been close friends in 2020 and 2021. She further stated that sometime in December 2021, Officer B informed her via WhatsApp that she had received inappropriate messages from the Officer and included a screenshot of the messages. Officer C said she was surprised by the content of the messages.

68. Officer C said she knew the Officer as a work colleague however, they did not work closely together because both were response drivers and were not generally deployed on the same operations. She said that she could however describe him as a friend.

69. Officer C explained that she received a message from an unknown person while asleep one evening in 2025, asking if she had a girlfriend called **[REDACTED].** She responded to the message the following morning asking for the sender's identity. The sender identified herself as the Officer's partner and alleged that the Officer was having an affair with Officer A. At that time, Officer C was in a relationship with Officer A.

70. Officer C said that following this she questioned Officer A about her relationship with the Officer and Officer A admitted what had been happening between herself and the Officer and further explained her feelings about the situation.

71. After learning of the messages exchanged between the Officer and Officer A and discovering that the matter had become common knowledge within the team, Officer C decided to confront the Officer to clarify the situation and obtain his account. She approached him calmly at the beginning of a shift, and they spoke privately for approximately five minutes. Officer C stated that she was not angry but felt that, unless she raised the matter directly, it would remain unresolved and create further awkwardness at work.

72. During the conversation, Officer C stated that the Officer acknowledged that this was not the first time he had sent sexual messages to women and that his behaviour had contributed to the breakdown of previous relationships. She said he described his messaging as like "an addiction". Officer C asked whether there had been any physical

contact between him and Officer A, and he said that all contact had been through messages. Officer C considered the Officer neither remorseful nor apologetic and confirmed that he did not apologise for sending the sexualised messages to her partner Officer A.

73. During cross-examination, Officer C confirmed that she had seen the exhibited messages between Officer A and the Officer. When she confronted Officer A, the latter admitted her participation in the exchanges. This resulted in Officer C and Officer A separating for a few days before reconciling.

74. Officer C explained that she had not accused the Officer of forcing Officer A to send messages because her purpose in confronting him was to establish his account and determine whether Officer A's explanation was truthful.

75. In response to questions from the panel about the messages to Officer B, Officer C described the Officers messages to Officer B as inappropriate, particularly because Officer B was married to a woman and the Officer knew of this. She recalled that she was aware that Officer B had indicated to the Officer that she did not welcome or want to receive messages from him but the Officer continued sending them.

76. Officer C did not discuss the disclosure made by Officer B with others because Officer B had told her that she had dealt with the matter and blocked the Officer. When she subsequently learned of the allegations involving Officer A, her initial reaction was that the Officer was engaging in similar behaviour again. Regarding the messages to Officer A, Officer C said she had informed Officer A that she had spoken to the Officer but she deliberately withheld the details of Officer B's disclosure from Officer A to preserve Officer B's confidentiality.

77. Officer C accepted that the information disclosed by Officer B had influenced her subsequent understanding of the events when she learnt that the Officer had also been messaging her partner Officer A.

78. Officer C confirmed that despite all that had happened, she confirmed that she had never seen the Officer behave unprofessionally towards colleagues or members of the public and her own working relationship with him remained cordial and professional.

79. She explained that, after confronting him, she considered the matter concluded and continued with her work as normal. The Officer was transferred away from the team shortly afterwards, so she had no knowledge of how the Officer perceived her confrontation or how the issue was officially resolved.

H: Oral Evidence of the Officer

80. The Officer explained that, given his length of service on the team, professional experience, genuine interest in colleagues' welfare, and willingness to provide support where management was perceived as less sympathetic or tolerant, his colleagues might have regarded him as an informal welfare contact. However, he maintained that he had never formally described himself as the team welfare officer. He further said that at the relevant time, no formal welfare support officer had been appointed, and his interactions with colleagues generally began with informal enquiries about their wellbeing. He denied discriminating between male and female colleagues or having

any sexual motives when offering assistance, maintaining that his intention was to help colleagues, including Officer A, become better officers by addressing their concerns.

81. The Officer denied that Officer A had spoken extensively to him about her personal life, although he acknowledged that she had briefly disclosed **[REDACTED].** He maintained that their communications evolved organically after he had relieved her whilst she was posted to an outdoor crime scene on a cold evening. On that occasion, they had enquired about each other's welfare and then speculated as to how they could keep each other warm. According to him, after this, the exchanges gradually became flirtatious and subsequently sexual in nature, with Officer A voluntarily reciprocating. He asserted that their communications were mutual, consensual and progressive, rather than messages sent randomly or with coercion.

82. The Officer stated that both he and Officer A exchanged sexual images and messages, including videos of Officer A **[REDACTED]** while they spoke on the telephone. He estimated that they exchanged approximately 15–20 images each, amounting to around 30–40 images in total, alongside numerous messages. He accepted sending the first sexual image, which was of himself, but denied initiating the first sexual message.

83. He maintained that they had mutually agreed to delete their communications and keep them secret because they were both in relationships, and asserted that this agreement preceded the exchange of sexual images. He admitted deriving pleasure from the exchanges but denied enjoying the secrecy or the risk of discovery. He also denied masturbating in a work shower cubicle and asking Officer A to assist him, although he accepted sending a message describing a fantasy of Officer A bumping into him in a corridor with only a towel wrapped around him, after a shower.

84. The Officer maintained that Officer A's participation in their communications was voluntary and that he had neither forced nor threatened her into engaging in them. He believed that her subsequent account of the communications as non-consensual or involuntary was influenced by the fact that their exchanges had become known to their respective partners and workplace supervisors. He further suggested that Officer A may have felt embarrassed because their communications had become common knowledge within the team, particularly given her relationship with Officer C.

85. He denied threatening to expose Officer A or telling her that he had compromising information about her. He maintained that he had deleted the messages, believing they were permanently removed, and said he had not known that deleted messages remained accessible in a concealed folder.

86. Regarding Officer B, the Officer maintained that their conversations and messages were mutual and that she sometimes initiated contact. He accepted sending her messages through Microsoft Teams and WhatsApp, including the exhibited messages which he characterised as examples of their usual flirtatious banter.

87. He also stated that Officer B had occasionally sent him photographs of herself wearing a bikini in a hot tub. He acknowledged sending her a message addressing her as "Hey Sexy Bum" but explained that he considered it acceptable given his perception of her personality, which he maintained was open and flirtatious. He stated that he apologised when she raised the issue, believed the apology had been accepted, and

that they subsequently remained friends. He nevertheless expressed the view that Officer B had presented a different character to the panel from the person he knew, describing her as more assertive, brash and outspoken. He questioned the honesty of her account, although he could not explain why she would be dishonest.

88. The Officer emphatically denied sending Officer B a sexual message over the workplace radio. He explained that the radio was not a private communication device and that such a message could have been overheard by colleagues or members of the public. He accepted sending a sexual message (about what underwear she was wearing) through WhatsApp, believing the communication to be private, and acknowledged that he had persisted with the question after realising from Officer B's responses that she was not amused. He apologised for the request and his persistence.

89. He also disputed Officer B's account concerning remarks about her **[REDACTED]** and a photograph of an apparent transparent dress worn to a wedding, asserting that the comments had been made by Officer B rather than by him. He expressed regret in not realising that he could have identified witnesses to support his account for the purposes of the Hearing.

90. Upon reflection, he accepted that sending private sexual referenced messages to colleagues using workplace devices (the MS Team chat being on a workplace device) was inappropriate.

91. The Officer repeatedly maintained that he did not know for certain whether Officers A and C were in a relationship during the relevant period. He acknowledged hearing rumours but said he had received no definitive information and assumed that Officer A would have told him if she were in a relationship with Officer C, or would not have engaged in sexual communications with him.

92. He described the relationship between Officers A and C as secretive and uncertain. **[REDACTED]**. The Officer further alleged that Officers A and C had both been subject to investigations concerning workplace discrepancies and integrity issues, suggesting that their accounts might not be truthful and that they were seeking to protect their relationship at his expense.

93. The Officer acknowledged having a brief conversation with Officer C, lasting approximately five minutes, during which she asked whether he and Officer A had been physically intimate. **[REDACTED].**

94. The Officer inferred that Officers A and C had separated and had not reconciled. **[REDACTED].** These were the Officer's interpretations rather than matters he claimed to know with certainty.

95. He denied telling Officer C that he had a long-standing problem with sending sexualised messages to women or making a comment comparing his behaviour

amounting to an addiction. Although he accepted telling her at some point that he struggled with physical intimacy in a relationship.

96. During questioning by the panel, the Officer explained that his communications with Officer A developed naturally from the closeness and sensitivity of their working relationship. He said their flirtatious messages became frequent and were mainly exchanged after shifts, when he was no longer working. He described the progression from conversations about their daily activities and what they were doing at bedtime to discussions of sexual fantasies, followed by the exchange of sexual images and descriptions of sexual acts.

97. He stated that the shower fantasy message was sent during working hours after he had showered following a shift and was walking along a corridor wearing a towel. Although he acknowledged that his communications developed into a sexual interest in Officer A, he maintained however that he did not pursue a physical relationship because he was already in a relationship with his partner and recognised the potential difficulties this could create at work.

98. In response to specific questions from the Panel, the Officer accepted that he had previously sent sexualised messages (referenced as 'sexting') to other females but denied that he had done this with any other female colleagues.

99. He was asked whether any other previous occasion of 'sexting' had been clandestine and whether whether it had led to breakdown of relationships (pertinent to the conversation referenced by Officer C). The Officer said that he there had been one occasion when clandestine 'sexting' had contributed to the breakdown of a relationship, but he described it happening in his younger days – when travelling.

100. In response to a follow up question by the Panel, he continued to deny previously sending sexualised messages to female colleagues and maintained that his relationship with Officer A was different because it developed from their close working relationship.

101. He also denied telling Officer A that he struggled to initiate physical intimacy with his partner, although he accepted telling her that life was difficult because his partner was studying for a degree and he was left to manage household chores and childcare after work. He further denied telling Officer A that he could not accept her Instagram friendship invitation because his partner objected to female friends, stating instead that he just simply declined the invite. He also denied sending a sexualised message to her shortly after that invite and after refuted the possibility that he might have sent her the message in error, intending it for someone else.

102. The Officer stated that he did not know how the allegations had been officially reported and he also did not know how it had become known to wider members of the team.

103. In terms of the impact that the investigation has had on him, he said he had experienced depression, sought medical intervention, lost confidence in the job he loved, and found discussions with his family about the future of his career difficult. He expressed remorse for the hurt his communications with Officer A had caused his

family. Nevertheless, he continued to dispute the accounts given by Officers A and C, believing they were protecting their relationship at his expense.

104. He did not accept Officer A's evidence that her messages were not consensual or voluntary, relying instead on his interpretation that she had participated willingly and had not been forced to send the communications.

105. During cross-examination and questioning by the panel, the Officer maintained his denial concerning the alleged radio messages, his alleged threats to expose Officer A, and the suggestion that he had described his sexual messaging to females as a problem or addiction – as claimed by Officer C.

106. He accepted that he had sent sexualised messages to Officer B through WhatsApp and acknowledged that his request concerning her underwear became inappropriate when he persisted despite her apparent lack of amusement.

107. In terms of the Officer saying he was unaware of his ability to call defence witnesses, the panel noted that the Regulation 30 notice included a letter from the investigating officer dated 18 June 2025 and the Officer's signed Regulation 31 response dated 28 June 2025, both of which invited him to provide any relevant information and supporting evidence. Although the Officer acknowledged having seen these documents, he could not provide a further explanation for previously stating that he had been unaware that he could call witnesses in his defence or why he had not done so.

I: Interim disclosure Issue

108. Following the Officer's answers to questions from the panel, the AA submitted that certain assertions made by the Officer contradicted information contained in the redacted material before the panel. The AA argued that the redacted portions of the documents were essential to the issues under consideration and should therefore now be disclosed and considered by the panel. The Fed Rep explained that he was unable to take instructions from the Officer because the Officer had not yet completed giving evidence.

109. The LQA advised that the panel could permit the Officer to consult his representative on the specific issue raised and provide the necessary instructions. The legal advice was accepted without comment or objection from either party, and the panel accordingly granted the Officer permission to speak with his representative and provide instructions on the issue.

110. After consultations with each other, both parties agreed that the relevant redacted material was both relevant and necessary for the panel's consideration and it was put before the panel accordingly.

111. The un-redacted material was paragraphs of the police investigation report namely

> *3.3 "It is alleged that PC Page's fiancée contacted another two officers via Instagram asking about 'sexting' messages PC Page had sent them, asking them whether they had had a relationship with him. The first officer was XXX* ***[REDACTED]*** *who used to be a PC on the same team until she was promoted two years ago. She messaged back stating she had never been in*

*a relationship with him and the messages he had sent were unwanted, unwarranted and she had not replied to them other than to tell him stop sending them. The second officer was YYY **[REDACTED],** who had also been on the same team but is now on Mounted Branch at Lewisham. She replied that she had never been in a relationship with him. It is unknown what messages were sent to her by him."*

*3.4 "…….**[REDACTED]** stated that he also sent messages to ZZZ **[REDACTED],** who would have been a probationer on the team at the time, and she had blocked his phone number because he kept sending her emails on the work email asking for her phone number. ZZZ **[REDACTED]** didn t want anyone to know about it."*

3.5 "…….

*- XXX **[REDACTED]** stated that she had nothing about PC Page that she wished to report, she did say that there were some consensual flirtatious/ sexual messages between the two but that they were reciprocated and were not of a nature that she wished to divulge or report.*

*-YYY **[REDACTED]** stated that the matter was quite personal but that she and PC Page had had consensual phone messages of a provocative nature and did not wish to report any matters.*

*-ZZZ **[REDACTED]** stated that she was surprised that PC Page is being looked at as he is one of the most genuine nice guys she has met. She too stated that there had been consensual sexual messages between the two that were nothing she wished to report. She stated that she didn't want to provide any account as she was pregnant and didn't need the added stress. She stated that she tried to add him on Instagram, but he told her he could not because of his partner forbidding it"*

112. The panel considered this new material, in relation to 3 female colleagues who all referenced receiving consensual sexual messages.

J: Resumption of the Officer's Oral Evidence

113. The Officer accepted that the un-redacted material revealed he had sent sexual messages to three other female colleagues, contradicting his earlier assertion that he had never sent such messages to female work colleagues. He explained that his earlier denial arose because he had not properly considered those previous incidents as his mind was focused on the allegations before the panel. He accepted that the three colleagues' accounts of the messages were accurate and confirmed that the communications occurred during working hours while he was in relationships, including his current partner. However, he maintained that all the exchanges were mutual and consensual, involved sexual messages and images, and did not progress to physical contact.

114. He stated that the communications with one female colleague occurred approximately eight years before the investigation, communications with another female colleague occurred approximately nine years ago, and those with the third

female college approximately four years before and lasted about one week. He added that the relationships developed similarly to his communications with Officer A and that he had retained none of the messages or images.

115. The Officer further accepted that he had informed his line manager that he had exchanged sexual messages with Officer A but denied stating that his anxiety and stress resulted from his partner discovering sexual messages on his phone which included 2 other female officers.

116. He also explained that, despite the rumours and suspicions surrounding Officer A, he initially believed she was heterosexual but attracted to women and therefore presumed she was bisexual at the time of their communications.

117. Following the oral evidence the Officer confirmed that he admitted allegation 1a but only insofar as the Microsoft Teams and WhatsApp messages were concerned. He maintained his denial of sending a message to Officer B through a work place radio and that his conduct as a whole in respect of Officer B amounted to gross misconduct. He maintained denial of the whole of allegation 1b

K: Stage 1 Submissions

AA Submissions

118. Mr Beloff on behalf of the AA provided detailed written submissions to the Panel and summarised them orally.

119. The AA highlighted the agreed and disputed facts and submitted that the Panel should find all the disputed allegations proven and conclude that they amount to gross misconduct.

120. The AA submitted that the Officer's evidence was unreliable, inconsistent and tailored to fit the evidence as the proceedings progressed. The AA submitted that the Officer lied at least twice when asked by the Panel whether he had ever before engaged in “sexting” with colleagues by denying it. When confronted by evidence that he had engaged with colleagues three times before, his explanation that had forgotten about them due to the stress of proceedings was not credible.

121. The AA also submitted that the Officer’s denial that Officer A had told him about her **[REDACTED]** and history was also incredible when set against his open admission that he had told her about his home work life imbalance.

122. By contrast, the AA contended that Officer A was a credible witness who gave a logical account of why and how the messaging developed to sexual messages and how she initially tried to ignore, to mutual sexting caused by the Officer’s persistence despite her her desire for them to stop. She was candid about her involvement in

responding to her own discredit but was clear about the shame and regret she felt when she did so.

123. The AA submitted that Officer B's account is accepted by the Officer in relation to the sending of the Microsoft Teams message and the fact that he sent inappropriate WhatsApp messages. The AA stated that Officer B gave a clear account of those matters as well as the disputed call over the radio.

124. Regarding Officer C, the AA submitted conversation between herself and the Officer is supported by the fact that she gave details of things he said that could only have come from the Officer; his previous messaging of women, the fact that it had ruined relationships and that he did not make relationships physical. If Officer C had not been told these matters by the Officer it is difficult to see how else she could have known about them.

125. Finally, the AA submitted that sending unwanted and persistent sexual messages to both Officers A and B, and in the case of Officer A, persisting when she was vulnerable until she felt she had no choice but to respond is a clear breach of professional standards. It was submitted that this conduct was aggravated by Officer A's vulnerability which the Officer was aware of. Cumulatively, this conduct falls clearly above the threshold of gross misconduct.

The Federation Rep Submissions

126. PC Edwards of the Federation submitted on behalf of the Officer that the panel should assess the credibility, reliability and independence of Officers A, B and C when determining the weight to attach to their evidence. He submitted that it should be noted that Officers A and C are in a relationship which raises concerns that discussions may have taken place between them leading up to the hearing which may give room for the possibility of conniving.

127. In relation to the communications between the Officer and Officer A, he submitted that the messages, photographs, and videos were exchanged consensually. This is evidence by Officer A's admission that she was not forced to send the material and the Officers account that he did not coerce her. The Fed Rep further submitted that the communications were subsequently deleted and was unavailable for scrutiny by the panel which limits the extent to which their content, context and nature can be independently assessed. In addition, he submitted that the AA has failed to obtain a statement from anyone who reportedly had first-hand knowledge of the messages, photographs, and videos. He concluded that the absence of this evidence may be relevant to the panel's assessment of the messages.

128. Regarding Officer B, the Fed Rep submitted that the Officer accepts that his use of Microsoft Teams to send certain messages amounted to misconduct, specifically in relation to the language used. However, he disputes Officer B's recollection of their interactions and maintains that their communications were reciprocal. He submitted that the Officer apologised for his conduct with Officer B and believed the matter had been resolved. He drew the panels attention to the fact that it was not contested by Officer B that the work culture permitted such flirty banter which was consensual.

129. The Fed rep invited the panel to distinguish between the admitted misconduct concerning the Microsoft Teams messages to Officer B and the disputed allegations relating to Officer A. He submitted that the evidence concerning Officer A principally involved conflicting accounts and that the absence of the original communications limits independent verification of their content and context. He further invited the panel to consider the respective conduct of the Officer and Officer A when determining the nature and seriousness of the disputed allegations

130. In conclusion, the Fed Rep submitted that the panel should find the conduct of the Officer with Officer A not proved and that his conduct with Officer B did not amount to gross misconduct.

L: The Panels Approach and Legal Framework

131. The Panel received the advice of the legal adviser. Neither party had any observations or comments to make on the legal advice

132. The Panel was advised on the stages rules and procedure to follow in making findings of facts, breaches of the standard of behaviour, misconduct and severity.

133. The legal advice included advice on the law and guidance in respect of inappropriate behaviour, harassment, vulnerable persons and sexual behaviour and motivation and misconduct. Reference was made to the following cases : *PSA for Health and social care V HCPC & Young 2021 EWHC 52 Admin,* on the need to establish the difference between harassment and inappropriate behaviour*, Robert Lambert-Simpson v Health and Care Professions Council [2023] EWHC 481 (Admin)* on the considerations for harassment and *Roylance v GMC (No 2) [2001] 1 AC* on Misconduct

M: Panel Findings on the Facts

134. The Panel considered all the evidence before it which included documents, and the oral and written accounts of witnesses. The panel first considered the AA's evidence to establish the facts before considering the evidence on behalf of the Officer and any impact it had on the AA's case.

135. Overall, the Panel found the AA witnesses; to be credible and truthful even where their evidence undermined their own actions. Overall, the Panel found Officers A, B and C to be consistent in the accounts they gave which on the balance of probabilities corroborated a logical sequence of events. The panel considered that Officer A's emotional state of mind beclouded her actions and contributed to her undermining participation.

136. The panel found the Officer's evidence to be unreliable. There were many contradictions in his own evidence and his oral evidence was particularly discredited when it became obvious under cross examination that he had been untruthful about sending similar sexualised messages to other female colleagues. The panel did not accept his explanation that he had not addressed his mind to the other messages when asked by the panel due to focusing his mind on the allegations alone. The Panel also noted that his denial was on more than 1 occasion and found it concerning that he was

disingenuous about his previous conduct with female colleges if it was consensual, as it would have been reasonable to admit it and provide an explanation, especially as he maintained it occurred at times when he was not in a relationship.

137. Turning to an assessment of the evidence of each allegation the Panel first identified the agreed and disputed facts and then went on to assess all the evidence with regard to the issues.

Allegation 1a

138. The Panel noted and accepted the agreed facts which were that the Officer and Officer B had had a good working relationship, which involved having a joke and/or laugh with each other. It is accepted that during the course of their relationship, the Officer sent a message to Officer B on a work Microsoft Teams platform with the opening line "*Hey Sexy Bum*". It is also accepted that on another occasion the Officer sent Officer B a Whatsapp message during which he said "…..*, what undies (sic) you have on x*" It was accepted that these messages were inappropriate and unwanted

139. In considering the disputed facts, the panel considered the evidence of both the Officer and Officer B as well as the exhibited messages. It noted that apart from the admitted Microsoft Teams and Whatsapp messages there was no other contemporaneous evidence of any other messages. In consideration of Officer B's evidence the panel noted that she said that she had received several other unwanted and inappropriate messages from the Officer which had all been deleted and no longer available.

140. The panel noted the examples of messages Officer B had cited of other inappropriate comments, such as asking whether she would be wearing a small bra to the Christmas party event. On another occasion when she was **[REDACTED],** Officer B stated that the Officer had made comments along the lines of - she should not have wasted her money as he could have **[REDACTED]** for free. Officer B was noted to have said she felt all these messages were inappropriate and did not welcome them.

141. The panel took into account an occasion when Officer B stated that during a work shift she was in the officers' writing room when she received a personal call, via the work radio, from the Officer which was inappropriate and sexual in nature.

142. The panel found Officer B's account credible, she gave an honest and plausible account of her response to the radio message "*when is he going to learn*" and described colleagues present rolling their eyes. The panel considered the Officer's account denying this incident and explaining that he would not send a personal message over the radio because radio messages are public, might be audio recorded and could potentially be heard by members of the public and colleagues. The panel did not accept this explanation especially as the Officer had sent a comparable similar-natured message to Officer B via Microsoft Teams which was also an auditable work provided platform.

143. Coupled with the general concerns about the reliability of the Officer's testimony, the panel determined that it was more likely than not, that he did transmit the message to Officer B over the work radio as described by Officer B.

144. Taking Officer B's evidence as a whole, the panel found that all the referenced messages sent by the Officer to Officer B were similar in nature.

145. The Panel found that the content of these referenced messages were sexual in nature, as they made reference to Officer A's intimate body parts, private areas or undergarments. The panel also found that these messages were inappropriate given the professional peer relationship between the Officer and Officer B. The Panel noted that Officer B had said that she considered the messages inappropriate. As the Officer knew she was happily married to a woman, yet he persisted in sending them even after she had directly and indirectly told him to stop sending them.

146. The panel bore in mind the open and casual office culture within the Team but considered that the messages had crossed both personal and professional boundaries. Furthermore, Officer B expressly had directly told the Officer that she would not divulge the requested information about her underwear and said 'please don't' to being called 'sexy bum'. As such, these messages were unwanted and unacceptable.

147. The panel further considered that the evidence of the persistence of such messages sent by the Officer which were to the annoyance and embarrassment of Officer B who said she "*was really annoyed, upset and disappointed when he went from having a laugh and crossing the line and if anything, I lost his friendship and trust over his unwanted behaviour."*

148. The panel found that the persistent unwanted sending of the messages to Officer B caused her distress in terms of her annoyance, disappointment and what she described as her concern for what the Officer felt was acceptable behaviour towards other women. In light of this the panel found the messages amounted to harassment.

149. The panel did not find any evidence of photographs sent to Officer B, but found that the messages sent were sufficient to make a finding on allegation 1a.

150. In view of all the above the panel found allegation 1a proved.

Allegation 1b

151. It was agreed and accepted that the Officer sent sexual messages and photographs to Officer A around 2023 to 2025. It is also accepted that Officer A responded to some of those messages and photographs in an equally sexual manner. It is contested that the Officer sent an initial random sexual message to Officer A in 2021. It was also contested that Officer A did not want to receive the messages and photographs or that she responded out of compulsion.

152. In assessing the disputed facts, the panel considered the evidence of the Officer, Officer A and Officer C. None of the messages or photos between the Officer and Officer A were available or evidenced by the AA.

153. Regarding the initial sexual message, the panel noted that Officer A could not remember the wording of the specific message however, it bore in mind that Officer A said the Officer had shortly before refused her 'friends request' explaining that "*he doesn't accept females due to questions being asked by his partner and that he has a reputation.*" The panel noted that the Officer denied that he ever told A that his partner did not encourage him having female friends and did not after hearing all of the

evidence, find it plausible that Officer A would have known this if he has not said so. In the light of this the panel accepted Officer A's account that that the initial sexual message was sent by the Officer, was unwanted, sudden and inappropriate.

154. The panel considered that by his own account, the Officer was an experienced and knowledgeable member of the team, was concerned about the welfare of his colleagues and gave guidance and support to them. The panel found this placed him in a position of trust.

155. The Panel determined that the Officer did not become a trained Welfare Officer until 18th March 2024 (based on training records and his evidence). However, the Panel felt that prior to this date he was performing a quasi-Welfare Officer role, as he volunteered and self-appointed himself as someone that colleagues could trust and confide in.

156. Officer A on the other hand was new to the team, joining as a probationer. She was struggling with some aspects of her work, **[REDACTED].** The panel concluded that in the light of this Officer A was in a vulnerable position.

157. The panel note that the Officer accepted that Officer A had told him that she had **[REDACTED]**. He also accepted that he had told her that he was struggling to balance his home and work life.

158. In view of the position of the Officer, the panel did not accept the Officer's account and found that it was more likely than not that Officer A had told PC Page about all of her issues which were impacting her, and he in turn had offered some advice. It concluded that the Officer should have known that she was in a vulnerable position and took advantage of this by sending persistent messages instead of maintaining respectful boundaries.

159. Turning to the communications between Officer A and the Officer, the panel noted that it was accepted by both parties that there were numerous messages, photographs, and videos sent which included nude images and sexual acts. The panel also noted that the Officer accepted that he had derived pleasure and excitement from the messages and images. The panel concluded that the communications were indeed sexual in nature.

160. In considering the appropriateness of the communications sent by the Officer to Officer A, the panel found that they were inappropriate in view of Officer A's known vulnerabilities and the advantageous power imbalance that the Officer had. In addition the panel found that Officer A had initially ignored and blanked the sexualised messages but the repeated and persistent nature of the messaging resulted in her feeling compelled to respond in a like manner. In particular the panel noted from Officer A's evidence that she said

> *"….Around the middle of 2024 my personal struggles worsened, and I felt in a very low place. I was continuing to receive messages from Alan to which at this point I started to respond to his sexual messages telling him what he wanted to hear. He would ask the same things. I thought by doing this he would get bored of asking, however that was not the case. …."*

"…. After a few months I wanted the messages to stop so I just wouldn't respond, but he was so persistent. I felt that I was trapped and couldn't tell him to stop messaging me as a comment had been made in conversation previously where he told me that he had stuff on me as I do on him…."

161. The panel determined that this behaviour crossed both personal boundaries and professional standards of acceptable behaviour.

162. The panel also found that persistence of the unwanted communications as well as their highly sexualised nature, had caused Officer A emotional and psychological distress. This was evidence in the fact that it put her relationship with her partner in jeopardy and she was signed off work due to the stress of the situation.

163. In considering the evidence of Officer C, the panel found that the evidence she gave about the discussion she had had with the Officer after the communications had been brought to her attention, were consistent and corroborated by the information that came to light that the Officer had engaged in similar communications with other females which had been problematic to his relationship.

164. The panel bore in mind the Officer's explanation regarding his conflicting information about sending sexual messages to other female colleagues and did not accept his explanation as plausible.

165. In the light of all the above the panel found allegation 1b proved

N: Findings on Breaches of Standard of Professional Behaviour (SPB)

Discreditable Behaviour:

166. The Panel considered what amounts to discreditable behaviour as described in the Regulations as "*Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty."*

167. In determining whether this standard has been breached the Panel paid due regard to the nature and circumstances of the Officer's conduct, including whether his actions were reasonable at the time of the conduct under scrutiny.

168. The Panel also recognised that the test of whether behaviour has brought discredit on policing, is not solely about media coverage and public perception and had regard to all the circumstances and taking into account how a reasonable member of the public properly informed of the facts, would consider the conduct.

169. The panel determined that colleagues and members of the public would find that the Officer's conduct in persistently sending unwanted, inappropriate and harassing messages to female colleagues was deplorable.

Authority Respect and Courtesy

170. The Panel was mindful of the definition of Authority, Respect and Courtesy within the Regulations namely that: "*Police officers should act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy"* and that

"*Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.*"

171. It also considered the test for this standard of behaviour within the Code of Ethics which is that police officers are are expected to:

a) *"carry out your role and responsibilities in an efficient, diligent and professional manner"*
b) *" avoid any behaviour that might impair your effectiveness or damage either your own reputation or that of policing"*
c) *"ensure your behaviour and language could not reasonably be perceived to be abusive, oppressive, harassing, bullying, victimising or offensive by the public or your policing colleagues."*

172. The Panel found in this regard that the fact that some of these unwanted messages were sent during office hours when the Officer was working using work devices was particularly undermining of the confidence that the public would have in the policing profession.

173. It also found that the nature of the messages and the persistence of them without regard to officers A and B was disrespectful to them.

174. In light of the above findings the panel found that both standard of discreditable behaviour and treating colleagues with respect, courtesy and dignity were breached.

O: Initial Assessment of Seriousness and Misconduct

175. When considering culpability, the panel determined that the overall culpability of the Officer was high as it was intentional, persisted over a long period of time and involved sexual impropriety and exploitation of a vulnerable person. The Panel also considered that the conduct falls under the category of 'violence against women and girls' [as set out in Guidance on Outcomes] due to the harassment of the female witnesses.

176. When considering harm, the Panel also found that the conduct against Officer A caused her considerable emotional and psychological harm but accepted that the harm to Officer B was less serious but only due to Officer B's personal resilience.

177. The panel also find that the Officer's conduct if known by members of the public, would cause harm to the reputation of the police and confidence of the public in the profession. The panel determined that overall the level of harm was high.

178. The panel did not find any mitigating circumstances but found aggravating factors in that the Officer's conduct was of a sexual nature, borne of sexual gratification, there was more than one victim, the conduct was repeated and he was in a position of trust.

179. In the light of the above and taking the findings the panel are satisfied that the conduct of the Officer collectively to Officers A and B amounts to Gross Misconduct.

P: Stage 2 - Submissions on Outcome

180. The Panel received submissions on sanction from both parties.

181. The AA submitted that in view of the seriousness and finding of the panel of gross misconduct, dismissal was the only outcome that would suffice.

182. The Fed Rep invited the panel to consider the previous good character of the Officer and the fact that even the AA witnesses all confirmed that he was an excellent police officer. He reminded the panel that the purpose of sanctions is not to punish the Officer and submitted that in the circumstance, a final warning would be an appropriate outcome.

183. The panel received and considered the advice of the legal adviser which included case law and guidance on the procedural approach and the available outcomes open to the panel. Neither party had any comment or observations to make on the advice given.

Q: Determination on Outcome

184. Having found the allegations proved, and determined that the conduct amounted to gross misconduct, the Panel then considered the appropriate sanction adopting the 3 staged approach as set out in the Guidance on Outcomes.

185. The Panel reminded itself that the purpose of sanction is not simply punitive – but to reflect the seriousness of the misconduct, maintain public confidence, uphold professional standards and to protect the public.

186. The Panel found the Officer's culpability to be high. The conduct was deliberate and intentional. It involved sexual and harassing messages being sent to two female colleagues, one of whom was considered vulnerable due to her personal circumstances at the time which made it especially serious. The Panel also considered that the proven conduct constituted abuse of two female colleagues and constituted behaviour that can be labelled as 'violence against women and girls' again another especially serious aspect of culpability.

187. In considering harm, the Panel considered the significant psychological impact upon Officer A and also the potential reputational harm to public confidence. As a serving police officer, the Officer was expected to maintain high standards of courtesy and respect professional boundaries. The Panel also considered the scale and depth of local and national concern towards 'violence against women and girls' and concluded that the proven conduct fell under the term 'abuse' and had the potential to bring discredit upon the Officer and the wider police service.

188. The Panel again carefully considered the aggravating and mitigating features and found that the Officer's conduct was borne out of sexual gratification, it continued and persisted after he should have realised it was wrong. There was more than one victim and in relation to Officer A he was in a position of trust.

189. The Panel considered the Officer's personal mitigation and had regard to 3 character statements of colleagues, that reference his general good level of professionalism.

190. The panel noted that the testimonials did not address the Officer's specific working relationship with female colleagues nor did any of the authors indicate that they were aware of the allegations. Further noting the Guidance on Outcomes which says that the weight given to personal mitigation is limited, the Panel attached little weight to the testimonials and concluded that they did not assist in improving the Officer's credibility nor did they outweigh the gravity of his misconduct.

191. The Panel was particularly concerned that the misconduct involved deliberate, repeated and unwanted sexual communication with female colleagues, a serious breach of trust and professional boundaries, significant psychological harm and a substantial potential impact upon public confidence.

192. The Panel found it necessary to address the sanction robustly to send a clear message about the standards expected of police officers and that deliberate, non-consensual sexual harassment towards colleagues is incompatible with the standards expected of a police officer.

193. The panel also noted that throughout the hearing process, the Officer sought to justify his actions by deflecting culpability from himself and blame others. The panel found that this demonstrated that the Officer had very little insight and had made no attempts to remediate his actions other than to say he was sorry for the effect his communications had on his own family relationships. The panel determined that the Officer's proven behaviour represented a deep-seated attitude which is fundamentally incompatible with his continued service as a police officer.

194. The panel considered the available outcomes in ascending order and determined that a final written warning would be disproportionate to mark the level of seriousness of the Officer's misconduct. It further considered that a reduction in rank was not an option because the Officer is a police constable (which is the lowest police rank).

195. Having determined that the Officer's conduct amounted to gross misconduct, to mark the level of seriousness and to uphold the overarching public interest objective, the Panel concluded that the only proportionate and appropriate outcome was dismissal without notice.