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

BETWEEN

THE COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY

AND

PC MIRATI SOULEIMAN

OFFICER CONCERNED

1. This hearing was held in public on 28 September 2026 – 9 October 2026 at Empress State Building, London, SW6 1TR. The Panel comprised Former Commander Andy Brittain (Chair), Mr Vince Canning and Mr Dave Scott Independent Panel Members. Ms Dale Simon was the Legally Qualified Person acting as Legal Advisor to the Panel (LQA).

2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Mr Alan Jenkins and the officer concerned was represented by his Police Federation representative PC Christopher Brinsley.

PRELIMINARY ISSUES

3. In accordance with pre-hearing directions the witness was granted anonymity and the cipher Officer A was used to protect her identity, during the hearing and in any subsequent public notices. Additionally, Officer A, Officer B, Officer C, Officer D Officer D, Officer F and Officer E were granted the use of screens while giving their evidence.

THE ALLEGATIONS

4. The allegations facing PC Souleiman are set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon him under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. These are:

It is alleged that you, Police Constable Mirati Souleiman by the conduct set out herein, have breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in the Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended), namely:

(i) Authority, Respect and Courtesy; and

(ii) Discreditable Conduct

Charge 1

Between 01/10/2024 and 28/01/2025, it is alleged that you failed to act with authority, respect and courtesy, and that your conduct was such that it is capable of discrediting the police service and/or undermining public confidence in it, in that you made/ engaged in a number of inappropriate and/or sexual comments or behaviours to or about colleagues and members of the public.

Particulars

1. Between 01/11/2024 and 25/12/2024, you asked Officer D: "do you think I'm too old to have sex with Officer A?";
2. On or around a date between 13/01/2025 and 17/01/2025, during a discussion referencing that you had DJ'd at a 16th birthday party, you said words/or words to the effect of, "teenage girls today they are dangerous." And, in correction of a misunderstanding by Officer G, you went on to say words/ or words to the effect of, "No, no, I mean development, they're so developed, you wouldn't' even know they're 15" and made a gesture with your hands outlining a female body;
3. During training, you showed an Instagram picture of your former partner to Officer F and said, pointing out her breasts, "She didn't have those [breasts] when she was with me, I missed out!";
4. You said of Officer H that she had "skinny legs" and would not "pull off" wearing a particular skirt; you compared Officer H's body to that of Officer F' saying Officer H was "really skinny" and Officer F had a "sexy body."; you said this in the presence of Officer F and Officer E;

5. On or around 20/01/2025 you asked Officer E if he would "fuck" Officer H and Officer F; you described Officer H as "skinny" and Officer F's body as being "sexy"; and on multiple occasions you asked Officer E if he was attracted to Officer F and if he had had sex with her;

6. You said to Officer F, "you look sexy in your uniform.";

7. On or around 28/01/2025 you referred to women as "pussy" during a conversation with Officer I and Officer J;

8. On more than one occasion between October 2024 and January 2025 at Hendon Police Training College, you made a "wolf-whistling" sound towards DC/Officer C; in November 2024 in the canteen, you made a comment to DC/Officer C about her glasses that was suggestive and flirtatious.

9. During familiarisation week commencing 09/01/2025, whilst on duty at a Chipotle restaurant near Charing Cross you stated loudly in reference to two passing female members of the public "Cwahhhhh they are good looking," accompanied by a sharp intake of breath and puckering of your lips in a suggestive, sexualised manner. You made these comments to or in the presence of Officer A;

10. During familiarisation week in the West End, you said words, or words to the effect, "Damn, they're fine" as well as making inappropriate noises whenever an attractive woman would walk by. On the same day, you said that you saw a man looking into any underwear shop and said words, or words to the effect, "He's buying underwear for his young mistress. Us men, we can just keep on going. This is why we don't like women our age, we like them young and pert." You made these comments to or in the presence of Officer G;

11. On multiple occasions during training at Hendon, you referred to younger, female colleagues as "fit" and leered at women.

12. On 22/01/2025 on the ground floor at Hendon, in the presence of Officer B and addressing Officer A, you said, "you know how good you look in uniform,"

immediately prior to the conduct particularised under Charge 2.

13. On the 24/01/2025 you placed his hands on Officer B's shoulders and rubbed them in a massaging motion.

Charge 2

On 22/01/2025, it is alleged that you failed to act with authority, respect and courtesy, and that your conduct was such that it is capable of discrediting the police service and/or undermining public confidence in it, in that you touched Officer A by embracing her and kissing her on the cheek and neck without her consent, and in circumstances where that touching was sexual.

Charge 3

Between 24/01/2025 and 28/01/2025, it is alleged that you failed to act with authority, respect and courtesy, and that your conduct was such that it is capable of discrediting the police service and/or undermining public confidence in it, in that you threatened those colleagues whom you believed had reported you.

Particulars

1. On 24/01/2025 at approximately 12:00 in the first-floor communal sofa area of Peel House, Hendon, you stated words, or words to the effect of: "If this little worm has said something to lose me my job I'm going to run her over and finish her off. I swear to god, I'll do it," which Officer L believed was directed at Officer B.

2. On the evening of 28/01/2025 in Classroom 8 at Hendon Training College, you stated words, or words to the effect of: "I changed my whole life for this job. I'm not gunna let no 19 year olds fuck it up for me…I swear on my kids' life… If any of these 19 year olds say anything about me I'm gunna fuck them up… Fuck that, on my kids life, I'm gunna fuck them up….I'll be waiting outside ,I'm gunna fuck them up one by one," which Officer J and Officer I understood to be directed towards Officer D, Officer E Officer E and Officer F Officer F.

The matters set out above, individually and/or collectively, amount to gross misconduct and are so serious as to justify dismissal.

CASE SUMMARY

5. The allegations facing PC Souleiman arise from a period between 1 October 2024 and 28 January 2025 while PC Souleiman was undertaking his initial recruit police training. Allegation 1 alleges multiple instances of inappropriate and/or sexualised comments or behaviour towards colleagues or members of the public as detailed in the regulation 30 notice above.

6. Allegation 2 alleges that on 22 January 2025, PC Souleiman approached Officer A and her friend Officer B in the main reception area at Hendon Police Training Academy (Hendon). He said to them, 'you know how good you look in uniform". He then proceeded to give Officer B a brief hug, but he fully embraced Officer A and kissed her on the cheek and neck. It is alleged that his conduct was sexual in nature, and was unwanted by Officer A.

7. Allegation 3 alleges that PC Souleiman issued threats, via third parties, to colleague officers that he believed had reported him for the misconduct which forms the substance of allegations 1 and 2.

8. PC Souleiman denies Allegation 1 either on the basis that the incidents alleged did not happen or because the incidents have been taken out of context and/or misinterpreted. PC Souleiman denies kissing Officer A's neck but acknowledges that he may have engaged in a customary brief greeting rooted in his Turkish Cypriot heritage. In relation to Allegation 3 PC Souleiman denies making the threats alleged, however, he accepts that he may have made some of the comments referenced in Allegation 3(2) but states that these comments were not targeted comments in the manner alleged as he was speaking out of general frustration about being kept in the dark in respect of the allegations against him.

EVIDENCE

9. In advance of this hearing the Panel was supplied with the documents in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, which included a copy of the papers served on PC Souleiman in accordance with Regulation 30 and PC Souleiman's response to the AA under Regulation 31. In determining the facts in this case, the Panel had regard to:

    - All documents and materials in the hearing bundle, the Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31 response whether they were explicitly referred to or not during the hearing.
    - The video exhibits.
    - The oral evidence of the witnesses called on behalf of the AA and PC Souleiman.
    - PC Souleiman's good character and the character statements submitted on his behalf
    - The submissions made on behalf of the AA and PC Souleiman.
    - The legal advice provided by the LQA

THE PANEL'S APPROACH

10. In considering the facts, the Panel was aware that the burden of proof is on the AA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. In line with the principle derived from *Byrne v General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 2237 (Admin),* the Panel recognised that there is only one standard of proof in civil and regulatory cases, namely whether the facts in issue more probably occurred than not. The seriousness of an allegation does not of itself require more cogent evidence. The inherent probability of the relevant conduct is a matter which can be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and in deciding whether the event/conduct occurred; this goes to the quality of evidence.

11. The panel considered the particular facts alleged in turn and then considered whether the facts found proved, collectively and/or individually breached the standards of

professional behaviour alleged. The panel noted that some allegations of fact had been replicated, in these circumstances the panel were mindful not to double count the same facts.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Allegation 1.1 Between 01/11/2024 and 25/12/2024, you asked Officer D: "do you think I'm too old to have sex with [Officer A]?";

12. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer Dand Officer A to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

13. In oral evidence Officer D adopted the contents of written statements dated 29 January 2025 and 31 January 2025. His oral evidence was consistent with his written statements and was corroborated in part by other witnesses, as such the panel found him to be a credible witness.

14. In his statement dated 31 January 2025 Officer D recalls that at some time between 1 November 2024 and 25 December 2024 during a conversation with PC Souleiman, (who everyone knew as Mickey) he was asked words to the effect of "*do you think I'm too old to have sex with [Officer A]?"* :

"I have replied to this affirmative, explaining that the age gap between them is too big, Officer A being 19 (nineteen) years old, and Micky – 37 (thirty seven). He then said that there are lots of relationships with this age gap, and as long as she is not underage and it is consensual, it should not be a problem. I did not agree, and told him that it did not matter and it would still be weird. He argued that it is not forbidden to have sex or a relationship with people from work, as we have been told on our induction day. I insisted on the fact that still she is half his age and it would be weird so he did not continue this conversation. I have never spoken to Micky about this again. However, after this conversation I started feeling a bit uncomfortable and felt like I have to talk to someone about this, as it did not feel right."

15. In oral evidence Officer D stated that shortly after joining the police service on 7 October 2024, he and PC Souleiman became close, he met the officer's wife on 4 or 5 occasions, he initially thought of him as a bit of a father figure and a caring, funny and nice person. But after Christmas 2024 PC Souleiman's attitude towards women became more inappropriate, so he started to have less contact with him, because everyone knew that they were close and he didn't want people to think that they were the same.

16. Officer D stated that he and Officer B were good friends. On 29 December 2024 while on a night out with Officer B, Officer A and others, he told Officer B about PC Souleiman's comment because he thought that she would know how best to tell her friend, Officer A.

17. Officer A confirms, in her statement, that while they were on a night out in December 2024, Officer B made her aware of a comment that PC Souleiman had made to Officer D namely: "am I too old to have sex with [*Officer A*]".

18. PC Souleiman gave oral evidence to the panel. In assessing the credibility of his evidence, the panel had regard to his good character, however, the panel found, that his credibility as a witness was significantly undermined by the lack of plausibility of some of his explanations and contradictions between his earlier explanations and his oral evidence.

19. In oral evidence PC Souleiman provided details of his background prior to joining the police service in October 2024. He stated that he was of Turkish Cypriot heritage and that he had worked as a barber and professional DJ for 16 years. He was 37 when he joined the police service only one officer in the class, Officer K, was older than him; the other class members were around 19 or 20.

20. He stated that for the first few days of the course at Hendon all the new recruits were in one group, there was an ice breaker session during which everyone said something about themselves, so everyone knew about his culture. He stated that after 3 days the recruits were split into different classes, after that he would continue to see people from the other classes at lunch time and breaks. He stated that he is a "*chatty guy*" and that he got on with everyone, but as the weeks went on, he got closer to a few people including Officer A and Officer B.

21. In relation to this allegation of fact (1.1) he stated that he was very close to Officer D and he would give him a lot of advice, he gave Officer Da new pair of shoes and Officer D would call him "*Dad*". He stated that their relationship advanced to what do you think about this or that. He recalled having a conversation with Officer D about going out on a double date with Officer A and Office B during which he stated "*Man's too old to have sex with Officer A*." He stated that he "*speaks road*" so Officer Dmay have misunderstood him. PC Souleiman also stated that it was a private conversation.

22. PC Souleiman also asserted that Officer Dwas in a relationship with Officer B but "he was never going to admit that they were together". This assertion had not been put to Officer B and Officer D when they gave evidence.

Panel determination

23. The panel noted that PC Souleiman and Officer D both described themselves as close friends who had spent a lot of time together at Hendon and socially. In these circumstances the panel found that it was unlikely that Officer D completely misunderstood what PC Souleiman had said. Further, personal relationships between colleagues are not prohibited, so even if Officer D and Officer B were in a relationship this fact would not have a negative impact on their careers as police officers. The panel therefore concluded that there was no credible evidence to support a finding that Officer D had a reason to fabricate his account of the conversation. Having found Officer D to be a credible witness the panel preferred his account over that of PC Souleiman and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.2: On or around a date between 13/01/2025 and 17/01/2025, during a discussion referencing that you had DJ'd at a 16th birthday party, you said words/or words to the effect of, "teenage girls today they are dangerous." And, in correction of a misunderstanding by Officer G, you went on to say words/ or words to the effect of, "No, no, I mean development, they're so developed, you wouldn't' even know they're 15" and made a gesture with your hands outlining a female body;

.

24. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer G, Carmine Nisco and PS David Carron to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

25. Officer G recounts in her statement dated 31 January 2025 how PC Souleiman, during a discussion referencing that he had DJ'd at a 16th birthday party, said words/or words to the effect of, *"teenage girls today they are dangerous."* And, in correction of a misunderstanding by Officer G, he went on to say words/ or words to the effect of, *"No, no, I mean development, they're so developed, you wouldn't' even know they're 15"* and made a gesture with his hands outlining a female body**.**

26. In oral evidence Officer G adopted the contents of her written statement. Her answers to questions were clear and consistent with her written statement, and some parts of her evidence were corroborated by other witnesses, therefore the panel found her to be a credible witness.

27. Officer G confirmed that she was in a different training class to PC Souleiman, and that she had very little contact with him prior to a familiarisation week during the 6-10 January 2026, when they were in the same group for a scavenger hunt team exercise. She found his comment about 15-year-olds to be gross.

28. PS Carron and Carmine Nisco both recount in their statements that this alleged conversation was reported to them by Officer G on 24 January 2025.

29. In oral evidence PS Carron stated that shortly after he had recorded the concerns reported to him by Officer G, Officer B and Officer A. He saw PC Souleiman passing by looking distressed. As a trainer on the course, it was his job to look after the welfare of everyone, so he gave him some information about what had been alleged and advised him to keep himself separate. He stated that he had a good working relationship with PC Souleiman who he described as a "*talkative guy*". He confirmed that he had not personally seen PC Souleiman act inappropriately towards anyone, but there were a number of occasions when he had spoken to PC Souleiman about how to conduct himself in a professional environment when recounting stories from his past. None of these talks resulted in any further action.

30. In oral evidence PC Souleiman stated that he had DJ'd at a number of parties where the children were under 16, the parents were always present and some venues required everyone to be DBS checked. He accepted that he had a conversation with Officer G about kids. He stated that Officer G told him about her kid and he spoke about his daughter, and they talked about how some of the girls had behaved at the party, how quickly his daughter was growing up and his concern that she would soon be attending similar parties. He said, "*I have a daughter and see how kids dress and act I am worried*". He denied outlining the shape of a female's body with his hands during this conversation.

Panel determination

31. The panel noted that there was no dispute that PC Souleiman and Officer G had a conversation relating to the rate at which young girls are developing, and that the backdrop to this conversation was the fact that PC Souleiman had DJ'd at a party for a girl who was under 16. The panel found that although the account of the exact words differed the gist of both accounts were similar in that the conversation centred around the speed at which girls developed. The Panel therefore found on the balance of probabilities that PC Souleiman had used **words to the effect** of *"teenage girls today they are dangerous."* and "*No, no, I mean development, they're so developed, you wouldn't' even know they're 15".*

32. In determining whether PC Souleiman had also outlined the shape of a female body with his hands during this conversation. The panel had regard to the fact that PC Souleiman described himself as a friendly and expressive person. The panel also noted that PC Souleiman gesticulated with his hands frequently while giving evidence. The panel, therefore, preferred the evidence of Officer G and found on the balance of probabilities that PC Souleiman had outlined the shape of a female with his hands during their conversation.

Allegation 1.3: During training, you showed an Instagram picture of your former partner to Officer F and said, pointing out her breasts, "She didn't have those [breasts] when she was with me, I missed out!";

33. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer F to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

34. In her statement dated 31 January 2025, Officer F states that she normally sat between PC Souleiman and Officer E in class. She describes initially finding PC Souleiman to be "*extroverted, loud and nice*" but overtime she would hear him make inappropriate comments about young female officers. She recounts how, during training, PC Souleiman showed her an Instagram picture of his former partner and said, pointing out his former partner's breasts, words to the effect of, *"She didn't have those [breasts] when she was with me, I missed out!"*.

35. In oral evidence Officer F adopted the contents of her written statement. Her answers to questions were clear and consistent with her written statement, and some parts of her evidence were corroborated by other witnesses, therefore the panel found her to be a credible witness.

36. She stated that when PC Souleiman made inappropriate comments about females, she wouldn't always know who he was talking about. He would show her Instagram reels and point out ex-partners and the changes they had made to themselves. She stated that she didn't want to hear comments like that so she would remind him that he had wife and at first, he would leave it there. She stated that PC Souleiman's comments made her feel uncomfortable about how he was viewing her and other female colleagues.

37. PC Souleiman's regulation 31 response states:
"The Officer recalls being sat next to Officer F and she commented on a photograph on The Officers mobile phone of his wife wearing a bikini.
Officer F commented that The Officers wife was beautiful and remarked on the size of her breasts. The Officer replied, "thank you" and added that his wife had not had that appearance previously and had the work done after having children.
The Officer never described the female as an ex nor that he had "missed out." He never showed Officer F a picture of an ex-partner."

38. In PC Souleiman's criminal investigation interview on 13 May 2025 he stated that the picture was of his current partner and he wasn't showing Officer F the picture:

"...she's sitting right next to me and typical being nosey as she is anyway alright during break, flicking through my Instagram, showing her holiday pictures she see, she goes, 'oh let me see that one', there you go, that's me, my partner and my two kids alright. It was a bit of a revealing picture on the beach by the pool, my partner in her bikinis that she wears alright and I dunno if I feel comfortable talking about this but she's got quite large breasts, they're…what's the word when they do them? They're fake, they're implants yeah alright. She made the comment, 'rah look at your partner's breasts' alright, I said, 'yes when I first met her they weren't like that, she got them done', I dunno what I'm missing out on, the words did not come out my mouth."

39. In oral evidence PC Souleiman stated that he and his wife were going through a rough patch and were separated at the time of this incident, which is why he may have referred to her as his ex. He stated that they were in a car and his phone was propped up between them. The picture of his wife wearing a revealing bikini was his screensaver. Officer F looked at the picture and said "*your wife is beautiful, lovely breasts*" and he responded she got them after the kids.

Panel determination

40. In determining this allegation of fact, the panel found that PC Souleiman had given contradictory accounts, the accounts differed as to where the incident occurred, whether he had shown Officer F the picture, whether he was holding his phone or whether he had referred to the female in the picture as his ex- partner. The panel concluded that these contradictions undermined PC Souleiman's credibility as a witness and tended to support Officer F's account of being shown Instagram reels and pictures on more than occasion. The panel had not been presented with any credible evidence to support a finding that Officer F had reason to fabricate her account, the panel therefore preferred her account over the inconsistent accounts provided by PC Souleiman and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.4: You said of Officer H that she had "skinny legs" and would not "pull

off" wearing a particular skirt; you compared Officer H's body to that of Officer F' saying Officer H was "really skinny" and Officer F had a "sexy body."; you said this in the presence of Officer F and Officer E;

41. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer F and Officer E to prove this allegation of fact.

42. In her statement Officer F recounts a day when she was talking to Officer D and Officer E about what she was planning to wear for her birthday party and PC Souleiman asked her what she was going to wear:
"*I showed him a photograph of the skirt from the website. Officer D also asked to see what I was going to wear and I showed him a photograph of me wearing the outfit. Micky asked me why I couldn't show him the photograph and that he wanted to see it. I remember saying to him "YOU DON'T NEED TO SEE THAT". Later that day, I was with Officer E in the break out area when Micky joined us. He made a comment about a colleague called DC Officer H who is from the same intake but different shift patterns. He said that Officer H had skinny legs and would not pull off wearing the skirt that I showed him earlier. He said that only I could pull it off. Both myself and Officer D challenged Micky on his comments.*
I recall that Micky had previously made a comment about Officer H's body, saying that she was really skinny and comparing her body to mine and saying I had a sexy body."

43. Officer F's oral evidence was consistent with her written statement.

44. In his statement dated 31 January 2025 Officer E states that he was in the same class as PC Souleiman at Hendon. He states the start of their relationship was fine and describes PC Souleiman as being very loud and extroverted: " *He is the sort of guy you could easily get along with as a first impression. He has always been nice to us, but in the last three or four weeks. I have noticed that he has become snappy and short tempered".*

45. In respect of this allegation of fact the statement recounts an incident shortly before Officer F's birthday:
"*Officer D and I were at Hendon Police Training College and discussing a night*

out and what we were going to wear. Officer F was in the room and she showed a picture of a skirt that she was planning on wearing. The picture showed Officer F wearing the skirt she planned to wear. This was shown to Officer D and I. Micky then asked to see the picture and Officer F showed a stock picture from a website, to which Micky responded "how come Officer E and Officer D get to see the picture of you wearing it and I don't"? Officer F responded "I don't want to show you a picture of me wearing it". He remarked that Officer H wouldn't look good in a skirt because her legs were too skinny. The conversation then died down, but I could see that Micky was not happy about it."

46. Officer E's statement also recounts an incident that occurred on the 20 January 2025 when he was alone with PC Souleiman in a room during a break and PC Souleiman described DC Officer H as being very skinny and Officer F's body as "sexy".

47. Officer E adopted his statement as his oral evidence. He confirmed that he was in the same class as PC Souleiman. The panel found that his oral evidence was consistent with his written statement and that his evidence was corroborated in part by other witnesses. The panel therefore found him to be a credible witness.

48. PC Souleiman's regulation 31 response states:

" The Officer denies describing Officer H as really skinny, neither did he describe Officer F as having a sexy body.
He recalls an informal conversation in class at Hendon. Officer F was upset because other colleagues had bought the same skirt as she had and was worried about her appearance for an upcoming birthday party.
Officer F had previously spoken with and confided in The Officer about her personal feelings and concerns. The Officer sought to reassure her and boost her confidence by saying the skirt would suit her better. He accepts he said the particular style of skirt would not suit Officer H in the same way it would Officer F. His comment was not meant as an insult to Officer H, only to comfort Officer F."

49. In oral evidence PC Souleiman confirmed the account provided in his regulation 31 response. He questioned why Officer F still ate with him at lunch times if she had been

so upset with him. He stated that he didn't know whether he was shown the same picture of the skirt as other colleagues, he wasn't concerned about the picture he was concerned that she was upset. He made the comment to boost Officer F's confidence. PC Souleiman also stated that he now accepts that his comment was inappropriate but at the time he said it to make Officer F feel better.

Panel determination

50. The panel noted that PC Souleiman accepts that that there was a conversation in the presence of Officer F, Officer D and Officer E about the skirt that Officer F was planning to wear to her birthday party and that a comparison was made between Officer H's body shape and that of Officer F. He denies calling Officer H "*really skinny*" and saying that Officer F had a "*sexy body".*

51. The panel noted that during oral evidence PC Souleiman had referred to Officer F as having a better shape than Officer H because Officer F had been an Olympic swimmer. The panel found that this comment tended to suggest that PC Souleiman had a positive opinion about Officer F's body shape, the panel therefore found that it was more likely than not that PC Souleiman had also referred to her as having a sexy body and to Officer H being really skinny in comparison.

52. The panel found that the evidence of when the "sexy body" comment was made and who was present was unclear. The statements of Officer E and Officer F both suggest that this comment was **not made** at the same time as the conversation about Officer F's skirt (when both officers were present). Officer F states that she recalls that PC Souleiman had "*previously*" made a comment comparing Officer H's body to hers and stating that she had a "sexy body". Officer E recounts an incident on the 20 January when PC Souleiman made a comparison and described Officer F as having a "sexy body".

53. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact partially proved on the basis that PC Souleiman had referred to Officer H as "really skinny" and to Officer F as having a "sexy body"; however, the panel were not satisfied that these comments were made in the presence of Officer F and Officer E.

Allegation 1.5: On or around 20/01/2025 you asked Officer E if he would "fuck" Officer H and Officer F; you described Officer H as "skinny" and Officer F's body as being "sexy"; and on multiple occasions you asked Officer E if he was attracted to Officer F and if he had had sex with her;

54. The AA relies on the evidence Officer E to prove this allegation of fact. The panel noted that this allegation of fact, replicates part of allegation 1.4 which has already been considered above, namely that "you described Officer H as "skinny" and Officer F's body as being "sexy". The panel therefore disregarded the duplicated allegation of fact and found the remaining allegations of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

55. In his statement Officer E recounts an incident on 20 January 2025, when he and PC Souleiman were alone during a break period, he states:
"Whilst I was texting, Micky asked me what girl I was chatting to. I told him that I was texting my friend, Officer H. Micky then asked me if I would fuck Officer H and Officer F. I laughed nervously and told him that I wouldn't as they were my friends. Micky then went on to describe their bodies...I didn't respond to this, mostly because a group member had walked in to the room."

56. Officer E also recounts being asked on multiple occasions whether he was in a relationship with Officer F:
"*He would also ask if Officer F and I have had sex together and asked me if I found her attractive. He would say this loudly and openly causing others to hear. I have had to tell people that this was not true which has caused me some embarrassment."*

57. PC Souleiman stated in oral evidence that Officer E had asked him for some relationship advice. Officer E had told him that he had sex with Officer F and asked whether he should go out with Officer H as well. PC Souleiman stated that he advised him to stick with Officer F as she looks better and he had already slept with her.

Panel determination

58. The panel noted that PC Souleiman stated that he had considered Officer E to be a friend and that he sat with Officer F and Officer E in class. During his oral evidence PC Souleiman made several references to the fact that he believed that Officer F and Officer E (and Officer B and Officer D) were in secret sexual relationships. The panel therefore found that as PC Souleiman held this belief it was also quite probable that he had asked Officer E to confirm whether his suspicions were correct. The panel therefore preferred the evidence of Officer E and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.6: You said to Officer F, "you look sexy in your uniform.";

59. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer E and Officer F to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact not proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

60. Officer E recounts in his statement that on a date that he can't recall: "*I have witnessed Micky say to Officer F, "you look sexy in uniform"."*

61. In her statement Officer F recounts that sometime after "Fam Week" she was told by Officer E that PC Souleiman had told him that "*I was sexy in uniform*".

62. PC Souleiman accepted that he told Officer F that she looked good in her uniform but he maintained that this was just a compliment and not sexual. He stated that it was part of his culture and background as a barber to compliment males and females on their appearance.

Panel determination

63. The panel found that the evidence of Officer F and Officer E was contradictory, the panel therefore found this allegation of fact not proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.7: On or around 28/01/2025 you referred to women as "pussy" during a

conversation with Officer I and Officer J;

64. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer I and Officer J to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

65. Officer I and Officer J were both in the same class as PC Souleiman. In his statement dated 31 January 2025 Officer J recounts an incident on 28 January 2025 when he and Officer I noticed that PC Souleiman seemed to be "worked up" the three officers went outside to get some air. While outside PC Souleiman started to speak about Officer D and said: "*You know how much I've done for this guy, he's met my wife and do you know why he did this? Because of Pussy*". Officer J states that he took this to mean he was either talking about Officer F or another girl from the sister class.

66. Officer I also recollects the same conversation between himself Officer J and PC Souleiman. He states that he thought the "pussy" comment meant "*because of a girl*" but he didn't know who PC Souleiman meant specifically.

67. PC Souleiman accepts that he used the word "pussy" during this conversation with Officer I and Officer J, however, he denies that he was referring to a particular female. He stated that the word "pussy" had many meanings and he gave the example of calling a man a "pussy" if he was afraid to do something. He stated that he had used the phrase in his conversation with Officer I and Officer J to mean sex/vaginas. He did not think that his use of the word in this context was derogatory.

<u>Panel determination</u>

68. The panel noted that PC Souleiman accepted that he had used the word "pussy" in his conversation with Officer I and Officer J. The panel found his explanation for using the word "pussy" lacked plausibility and demonstrated a concerning lack of awareness that his use of the word was offensive and inappropriate in a professional environment. Officer I and Officer J were both friends of PC Souleiman and they both formed the opinion that the phrase had been used to refer to a specific or unknown female. The panel preferred the evidence of Officer I and Officer J over

that of PC Souleiman and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.8: On more than one occasion between October 2024 and January 2025 at Hendon Police Training College, you made a "wolf-whistling" sound towards Officer C; in November 2024 in the canteen, you made a comment to Officer C about her glasses that was suggestive and flirtatious.

69. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer A, Officer B, Officer C and Officer G to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities on the basis that PC Souleiman made a wolf- whistling sound towards Officer C on one occasion for the reasons detailed below.

70. In her statement dated 7 February 2025 DC Officer C recounts an incident around November 2024 in the first-floor canteen at Hendon Police College. She states that she had kept her glasses on from class and PC Souleiman remarked on her glasses implying that she looked attractive in them. She continues:

"*His demeanour was such that it came across as cheeky, flirtatious and suggestive, and I got the impression that he found me attractive in them."*

71. Officer C also describes an incident around December 2024 or January 2025. She recounts walking through the breakout area at Hendon Police College and seeing PC Souleiman, Officer A, Officer B and Officer G sitting together with some other colleagues. She states:

"As I walked past I smiled and waved at Micky who said hello. I turned away and carried on walking. I then heard a wolf-whistle, but I didn't react to it and carried on. At the time, I knew this was directed at me and that it was Micky who did it. I knew this because, along with Rosie, I was the only one female who was walking down this corridor, the others being male. I knew Micky, by this point, was quite flirtatious towards me, so this also made me feel like this was directed at me."

72. Officer C adopted her statement as her oral evidence. The panel found that her oral evidence was consistent with her written evidence and that her evidence was

corroborated in part by other witnesses the panel therefore determined that she was a credible witness.

73. Officer C stated that she was in a sister class to PC Souleiman. She described PC Souleiman as being friendly, outgoing, chatty and very nice. She stated that after a few weeks he became more flirtatious, but she would normally laugh his comments off. She recounted a conversation with PC Souleiman when he implied that she was too pretty to work in Wood Green. She stated that it was hard to describe why she knew that he was being flirtatious with her.

74. Officer A states that she witnessed PC Souleiman wolf whistle at Officer C in one of the breakout areas. She recounts that she did not know if Officer C was aware of what had happened as she continued walking. Officer A describes being shocked that PC Souleiman thought it was appropriate and acceptable "*to do this*" to another colleague.

75. In her statement dated 19 February 2025 Officer B states:

"*Lastly I wish to talk about an occasion when Micky wolf-whistled at DC Officer C, who was also a student in my class. This occurred at Hendon and I was sitting with Micky and a few others in the breakout area on the first floor. At some point Officer C walked past us towards the classrooms. Micky wolf-whistled at her in an obvious and directed way. Upon hearing this, I told him that it was not appropriate to do this especially in a police building. Micky responded by saying "me and Officer C are just friends" and "you lot are so boring". I found Micky to be angry at this and he got quite defensive*."

76. Officer G recounts in her statement that she witnessed PC Souleiman wolf whistle at Officer C on more than one occasion when she has walked past him. The panel asked Officer G if she was able to provide details about any of the other occasions when she heard PC Souleiman wolf whistle at Officer C, but she was unable to do so. She stated that she vaguely recollected it happening more than once.

77. In his criminal investigation interview PC Souleiman stated that he did not remember making inappropriate comments towards Officer C. He also stated that

he knew what a wolf whistle was, but he cannot whistle and could not recall anyone making wolf-whistle noises whilst at Hendon. With regards to Officer C's glasses, PC Souleiman admitted to telling Officer C that she looked good in her glasses and maintained that if Officer C found the comment to be inappropriate "She *should've said something*".

78. In oral evidence PC Souleiman stated that he was in the breakout area with some male colleagues shortly after a training session in which "*wolf whistling*" had been mentioned. He stated that he didn't know what a wolf whistle was, but he didn't want to look stupid in class, so he asked his colleagues what it meant when they went on break. He stated that after a colleague described what it meant, he did whistle but this was not directed at DC Officer C or anyone else.

Panel determination

79. The panel noted that PC Souleiman accepted in oral evidence that he did wolf whistle in the breakout area, but he denied that he had whistled in the direction of anyone. His oral evidence directly contradicted the account of the incident that he provided in interview when he had claimed that he couldn't whistle. The panel determined that this contradiction undermined PC Souleiman's credibility. The panel found that the statements of Officer C, Officer A and Officer B were detailed and largely corroborative of each other. The panel therefore preferred the evidence presented by the AA over the evidence of PC Souleiman and found that PC Souleiman had wolf-whistled in the direction of Officer C in the breakout area at Hendon.

80. The panel found that the statement of Officer G was the least detailed of the statements relied on by the AA, and that she was the only witness who referred to PC Souleiman wolf whistling on more than one occasion. The panel had regard to the absence of any detail in respect of other alleged occasions and concluded that it could not be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that PC Souleiman had wolf whistled in the direction of Officer C on more than one occasion. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact proved on the basis that PC Souleiman had wolf whistled in direction of Officer C on one occasion.

81. The panel noted that PC Souleiman accepted that he had told Officer C that she looked good in her glasses but maintained that it was just a compliment; he also denied that he was being flirtatious. Having found that PC Souleiman had wolf whistled in the direction of Officer C, the panel found it more likely than not that he was being suggestive and flirtatious when he told Officer C that she looked good in her glasses. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

.

Allegation 1.9: During familiarisation week commencing 09/01/2025, whilst on duty at a Chipotle restaurant near Charing Cross you stated loudly in reference to two passing female members of the public "Cwahhhhh they are good looking," accompanied by a sharp intake of breath and puckering of your lips in a suggestive, sexualised manner. You made these comments to or in the presence of Officer A;

82. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer A to prove this allegation. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

83. In her statement dated 29 January 2025 Officer A states:

"*On the week of the 9 Jan 2025 whilst on Familiarisation week we were all getting food in Chipotle, two girls walk in and Micky makes a bee line for the door, he opens the door for them in a dramatic manner as they pass. As they pass he makes a very loud comment of "Cwahhhhh they are good looking" this was followed by a sharp in break of breath and puckering of his lips in a suggestive, sexualised manner.*
I was disgusted as he was on duty as we were on a lunch break and he was making comments like that to two young ladies who were members of the public. That made me think he will be dealing with members of the public every day and how will he react to victims or witnesses of incidents he was investigating".

84. In oral evidence PC Souleiman stated that he was in the queue waiting to be served, he did not make a beeline for the door, he was near the door, so he opened it for two ladies. He stated that he had also opened the door for families to get through. He denied puckering his lips or making any comment about the appearance of the two females. He stated that opening the door was just something that he did to be polite.

Panel determination

85. The panel noted that PC Souleiman had accepted that complimenting people on the way that they looked was something that was part of his culture and background as barber; therefore, the panel determined that it was also likely that PC Souleiman would make a comment if he thought that females were good looking. Having found Officer A to be a credible witness the panel preferred her account over that of PC Souleiman and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.10: During familiarisation week in the West End, you said words, or words to the effect, "Damn, they're fine" as well as making inappropriate noises whenever an attractive woman would walk by. On the same day, you said that you saw a man looking into any underwear shop and said words, or words to the effect, "He's buying underwear for his young mistress. Us men, we can just keep on going. This is why we don't like women our age, we like them young and pert." You made these comments to or in the presence of Officer G;

86. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer G to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

87. In her statement Officer G recounts that during familiarisation week in the West End of London, PC Souleiman said words, or words to the effect of, *"Damn, they're fine"* as well as making inappropriate noises whenever an attractive woman would walk by. On the same day, she recounts that PC Souleiman saw a man looking into an underwear shop and said words, or words to the effect of, *"He's buying underwear for his young mistress. Us men we can just keep on going. This is why we don't like women our age, we like them young and pert"*.

88. In oral evidence PC Souleiman stated that the comments that Officer G had attributed to him, had in fact been made by their colleague Officer K. He stated that Officer G had made things up because he had spoken to her roughly during the treasure hunt.

Panel determination

89. The panel noted that Officer G had not been asked during cross examination whether she had wrongly attributed Officer K comments to PC Souleiman. The panel found that it was highly unlikely that Officer G was unable to distinguish between the PC Souleiman and Officer K, as they were all on the same course together and there is no suggestion that they comments were made in a loud or chaotic environment. The panel were also not satisfied that there was any credible evidence to support a finding that Officer G had fabricated her evidence. Having found Officer G to be a credible witness the panel therefore preferred her evidence over that of PC Souleiman and found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.11: On multiple occasions during training at Hendon, you referred to younger, female colleagues as "fit" and leered at women.

90. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer F and Officer E to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

91. In her statement dated 31 January 2025 Officer F states:
"*Normally, in our class, our tables are arranged in a horseshoe shape and since the start of training, we sit where we sat from the beginning. I sit between Officer E and Micky. Initially, I found Micky to be extroverted, loud and nice. However, over time, I would hear Micky make inappropriate comments about young female officers such as "SHE'S FIT" or leering at them."*

92. In his statement dated 31 January 2025 Officer E states:
"*On a number of occasions, I have witnessed Micky staring at female colleagues in an intense and inappropriate way. He would look a female up and down and then smile, almost as a way to show gratification*."

93. PC Souleiman accepted that he might have used the phrase "fit", but he maintained that this would be in relation to people looking after themselves rather than in a sexual way, he denied leering at females.

Panel determination

94. The panel noted that PC Souleiman accepted that he might use the word "*fit*" and that he also described himself as someone who "*speaks road*". The panel had regard to the evidence of Officer F who believed PC Souleiman's use of the word "*fit*" when he was speaking about female officers was inappropriate. The panel concluded that it was more likely that PC Souleiman was using the word "*fit*" in a more colloquial/street way which has sexual connotations rather than in reference purely to physical wellbeing. The panel therefore found on the balance of probabilities that PC Souleiman's use of the word "*fit*" when referring to female colleagues was inappropriate.

95. The panel noted that Officer F and Officer E both describe PC Souleiman leering/ staring at females in an intense and inappropriate way. The panel found that this alleged behaviour was consistent with the behaviour reported by Officer A at allegation 1.9 above. Having found that PC Souleiman had looked inappropriately at members of the public the panel found that it was more likely than not that he had also leered at female colleagues. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.12: On 22/01/2025 on the ground floor at Hendon, in the presence of Officer B and addressing Officer A, you said, "you know how good you look in uniform," immediately prior to the conduct particularised under Charge 2.

96. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer A to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

97. In her statement dated 29 January 2025 Officer A recounts an incident on 22 January 2025 when she was walking down the stairs to the main reception area at Hendon Police College with Officer B. She states that PC Souleiman approached them and said, "*you know how good you look in uniform*". This comment made her feel awkward, but she didn't want to confront him.

98. In oral evidence Officer A clarified that the comment made her feel awkward because it wasn't the first time that PC Souleiman had seen her in uniform.

99. In his criminal investigation interview PC Souleiman stated that he did not remember telling Officer A that she looked good in uniform on 22 January 2025. He stated that he may have said so on another day at BCU when everyone put their uniforms on "that everyone looks cool in their uniforms".

100. In oral evidence PC Souleiman accepted that he did tell Officer A that she looked good in her uniform, he couldn't recall this particular occasion, but he maintained that it was said purely as a compliment and was not sexual.

Panel determination

101. The panel noted that Officer A was clear that the comment about her looking good in uniform was made on the 22 January she recollected where she was when the comment was made and how the comment had made her feel. PC Souleiman accepted in oral evidence that he had made the comment, but he couldn't recollect exactly when he had done so. The panel found that Officer A's recollection of the the incident was more reliable than that of PC Souleiman's. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 1.13: On the 24/01/2025 you placed his hands on Officer B's shoulders and rubbed them in a massaging motion.

102. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer B and Officer G to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

103. In her statement dated 19 February 2025 Officer B recounts an incident that occurred on 24 January 2025 when she was sat on the sofa in the breakout area on the first floor of Hendon Training Centre with Officer A and Officer G when PC Souleiman came and sat next to her. She states:

"*Prior to this I had been with Officer A and Officer G and had reported Micky to staff about his behaviour during our training. Having sat in the breakout area Micky was approaching us. I saw this and alerted Officer G and Officer A. Officer A said "get rid of him". Micky sat next to me and asked all three of us how we all were and what was going on. I said to him "we are having a girly chat, if you don't mind…we can talk later". He said "ok" and got up and left. As he left, he walked to the back of me and put both of his hands on each of my shoulders and rubbed them in a massaging motion. I felt uncomfortable with this, I didn't perceive this to be sexual. It was uncomfortable because I had just been to report him and he did this to me in a friendly way."*

104. In her statement dated 31 January 2025 Officer G states:

"*On Friday 24th January 2025, at Hendon, myself, Officer A and Officer B reported Micky to PS David Carron. After we made our report, we went to sit in the breakout area near the canteen. Micky approached us and sat down next to Officer B. Officer B asked Micky to give us space. Micky said ok and got up, rubbed Officer B on the shoulders then walked off."*

105. Officer J recounts having a conversation with PC Souleiman and Officer I on 28 January 2025. PC Souleiman was asked if knew why he couldn't contact colleagues from their sister class:

"Micky said that he had approached a female officer called Officer B and put his hands on her shoulders and asked if she was ok as he saw her speaking to Sergeant Carron. He said that she had said not right now and she was having a rough time. Micky said he let go of her and said he would let them have their girl talk with the other female officers she was with. He stated that this was the only thing he could think of."

106. Officer I corroborates Officer J's account of the conversation above.

107. In oral evidence PC Souleiman stated that he put his hands on Officer B's shoulders because she was crying and she said she was having a girly chat. He told her to let him know if she needed anything. He denied massaging her shoulders he stated that he had lightly tapped her on her shoulders.

<u>Panel determination</u>

108. The panel noted that PC Souleiman accepts that his hands made contact with Officer B's shoulders, the panel found that his description in oral evidence was not consistent with the account of the incident that he conveyed to Officer J and Officer I. This inconsistency undermined the credibility of PC Souleiman's oral evidence. The panel found that the description of the incident that PC Souleiman gave to Officer J and Officer I was broadly consistent with the accounts of Officer B and Officer G. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

Allegation 2: On 22/01/2025, it is alleged that you failed to act with authority, respect and courtesy, and that your conduct was such that it is capable of discrediting the police service and/or undermining public confidence in it, in that you touched Officer A by embracing her and kissing her on the cheek and neck without her consent, and in circumstances where that touching was sexual.

109. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer A and Officer B to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact not proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

110. In her statement dated 29 January 2025 Officer A states that shortly after the incident alleged at 1.12 above. PC Souleiman gave Officer B a brief hug and then: "*...he embraced me in a full hug and kissed me on the cheek and neck. This is not normal behaviour I recoiled away from Micky and turned into Office B, feeling embarrassed. I did not say anything to him as I find him quite a domineering character, I didn't know how he would react I have felt intimidated the whole way through our training course*".

111. In oral evidence Officer A clarified that PC Souleiman had only kissed her once on the lower cheek/jaw area close to her neck.

112. Officer B makes no reference to this incident in her statements or in her oral evidence.

113. In his criminal investigation interview PC Souleiman stated that he did not know about the day that the hug was alleged to have occurred, but he accepted that he shared hugs with everyone. He stated:

"*I'm known as "Uncle Micky" I'm 37 a bit older than all the rest of them, boys hug me, other girls from other classes hug me, "Micky how you doing" they love it like as in we're friends yeah*".

114. PC Souleiman's regulation 31 response states:

"*The Officer denies ever touching Officer A in a sexual circumstance or manner.*

Officer A alleges The Officer kissed her on the cheek and neck on the 22nd January 2025. He denies this.He recalls encountering Officer A by stairs in Hendon and hugged her. They had hugged before, he often hugged individuals (male and female) when saying hello or goodbye. He had no reason to think this occasion was any different. At no point did he intend to cause any distress or discomfort.

The Officer's upbringing and cultural background lend him to greeting people with a light kiss on both cheeks. This is a traditional Turkish greeting. He recalls greeting people when he first met them, at the start of his course, and may have around that time kissed Officer A on the cheek.

Had he done so, it would have been brief, completely non-romantic and certainly not a kiss on the neck"

115. In oral evidence PC Souleiman stated that he had hugged Officer B and Officer A on numerous occasions. He stated that he did not place his lips on Officer A's cheek. He demonstrated a "Greek Kiss", he stated that you touched cheek to cheek and made a kissing sound with his lips. He accepted that he did not ask for Officer A's consent before greeting her in this manner. He also stated that he didn't know at the time that it wasn't professional to act in that way. He confirmed that he did not attempt to greet Officer A in this manner again.

<u>Panel determination</u>

116. The panel noted that Officer A accepted in oral evidence that PC Souleiman had only made contact with her cheek area once. The panel also noted that Officer B was present during this incident but did not reference this occasion when detailing occasions when she believed PC Souleiman had acted inappropriately. The panel found that the absence of any comment from Officer B tended to support PC Souleiman's account that it was normal/usual for him to greet everyone with a hug.

117. The panel had regard to Officer A's account of how the kiss on her cheek made her feel; however, the panel found PC Souleiman's explanation of how he had performed the "Greek kiss" to be plausible and accepted that greeting someone in this way was cultural and not sexual in nature. PC Souleiman accepted that he did not ask for Officer A's consent before touching her, however, given the non-sexual nature of the contact the panel were not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that his conduct was capable of discrediting the police service and/or undermining public confidence in it. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact not proved.

Allegation 3.1: On 24/01/2025 at approximately 12:00 in the first-floor communal sofa area of Peel House, Hendon, you stated words, or words to the effect of: "If this little worm has said something to lose me my job I'm going to run her over and finish her off. I swear to god, I'll do it," which Officer L believed was directed at Officer B.

118. The AA relies solely on the direct evidence of Former Officer L to prove this allegation of fact which is denied by PC Souleiman. The AA had made a number of unsuccessful attempts to secure the attendance of Officer L. Counsel for the AA submitted that in the absence of Officer L there was no evidence to prove this allegation of fact. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact not proved.

Allegation 3.2: On the evening of 28/01/2025 in Classroom 8 at Hendon Training College, you stated words, or words to the effect of: "I changed my whole life for this job. I'm not gunna let no 19 year olds fuck it up for me…I swear on my kids' life… If any of these 19 year olds say anything about me I'm gunna fuck them up…

119. The AA relies on the evidence of Officer J and Officer I to prove this allegation of fact. The panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities for the reasons detailed below.

120. Officer J and Officer I were both in the same class as PC Souleiman. In their statements dated 31 January 2025 they both recount an incident on 28 January 2025 when they recalled seeing PC Souleiman in an agitated/worked up state. It was suggested that the three of them go outside for some air. They return to the classroom after a short conversation outside.

121. After returning to the classroom Officer J recounts PC Souleiman coming to sit next to him and Officer I and saying: "*I changed my whole life for this job I'm not gunna [sic] let no 19 year olds fuck it up for me*" and "*I swear if any of these 19 year olds say anything about me I'm gunna [sic] fuck them up*". Officer J further states that Officer I reminded PC Souleiman that he had children and to stay calm to which PC Souleiman replied: "*Fuck that, on my kids life, I'm gunna [sic] fuck them up*". After listing the days of the week PC Souleiman then said "*I'll be waiting outside, I'm gunna [sic]fuck them up one by one*".

122. Officer I corroborates Officer J's account of what was said by PC Souleiman when they returned to the classroom.

123. PC Souleiman's regulation 31 response states that:

> "*He accepts using the phrase "fuck them up" and regrets his choice of words in the moment. He did not mean to insinuate he would physically or violently respond to those who'd complained about him.*
> *What The Officer meant, poorly expressed due to frustration, was that he would defend himself if false information was being spread, and that he would reveal the truth about situations or personal dynamics that had already been openly discussed within the group. This included information they themselves had previously confided to him about their relationships and interactions with one another*
> *The Officer has long since recognised that his emotional outburst was inappropriate and could easily have been misunderstood, but his true intent was never violence.*
> *The Officer did not say that he would "wait outside Hendon Monday, Tuesday,*

Wednesday, Thursday and Friday." He was expressing that he had already been waiting across several days, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, for an update from the sergeant, and was becoming increasingly stressed about the lack of communication."

124. It is further stated in the regulation 31 response that PC Souleiman's tone and choice of words may have been influenced, by stress, frustration, and his communication difficulties related to dyslexia and dyspraxia which sometimes cause him to express himself in a way that does not reflect what he actually means:
"He regrets if anything he said was misinterpreted or caused concern. The Officer's intention was purely to express his distress and confusion about the situation, not to direct hostility or threats toward anyone."

125. In oral evidence he confirmed that he did make the comment about 19 year olds and he did say that he was going to "fuck them up" but he meant that he was to harm their careers, he was not referring to violence.

126. PC Souleiman was asked by the panel why he thought that disclosing the private relationships of his colleagues would ruin their careers. He stated that this was because the officers were scared to be seen together. He made it clear, however, that the potential embarrassment of his colleagues was solely on the basis of their personal relationships and did not involve any personal misconduct on their part.

Panel determination

127. The panel noted that there was no dispute that PC Souleiman had told Officer J and Officer I that he intended to "fuck up" his colleagues. Therefore, the only issue for the panel to determine is whether PC Souleiman was threatening violence when he issued the words. The panel found that PC Souleiman's account that he was referring to messing up the officers careers when he threatened to "*fuck them up*" lacked plausibility. Disclosing that colleagues were involved in personal relationship could cause some embarrassment to them, but it would not have any negative impact on their careers with the police service.

128. Officer J and Officer I both describe PC Souleiman as being worked up and agitated when he threatened to "fuck up" his colleagues. The panel concluded that in these circumstances it was highly likely that PC Souleiman was threatening to use violence against his colleagues for ruining his career. The panel therefore found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities on the basis that PC Souleiman had threatened violence towards his colleagues.

BREACH OF STANDARDS

129. Having found all of the allegations of fact proved or partially proved apart from allegations 1.6 ,2 and 3.1. The panel went on to consider whether PC Souleiman's conduct breached the professional standard of Authority Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable conduct as alleged by the AA. The standards provide:

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

"Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

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.

130. In relation to allegation 1 The panel have found that PC Souleiman engaged in a course of conduct that was inappropriate and misogynistic, and that he behaved in this manner towards colleagues and members of the public, taken collectively the conduct found proved clearly breaches both of the standards alleged.

131. In relation to allegation 3 the panel have found that PC Souleiman issued threats of violence towards colleagues who acted appropriately and had reported his inappropriate and misogynistic behaviour to a senior officer. His threatening behaviour was akin to a criminal offence and as such his conduct clearly breached both of the alleged standards.

GROSS MISCONDUCT OR MISCONDUCT

132. The panel next considered whether the breaches of the standards found proved amounted to gross misconduct, misconduct or neither. Misconduct is defined in the Regulations as meaning a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross misconduct is defined as a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal. The panel reminded itself of the circumstances of this case, the breach of the standard found proved, the need to protect public confidence in, and the reputation of the Police Service, the need to maintain high professional standards and the need to protect the public and officers and staff by preventing similar misconduct in the future.

133. In assessing the seriousness of PC Souleiman's conduct the panel had regard to the outcome guidance which provides that panels should assess the seriousness of the proven conduct by reference to the officer's culpability for the misconduct, the harm caused by the misconduct, the existence of any aggravating factors and the existence of any mitigating factors.

134. In respect of culpability the panel found that PC Souleiman's actions were deliberate and targeted towards females and that this conduct occurred shortly after receiving training on ethics and police standards. Further, his threats of violence towards colleagues were serious, intimidating and carried an implication of violence, and as such they were akin to a serious criminal offence. The panel therefore determined that the level of PC Souleiman's culpability was high.

135. In respect of harm the panel noted that some emotional harm had been caused to police colleagues as a result of PC Souleiman's inappropriate and misogynistic conduct, and that he had caused the colleagues that he had threatened with violence significant emotional distress. The potential reputational harm was high in this case, there is high level of national concern in respect of misogyny in the police service. Further, police officers are expected to uphold the laws of the land when they behave in a manner that is akin to a criminal offence the potential for reputational harm to the police service will always be high. The panel therefore determined that the level of harm in this case was also high.

136. The panel found the following aggravating factors in this case:

- PC Souleiman's inappropriate conduct was repeated and sustained
- There were multiple victims

137. In respect of mitigating factors, the panel found no mitigating factors that were relevant to their consideration of seriousness in this case. The panel noted that PC Souleiman had raised his lack of training as a mitigating factor, however, even on the officer's own account he had completed his ethics and standards training within 4 to 5 weeks (by early November 2024) the panel therefore concluded that a lack of training was not a relevant mitigating factor in this case.

138. The panel also noted that it was asserted in PC Souleiman's regulation 31 response that he had been diagnosed with dyslexia and dyspraxia and that these conditions may have influenced the way that the officer responded to stress and anxiety. However, in the absence of medical evidence to support this assertion the panel were unable to place any weight on this assertion.

139. In light of the above findings the panel concluded that the level of seriousness in this case was high. The panel therefore determined that the breaches of the standards found proved amounted to gross misconduct.

OUTCOME

140. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction the panel had regard to PC Souleiman's service record, the testimonials produced on his behalf, the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf the AA and PC Souleiman and the legal advice received from the legal advisor. The panel applied the three-stage procedure set out in the College of Policing Outcome Guidance. The panel assessed the seriousness of the misconduct, keeping in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions and chose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.

141. Counsel for the AA submitted that the only appropriate outcome in the circumstances of this case given public concern about misogyny in the police service was dismissal without notice. It was submitted on behalf of PC Souleiman that he was at the beginning of his career and hadn't fully appreciated the required standards of a police officer undergoing initial training. It was therefore submitted that a final written warning would be appropriate in this case.

142. PC Souleiman addressed the panel in person, he accepted that he had caused harm to his colleagues but stated that this was unintentional and that he never intended to demean or disrespect anyone. He apologised for the harm caused and the impact of his behaviour and stated that he had learnt from his experience and had changed his behaviour as a result. He asked to be given another chance to put what he had learnt into practice and show that he could develop into a good police officer.

143. The panel reconsidered its assessment of seriousness in light of the further submissions made. For the reasons detailed above the panel found that the level of culpability and harm remained high.

144. The panel also reconsidered its assessment of aggravating and mitigating factors. The panel did not identify any further aggravating factors. As to mitigation, the panel noted that PC Souleiman apologised for the impact of his behaviour and expressed remorse for the harm caused to his colleagues; however, the panel found that he showed limited insight into the impact of his actions on the reputation of the police service.

145. The panel kept in mind at all times the threefold purpose of imposing sanctions, namely: (a) maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; (b) upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; (c) protection of the public.

146. In line with the outcome guidance at paragraph 7.4, the panel considered the least severe outcome first. PC Souleiman's conduct amounted to a serious departure from the standards expected of serving police officers. He behaved in a misogynistic and threatening manner and has shown little understanding of the impact of his

behaviour on public confidence in the police service. This type of conduct is totally inconsistent with the values and standards that the Metropolitan Police Service expects of serving police officers. Therefore, the panel determined that a final written warning would be neither proportionate nor appropriate to address the seriousness of the misconduct found proved and to uphold high standards in policing and deter other officers from acting in a similar manner.

147. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that the only appropriate sanction in this case was dismissal without notice.

DIRECTIONS ON PUBLICATION

148. The panel directed that the names of the PC's who were the subject of inappropriate comments should be redacted from the public notice in addition to the cipher that had previously been agreed for Officer A.