IN THE MATTER OF THE MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024)

BETWEEN

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

and

FPS Sanjar Sefer

PANEL FINAL DECISION

Introductions:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for FPS Sanjar Sefer (the Officer). The outline of the Panel decisions on facts and outcome was provided to the Officer during the hearing.

2. The Panel was chaired by T/Commander Brigid Beehag-Fisher (Chair), with independent members Mrs Margie Leong and Mr Leslie Bowman. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Olivia Kong.

3. The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by Mr Kevin Saunders (AA's representative). The Officer was represented by Mr Thomas Beardsworth (The Officer's representative). The Officer was also supported by his Federation representative.

4. The hearing was held from 21 September 2026 to 02 October 2026 at the Patrick Dunne House, Sutton Police Station, 6 Carshalton Road, Sutton, SM1 4RF.

5. At the outset of its determinations, and throughout the hearing, the Panel has remained mindful of the overarching purpose of police misconduct proceedings, namely:

    i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;

    ii. To uphold high standards of professional conduct and deter misconduct;

iii. To protect the public.

The Allegations:

6. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of the Officer containing the allegations and that her conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct, namely:

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

SANJAR SEFER, whilst a Sergent serving with the Metropolitan Police Service, your conduct is alleged to have fallen below the standard expected of a serving police officer in such a way that you have contravened the Standards of Professional Behaviour so as to amount to gross misconduct as set out below:

ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT

1. On 23 December 2023 whilst carrying out the role of BX11 loggist you engaged in harassing behaviour towards Officer A which was unwanted and/or was of a sexual nature and/or which related to her sex and/or age (protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010) and that unwanted conduct was unprofessional and had the effect of intimidating or violating the dignity of that person, or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that person.

2. Between about 12 December 2024 and 17 December you engaged in harassing behaviour towards Officer B which was excessive and overbearing, unwanted and/or was of a sexual nature and/or which related to her being female (a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010) and that unwanted conduct was unprofessional and had the effect of intimidating or violating the dignity of that person, or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that person.

3. On 17 December 2024 you engaged in behaviour amounting to sexual harassment of Officer B in that you subjected her to unwanted conduct of a sexual nature by saying words to the effect that you were in love with her and that she ought to excuse your unprofessional behaviour towards her because of this.

4. Your behaviour in relation to the allegations listed above, was in breach of the following standards: a. Discreditable conduct b. Equality and diversity c. Authority respect and courtesy.

5. Your behaviour is properly seen as a pattern or course of misconduct which could be considered so serious that your conduct warrants dismissal.

Preliminary Issues

Severance Argument

6. At the preliminary hearing, the Officer's representative applied for Allegation 1 to be severed from Allegations 2 and 3, on the basis that the Regulation 30 notice improperly combines two separate and distinct investigations.

7. The Officer's representative further sought the exclusion of the material concerning the Officer's interactions with Officer B between 2022 and 2024, as set out at paragraphs 6(a) to (g) of his response, from both the Regulation 30 notice and the hearing bundle.

8. The Chair refused the application for severance. The Chair directed that the Panel will consider the conduct as cumulative behaviour, reflecting an overarching course of conduct rather than discrete, severable incidents.

9. The Chair directed the redaction of paragraphs 10–12 of the Regulation 30 notice and any related material within the hearing bundle.

10. The Chair directed that the remaining material will assist the Panel as background and explanatory evidence, particularly in illuminating the nature of the complex relationship between the Officer and Officer B. No further redaction is directed.

Special measures

11. The AA's representative applied for the Officer A and Officer B to be anonymised and to give evidence behind screens. The Officer's representative raised no objection to the application.

12. The Chair directed that screens are granted for Ms A and Ms B. The witnesses are to be anonymised and referred to as Officer A and Officer B throughout these proceedings. Permission is given for the Victim Support Unit to attend to provide support.

The Panel's Approach

13. The Panel reminded itself of its core responsibilities:

a. To assess the facts of the case and make findings in relation to each allegation;

b. To determine whether those findings amount to a breach of the relevant Standards of Professional Behaviour;

c. To decide whether the conduct found proven constitutes misconduct or gross misconduct.

14. The Panel remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the AA throughout the proceedings. The applicable standard is the balance of probabilities, that is, whether the alleged conduct is more likely than not to have occurred.

15. In reaching its decisions, the Panel considered the purpose and nature of police misconduct proceedings. The primary aim is not to punish the Officer, but to uphold public confidence in the police service and protect its reputation by ensuring accountability and making clear that improper conduct will not be tolerated. A secondary aim is to affirm and promote high professional standards. A further purpose is to protect the public, the Complainant, and police staff by preventing recurrence of similar misconduct. In doing so, the Panel had regard to the principles established in *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512; *Chief Constable of Dorset v PAT, Salter (Interested Party)* [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin); and *R (Williams) v PAT* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).

16. The Panel also considered the relevant regulatory framework and guidance, including:

a. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 ("the Regulations"), particularly the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2;

b. The 2018 Home Office Guidance ("HOG"), with specific reference to Chapter 1, which summarises the Standards;

c. The definition of misconduct under Regulation 3(1): "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour";

d. The definition of gross misconduct under Regulation 3(1): "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified".

17. The Panel listened carefully to all oral evidence and thoroughly reviewed the documentary evidence. It considered the totality of the evidence and submissions. While it does not propose to address every individual point raised, the Panel sets out its principal findings and conclusions.

Evidence

18. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:

    a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31(MG14) response) consisting of 368 pages;

    b. AA's opening note consisting of 24 pages;

    c. The Officer's character evidence of 52 pages.

    d. CCTV clips – SM31 – 3 mins 3 seconds

    e. CCTV clips – SM32 – 1 min 3 seconds

19. The Panel also heard from the following live witnesses:

    a. Officer A

    b. Officer B

    c. PC Searle

    d. PS Hills

    e. PS Pettit

    f. PC Hicks

    g. PS Mills

    h. Inspector Watts

    i. FPS Shipton

    j. PS Tee

    k. PS Hale

    l. Superintendent Gael

    m. Inspector Sincock

n. CI Newman

o. The Officer

Case Summary

20. On 23 December 2023, the Officer attended the Special Operation Room (SOR) and spoke with Officer A. Officer A states that the Officer's behaviour during this interaction was inappropriate, unwanted, and made her feel uncomfortable in the workplace. She states the Officer made comments which she interpreted as belittling, dismissive, and sexist.

21. The Officer denies the allegation. He states that any remarks were intended as humour, denies behaving inappropriately in the SOR, and disputes Officer A's interpretation of the incident. He maintains that he did not intend to cause offence or discomfort.

22. On 12 December 2024, after leaving a team Christmas event, the Officer asked Officer B if he could stay at her home, which she declined. He subsequently made over 24 calls to her, all unanswered, and sent multiple text messages suggesting that she was "not being there for him", that "there was more to it", and that he could "explain his behaviour".

23. On 17 December 2024, it is alleged that the Officer telephoned Officer B and told her that he had been in love with her, stating this was the reason for his behaviour. He continued to send further messages, to which she did not respond.

Finding of Facts & Breaches

24. The Panel considered the closing submissions advanced by representative for both the AA and the Officer, together with the legal advice provided. The Panel followed that advice throughout and remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the AA. The applicable standard is the balance of probabilities.

25. The final hearing bundle was agreed by both parties. The Panel has considered all of the evidence contained within it. The Panel heard live evidence from 13 witnesses: Officer A, Officer B, PS Pettit, PC Searle, PC Hicks, PS Tee, Superintendent Geal, CI Newman, PS Mills, PS Shipton, Inspector Watts, Inspector Sincock and the Officer.

26. In relation to Allegation 1, it is not in dispute that the Officer attended the SOR, where Officer A was the controller, and spoke with her. The issue for the Panel is whether the exchanges were lighthearted and joking in nature, as the Officer maintains, or whether they amounted to unwanted, sexist and harassing behaviour towards Officer A.

27. In relation to Allegations 2 and 3, it is accepted that the Officer and Officer B had a friendship and supported one another both professionally and personally. What is in dispute is whether the Officer's conduct towards Officer B crossed the line into behaviour that was unwelcome, harassing and whether it also amounted to unwanted conduct of a sexual nature.

The live witnesses

Officer A

28. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Officer A, which it accepted in full as broadly consistent with her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was detailed, coherent, and the Panel was satisfied as to her overall truthfulness and reliability.

29. Officer A stated that on 23 December 2023, while she was working as controller at Lambeth with three other Officers, two of whom she had never met before. She was approached by the Officer, whom she had not met before. She stated some of the conversations were inappropriate, made her feel uncomfortable and she asked him to leave several times in a light hearted manner.

30. She stated that the Officer commented on her finger tattoo, asked whether it hurt, and she made a remark about her pain tolerance. He questioned how long she had been a sergeant and suggested that her role on EA was "not really a sergeant's role." He emphasised his own experience and insisted she address him as "Sergeant" on the radio.

31. Officer A stated that the Officer made several comments about her age, appearance and make up, pointing near her face and suggesting she looked tired or was trying to appear younger. When she disclosed her age, he responded, "don't smile, it's not a compliment, have you seen your face."

32. She stated that he moved closer to her, prompting her to stand. He told her he could put her in a headlock and "floor her" within seconds. When she attempted to lighten the mood with an anecdote about Public and Personal Safety Training, he told her to "shut up" and rated her story as "a 3 on the scale of boring." Feeling upset and frustrated, she called him a "prick," which she accepted she should not have done. She asked him to leave, but he retorted that if she needed TSG support, they would not attend.

33. Although unclear of the order as to the conversation Officer A stated that he then made disparaging remarks about her being from Essex, prompting colleagues PC Hicks to state he was also from Essex although this comment was ignored. She

again asked him to leave. As he departed, she asked if he needed anything else; he replied, “don’t forget to address me as Sergeant.” She responded sarcastically, and asked whether the Officer wanted some crayons, which he challenged as “out of order” and accused her of stereotyping TSG. She told him his behaviour had been abusive throughout the interaction.

34. After the Officer left, both PC Hicks and PC Pettit asked if Officer A was alright and described the Officer’s behaviour as “out of order.” Officer A said she was left shaking, went to an office, and felt close to tears. She described the Officer as passive aggressive and said the encounter undermined her in front of others.

35. The Officer later emailed an apology, but Officer A felt it was not a genuine apology and instead focused on excusing his personality. She stated that no officer should be spoken to in that manner, male or female, nor undermined publicly in front of colleagues.

PC Searle

36. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of PC Searle, which it adopted in full from his written statement and found to be supported by his oral testimony.

37. PC Searle stated that he was seated next to Officer A on 23 December 2023. He recalled an initial discussion between Officer A and the Officer about serials booking on, including one that was running 15 minutes late. He heard the Officer say words to the effect of: *“You lied, you told me you had everything under control but clearly not, you don’t know what you’re doing.”* He also heard the Officer insist that he should be addressed as “Sergeant” over the radio, adding “especially by you” to Officer A.

38. Although he did not hear the full conversation because he was dealing with radio transmissions, he described the Officer’s tone as light-hearted “banter,” but said the content was passive aggressive, dominating and uncomfortable. He felt that the Officer was attempting to flirt with Officer A and present himself as macho, noting that Officer A was seated while the Officer stood over her.

39. PC Searle observed that Officer A appeared taken aback by the Officer’s comments. She told him to leave, saying “go get me some chocolate or a coffee,” which he understood as a playful attempt to end the interaction without causing a scene. As the Officer walked away, he continued engaging with her, saying he would not get her anything.

40. PC Searle initially assumed they knew each other, but Officer A confirmed they had never met. She told him she was shocked by how the Officer had spoken to

her. PC Searle later became aware that further remarks were made by the Officer to Officer A later that day, which upset her, although he was not present for those comments.

PC Hicks

41. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of PC Hicks, which was adopted in full from his written statement and supported by his clear and consistent oral testimony. The Panel found him to be a straightforward and reliable witness who gave his evidence without embellishment.

42. PC Hicks stated that while on duty on 23 December 2023 he overheard several remarks made by the Officer towards Officer A . Initially he felt they were both "winding each other up" and that she was a willing participant, but it developed into an exchange which he found inappropriate, offensive and sexist. He recalled the Officer interrupting Officer A and turning instead to a male sergeant, saying he would get a “better response” from him. When Officer A asked whether this was because she was female, the Officer replied, “yeah, well you know,” and dismissed her.

43. He stated that the Officer made further comments about her being from Essex, smirking when she confirmed she was, and did not acknowledge PC Searle when he challenged the remark. He also heard the Officer ask her age and then say he could not tell because she had “a lot of slap on,” which PC Hicks interpreted as a reference to her wearing makeup. In PC Hicks’ oral evidence, he was clear that he does not use the word “slap” himself, which reinforced his recollection that this was the word used.

44. PC Hicks recalled the Officer making remarks about being able to overpower Officer A or put her in a headlock, which he felt implied she was weak because she was female. He also heard the Officer belittle her contribution to a discussion about PPST training, rating her “chat” as “a 3 at best.”

45. He observed that out of all the controllers present, the Officer only approached and engaged with Officer A, and did so in a disrespectful manner. He believed this was because she was the only female and that the Officer saw her as an easy target to assert dominance. He stated that she asked him three times to leave, but he ignored her and continued being rude.

46. PC Hicks described the Officer as intentionally disrespectful, standing close to Officer A, puffing out his chest, and “squaring up” to her. He could see that Officer A was uncomfortable but trying not to appear intimidated. He noted that

she eventually became defensive, calling him a "prick," and later made a remark about TSG "using crayons," which he understood to be a common joke.

PS Pettit

47. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of PS Pettit, which was adopted in full from his written statement and supported by his measured and consistent oral testimony.

48. PS Pettit described the interaction between the Officer and Officer A on 23 December 2023 as *very offensive*. He stated that he is not someone who is easily offended or oversensitive, yet he was shocked, angry and appalled by what he heard.

49. He recalled that the Officer spoke to Officer A in an overly familiar manner and initially assumed they knew each other; he later learned they did not. He reported that the Officer said to Officer A, "you must be from Essex," implying she was not intelligent, and then went on a long ramble about people from Essex.

50. He stated that the Officer made disparaging comments about Officer A's appearance, asking her to stand up so he could see her better, and then saying she was older than he had thought. He recalled further comments about her being a woman, suggesting she was weak, boring, and "overly sensitive."

51. PS Pettit stated that the Officer also said to him, "oh, I didn't realise you were a skipper, if I had I would have spoken to you before," which he interpreted as implying that constables were beneath him. He stated that the Officer then told Officer A she was to address him as "Sergeant" at all times, and asked her age and length of service, implying that he was a more experienced and superior sergeant.

52. He described the Officer making a string of sexist and belittling comments for several minutes. He felt that the Officer was trying to be funny and flirtatious with Officer A, who was clearly becoming more uncomfortable. He said he contemplated intervening and regrets not doing so, partly because he mistakenly believed they knew each other.

53. He recalled Officer A calling the Officer a "prick," which he felt was reasonable in the circumstances, and making a remark about TSG "using crayons," which he also considered understandable given the lengthy sexualised and belittling comments she had endured. Officer A told the Officer to go away and not return.

54. After the Officer left, PS Pettit asked Officer A if she was alright and whether she had been uncomfortable. He stated that she was shaken and clearly upset by what had occurred.

FPS Shipton

55. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of FPS Shipton (now retired), which was adopted in full from his written statement and supported by his consistent oral testimony.

56. FPS Shipton stated that he met the Officer for the first time on 23 December 2023 and worked alongside him for most of that day. After a briefing, he, the Officer and Inspector Watts went to speak with officers at the pod where Officer A was working. Although he did not personally know the officers on the pod, he recognised them from previous deployments.

57. He described the interaction between the Officer, Inspector Watts and Officer A as jovial and light hearted. The only parts of the conversation he could recall related to age and football. He remembered the exchange as humorous, with people smiling and frequent eye contact between Officer A and the Officer.

58. FPS Shipton formed the impression that Officer A and the Officer already knew each other. He described Officer A's eye contact towards the Officer as "lingering" and felt they were flirting with one another.

59. He estimated that he was at the pod for around five to ten minutes and provided no further detail.

PS Mills

60. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of PS Mills, which was adopted in full from his written statement and supported by his clear and consistent oral testimony.

61. PS Mills stated he knew FPS Sefer in a work context in particular public order work, and that in his experience, the Officer could be socially awkward but not malicious, and he believed the interaction with Officer A had been a clumsy attempt at conversation rather than intentionally inappropriate behaviour.

62. He offered to speak to the Officer on Officer A's behalf, as she was considering making a complaint. He asked Officer A whether an apology would resolve the matter, and she indicated that it would. PS Mills also expressed concern that another supervisor had been present at the pod during the interaction; he felt that

if the behaviour had reached a disciplinary threshold, that supervisor should have challenged it at the time and dealt with any necessary referral.

63. PS Mills then spoke to the Officer, informing him that he had upset Officer A and that, although he may have intended to joke, it had not been received that way. He told him that Officer A had been offended and that the behaviour was inappropriate. The Officer appeared shocked and upset, saying that Officer A had been joking with him about being in TSG and needing crayons to write. He described the exchange as "banter" and said that others present had heard it and had not taken it seriously.

64. PS Mills advised him that Officer A had only joked in response to minimise the offence, and that others present were considering making a complaint. The Officer agreed to apologise, and PS Mills informed Officer A of this. Officer A later showed him the apology email sent by the Officer. In the email, the Officer expressed remorse and said he was sorry if others had been offended or taken the conversation the wrong way.

65. Officer A told PS Mills that she did not consider this to be a genuine apology and intended to make a formal complaint.

Inspector Watts

66. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Inspector Watts, which was adopted in full from his written statement and supported by his consistent oral testimony.

67. Inspector Watts explained that on 23 December 2023 he attended the SOR with the Officer and PS Shipton. He stated that he selects his command team carefully and, based on previous experience, had found the Officer to be professional, clear in his communication, and able to put people at ease.

68. At around 11:00, he visited the Silver suite and then the communications pod for his sector. When he approached the pod at approximately 11:40, he saw the Officer already speaking with the pod staff, including Officer A. He described the interaction as friendly, relaxed and jovial, with smiling, laughing and easy conversation. He observed no signs of discomfort or unease from any of the officers present. Officer A was laughing and smiling while responding to the Officer, which led him to believe they knew each other and were comfortable in each other's company.

69. He left the SOR at around 11:45 to prepare his briefing. After receiving deployments, the Officer returned to the pod to update them. When he later

came back, he told Inspector Watts that Officer A had teased him about being in TSG and writing with crayons. Inspector Watts understood this as further light hearted teasing consistent with the earlier interaction he had witnessed, and saw nothing inappropriate in the exchange.

Officer B

70. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Officer B, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was detailed, internally coherent and broadly consistent.

71. Officer B described her relationship with the Officer as tumultuous. At times, they were close, the Officer would support her in her work, offer advice she found helpful, and they would use pet names for each other. He also supported her when she experienced difficulties in her personal relationships. She stated that when the Officer's father was ill, she tried to support him by talking to him, but was told by the Officer that he would rather not discuss it.

72. She explained that whenever they fell out, they could go long periods of time without speaking. She said she found the Officer emotionally demanding and volatile, and that she was tense around him when he was in a bad mood, leading her to tread carefully so as not to upset him. She described doing things to appease him in order to calm him down and avoid triggering further anger. She characterised this pattern of closeness, followed by abrupt withdrawal and hostility, as typical of their dynamic.

73. Officer B gave evidence of a prolonged pattern of overbearing, abusive and intimidating behaviour by the Officer, which made her feel uncomfortable and ultimately unable to work with him. She joined TSG in March 2022 and initially had a professional relationship with the Officer, but describes his behaviour becoming increasingly volatile, controlling and unpredictable. She characterises him as charismatic when in a good mood, but rude, aggressive and unprofessional when in a bad mood. She provides several examples of this behaviour.

74. In April 2023, following a supervisors' night out, the Officer made an abusive phone call to her, berating her about annual and compassionate leave. Around the same time, he removed her from an operational WhatsApp group without explanation, causing embarrassment, before later reinstating her. On 27 April 2023, during a disagreement about taking a carrier out of service, he told her to "go away", then later called her, shouting and swearing, using derogatory terms including "cunt", "arrogant" and "selfish". He told her they were no longer friends and encouraged her to "make a complaint".

75. She describes further incidents, including a confrontation at a Sergeants' meeting where he shouted at her for around 20 minutes, called her selfish, denied previous insults, and threatened to throw her out of a window. She says she felt intimidated and fearful due to his physical stature. In August 2023, he publicly berated her in the custody suite, accusing her of favouritism, and later followed her aggressively when she attempted to speak privately with an Inspector. She requested a transfer as a result but later forgave him after he apologised.

76. Officer B recounts another incident during crew training when the Officer accused her of undermining him, screamed in her face, and later, inside a carrier, threw a protein shake on the floor, blocked her exit, and punched the vehicle while shouting insults. She says she felt scared and cried during the incident, noting that other officers returning to the carrier likely overheard it.

77. She also describes escalating behaviour at the team's Christmas party on 12 December 2024. She says the Officer appeared jealous and possessive, insisted on accompanying her after the event, and was insistent he was going to go to her home despite her refusal. After she left him at a tube station, she received 24 missed calls and numerous messages from him. In the days that followed, he accused her of being a bad friend and then confessed he had been in love with her for 18 months, which she believes explains his behaviour. Despite repeated apologies and pleas for contact, she ceased communication with him after 17 December 2024.

78. Officer B provides exhibits including WhatsApp messages, call logs and screenshots evidencing the Officer's conduct. She states that for over a year she felt compelled to placate him due to his influence over overtime and his connections within TSG, but ultimately found his behaviour intimidating, controlling and unacceptable.

PS Tee

79. The Panel considered the evidence of PS Tee, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was clear, balanced and broadly consistent.

80. She explains that she and the Officer were initially close friends, and that he offered her professional support. However, from spring 2023, his behaviour changed markedly. She describes a pattern of erratic, hostile and controlling conduct which caused her considerable anxiety. This included repeated angry outbursts, accusatory telephone calls, and attempts to use perceived professional "favours" to exert influence over her. He demanded demonstrations

of loyalty, reacted aggressively when challenged, and contacted her so persistently after disagreements that she ultimately blocked him.

81. PS Tee said she had concerns about the Officer's behaviour towards Officer B. She states that he expected her to support him in disputes and became angry when challenged. She recounts incidents where his hostility escalated, including a prolonged two hour tirade over a minor operational matter, and a conversation in which he admitted romantic feelings for Officer B, expressed jealousy, and made inappropriate comments about her [REDACTED] to which she told him "To get over it". She states that this left her feeling deeply uncomfortable

82. PS Tee also relays accounts from Officer B of further aggressive behaviour, shouting at her so loudly that a colleague intervened to check her welfare; berating her with personal insults and throwing a protein shaker during an operational incident; and shouting at her on parade until she became visibly distressed. PS Tee said the Officer's behaviour was manipulative, aggressive, and inconsistent with the standards expected of a police supervisor.

Superintendent Geal

83. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Superintendent Geal, which was adopted in full from her written statement and supported by her oral testimony. Her account was detailed and consistent, and she demonstrated a clear distinction between events she directly observed and those relayed to her by others.

84. Superintendent Geal stated that she has known Officer B since January 2020, when they worked together as sergeants on a response team, and they developed a close friendship that continued after moving roles. She had met FPS Sefer through public order policing but had no social relationship with him outside work. In March 2022, Officer B joined TSG, where FPS Sefer was already a sergeant, and over the following 18 months they became friends. By early 2024, Superintendent Geal observed, and was told by Officer B, that the relationship had become volatile. Officer B described the Officer as increasingly moody and rude without warning, leaving her anxious about returning to work. Although he would sometimes "talk her round" after losing his temper, the pattern persisted. When on good terms, their interactions appeared friendly and good humoured based.

85. Superintendent Geal recalled several specific incidents disclosed to her by Officer B. One involved the Officer shouting at and belittling Officer B in front of colleagues at the custody suite, leaving her upset and anxious. Another incident recounted by Officer B took place on 26 August 2024, when the Officer became

angry because a training session overran by nine minutes; he threw a protein shaker inside a carrier, shouted aggressively at Officer B, and made cruel, misogynistic remarks. Superintendent Geal expressed regret for not reporting this at the time.

86. She stated that matters escalated further at a Christmas event on 12 December 2024. Officer B disclosed that after leaving the event, the Officer accompanied her to a casino and then insisted on staying at her flat, which she refused. He falsely claimed to have missed his train, which Officer B disproved, and she escorted him to the tube station. Following this, he sent numerous messages and made 24 calls to her. Officer B told Superintendent Geal she feared something serious might have happened had he returned to her flat, which caused Superintendent Geal significant concern.

87. On 17 December 2024, the Officer told Officer B he had been in love with her for 18 months and attributed his behaviour to jealousy. Officer B informed Superintendent Geal the following day. Superintendent Geal considered his behaviour highly manipulative. Despite Officer B's reluctance to escalate matters, Superintendent Geal felt compelled to act due to the impact on Officer B's wellbeing and her expressed desire not to work with him. On 19 December, she contacted CI Newman to raise her concerns. That same day, the Officer continued to call and message Officer B repeatedly.

88. Superintendent Geal concluded by expressing regret for not intervening sooner. She stated that Officer B now feels relieved and able to work without fear, and she emphasised the prolonged and damaging effect the Officer's behaviour had on Officer B's wellbeing and professional confidence.

Inspector Sincock

89. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Inspector Sincock, which was adopted in full from his written statement and supported by his oral testimony. His account was measured and broadly consistent.

90. Inspector Sincock stated that he has known the Officer since 2007 and worked closely with him until 2012. He has known Officer B since May 2023 and, from that point, served as line manager for both sergeants on TSG. He continues to manage Officer B but no longer manages the Officer, who has since moved to a different TSG unit.

91. He described an incident on 19 August 2023 at approximately 03:15 hours, when Officer B approached him in a police canteen visibly upset, followed shortly afterwards by the Officer. Officer B accused the Officer of being a bully. Inspector

Sincock separated them and spoke to each individually. Officer B reported that the Officer had belittled her and raised his voice in custody after she inadvertently booked her PC's prisoner in ahead of his. She later clarified that she did not consider him a bully and did not wish to escalate the matter, citing their friendship and his family circumstances. She requested a transfer to another TSG unit, which was discussed with CI Newman.

92. Inspector Sincock reviewed custody CCTV and obtained a peer review from the Custody Inspector; neither identified raised voices or inappropriate behaviour. Two weeks later, he held a meeting with both sergeants to reinforce expectations of professional conduct and boundaries.

93. He was made aware of a further disagreement in 2024 while he was on annual leave. Officer B, acting up as Inspector, had allowed a physical training session to run longer than agreed, which the Officer perceived as undermining him. On his return, Inspector Sincock noted tension and convened a meeting, reiterating professional standards and deciding that neither sergeant would act up in rank during his absence. The relationship appeared to stabilise afterwards.

94. Inspector Sincock described their relationship as a close friendship with fluctuating dynamics, characterised by periods of strong rapport followed by disagreements and reconciliations. He stated that they frequently communicated outside work and confided in each other about personal and professional matters. He had not seen or heard any inappropriate or abusive language used by the Officer towards Officer B.

CI Newman

95. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of CI Newman, which was adopted in full from his email correspondences and supported by his oral testimony. His account was broadly consistent.

96. CI Newman emailed Inspector Sincock on 1 September 2023 regarding the custody incident between the Officer and Officer B. He stated that the Officer was distressed at being described as a bully, citing emotional strain and personal pressures, including his father's declining health. CI Newman advised him to focus on self care and suggested mediation rather than a team move.

97. Officer B clarified that her concern related to the Officer's "bullish" manner rather than bullying, noting that his directness could feel overwhelming as she was the only female supervisor. She described the incident as a minor disagreement and confirmed that she and the Officer had discussed improving their working relationship. CI Newman acknowledged the gender dynamics and observed that

repeated apologies following outbursts could indicate a pattern, though he did not consider the behaviour abusive. He recommended careful management of responsibilities, particularly around acting up duties.

The Officer

Re: Officer A

98. The Officer denies all allegations. He denies saying that Officer A "lied" or that she did not know what she was doing. He states that his comment about being addressed as "Sergeant," including the phrase "especially by you," was intended to be light-hearted. He also describes his remark about waiting all day for deployments as humorous.

99. He denies belittling Officer A's role, denies saying she looked tired, and denies making any comment about the amount of makeup she was wearing. He also denies saying, "don't smile, it's not a compliment, have you seen your face." He states that he did not move closer to Officer A; rather, he says she stood up and moved closer to him.

100. In relation to the comment about her story being "a 3," he denies saying it was "a 3 on the scale of boring," and says he instead remarked, "I give that story a 3 out of 10." He denies making any comment about putting Officer A in a headlock. He says that when Officer A called him a "prick," he interpreted it as jovial.

101. He states that neither PS Pettit nor PC Hicks indicated they felt uncomfortable or encouraged him to leave. Regarding the remark about Officer A being from Essex, he says he actually said, "yeah, I probably could have guessed that." He also says that his comment about preferring to deal with a "skipper" was directed at Officer A, and that she smiled in response.

102. He denies losing his temper when Officer A made the comment about crayons and denies challenging or abusing her for 20 minutes. He says that when he left the SOR, Officer A was not shaking or close to tears; he describes her as smiling, laughing and nudging his arm.

103. He rejects PC Searle's account, denying that he tried to appear macho. He also states that PC Hicks' account is untrue, expressing shock that PC Hicks believed Officer A appeared uncomfortable or intimidated.

104. He believes that any comment about Officer A's makeup was made in the presence of PS Shipton and Inspector Lea, though PS Shipton recalls only football and age being discussed, and Inspector Lea recalls only a jovial atmosphere. He denies being loud or brash.

Re: Officer B

105. The Officer stated he was under significant personal strain due to his father's prolonged illness and death, which affected his emotional wellbeing. He explained that his early interactions with Officer B were limited and sometimes strained, but from early 2023 she began seeking his advice frequently on both professional matters and personal issues, including relationship difficulties. He said this led to regular contact outside work, calls and messages, which he maintains were largely initiated by Officer B. He described their relationship as perceived by colleagues as a "big brother/little sister" dynamic but now believes he was relied upon excessively during a vulnerable period.

106. He acknowledged that physical contact occurred but stated it was predominantly initiated by Officer B, including hugs and touching his shoulders or leg, sometimes in front of colleagues. He denied any flirtatious behaviour, romantic feelings or sexual relationship, and maintained that his own conduct remained professional.

107. He denied using abusive language or acting disrespectfully during the April 2023 dispute; denied shouting or intimidating behaviour during the July 2023 sergeants' meeting; and described the August 2023 custody incident as a brief professional disagreement, pointing to CCTV and managerial review as supporting his account. Regarding the December 2024 Christmas event, he accepted sending multiple messages and calls afterwards but said this was due to feeling abandoned while unwell and intoxicated. He stated that Officer B continued contacting him afterwards, which he believes contradicts claims of distress.

108. Throughout his account, the Officer strongly refuted allegations of controlling, excessive or abusive behaviour. He maintained that Officer B initiated most contact and relied heavily on him for support. He accepted that disagreements occurred but denied any intention to cause distress.

Finding of facts

109. In assessing the evidence, the Panel first took account of the Officer's good character. He has no previous findings of misconduct, and this positive feature of his record was considered when evaluating both his credibility and the likelihood of him having acted as alleged. The Panel recognised that good character does not determine the outcome and cannot outweigh clear, reliable evidence; however, it forms part of the overall evidential landscape and has been given appropriate weight in reaching the Panel's findings.

110. The Panel then considered whether any of the Officer's behaviour towards B can be treated as conduct took place in his private life. The Panel found the Officer's

behaviour towards Officer B cannot properly be regarded as taking place within his private life. Although the Officer and Officer B had a friendship, the conduct complained of occurred overwhelmingly in the workplace, during operational duties, in police vehicles, at custody suites, during training, and within supervisory or professional interactions. The behaviour directly affected working relationships, team dynamics, operational decision making and Officer B's ability to carry out her role. As confirmed in the case of *Beckwith*, private life protections apply only where conduct is genuinely private and unconnected to professional obligations; they do not shield behaviour that intrudes into workplace relationships or undermines professional standards. In the case of *Farquharson* further establishes that even informal or ostensibly personal exchanges can amount to misconduct when they occur in a policing context and impact colleagues or the working environment. In Officer B's case, the Officer's conduct was not detached, consensual or confined to private settings, it was repeatedly manifested in the course of duty, towards a colleague, and in circumstances where professional standards of respect, courtesy and self-control were directly engaged.

Allegation 1

111. The Panel accepts that the Officer attended the SOR where Officer A was the controller. The issue was whether his comments and behaviour amounted to light-hearted joking, as he maintained, or whether they constituted unwanted and harassing conduct. The SOR was a busy, noisy workspace, and the Panel recognises that witnesses may not have heard every word with precision. However, the Officer accepted making several of the remarks alleged by Officer A, including comments about her tattoo, age, appearance, make-up, being addressed as "Sergeant", placing her in a headlock, and suggesting he could "guess" she was from Essex. He characterised these as jokes. The Panel does not accept that explanation.

112. There were two separate encounters. The Panel found that Inps Watts, FPS Shipton and PC Searle only witnessed the first encounter.

113. Several witnesses described the initial encounter as mostly jovial, humorous and possibly flirty and presumed that they knew each other. However, as the conversation progressed in the second encounter the Officers tone and content became increasingly inappropriate and uncomfortable. PC Searle stated that although the Officer appeared light-hearted, the remarks were passive aggressive and made him uncomfortable. PC Pettit described the exchange as "very offensive", recalling sexist and disparaging language about Officer A's appearance and professional capability, and noting that he was sufficiently shocked to stop what he was doing and listen. PC Hicks heard the Officer say that Officer A looked young for her age but he "couldn't tell because she had a lot of slap on", and

heard the Officer suggest she would be unable to escape a headlock, comments he interpreted as implying she was weak or because she was female.

114. While there were differences in the witnesses' recollection of the precise wording, the Panel considers these minor and attributable to the busy environment. The overall consistency in their descriptions of tone, impact and impropriety strongly supports Officer A's account. The Panel also considered the Officer's assertion that he used the word "make up" rather than "slap". Even if accepted, the Panel finds that the comment remained inappropriate and served to diminish the seriousness of the situation in the context described. Officer A's reaction, calling the Officer a "prick" and becoming visibly upset, was also observed by others and is consistent with her account of feeling undermined.

115. The Officer's explanation that the exchange was merely humorous is not supported by the wider evidence. The Panel is satisfied that his behaviour went beyond acceptable professional interaction and amounted to unwelcome and undermining conduct towards Officer A, which was unwanted, related to her sex, and constituted unprofessional behaviour that violated her dignity and created an intimidating, hostile, humiliating and offensive environment. On the balance of probabilities, Allegation 1 is proved.

Context for Allegations 2 and 3

116. The Panel accepts that the Officer and Officer B had a complex and fluctuating relationship. Both described a dynamic in which they could be supportive of each other in their professional and personal lives yet also experience periods of complete disengagement. When relations were positive, they used affectionate nicknames, and Officer B acknowledged that the Officer had provided her with significant support, both at work and in relation to her personal circumstances. She accepted that he could be a good friend they exchanged large volumes of messages often expressing appreciation for each other. However, she also described feeling the need at times to tread carefully around him, to avoid upsetting him, and to appease him because of his volatility.

117. This pattern was corroborated by PC Tee, who had also been close to the Officer and described similar fluctuations in his behaviour, while he could be an excellent mentor, he could also be unpredictable and volatile. The Panel found Officer B's evidence balanced, measured and consistent. The Panel also reviewed the phone messages and call logs between them, which illustrated the inconsistent and emotionally charged nature of their interactions.

118. Taken together, this evidence provides a clear picture of a relationship marked by support on the one hand and volatility on the other, consistent with both Officer B's account and the Officer's own description of their dynamic. This is further supported by the evidence of Inspector Sincock, who stated that the nature of

their relationship meant colleagues under their command would often be "walking on eggshells," as this volatility spilled into the workplace.

119. The panel note there were other allegations made by Officer B, however as they do not form part of the allegations on the Reg 30 Notice the panel make no finding on those matters.

Allegation 2

120. Having considered all the evidence, the Panel finds Allegation 2 proved. The conduct between 12 and 17 December went well beyond the boundaries of a supportive friendship. The Officer accepted that he became involved in a heated discussion with Officer B because he felt she had "talked him into coming out" to the Christmas party while he was unwell but had not given him the attention he expected. He further accepted that making 24 phone calls to her later that evening was excessive. The phone logs show that, within an hour of Officer B telling him to leave her alone, he sent a further 22 WhatsApp messages. This level of persistent and unwanted contact is consistent with Officer B's account of feeling pressured, overwhelmed and unable to disengage.

121. The Officer's evidence was inconsistent. When asked whether he had asked to go to Officer B's home on the night of the Christmas party, he initially denied doing so, but later accepted that he may have asked if he was "too tired and unwell" to return to his own home. He maintained that he only wished to "crash on her sofa". He apologised for his behaviour that night but claimed he could not remember the events; however, his message to Officer B on 13 December clearly shows he did remember, as he apologised for what had occurred. These inconsistencies undermined the reliability of his account.

122. By contrast, Officer B's evidence was clear, balanced and consistent. The Panel was able to draw reliable inferences from the phone logs and messages exchanged between them, which aligned with her description of feeling intimidated, overwhelmed and subjected to excessive and overbearing behaviour. The Panel also notes that PS Hale was sufficiently concerned to telephone Officer B twice to check on her welfare after leaving to go home. The Panel considers this an important indicator of how hostile and uncomfortable the environment had become for Officer B as a result of the Officer's conduct.

123. Taken together, the Officer's persistent calling, his volatile reactions, his inconsistent explanations, and the concerns raised by PS Hale demonstrate behaviour that was excessive and overbearing, unwanted and unprofessional. The Panel is satisfied that this conduct had the effect of creating an intimidating, hostile and humiliating environment for Officer B.

Allegation 3

124. Having considered all the evidence, the Panel finds Allegation 3 proved. Officer B's account was that, on 17 December, the Officer told her he had been in love with her for the past 18 months and suggested that she should excuse his earlier behaviour because of this. The Officer denied making such a declaration. The Panel does not accept his denial.

125. The messages sent immediately prior to the phone call contain a series of emotionally charged statements from the Officer, including: "there is a reason", "I will come clean", "you can hate me but I'll always care about you", "I'm sorry I felt I needed more", "I care for you daily, I love you daily, I want attention daily", "I can't deal with showing how I feel", "don't be angry. I can explain", and "please don't be angry and don't ignore me… it's not happened overnight". These messages clearly indicate that the Officer was preparing to disclose feelings that went beyond friendship. The Panel also notes the message, "if after the call you want to be colleagues I'll still care… but be colleagues", which strongly suggests that the Officer wished for a relationship that was more than collegial.

126. The panel also noted from PS Tee's evidence the Officer has admitted to her he was jealous when he saw Officer B speaking to other men.

127. Taken together, these messages and PS Tee's statement make Officer B's account of the Officer declaring his love during the subsequent call more likely.

128. Officer B's reaction was immediate and unequivocal. She emailed Inspector Sincock shortly afterwards, stating that the Officer had made declarations which made her feel uncomfortable and that she no longer wished to work with him. She described the difficulties in their friendship and her inability to sustain it any longer. This contemporaneous account supports her evidence that the Officer's declaration was unwanted and had a significant impact on her.

129. The Panel also considered the evidence of PC Terry, who stated that she once observed Officer B place her hand on the Officer's knee in a police carrier. As both the Officer and Officer B denied this incident, and there is no supporting evidence, the Panel places no weight on this account. It does not alter the Panel's assessment of the events of 17 December.

130. The Panel is satisfied that telling a colleague he was "in love" with her, coupled with the suggestion that this excused his prior behaviour, amounted to unwanted conduct of a sexual nature. In the context of their professional relationship, this was inappropriate, unprofessional and had the effect of violating Officer B's dignity and creating an intimidating and uncomfortable environment.

Breach of the Standards

131. In light of the above findings, the Panel concluded that the Officer's conduct engaged the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Authority, Respect and Courtesy, Equality & Diversity and Discreditable Conduct,

(a) Authority, Respect and Courtesy

132. The standard of Authority, Respect and Courtesy requires police officers to act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

133. The Officer's overall conduct demonstrated a failure to treat colleagues with the professionalism, restraint and courtesy required by this Standard. His interactions included belittling remarks, inappropriate personal comments, and behaviour that caused discomfort and distress to those present. The Officer's approach was at times confrontational, overly familiar, and lacking in the respect expected within a disciplined organisation. His persistent and at times unwelcome contact with Officer B, coupled with emotionally charged communications and disregard for her attempts to disengage, showed an absence of courtesy and consideration for her wellbeing. The cumulative effect of these behaviours was incompatible with maintaining constructive working relationships and fell significantly below the level of respect and civility expected of a police officer.

(b) Discreditable Conduct

134. The standard of Discreditable Conduct requires police officers to behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in the police service.

135. The Officer's actions demonstrated a lack of judgement and professionalism that fell markedly below the expectations placed upon a police officer. The inappropriate remarks directed at colleagues, the intrusive and unwelcome contact with Officer B, and the disclosure of personal feelings in a professional context collectively represent conduct that is incompatible with the responsibilities and public trust associated with policing. The fact that his behaviour caused concern among colleagues illustrates the seriousness with which it was perceived. Conduct of this nature, if known publicly, would be liable to diminish confidence in the police service and adversely affect its reputation.

136. The Panel therefore finds that the Officer's behaviour discredited the police service and undermined public confidence in it, amounting to a breach of the Standard of Discreditable Conduct.

(c) Equality and Diversity

137. The standard of Equality and Diversity requires that police officers act with fairness and impartiality and do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.

138. The Panel is satisfied that the Officer's overall behaviour breached the Standard of Equality and Diversity. His remarks towards colleagues included comments that were gender-based, diminishing and reliant on stereotypes relating to appearance and capability. Such comments were not neutral or impartial; they singled out female colleagues in a way that was unfair and inconsistent with treating individuals with equal respect. In addition, the Officer's declaration of romantic feelings to a colleague, and the suggestion that this should excuse his behaviour, amounted to unwanted conduct of a sexual nature. This behaviour affected her dignity and contributed to an environment that was unwelcome and uncomfortable. The Officer did not act with fairness or impartiality, and his conduct amounted to discriminatory and unequal treatment. The Panel therefore finds that the Standard of Equality and Diversity is breached.

Misconduct or Gross Misconduct

139. Under the *Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings*, misconduct is defined as:

"A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action."

140. Gross misconduct is defined as:

"A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal."

141. The Panel carefully considered the threshold between Misconduct and Gross Misconduct with reference to the above assessment on seriousness. The Panel determined that the Officer's conduct meets the threshold for Gross Misconduct for the following reason:

142. The conduct represented a serious breach of multiple Standards of Professional Behaviour, caused significant harm to colleagues and was capable of undermining public confidence in the police service. It occurred across several incidents and over a period of days, demonstrating a sustained departure from the standards expected of a police officer. Taken together, the seriousness of the behaviour and the impact on individuals and the organisation are such that dismissal would be justified. The Panel therefore finds that the Officer's conduct constitutes gross misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

143. The panel reminded ourselves of the 3 stages to determining outcome; namely:-
    a. To assess the seriousness
    b. Keep in mind the purpose of imposing the sanctions
    c. Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

Stage 1: Overall Assessment of Seriousness

Assessment of Culpability

144. Based on the following factors:

Deliberate Conduct and Choices Made

- The Officer's behaviour across the incidents was deliberate rather than inadvertent. He chose to make personal and belittling remarks to a colleague, persisted in contacting another colleague despite her clear attempts to disengage, and consciously disclosed personal feelings in a professional context. These actions demonstrate intentional conduct and a failure to exercise the judgement expected of a police officer.

Harassing Behaviour

- Elements of the Officer's conduct amounted to harassment. His remarks to Officer A were diminishing and gender based, delivered in a manner that caused her distress. His repeated and unwanted contact with Officer B, coupled with emotionally charged messaging, created pressure and discomfort. These behaviours were capable of causing humiliation and anxiety.

Lack of Respect for Dignity

- The Officer's comments to colleagues failed to respect their dignity. His remarks to Officer A relied on stereotypes relating to appearance and capability, diminishing her professional standing. His disclosure of romantic feelings to Officer B, and the suggestion that this should excuse his behaviour, was inappropriate and undermined her dignity in a professional setting.

Discriminatory or Gender Based Conduct

- Several of the Officer's comments were gender based and unfairly targeted female colleagues. His remarks to Officer A about her appearance and capability, and the unwanted declaration of romantic feelings to Officer B, amounted to conduct of a sexual nature that was unwanted and discriminatory.

Repetition and Pattern of Behaviour

- The Officer's behaviour was not an isolated lapse. It occurred across multiple incidents and over several days, involving repeated remarks, persistent contact, and escalating emotional pressure. This pattern of conduct increases seriousness and demonstrates attitudinal concerns.

145. The panel concluded the Officer's culpability was high.

Assessment of Harm

146. Based on the following factors:

Distress and Emotional Impact

- The Officer's behaviour caused clear distress to colleagues. Officer A became visibly upset following the remarks directed at her, and colleagues observed the emotional impact of the exchange. Officer B described feeling overwhelmed, pressured and unable to disengage from the Officer's conduct. The Panel is satisfied that the Officer's behaviour caused significant emotional harm to both colleagues.

Reputational Harm

- The Officer's conduct was capable of damaging the reputation of the police service. The inappropriate remarks would undermine confidence in the professionalism and judgement of police officers should they be publicly known.

Harm Arising from Misuse of Professional Relationships

- The Officer's behaviour towards Officer B placed an unfair emotional burden on her and disrupted the professional relationship. This misuse of a colleague's trust created harm by placing her in a position where she felt obliged to manage his reactions and navigate his volatility, affecting her sense of wellbeing at work.

Multiple Breaches and Sustained Conduct

- The harm caused was compounded by the fact that the Officer's behaviour involved multiple breaches across several incidents and over a period of days. This was not a single lapse but a sustained pattern of conduct, increasing the seriousness of the harm caused to individuals and to the organisation.

147. The panel concluded that the level of harm was high.

148. Aggravating Factors

- None

149. Mitigating Factors

- None

150. Personal Mitigation

The Panel also noted that the Officer's father was experiencing a decline in his health at the time of the incident which led to his death.

Stage 2: The purpose of imposing sanctions

151. The Panel have taken into account the threefold purpose for imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; upholding the high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and protecting the public).

Stage 3: Appropriate sanction

152. The Panel is mindful that the most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole.

153. The panel acknowledge that this was a period of considerable emotional distress for the Officer. The panel also acknowledges the character references in support of the Officer and his good service. The Panel recognised that this evidence demonstrates that the Officer has made a positive contribution in the course of his policing career.

154. The Panel gave these matters appropriate weight when considering the overall proportionate outcome. However, the Panel remained mindful that personal mitigation carries limited weight., including positive character evidence and does not diminish the seriousness of the misconduct itself.

155. Therefore, the panel found that the breaches of the standards were so serious as to justify dismissal had he been serving.

156. The panel orders publication pursuant to regulation 43 (6) of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

<u>Right of Appeal</u>

157. In accordance with Regulation 43(2), the Appropriate Authority shall provide the Officer with a copy of this report and a notice of the right of appeal. The Officer is reminded he has a right to appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal (PAT). The PAT may increase or decrease any penalty or overturn this decision.

T/Commander Brigid Beehag-Fisher

2 October 2026