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

CM/1177/25

B E T W E E N:-

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

Appropriate Authority

- and -

PC CONOR O'KELLY

Officer Concerned

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

Officer concerned:	PC Conor O'Kelly
Date of hearing:	22 December 2025
Name of person chairing:	Commander Katie Lilburn

[References in this decision to the Conduct Regulations are to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 and the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025. The Appropriate Authority is referred to as AA].

The Decisions of the Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Summary

The Allegations were found proved. It was determined that PC O'Kelly's conduct had fallen below the standards expected of a serving police officer such as to contravene the Standards of

Professional Behaviour and to amount to gross misconduct. It was determined that PC O'Kelly should be dismissed without notice.

Attendances

- PC O'Kelly attended the hearing and was represented by PC Caitriona Ferguson, Police Federation representative.
- The AA's case was presented by PC Hannah Clark.
- The Chair was assisted by a legally qualified adviser, Mr Chris Pataky.

Evidence and documentation

The Chair had been provided with the following evidence and documentation:

(a) Notice of Decision to Refer an Allegation to an Accelerated Hearing dated 1 December 2025 (5 pages).
(b) Regulation 54 response of PC Conor O'Kelly dated 11 December 2025.
(c) Misconduct hearing bundle (40 pages)
(d) Exhibit SM2 (1 page)
(e) Exhibit SM3 (1 page)
(f) Exhibit SM4 (1 page)
(g) Exhibit SM5 (1 page)
(h) Exhibit SM7 (1 page)
(i) Exhibit SM8 (3 pages)
(j) Exhibit SM9 (3 pages)
(k) Exhibit SM10 (3 pages)
(l) Exhibit SM11 (1 page)
(m) Email dated 10 December 2025 from PC Caitriona Ferguson
(n) PC Conor O'Kelly's HR record (3 pages)

Allegations

The allegations against PC O'Kelly were as follows:

Allegation 1

Between 13th August 2025 and 27th August 2025, you sent unsolicited messages via Instagram, SMS and WhatsApp to another officer which were grossly offensive, malicious, and contained sexually explicit comments.

Particulars:

(i) On 13th August 2025, via the Instagram account [redacted] registered using the email [redacted], you said,
"This [redacted] lad from [redacted] says you're a [redacted] but still a [redacted] You up for a quickie?"

(ii) You sent a text messages from [redacted] on 15th August 2025 saying,

"So you are the one that's been sleeping around and got everyone talking, Met's Bonnie Blue".

"Heard stories about ya, see you around at [redacted], what team are you? X"

"It sounds like [redacted] and half the Met have done you but I don't care about sloppy seconds, can I have a go".

(iii) You sent text messages via WhatsApp from [redacted] on 15th August 2025 attaching a picture of the officer you were contacting saying,

"Is this you? Apparently ure selling [redacted] and [redacted] tapes, how much?"

"Or better still are you [redacted] [redacted])?"

(iv) The IP address linked to the aforementioned Instagram account and mobile numbers have been traced to you.

Professional Standards of Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that your actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in the Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024, namely:

(i) Discreditable Conduct
(ii) Authority, Respect & Courtesy
(iii) Equality & Diversity

In that your conduct may bring the police service into disrepute and damage the relationship of trust and confidence between the police and the public.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, your conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct and your dismissal may be justified.

Preliminary Matters

Public proceedings: At the outset, the Chair confirmed that the hearing would take place wholly in private, this having been previously determined on the papers, on 11 December 2025 following the receipt of written of submissions by the parties. The reasoning for the decision having already been set out in writing and communicated to the parties prior to the hearing. In summary, the Chair had concluded that the hearing should be in private due to 'parallel live criminal proceedings' and the wish to not prejudice those proceedings.

Notice and service requirements: The Chair confirmed that she was satisfied that the notice requirements and service requirements as outlined within Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 had been complied with.

Allegations: The allegations were read into the record. A Regulation 54 response had been received from PC O'Kelly which included the following:

"*Due to ongoing criminal investigation (sic) I am unable to give an account at this stage as this would affect the ongoing investigation and potentially prejudice any future legal proceedings. No incontrovertible evidence has been provided, however other than denying the allegation I can't say any more*."

Adjournment application: PC Caitriona Ferguson confirmed that having received 'further information' from PC O'Kelly's solicitor she would be seeking an adjournment of the proceedings, given the ongoing criminal proceedings. Following a short break in proceedings to enable PC Hannah Clark to take instructions as to the AA's position on the adjournment request, it was confirmed that the AA opposed the application to adjourn on a number of grounds including: the AA's case was in respect of professional standards and was not contingent upon any decision within the criminal proceedings; PC O'Kelly had remained silent during the interview within his criminal investigation; no witnesses were being called within these proceedings; there was 'strong' evidence in support of the allegations; the victim in this case was a serving officer; and Regulation 49 made clear that matters to be considered under an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing should proceed 'without delay'.

The Legal Adviser advised that the Chair had a power to adjourn proceedings where 'necessary' and 'expedient to do so' under Regulation 61(3) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. The Legal Adviser advised in respect of the principles which might assist as set out within paragraph 9 within the judgment of *CPS v Picton [2006] EWHC 1108*. The Legal Adviser further advised as to the principles within the judgment of *R v The Executive Council Joint Disciplinary Scheme ex parte Hipps and others [1996] Lexis Citation 1263* which might assist in determining whether an adjournment ought to be granted pending the outcome of other proceedings. The Legal Adviser advised that consideration ought to be given to the Home Office Guidance 'Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing and specifically paragraph 7.81 and 7.82 which states that '*where there are possible or outstanding criminal proceedings against an officer, these will not normally delay the misconduct proceedings. They will only delay proceedings under the Conduct Regulations where the appropriate authority considers such action would prejudice the outcome of the criminal case'* and also that '*the presumption is that action for misconduct should be taken prior to, or in parallel with, any criminal proceedings….*' The Legal Adviser advised that in determining the application, consideration ought to be given to a range of factors including what PC O'Kelly had stated within his Regulation 54 response, the need for fairness; and also the length of the adjournment sought.

Chair's Decision on Adjournment Application.

I considered both the public interest in the need for the expeditious disposal of proceedings as well as the need for fairness to the officer in this case. Taking into account that the hearing was

already being held in private as well as the fact that the Appropriate Authority were not relying on live witnesses in this case, I determined that there did not appear to be an obvious risk of prejudice to any other proceedings that may be taking place.

I considered that no indication had been provided as to how there would be a real risk of prejudice to PC O'Kelly if this matter were to proceed.

I also considered that the period for which an adjournment was being sought was not specified and understood that whilst a bail to return date had been set for January 2026, the conclusion of the criminal matter could be potentially far beyond this. I therefore concluded that it would be appropriate to proceed with the Accelerated Misconduct Hearing.

Background

The proceedings arose out of a number of unsolicited messages received by PC A, the complainant and a female colleague of PC Conor O'Kelly. The messages had been sent from two mobile phone numbers and an Instagram account that were unknown to her. From some of the content received, PC A believed that the messages had been sent to her by someone she knew from her work.

Evidence of PC Conor O'Kelly.

As foreshadowed within the Regulation 54 response, PC O'Kelly did not give evidence during the hearing. During the hearing the Chair observed that from the papers it appeared that PC O'Kelly had been residing in a one-bedroom flat and was living alone. The Chair enquired through PC O'Kelly's Police Federation Representative if PC O'Kelly was prepared to 'say more' in relation to this. PC Ferguson (PC O'Kelly's Police Federation representative) responded on PC O'Kelly's behalf stating that whilst he resides at the property other individuals do visit the property.

Findings on the facts

The Legal Adviser advised that the standard of proof within the proceedings was the civil standard. The Chair was advised that no finding could be made that the alleged conduct amounted to gross misconduct unless the Chair was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this was the case. The Chair was advised that the burden of proof rested with the AA.

The Chair received legal advice from the Legal Adviser in respect of *Kuzmin v GMC [2019] WLR 6660* and in particular that no adverse inference should be drawn in respect of a person that is subject to a complaint when they elect not to give evidence in their own case unless that individual had been previously provided with an appropriate warning that such an inference could be drawn.

The Legal Adviser provided advice in respect of the words contained within the head of charge and that and that each word should be given their plain and ordinary meaning. Advice was given as to the online Oxford English Dictionary (OED) definitions for a number of the words contained within the charge:

- In respect of the term 'Unsolicited', the OED definition was 'not asked for; given or done involuntarily'.
- In respect of the term 'grossly' the OED definition was 'coarsely, vulgarly, indelicately, indecently; in a manner liable to offend or upset; boorishly; reprehensibly.'
- In respect of the term 'offensive' the OED definition was 'hurtful, harmful injurious…'
- In respect of the term 'malicious,' the OED definition was 'of a wilful disposition, etc: given to malice; characterised by sentiments or acts of ill will; full of hate. Now also in a weakened sense: given to mischief; inclined to tease.'

Advice was further provided in relation to the statutory definition of 'gross misconduct' by reference to Regulation 2(1) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended).

The Chair's Findings on the facts alleged and on Gross Misconduct

Careful consideration was given to all of the documentary material together with the submissions made by each of the representatives and the advice provided by the Legal Adviser which was accepted by both parties.

Allegation 1.

Between 13th August 2025 and 27th August 2025, you sent unsolicited messages via Instagram, SMS and WhatsApp to another officer which were grossly offensive, malicious, and contained sexually explicit comments.

Particulars:

i. On 13th August 2025, via the Instagram account [redacted] registered using the email [redacted], you said,

"This [redacted] lad from [redacted] says you're a [redacted] but still a [redacted] You up for a quickie?"

ii. You sent a text messages from [redacted] on 15th August 2025 saying,

"So you are the one that's been sleeping around and got everyone talking, Met's Bonnie Blue".

"Heard stories about ya, see you around at [redacted] what team are you? X"

"It sounds like [redacted] and half the Met have done you but I don't care about sloppy seconds, can I have a go".

iii. You sent text messages via WhatsApp from [redacted] on 15th August 2025 attaching a picture of the officer you were contacting saying,

"Is this you? Apparently ure selling [redacted] and [redacted] tapes, how much?"

"Or better still are you [redacted] [redacted])?"

iv. The IP address linked to the aforementioned Instagram account and mobile numbers have been traced to you.

Whilst PC O'Kelly did not provide oral evidence during the hearing I can confirm that no adverse inference was drawn from this or any aspect of PC O'Kelly's response or submissions made by him prior to these proceedings or on his behalf during these proceedings.

I first considered the attribution of the material and in particular the evidence of [redacted] employed by the Metropolitan Police Service in the role of Digital Media Investigator (DMI).

Within the witness statement of [redacted], I noted that confirmation of the following was provided:

- The Instagram account in the username of [redacted] (from which PC A stated she had received a message on 13 August 2025) had the email address [redacted]' registered to it.
- The email address [redacted]' had two telephone numbers registered to it, namely: [redacted] and [redacted]. (I note that each of these telephone numbers were telephone number from which PC A had stated she had received text messages and WhatsApp messages).

- The email address [redacted]' was accessed on 22 August 2025 at 17:01:16 using the IP address [redacted].
  (I note that the email address was therefore accessed approximately 9 days after Person A stated that she had received the message from the Instagram account in the username of [redacted] which was linked that 'Gmail' address. It was also approximately 7 days after Person A stated she had received the messages from [redacted] and [redacted]. According to [redacted], both of these numbers were associated with that 'Gmail' address).
- The IP address [redacted] 'resolves to' Conor O'Kelly at [redacted].
- On 16 October 2025, [redacted] attended the address which he referred to as a 'one bedroom flat' and that he together with [redacted] were invited in by the 'sole occupant'. (I note that this is also the date that [redacted] confirms in her statement that [redacted] arrested PC Conor O'Kelly).

I have accepted the written evidence of [redacted] in full. The evidence is clear and detailed. I have concluded that there is no reason to consider that the evidence within this statement is anything but factual and accurate.

In considering PC A's evidence, it is noted that her MG11 statement was signed and dated 18 August 2025. The statement was therefore prepared relatively soon after the events to which it refers to, it is detailed, and PC A also produces screenshots of the communications that she received that support each of the allegations under consideration. I see no reason to doubt the truthfulness of the evidence in her witness statement and have therefore accepted PC A's evidence in full.

Having considered the evidence provided by [redacted] alongside that contained within the statement of PC A (and also that of [redacted]), I am satisfied on the balance of probabilities that each of the messages referred to within Allegations 1(i), (ii) and (iii) and within the statement of PC A, can be attributed to the home address of PC O'Kelly.

I am further satisfied on the balance of probabilities that each of those messages were sent on the dates alleged and that they were sent to PC A by PC Conor O'Kelly.

In reaching this conclusion I have also considered that PC Conor O'Kelly's residence is described by [redacted] as a 'one bedroom flat' of which PC Conor O'Kelly is described on 16

October 2025 as being 'the sole occupant'. I have further considered that the 'subscriber result for the IP address [redacted] is also linked to the email address 'conor.okelly@[redacted] (as appears to be evident from Exhibit SM11 / Exhibit AJB-05).

Having reached a conclusion on the attribution of each of the messages within the allegations, I now turn to the content of each of the messages outlined within them.

Allegation 1(i) 13 August 2025:

(i) On 13th August 2025, via the Instagram account [redacted] registered using the email [redacted], you said,
"This [redacted] lad from [redacted] says you're a [redacted] but still a [redacted] You up for a quickie?"

PC A describes her initial concern in relation to receiving the first message which referred to her as a '[redacted]' and 'a [redacted]' and also stated 'you up for a quickie?'. PC A makes clear in her statement that she considered the content of the messages that she received to be both 'malicious' and 'sexual' in nature and noted that the content appeared to refer to someone she had had an intimate relationship with previously.

I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that the message which had been sent via Instagram was unsolicited, that its content was grossly offensive and sexually explicit. I have no doubt that a reasonable member of the public would consider such content to be grossly offensive, malicious and to contain sexually explicit comments.

Allegation 1(ii) 15 August 2025

(ii) You sent a text messages from [redacted] on 15th August 2025 saying,

"So you are the one that's been sleeping around and got everyone talking, Met's Bonnie Blue".

"Heard stories about ya, see you around at [redacted] what team are you? X"

"It sounds like [redacted] and half the Met have done you but I don't care about sloppy seconds, can I have a go".

PC A makes clear in her statement that she considered the content of the messages that she received to be both 'malicious' and 'sexual' in nature. In respect of the messages specifically underlying this allegation, PC A states that from the content of the messages, it was clear to

her that the person sending the messages knew the police station where she was stationed at that time and 'must have been someone who [knew her] through work'.

The content included allegations of her 'sleeping around', referring to PC A as the 'Met's Bonnie Blue' and it also included 'heard the stories about ya (sic)' as well as 'I don't care about sloppy seconds, can I have a go…'

The references to 'Bonnie Blue' and the assertions of promiscuity appear to have misogynistic overtones which together with the reference to 'sloppy seconds' are demeaning, sexualised in nature and highly derogatory both to PC A and to women generally. I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that the messages which had been sent were unsolicited, and that the content was grossly offensive and sexually explicit.

I have no doubt that a reasonable member of the public would consider such content to be grossly offensive and to contain sexually explicit comments.

Allegation 1(iii) 15 August 2025

(iii) You sent text messages via WhatsApp from [redacted] on 15th August 2025 attaching a picture of the officer you were contacting saying,

"Is this you? Apparently ure selling [redacted] and [redacted] tapes, how much?"

"Or better still are you [redacted])?"

PC A makes clear in her statement that she considered the content of the messages that she received to be both 'malicious' and 'sexual' in nature. In respect of the messages underlying this allegation, PC A confirmed that the first message contained the words "apparently ure (sic) selling [redacted] and [redacted] tapes, how much?' and the second message contained the words '…are you [redacted]?' which she had interpreted to mean '[redacted]'.

The reference made within the messages are both demeaning and sexual in nature. I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that the messages which had been sent were unsolicited, and that the content was grossly offensive and sexually explicit.

I have no doubt that a reasonable member of the public would consider such content to be grossly offensive and to contain sexually explicit comments.

Allegation iv

(iv) *The IP address linked to the aforementioned Instagram account and mobile numbers have been traced to you.*

For the reasons I have already outlined above, I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that the IP address [redacted] is linked to the Instagram account referred to in Allegation 1 and also to those mobile telephone numbers referred to within Allegation 2 and Allegation 3. For the reasons already outlined, I have concluded on the balance of probabilities that the IP address, Instagram account referred to within Allegation 1 and also those mobile telephone numbers referred to within Allegation 2 and Allegation 3 have each been traced to PC O'Kelly.

Having accepted the evidence of both [redacted] and PC A which have been tendered in support of the Appropriate Authority's case, I find that the facts in respect of each of the allegations, namely allegation 1(i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) to be proven on the balance of probabilities.

Breach of standards

I am satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the actions of PC O'Kelly breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

(i) Discreditable Conduct

PC O'Kelly engaged in behaviour that was wholly inappropriate, and clearly unwanted behaviour towards a female colleague. The messages contained sexually explicit comments which were grossly offensive and malicious. Such conduct was intentional and undertaken under the cloak of secrecy which caused clear distress to his colleague. The conduct was repetitive and harassing in nature toward PC A. Such conduct brings discredit to the police service and undermines public confidence in it.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden in relation to allegation 1(i)-(iv) and that the conduct underlying those particulars did breach the Standard of Discreditable Conduct.

(ii) Authority, Respect and Courtesy

PC O'Kelly engaged in behaviour that was highly disrespectful, demeaning and lacking in courtesy towards a female colleague. The messages included comments which were

misogynistic, sexual in nature, included references to a previous relationship that she had had and further suggested that PC A should engage sexually with him.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden in relation to allegation 1(i)-(iv) and that the conduct underlying those particulars did breach the Standard of Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

(iii) Equality and Diversity

PC O'Kelly engaged in behaviour which related to a colleague's protected characteristic of sex. The content of the messages were both disrespectful and discriminatory in nature in that they deliberately sought to tarnish PC A on the basis of her sex.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged the burden in relation to allegation 1(i)-(iv) and that the conduct underlying those particulars did breach the Standard of Equality and Diversity.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that it could justify dismissal. Applying that definition, I am satisfied that the breach of the standards in this case is sufficiently serious to amount to gross misconduct. PC O'Kelly sent grossly offensive messages on two separate dates by text, WhatsApp and Instagram. Due to the nature, tone and the covert nature of the messages and due to the conduct having been repeated, I am firmly of the view that such conduct towards a serving female colleague is sufficiently serious to amount to gross misconduct.

Findings on outcome

A copy of PC O'Kelly's service record was provided by the Appropriate Authority. This confirmed that there had been no previous matters of concern.

The Chair received the advice of the Legal Adviser and was advised to consider the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings. The Chair was advised to adopt what is often referred to as the 'three stage process' as outlined within the College of Policing Guidance, namely, to assess the seriousness of the misconduct; to keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions; and to consider the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that

purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question. The Chair was also advised as to the wording of Regulation 62 of the Police Conduct Regulations 2020.

The Chair's Decision on Outcome

Careful consideration was given to all of the documentary materials together with the submissions made by each representative and advice provided by the Legal Adviser which was accepted by both parties.

Seriousness

I have borne in mind that the first stage in determining the appropriate outcome is to assess the seriousness of the conduct. This is assessed by reference to: (i) the officer's culpability; (ii) the harm caused by the misconduct; (iii) the existence of aggravating factors; (iv) The existence of mitigating factors.

The purpose of the police misconduct regime

The second stage requires me to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime. I remind myself that this has three elements: (i) to maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; (ii) to uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and (iii) to protect the public. I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers. It is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

Appropriate Sanction

The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils that purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question. I am mindful that Regulation 62(1) makes clear that where the conduct of the officer concerned 'amounts to gross misconduct' the 'disciplinary action, which, subject to the provisions of this regulation [must be] – (a) dismissal without notice, or (b) if the person or persons conducting the accelerated misconduct hearing are satisfied that there are exceptional circumstances which justify it – (i) a final written warning, or (ii) reduction in rank'.

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct.

Culpability

PC O'Kelly's conduct was intentional and deliberate, repetitive in nature and targeted towards a female colleague. PC O'Kelly was fully responsible for his actions. I therefore assess the culpability as high.

Harm

PC O'Kelly's behaviour caused harm to PC A as is evident from her witness statement. PC A confirms within her statement that the first message upset her and that the subsequent messages left her feeling [redacted]' and that they also took a [redacted] on her. She describes the final messages as 'scary' and 'unsettling'. There is particular concern by the public in respect of harassing behaviour towards women and girls. Such conduct by a serving officer will always harm public confidence in policing. The public would not expect a serving officer to behave in this manner. I therefore assess the harm to be high.

Aggravating Factors

The conduct of PC O'Kelly was repetitive in nature would likely have taken some planning and was covert in nature.

Mitigating Factors

There is no evidence to suggest that concerns about PC O'Kelly's behaviour had been raised previously. There are no other mitigating factors.

Conclusion on Seriousness

Taking all these matters into consideration, I assess the seriousness of the conduct as high.

Personal mitigation

There has been no personal mitigation provided by PC O'Kelly.

Stage 2: the purpose of the police misconduct regime

I have considered the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case. The police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole. It is to uphold standards and to ensure that the public is protected.

- *Protecting the public*: PC O'Kelly's conduct demonstrates a wilful disregard for appropriate conduct by a serving officer and caused harm to a colleague. PC O'Kelly's conduct raises concern about his suitability for service within the police service.
- *Maintaining public confidence:* Abusive and offensive conduct by a serving officer which is targeted towards women and girls is likely to significantly undermine public confidence in the MPS. It is the type of conduct which requires both decisive and proportionate action in order to uphold standards and preserve public confidence in the police service.
- *Upholding standards of behaviour:* PC O'Kelly's conduct represent a serious departure from the expected standards of serving police officer.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

I have considered the officer's record of service.

I have also considered the wording of Regulation 62 that makes clear that in a case where gross misconduct has already been established, unless I am satisfied that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a different outcome, I must impose a sanction of dismissal without notice.

Having considered this case carefully, I have been unable to identify any exceptional circumstances to justify a different outcome. My decision is therefore that dismissal without notice is the only viable option.

In any event, having considered the nature and seriousness of PC O'Kelly's conduct together with the severity of the breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, I am satisfied that no lesser sanction would be appropriate in this case.

The Appropriate Authority is directed to inform the College of Policing that PC O'Kelly's name should be recorded on the police barred list.

Decision on Publication

It is further directed that this decision shall *not* be published in accordance with Regulation 63(5) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended) until the conclusion of the parallel criminal proceedings.

It is further directed that any submissions about anonymity within this decision should be submitted in writing at the conclusion of the criminal proceedings and prior to publication of this decision. Any submissions received at that point will then be considered.

Chairperson's signature *Katie Lilburn* **Date:** *1st January 26*

Right of Appeal

A police officer has a right of appeal against any disciplinary finding and/or disciplinary outcome imposed at an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing held under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended). Notification of this right of appeal is provided in accordance with Regulation 63(2) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended).