Misconduct of PC Melek Ukuser held on 27 to 30 October, 2026

Panel: Ms Katie Lilburn (Chair), Mr David Scott, Ms Sarah Kinsella

Legally Qualified Person ("LQP"): Mr Ian Comfort

Hearing: Public hearing held on 27-30 October 2026

Appropriate Authority ("AA"): represented by Mr Rupert Beloff of Counsel.

Officer: in attendance and represented by Ms Tilly Taylor, Solicitor Advocate.

OUTCOME: The allegations of misconduct and gross misconduct are not proved.

INTRODUCTION

1. This is the Panel's written determination following a public misconduct hearing concerning PC Melek Ukuser ("the Officer"). The hearing was convened under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (the "Regulations") and proceeded on the basis of the allegations particularised in the Regulation 30 notice.
2. This determination sets out the legal advice provided to the Panel, the Panel's findings of fact, its assessment as to breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, and the outcome determined under Regulation 43.

BACKGROUND

3. PC Ukuser joined the Metropolitan Police in January 2025 and was posted to [redacted] in August 2025 as a probationary police constable.
4. The allegations are of breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, namely discreditable conduct, arising from complaints made by three officers. The matters concerning Officer A arise principally from events said to have occurred during a hospital guard on 20 December 2025, together with conduct said to have occurred at a Christmas social event on 17 December 2025. The matters concerning Officer B arise from interactions between Officer B and PC Ukuser during the period from approximately October to December 2025. The matters concerning Officer C arise from two incidents said to have occurred

on 21 December 2025, the first at a café and the second whilst travelling in a police vehicle.

5. The Appropriate Authority's case (as stated in the Opening Note) is that PC Ukuser made inappropriate personal and sexualised remarks towards Officers A and B and engaged in unwanted physical contact with Officer C. PC Ukuser denies all allegations. She contends that the alleged conduct did not occur and, in relation to Officer C, that any physical contact was consensual and occurred within the context of a friendly working relationship.

6. Concerns first came to the attention of supervisors during December 2025. Officer A spoke to PC Cartwright following the hospital guard on 20 December 2025. Concerns were subsequently reported to and recorded by PS Godfrey. During the same period concerns were also raised by Officers B and C.

7. The matters were subsequently referred for investigation. Witness statements were obtained from the relevant officers and supporting witnesses. PC Ukuser was interviewed on 17 March 2026 and denied the allegations.

ALLEGATIONS

8. The allegations of fact and misconduct made against the Officer are set out in the Regulation 30 Notice as follows:

(1) It is alleged that:

(a) PC Melek Ukuser at a Christmas party on or about 19 December 2025 was sitting opposite Officer A. She then moved and squeezed herself into a tiny space between Officer A and another female;

(b) that on or about 20 December 2025, whilst thy (sic) were on their way to a hospital guard, PC Ukuser asked Officer A if she smelt nice that day. Later at the hospital it is alleged that PC Ukuser waved her hair in Officer A's face and asked if it smelt nice and then proceeded to ask for Officer A's phone number saying she might get lost;

(c) that as they were leaving the hospital PC Ukuser held open the driver's car door for Officer A and, when he asked why she was doing that, stated that "he was her prince today";

(d) that on the subsequent journey from the hospital PC Ukuser told Officer A that he was one of her top three men on the team;

(e) that she proceeded to tell Officer A the (sic) "her head game was good" and that she had no lip fillers, was all natural and her previous partners had commented on how good she was. It is alleged that these comments referred to oral sex;

(f) that when Officer A told PC Ukuser he did not want to talk about such matters, PC Ukuser asked him to at least tell her what his favourite position was and how long he lasted in bed;

(g) that a few days later PC Ukuser sent a text message to Officer A asking "where are you Habibi", the later (sic) word meaning my love or darling in Arabic and upon him responding where he was she texted "come here right now".

(2) It is further alleged that:

(a) in or about October 2025 PC Ukuser asked Officer B to "pinky promise" that he would not tell anyone what she was about to say and then proceeded to tell him that he was in her top three good looking men on the team;

(b) On various occasions thereafter in 2025 made comments about Officer B's looks including words to the effect that he was really attractive and goodlooking (sic).

(3) It is further alleged that:

(a) on or about 21 December 2025 PC Ukuser was in a café with Officer C in uniform, she said words to the effect of hold my hand and at the same time grabbed his hand, pulled it towards her and held it for a few seconds. PC Ukuser took a photograph on her camera at the same time;

(b) later the same day when seated with Officer C in a patrol car PC Ukuser said her hands were cold and asked Officer C to touch her hand. She then grabbed his left hand and intertwined her fingers with his. PC Ukuser would not release Officer C's hand, despite his

efforts to move it until they arrived back at the yard a few minutes later.

(4) It is further alleged that the allegations set out above breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, namely: Discreditable Conduct

(5) It is further alleged that the conduct set out above, whether individually or collectively, amounts to gross misconduct in that it is so serious as to justify dismissal.

EVIDENCE

9. The Panel was provided with an electronic hearing bundle comprising 151 pages. The bundle included witness statements, supervisory notes made by A/PS Godfrey, WhatsApp messages, social media material, photographs, interview records and other documentary evidence relied upon by the parties.

10. In addition the Panel was provided with digital material comprising a video recording of PC Ukuser's misconduct interview and a video of Instagram reels supplemented with a screen shot of Officer A's Instagram account.

11. The Panel received oral evidence from Officer A, Officer B, Officer C, PC Mollie Cartwright, A/PS Jordan Godfrey and PC Ukuser.

12. The Panel has considered all of the evidence placed before it, whether specifically referred to in this determination or not. References to particular items of evidence should not be taken to indicate that other evidence has been disregarded.

LEGAL ADVICE AND THE PANEL'S APPROACH

13. In reaching its findings and conclusions, the Panel has considered all of the evidence, the submissions advanced by Mr Beloff on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and Ms Taylor on behalf of the Officer, together with the legal advice received throughout the proceedings.

14. The Panel accepted and applied the legal advice which it received. The Panel particularly reminded itself that the burden of proving the allegations rests throughout upon the Appropriate Authority and that the Officer is not required

to prove her innocence. The applicable standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

15. The Panel further reminded itself that its task is to address three questions in sequence. First, whether the factual allegations are proved. Secondly, whether any facts proved amount to a breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct. Thirdly, if a breach is established, whether that breach amounts to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

16. In determining the facts, the Panel considered all of the evidence presented during the hearing, including the oral evidence of witnesses, contemporaneous records, witness statements, documentary exhibits and the submissions advanced by the parties.

17. The Panel assessed the reliability of witnesses by reference to the evidence as a whole, the contemporaneous records and the extent to which individual accounts were internally consistent and consistent with other evidence accepted by the Panel.

18. The Panel has considered the manner in which the Appropriate Authority has advanced its case.

19. The Appropriate Authority's case is that between October and December 2025 PC Ukuser made inappropriate personal and sexualised remarks towards Officers A and B and engaged in unwanted physical contact with Officer C.

20. The Appropriate Authority submitted that the allegations should be viewed collectively and that similarities between the complaints made by the three officers were relevant to the Panel's assessment of the evidence.

21. The Panel has borne that submission in mind. However, whilst Allegations 1, 2 and 3 each contain a number of factual particulars, none is pleaded by reference to a stem allegation describing the conduct said to be demonstrated by those particulars. Instead, the Regulation 30 Notice pleads a series of discrete factual allegations said to have occurred on different occasions and in different circumstances.

22. The Panel has therefore approached the matter by considering each allegation on its own facts and evidence. In doing so, the Panel has borne in mind that Allegations 1 and 2 concern words said to have been spoken in different contexts and at different times, whereas Allegation 3 concerns allegations of physical contact occurring on a separate occasion.

23. The Appropriate Authority submitted that the number of complaints raised within a relatively short period was a matter to which the Panel could have regard when assessing the evidence. The Panel has considered the evidence both individually and collectively. However, the Panel has not treated the existence of multiple allegations as relieving the Appropriate Authority of the burden of proving each allegation on the balance of probabilities.

24. Accordingly, the Panel has first assessed each allegation by reference to the evidence relevant to that allegation. The Panel has then considered the evidential picture as a whole before reaching its conclusions.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Allegation 1(a) : - seating at the Christmas Party

25. The Panel has carefully considered the evidence of Officer A and PC Ukuser together with the circumstances in which the alleged incident occurred.

26. Officer A's evidence was that PC Ukuser moved from a position opposite him and squeezed herself into a small space beside him. He regarded this as unusual conduct and viewed it as part of a developing pattern of behaviour directed towards him.

27. PC Ukuser accepted that she ultimately sat beside Officer A but denied that she deliberately moved in order to do so. Her evidence was that the venue was crowded, that she had left the table for a period, and that upon her return her original seat was no longer available. She stated that she sat in an available space on the bench and continued speaking with other colleagues.

28. The Panel notes that there is no independent evidence corroborating Officer A's account that PC Ukuser squeezed herself into a tiny space between him and another colleague. The allegation rests entirely upon Officer A's recollection.

29. The Panel has also considered Officer A's evidence during cross-examination. He accepted that the venue possibly was busy, that individuals were moving around the venue throughout the evening, and that people were getting up from the table for drinks and other reasons. He accepted that he remained seated and did not ask PC Ukuser to move.

30. Whilst maintaining his account, the Panel found aspects of Officer A's evidence on this issue to be evasive. In particular, the certainty with which he described PC Ukuser deliberately squeezing into a confined space sat uneasily with the concessions he subsequently made regarding the availability of seating and the fluid nature of the social event.

31. By contrast, the Panel found PC Ukuser's explanation plausible and consistent with the circumstances of a busy Christmas gathering. Her account provides an ordinary and credible explanation for why she came to be seated beside Officer A.

32. The Panel has therefore concluded that it is unable safely to rely upon Officer A's account of this incident. The evidence does not satisfy the Panel that PC Ukuser deliberately moved and squeezed herself into a tiny space beside Officer A in the manner alleged.

33. Accordingly, Allegation 1(a) is not proved.

Allegation 1(b) – on the way and at the hospital

34. The Panel has carefully considered the evidence of Officer A and PC Ukuser together with the surrounding circumstances.

35. Officer A's evidence was that, whilst travelling to the hospital, PC Ukuser asked him whether she smelt nice. He further alleged that, whilst at the hospital, she waved her hair in his face, again asked him whether it smelt nice and then requested his telephone number.

36. PC Ukuser denied each aspect of the allegation. Her evidence was that she was in full uniform throughout the deployment and that her hair was secured in a bun in accordance with Metropolitan Police dress requirements. She explained that her hair was plaited, twisted into a bun and secured with pins. She stated that she did not remove, loosen or restyle her hair during shifts

and did not believe Officer A had ever seen her hair worn down. She denied asking Officer A whether she smelt nice and denied waving her hair in his face.

37. The Panel found PC Ukuser's evidence regarding her hair to be plausible and consistent with the practical realities of operational policing. At the material time she was a probationary constable deployed on a hospital guard whilst in full uniform. In the absence of any supporting evidence, the Panel was not satisfied that the conduct alleged by Officer A occurred in the manner described.

38. The Panel has also considered the allegation that PC Ukuser twice asked Officer A whether she smelt nice. This aspect of the allegation depends solely upon the evidence of Officer A. There is no contemporaneous document, message or independent witness supporting the assertion. In those circumstances the Panel was not satisfied that it could safely rely upon his account on this issue.

39. The Panel notes that both parties agree that PC Ukuser asked Officer A for his telephone number whilst at the hospital. However, the evidence of both parties was that they were working together in a hospital environment and that there was a possibility that they could become separated whilst carrying out their duties. The Panel finds there is no reason to doubt the operational explanation advanced for that request.

40. Having considered all of the evidence, the Panel is not satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has established that PC Ukuser asked Officer A whether she smelt nice during the journey to the hospital, waved her hair in his face at the hospital, or again asked whether she smelt nice there.

41. Accordingly, Allegation 1(b) is not proved.

Allegations 1(c) -1(f) – the car journey

42. The Panel considered allegations 1(c), 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f) together. Whilst the allegations differ in their nature and seriousness, they are alleged to have formed part of the same sequence of interactions between Officer A and PC Ukuser during and immediately following the journey from the hospital on 20

December 2025. The Panel considered it artificial to assess each allegation in isolation. Rather, the Panel considered the evidence as a whole in order to determine whether it could safely conclude that the conduct alleged occurred.

43. The allegations represent an escalating course of conduct. Allegation 1(c) concerns the alleged use of the term "my prince" when opening the driver's door for Officer A. Allegation 1(d) concerns the alleged statement that Officer A was one of PC Ukuser's "top three men" on the team. Allegations 1(e) and 1(f) are materially more serious. They involve allegations that PC Ukuser made explicitly sexual remarks and thereafter questioned Officer A about intimate aspects of his sexual life after he had indicated that he did not wish to engage in such a discussion.

44. Officer A's evidence was that these incidents formed part of a broader pattern of flirtatious and increasingly sexualised behaviour directed towards him. He told the Panel that after returning to the police vehicle PC Ukuser opened the driver's door and referred to him as her "prince". He further stated that she told him he was one of her top three men on the team. According to Officer A, the conversation subsequently developed into a discussion of a sexual nature initiated by PC Ukuser.

45. Officer A alleged that PC Ukuser stated that her "head game was very good", that she had no lip fillers and was "all natural", and that previous partners had complimented her abilities. Officer A understood those comments to be references to oral sex. His evidence was that he felt uncomfortable, attempted to disengage from the discussion and indicated that he did not wish to talk about such matters. He alleged that despite this PC Ukuser then asked him what his favourite sexual position was and how long he lasted in bed.

46. Officer A described himself as shocked by the conversation. He regarded the comments as wholly inappropriate within a professional policing environment. The Panel accepts that he subsequently discussed his concerns with colleagues and that those concerns were ultimately raised through supervisory channels. The Panel therefore accepts that Officer A made a contemporaneous complaint.

47. However, the fact that a complaint was made shortly after the alleged events cannot by itself establish that the events occurred in the manner alleged. The issue before the Panel is not whether Officer A genuinely believed that concerns should be raised, but whether the Appropriate Authority has proved, on the balance of probabilities, that the specific comments alleged at particulars 1(c) to 1(f) were made by PC Ukuser.

48. PC Ukuser's account was fundamentally different. She denied opening the vehicle door for Officer A. She denied calling him her "prince". She denied describing him as one of her top three men on the team. She further denied making any of the sexual comments alleged by Officer A.

49. PC Ukuser's evidence was that it was Officer A who introduced personal subjects into the discussion. She stated that Officer A raised matters concerning relationships and marriage, discussed workplace relationships and asked questions concerning cosmetic procedures, including lip fillers. She further alleged that it was Officer A who ultimately asked her what her favourite sexual position was. Her case was therefore not merely a denial of the allegations but a positive assertion that Officer A was an active participant in, and indeed the instigator of, any discussion of a personal nature.

50. The Panel has considered carefully the contemporaneous evidence relied upon by PC Ukuser. In particular, she relied upon a message sent to a colleague in which she described Officer A as "very flirty" and recorded that he had told her that she was "the whole package". The Panel is satisfied that this message was sent at or around the relevant time and therefore constitutes genuinely contemporaneous evidence. The message is significant not because it proves any particular allegation, but because it provides insight into how PC Ukuser perceived the interaction at the time.

51. The Panel recognises that a person's subjective interpretation of an interaction may be mistaken. Nevertheless, the message tends to support PC Ukuser's account that she regarded Officer A as engaging in personal or flirtatious conversation. It sits less comfortably with Officer A's account that he played no role in introducing personal subject matter and was merely the passive recipient of unwanted comments.

52. The Panel has also considered the Instagram material relied upon by PC Ukuser. Officer A accepted that the account belonged to him and that the profile image depicted him. Whilst Officer A was somewhat equivocal regarding responsibility for sending the reels sexualising females, the Panel concluded on the balance of probabilities that he had done so.

53. The Panel is careful not to place undue weight on this material. A person's engagement with sexualised content on social media does not make it more likely that they would welcome sexual comments in the workplace. Equally, it does not make it less likely that they may feel uncomfortable or offended by inappropriate conduct occurring in a professional setting.

54. However, the material is not wholly irrelevant. When viewed alongside the contemporaneous message relied upon by PC Ukuser, it is capable of providing some limited support for her contention that Officer A was prepared to engage in personal or sexualised discussions. The Panel therefore takes the material into account but attaches only modest weight to it.

55. The Panel has also had regard to the fact that allegations 1(c) to 1(f) arise from the same broad sequence of events as allegations 1(a) and 1(b) and has assessed the evidence in the round. Whilst those findings do not determine the present allegations, they form part of the overall assessment of the evidence. In circumstances where allegations 1(c) to 1(f) depend substantially upon disputed recollections of a private conversation, and where there is no independent evidence capable of resolving that dispute, the Panel considers it necessary to approach the evidence with appropriate caution.

56. That consideration is important because allegations 1(c) to 1(f) depend almost entirely upon the competing recollections of two individuals. The conversations are alleged to have taken place when only Officer A and PC Ukuser were present. No third-party witness heard the exchanges. There is no contemporaneous recording, note or other documentary material capable of independently verifying what was said. Ultimately, the Panel is asked to prefer one account over the other in circumstances where the available supporting evidence is limited and indirect.

57. Looking at the evidence in the round, the Panel is left with two competing accounts, each of which contains matters that find some support in the surrounding evidence. The contemporaneous reporting supports Officer A's account that he was troubled by the interaction. The contemporaneous message relied upon by PC Ukuser supports her account that she perceived Officer A to be engaging in flirtatious conduct. Neither piece of evidence resolves the central dispute regarding what was actually said during the journey.

58. In those circumstances the Panel is not satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged the burden of proving allegations 1(c), 1(d), 1(e) or 1(f). Having considered all of the evidence, the Panel is unable to conclude that it is more likely than not that the specific comments alleged were made.

59. Accordingly, allegations 1(c), 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f) are not proved.

Allegation 1(g) – text message

60. The Panel has carefully considered the messages relied upon by the Appropriate Authority together with the evidence of Officer A and PC Ukuser.

61. The existence and substance of the message exchange are not disputed. The screenshots show that PC Ukuser sent the message:

"where are u habibiti"

Officer A replied:

"Green Lanes ATM"

PC Ukuser then responded:

"come here rn"

Officer A replied:

"Green Lanes now"

to which PC Ukuser responded:

"Alr".

62. The Panel notes minor differences between the wording contained within the allegation, Officer A's statement and the screenshots themselves. The

allegation refers to "Habibi", Officer A's statement refers to "Habibti", whilst the screenshot records "habibiti". Similarly, the allegation refers to "come here right now", whereas the message records the abbreviation "come here rn". The Panel does not regard those differences as material and is satisfied that the allegation accurately reflects the substance of the exchange.

63. The Panel therefore finds as fact that the messages were sent.

64. The factual allegation at 1(g) is therefore proved.

65. *Allegation 2(a) and 2(b)*

66. Before considering the merits of Allegation 2, the Panel considered whether the allegations were sufficiently particularised to permit a fair determination.

67. The Panel distinguished between Allegations 2(a) and 2(b).

68. In relation to Allegation 2(a), the Panel is satisfied that the allegation was sufficiently particularised to be fairly answered. Although no precise date, time or location was identified, the allegation concerned a specific interaction and specific words, namely that PC Ukuser told Officer B that he was one of the top three good looking men on the team and asked him to make a "pinky promise". The allegation was also confined to a relatively short period, namely in or around October 2025, rather than an extended period of months or years. The Panel is satisfied that PC Ukuser understood the allegation and was able to respond directly to it.

69. The Panel reaches a different conclusion in relation to Allegation 2(b).

70. The concern regarding lack of specificity was identified by PC Ukuser at an early stage. It was expressly raised within her Regulation 31 response and was discussed at the preliminary hearing on 24 September 2026. The Appropriate Authority was aware of the issue and had the opportunity to seek amendment or provide further particulars but did not do so.

71. By the conclusion of the evidence, Officer B remained unable to identify with any meaningful specificity when the comments were made, where they were made and how frequently they were made. In those circumstances, the Panel concludes that the allegation lacked sufficient particularity to permit a fair

determination and materially impaired PC Ukuser's ability properly to answer the case against her.

72. For those reasons, the Panel is not satisfied that Allegation 2(b) can properly be determined consistently with procedural fairness. The allegation is therefore not proved.

73. The Panel therefore proceeds to consider Allegation 2(a) on its merits.

Allegation 2(a) –Officer B; pinky promise

74. The Panel has carefully considered the evidence of Officer B, PC Ukuser and A/PS Godfrey.

75. The Panel accepts that Officer B was transparent about the limits of his recollection. He did not seek to claim a memory he did not possess. He readily accepted that he could not recall dates, times or locations and was unable to identify the number of occasions on which comments relating to his appearance were allegedly made. The Panel has taken those matters fully into account.

76. The Panel has also considered the fact that Officer B's witness statement was not made until February 2026, several months after the events said to have occurred during approximately October 2025.

77. The Panel was conscious that Officers A and B were longstanding colleagues and that recollections can occasionally be influenced, consciously or unconsciously, through subsequent discussion. The Panel has borne that possibility in mind but makes no finding of collusion.

78. The Panel further notes that Officer B did not purport to recall the precise words used. Rather, his evidence was that PC Ukuser said words to the effect that he was one of the top three good looking men on the team. The Panel accepts that he was recalling the substance of the interaction rather than purporting to give a verbatim account.

79. The Panel also considered the circumstances in which the matter first came to light. A/PS Godfrey's evidence was that he was advised to speak to Officer B by another colleague. He subsequently spoke to Officer B in private and asked whether any female colleague had made unwanted sexual advances or

inappropriate sexual comments towards him. According to the note prepared by A/PS Godfrey, Officer B identified PC Ukuser as the officer concerned and reported comments relating to his appearance and attractiveness.

80. The Panel has taken into account that this note was not created contemporaneously with the conversation itself. A/PS Godfrey accepted that he prepared the note on 22 December 2025 following conversations which had taken place the previous day. The Panel therefore approaches the note with appropriate caution.

81. The Panel further observes that the note does not record the specific allegation that Officer B was told he was one of the top three good looking men on the team and does not refer to a "pinky promise". The Panel therefore does not treat the note as independent proof of the words alleged in this particular. At its highest, the note demonstrates that concerns regarding comments about Officer B's appearance were raised at an early stage. It does not independently establish the specific words alleged in Allegation 2(a).

82. The Panel has also considered PC Ukuser's evidence that Officer B was friendly with Officer A and PC Cartwright. The Panel accepts that those officers were longstanding colleagues. However, the Panel has seen no evidence capable of supporting a finding of collusion or fabrication. The Panel does not consider that workplace friendships, without more, provide a proper basis upon which to reject the evidence.

83. The issue for the Panel is not whether comments concerning Officer B's appearance were made generally, but whether the Appropriate Authority has proved the particular allegation 2(a) remaining before it, namely that PC Ukuser told Officer B that he was one of the top three good looking men on the team and asked him to make a "pinky promise".

84. In assessing that question, the Panel has taken account of the absence of any contemporaneous record of the specific words alleged, the absence of any reference to a "pinky promise" in the early material, the delay before a formal statement was obtained, Officer B's inability to identify when the alleged conversation occurred, beyond his evidence that it took place whilst on AID

duties, and the absence of independent evidence supporting the specific interaction relied upon.

85. Considering the evidence as a whole, the Panel is not satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has proved, on the balance of probabilities, that PC Ukuser told Officer B that he was one of the top three good looking men on the team and asked him to make a "pinky promise".

86. Accordingly, Allegation 2(a) is not proved.

Allegation 3(a) Officer C; in the café

87. The Panel has carefully considered the evidence of Officer C, PC Ukuser, PS Godfrey and the photograph relied upon by the parties.

88. Officer C's evidence was that, whilst seated in a café with PC Ukuser, she said words to the effect of "hold my hand", grabbed his hand, pulled it towards her and held it for several seconds. Officer C maintained that the interaction was unwanted and described himself as having been shocked by it.

89. PC Ukuser's account was materially different. Her evidence was that the interaction was consensual and formed part of a light-hearted message exchange involving a non-present colleague, PC Bejraoui. According to PC Ukuser, Officer C suggested taking a photograph whilst they were holding hands and thought it would be amusing to send the photograph to PC Bejraoui. She denied that the contact was unwanted.

90. The Panel has considered the photograph carefully. It plainly shows the parties holding hands across a table. However, the photograph does not reveal how the contact commenced, who initiated it, or whether it was welcomed by both parties. It is therefore incapable of resolving the central issue in dispute.

91. The Panel notes that the photograph was not independently discovered during the investigation. Rather, it was provided by PC Ukuser. Her evidence was that she disclosed it because it demonstrated the friendly nature of her relationship with Officer C and supported her account that the hand-holding formed part of a joke involving PC Bejraoui.

92. The Panel further notes that the photograph was taken using PC Ukuser's telephone and sent to PC Bejraoui at the time. In her statement dated 22 March 2026, PC Ukuser maintained that the photograph formed part of that “teasing dynamic”. The Panel also notes that PC Bejraoui responded to the photograph with the comment:

"[Officer C] trying to make me jealous again."

93. Whilst not determinative of the allegation, the response is consistent with the photograph having been sent as part of a light-hearted exchange involving a third party, as described by PC Ukuser.

94. The Panel has also considered the chronology of Officer C's account. The alleged café incident was not referred to in his initial report to PS Godfrey. The complaint recorded by PS Godfrey concerned the later incident in the police vehicle. The café incident does not appear within that account. The Panel regards the omission as a factor relevant to the assessment of reliability, particularly given Officer C's evidence that the incident was unwanted and left a lasting impression upon him.

95. The Panel further notes that the café allegation emerged only after the photograph came to light during the investigation.

96. The Panel also notes that Officer C accepted aspects of his description of the café incident were inaccurate. In his statement he referred to food having been served and placed on the table prior to the alleged hand-holding. However, when shown the photograph, he accepted that the photograph did not support that aspect of his recollection.

97. The Panel has further considered the evidence of A/PS Godfrey. Whilst the Panel accepts that PS Godfrey recorded concerns raised by Officer C shortly after the events in question, his evidence does not provide support for the café allegation itself. The absence of any reference to the café incident from the initial report is a matter the Panel has taken into account.

98. Ultimately, the allegation depends upon the Panel being satisfied that PC Ukuser initiated the hand contact, said words to the effect alleged and that the contact was unwanted. The photograph confirms that hand-holding occurred.

However, it does not establish that the interaction was initiated by PC Ukuser, that words to the effect alleged were spoken, or that the contact was unwanted.

99. Considering the evidence as a whole, the Panel is not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that PC Ukuser said words to the effect of "hold my hand", grabbed Officer C's hand, pulled it towards her and held it for a few seconds as alleged.

100. Accordingly, Allegation 3(a) is not proved.

Allegation 3 (b) – holding hands in the car

101. The Panel has carefully considered the evidence of Officer C, PC Ukuser and PS Godfrey.

102. Officer C's evidence was that there was unwanted hand contact whilst he and PC Ukuser were travelling together in a police vehicle. He maintained that the contact made him uncomfortable and that he did not welcome it.

103. PC Ukuser denied the allegation. Her evidence was that she did not tell Officer C that her hands were cold, did not ask him to touch her hand and did not grab his hand or intertwine her fingers with his. According to PC Ukuser, following the earlier café incident, Officer C suggested repeating the hand-holding joke and taking another photograph. Her evidence was that she considered such a suggestion odd and declined it. PC Ukuser maintained that any hand contact in the vehicle was initiated by Officer C and denied that the incident occurred in the manner alleged.

104. The allegation as drafted is a specific allegation. It requires the Panel to be satisfied that PC Ukuser said that her hands were cold, asked Officer C to touch her hand, grabbed his hand, intertwined her fingers with his and refused to release his hand until they returned to the yard.

105. The Panel has carefully considered the competing accounts. There is no independent witness to the incident and no contemporaneous record of the specific words alleged. The case therefore depends principally upon the evidence of Officer C and PC Ukuser.

106. The Panel has also considered the evidence of A/PS Godfrey. The Panel accepts that Officer C raised concerns regarding an incident in the vehicle shortly after it was said to have occurred. However, the account recorded by A/PS Godfrey does not reflect the allegation as ultimately advanced before the Panel. The Panel notes that important aspects of the account recorded by A/PS Godfrey were not adopted by Officer C in his oral evidence. The Panel has taken that inconsistency into account when assessing the reliability of the evidence relating to this allegation.

107. The allegation requires the Panel to conclude that a series of actions occurred whilst Officer C was driving a police vehicle. Having considered all of the evidence, including the inconsistencies identified above and the absence of supporting evidence, the Panel is not satisfied that the incident occurred in the manner alleged.

108. Accordingly, the Panel is not satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has proved, on the balance of probabilities, that PC Ukuser said her hands were cold, asked Officer C to touch her hand, grabbed his hand, intertwined her fingers with his and refused to release it until they arrived back at the yard.

109. Accordingly, Allegation 3(b) is not proved.

Summary

110. The Panel therefore finds:

    i. Allegation 1(a) to 1(f) not proved.

    ii. Allegation 1(g) – proved.

    iii. Allegation 2(a) – not proved

    iv. Allegation 2(b) – not proved

    v. Allegation 3 (a) – not proved

    vi. Allegation 3 (b) – not proved.

BREACH OF STANDARD

111. The Panel then considered whether the only proved factual allegation, namely allegation 1(g), concerning the text message *"Where are you Habibi?"*, amounted to a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of discreditable conduct.

112. The evidence before the Panel did not establish that the term was used in a romantic, flirtatious or sexualised sense. Officer A did not suggest in his evidence that he understood the message in that way and no independent evidence was called regarding the meaning or usage of the term. The exchange itself is brief and unremarkable and contains nothing from which the Panel could infer an inappropriate meaning.

113. The Panel therefore considered whether the sending of the message, viewed objectively and in its proper context, was capable of bringing discredit upon the police service. Having regard to the limited content of the exchange, the absence of any overtly flirtatious, sexualised or otherwise inappropriate language, and the Panel's findings regarding the meaning of the term used, the Panel concluded that it was not.

114. Accordingly, whilst allegation 1(g) is proved as a matter of fact, the Panel finds that it does not amount to discreditable conduct and therefore does not constitute a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

MISCONDUCT

115. The Panel has found that the Appropriate Authority has failed to prove a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

116. It follows that the issues of misconduct and gross misconduct do not arise for determination.

117. Accordingly, the allegations of misconduct and gross misconduct are not proved and are dismissed.

Katie Lilburn

Chair

30 October 2026