

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

ACTING POLICE SERGEANT RACHEL BRIGHT (A/PS BRIGHT)

FINAL OUTCOME REPORT

Introduction:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for A/PS Rachel Bright. An outline of the Panel's decision was given to the Officer at the conclusion of the hearing.
2. The misconduct hearing was held in public from 1- 4 September 2026 at Palestra House, 197 Blackfriars Road, SE1 8NJ. A notice of the hearing was published in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ('the 2020 Regulations').
3. The Panel was chaired by T/Commander Brigid Beehag-Fisher, supported by independent members Ms Zofia Darmas and Ms Chiew Yin Jones. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Salma Yousef.
4. The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by Mr Sam Thomas (AA's representative) and the Officer was represented by Ms Rosa Bennathan (Officer's representative). The Officer was also supported by Federation Representative Inspector Paula Dodds.
5. At the outset of its determinations, and throughout the hearing, the Panel remained mindful of the overarching purpose of police misconduct proceedings, namely:

To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;
To uphold high standards of professional conduct and deter misconduct;
To protect the public

The Panel also reminded itself of its core responsibilities

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

To determine whether those findings amount to a breach of the relevant Standard of Professional Behaviour;

To decide whether the conduct found proven constitutes misconduct or gross misconduct or neither.

Preliminary matters

Anonymity and Special Measures

6. At the pre-hearing on 3 August 2026, it was determined that the misconduct hearing concerning A/PS Bright would proceed in public.
7. The Chair granted special measures at a pre hearing on 3rd August 2026 by way of screens for Ms A, anonymity and permission for her VSU Officer to present during proceedings to enable her to give her best evidence.

Allegations

8. On the first day of the hearing, the Regulation 30 notice in respect of the Officer was read out, namely:

On 5th December 2022 whilst off duty you went on a night out together with other police officers to have a Christmas party.

You joined the group of officers after 17.00 hours on 5th December 2022. The group visited several venues during the course of the evening, such that at about 22.30 hours you and other officers were at a venue BE AT ONE in Battersea Rise, London SW11. During the course of the evening you drank alcohol. At the time of these events you were the line manager for [Ms A] You were her sergeant.

On several occasions during the evening you paid attention to [Ms A] in a manner that was inappropriate:

- a. You hugged [Ms A] and told her that you loved her;*
- b. You tried to kiss [Ms A] on at least one occasion, including on her lips;*
- c. You deliberately touched [Ms A] bottom when a photograph of a group of officers was being taken;*
- d. You touched [Ms A] in the area of her vagina, over clothing, in an action that was deliberate;*
- e. After touching [Ms A] in the area of her vagina you said words to the effect of "That's one way to get your attention"*

Your actions, as set out in paragraph 4, breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour of Discreditable Conduct:

Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.

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

9. The Officer denied the allegations. Her response is set out full in her Regulation 31 response below.

Background

10. On 5th December 2022, the My Investigation Support Team ("MIST"), including Ms A and A/PS Bright, attended a "bottomless brunch" at All Bar One, Clapham, to celebrate Christmas.
11. Ms A had worked under the supervision of A/PS Bright for approximately five months.
12. The All Bar One bottomless brunch consisted of food and unlimited alcoholic cocktails or Prosecco. A/PS Bright drank alcohol to excess and cannot remember leaving All Bar One.
13. Towards the end of the time at All Bar One, A/PS Bright hugged Ms A and said that she loved her.

14. After attending the bottomless brunch at All Bar One, several of the MIST team, including Ms A and A/PS Bright, went to 'Be At One', another bar.
15. At 'Be At One', it is alleged that A/PS Bright engaged in the following behaviour towards Ms A, which was inappropriate:
- a. A/PS Bright deliberately placed her hand onto Ms A's bottom.
 - b. A/PS Bright tried to kiss Ms A, on at least one occasion, including on her lips
 - c. A/PS Bright touched Ms A in the area of her vagina, over clothing, in an action which was deliberate. When A/PS Bright touched Ms A in the vaginal area, the complainant states that she said words to the effect of: "That's one way to get your attention".
16. Ms A states that she reported this immediately to PC Gemma Dodson in Be At One by exclaiming: "She just touched my f***** vagina", or words to that effect.
17. Ms A reported A/PS Bright's conduct again to PC Dodson upon leaving Be At One together. PC Dodson describes Ms A as being 'upset and angry at the time'.
18. The following day, Ms A reported the matter, to Inspector Croucher. The same day, A/PS Bright was arrested and taken to the Police Station. She was subsequently interviewed under caution provided a prepared statement and was charged.
19. The matter has twice been heard at the Crown Court in September 2024 and April 2025. but no conviction resulted from the criminal proceedings

Officer's response

20. A/PS Bright denied acting in the manner alleged. She gave a detailed Regulation 31 response as follows:
21. The Officer attended the Christmas night out on 5 December 2022. Regrettably, she became heavily intoxicated and does not have an independent recollection of much of

the evening. However, through partial recollections, knowing her own personality, and seeing the relevant CCTV, the Officer has been able to say from the outset of proceedings that she did not sexually touch the Complainant. With the benefit of having now been through two Crown Court trials in respect of these events, and having seen the CCTV forensically examined and heard evidence including from other police officers present on the night out, the Officer now has a reasonably clear understanding of what must have happened that evening.

22. The Officer's response in relation to each allegation of inappropriate behaviour is as follows:

The Officer accepts hugging Ms A ('the Complainant'). The Officer Accepts that it is possible that she said something about loving some aspect of the Complainant (eg, her victim care at work).

The Officer accepts kissing the Complainant on the cheek. This was consistent with the way that those on the night out were interacting with each other generally.

The Officer denies deliberately touching the Complainant's bottom. She did put her hand around the Complainant's waist in a photograph. This was consistent with the way that those on the night out were interacting with each other generally.

The Officer denies touching Ms A in the area of her vagina, in an action that was deliberate. She believes that she was trying to usher Ms A off the dance floor to where PC Dodson was waiting for her. In the CCTV she touches Ms A on the back, and then taps her hip, she believes that she then reaches around to try and take Ms A's hand to direct her towards PC Dodson.

On balance, the Officer does not think she said words to the effect of 'that's one way to get your attention / that got your attention' but it is in any event denied that this would amount to misconduct in the absence of inappropriate sexual touching, as previously denied.

The Panel's Approach

23. 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.

24. In considering the facts, the Panel remained mindful that the burden of proof is on the AA and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. In line with the principle derived from *Byrne v General Medical Council* [2021] EWHC 2237 (Admin), the Panel recognised that there is only one standard of proof in civil and regulatory cases, namely whether the facts in issue more probably occurred than not.

25. The seriousness of an allegation does not of itself require more cogent evidence. The inherent probability of the relevant conduct is a matter which can be taken into account when weighing the probabilities and in deciding whether the event/conduct occurred; this goes to the quality of evidence.

26. The Panel was also mindful not to assess a witness's credibility exclusively on their demeanour when giving evidence and that their veracity should be tested by reference to objective facts proved independently in their evidence, in particular by reference to the documents and CCTV in the case.

27. The Panel also reminded itself that it should make a rounded assessment of a witness's reliability, rather than approaching their reliability in respect of each charge in isolation from the others: *R (on the application of Dutta) v GMC* [2020] EWHC 1974 (Admin).

28. As to individual pieces of evidence, the Panel was mindful that it is entitled to draw proper inferences, that is to come to common sense conclusions based upon the evidence which it accepts as reliable; but it must not speculate. Similarly, the Panel must not speculate about what other evidence there might have been.

29. In reaching its decisions, the Panel considered the purpose and nature of police misconduct proceedings. The 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.

30. 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).

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

The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 (“the Regulations”), particularly the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2;

The 2020 Home Office Guidance (“HOG”), with specific reference to Chapter 1, which summarises the Standards;

The definition of misconduct under Regulation 2(1): “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour”; a breach of the SPB that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action

The definition of gross misconduct under Regulation 2(1): “a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified”.

Evidence

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

- I. Final Bundle for A/PS Bright comprising 297 pages
- II. A/PS Bright’s Regulation 31 Response (4 pages)
- III. 7 video files (in folder ‘Media’)
- IV. AA’s Opening Note
- V. Bundle of Character references

Evidence of Ms A

Ms A was referred to her witness statement. She confirmed she had gone through her statement but hadn’t seen the transcripts of her evidence at the Crown Court. She explained that she had moved to the MIST team about 4-5 months prior to the date of the alleged incidents. She stated she knew some of the others in the team prior to the move and confirmed she got on well with the team.

33. CCTV of the incident was played of Ms A in the bar. It was suggested to her that it was normal for people to be hugging each other. She was referred to the photograph on Page 61 and again it was suggested this was typical of how people were behaving on the night out.

34. In terms of photograph, Ms A was questioned about the way she was positioned and stated in photos she often positions herself in this way. She described her blazer was covering her hand on her bum to cover where A/PS Bright had put her hand. It was suggested to her that her leg was wrapped around the A/PS Bright in photograph [REACTED]/01 which she disagreed with.

35. Ms A asserted 'you can see the photo of her doing that'. Ms A said her blazer was over the Officer's hand. It was suggested to her that she was pulling up the blazer to show her skorts and that the Officer's hand was on or aimed at her back.

36. In terms of her relationship with the Officer, she said 'I saw her as my boss' and stated 'I felt she cared about my wellbeing'. She said she was friendly but wasn't affectionate. Ms A further stated she would be friendly to any human being.

37. She was taken thought the message history between her and A/PS Bright and stated that's how people speak to each other and acknowledged they spoke in a warm affectionate way to each other, describing it as friendly. She said 'these are just informal, friendly messages'.

38. She confirmed they mainly saw each other at work and that they hugged on a couple of occasions. Outside of work she said the extent of their contact was a hug and a kiss on the cheek. She stated they maybe hugged on one occasion and confirmed they attended a Cheese and Wine event at the Officer's address on 22nd November 2022.

39. Describing the night of the alleged incidents, she stated in the first bar the Officer was trying to kiss her on the lips. It was suggested to Ms A that if the Officer had been trying to kiss her on the mouth she would have said something. She referred to the photo which she alleged showed this but that the Officer moved away quickly. She confirmed 'the A/PS Bright did kiss me on the lips. It was suggested to Ms A if that that had happened, she would have told someone.

40. It was suggested that parts of the allegation were only raised the following morning and this was because it didn't happen. Ms A confirmed that she mentioned it to PC Dodson straight away.
41. Ms A confirmed during the course of the night, she was chatting to everyone, and that she spoke to the Officer quite a bit in the second bar and that these conversations were mainly initiated by her.
42. In relation to the photographs with the A/PS Bright, she stated 'I remember thinking it's embarrassing - why does my boss want to take photos with us'. She said I remember wanting to get photos with Gemma and [REDACTED]. I thought they were my friends.
43. In the second bar, she confirmed there were a number of close 1:1 conversations amongst members of the team including between A/PS Bright and PC Dodson.
44. Ms A was asked when she reported the incident the next day why she didn't mention anything about the kissing or inappropriate touching. She explained her challenges with making the report saying, initially PC Dodson tried to dissuade her from making it, and then it 'took them so long to get out what happened'. She described being mortified, and that the Inspector taking the report initially thought it was a male colleague who was responsible.
45. Ms A set out her concerns; that the Officer is protecting the public and I don't want to be around someone like that'.
46. In terms of her alcohol consumption, Ms A stated she had two drinks at the first venue and then one at the second venue. She stated, 'I didn't really drink that much at the time. [REDACTED]'. Ms A described that court proceeding have been hell over the last 4 years.
47. In describing the allegation Ms A said 'she violated me, she had her hand on my vagina. It woke me up. Her hand was up my skirt, on my vagina. It doesn't matter how many drinks I had. She violated me. Made me feel uncomfortable in what I was wearing'.
48. In terms of the lead up, she said 'I became aware someone was behind me. She said she was dancing and had said bye to everyone and then felt a presence behind me, and felt a hand up my skirt. Then I heard her voice. That's when I knew who it was'. She said

“as you see on the video — I turned in shock. Then i immediately turned and told Gemma’. She said she turned around and said to PC Dodson, ‘Oh my God, she touched my vagina’.

49. It was suggested to Ms A that she was wedded to her account and it was hard to turn around at this stage.

PC Dodson

50. PC Dodson was asked when she was told by Ms A about what had happened. She said on the way to McDonalds, as they walked out of the pub, she was told at the crossing. She described Ms A as angry and upset and that she had tears in her eyes and was very loud.
51. PC Dodson explained that when she woke up, she told her husband that she thought Ms A had told her she had been touched by A/PS Bright. She said she then contacted Ms A to clarify that she remembered correctly.
52. When asked about the night of the incident, she stated that she met with Ms A at the previous venue and then went to the brunch venue. She said she was sitting with Ms A. In terms of alcohol consumption, she said she would order prosecco or cocktails but could not say how many Ms A had. She said Ms A was probably quite drunk, her eyes were glazed, she was very emotional and was giving Ms A kisses on the cheek.
53. In terms of the conversation about leaving the event she said she couldn’t remember where it happened but definitely said they would leave together. She recalls Ms A was worried her skirt was too short and someone else said ‘no you look lovely’. She said she didn’t hear A/PS Bright saying anything and she was fairly close. She said ‘ I believe I would have heard something’.
54. In terms of the photographs being taken she said she only took one photograph, but people were taking lots of photographs and everyone was in the photos in groups. She referred to Ms A lifting up her blazer so people could see her skirts.

A/PS Bright

55. The Officer confirmed she had been a Police Constable for 19 years and at the time of incident she was a part-time PC and part-time A/PS. She confirmed Ms A joined her team around the end of July/ beginning of August 2022 and at the time of the incident she was an acting up Sergeant.
56. In relation to complimenting Ms A, Bright referred to an outfit Ms A was wearing at the beginning of the night and encouraged her to wear it. She stated PC Dodson also complimented her.
57. In terms of the day of the MIST team brunch, she said she had a fry up to eat and her glass kept getting filled up. She described herself as very intoxicated
58. In terms of her demeanour on the evening, A/PS Bright had no recollection of the evening in Be at One. Her own assessment of the behaviour, taken from viewing the CCTV in that venue was that she was moving around and staggering because she was drunk and was also walking backwards and hugging everyone. She described it as a touchy-feely/tactile evening.
59. She stated, 'I wish I had been buying my drinks', confirming that there was not a chance she would do the same again.
60. In terms of the allegations of that evening she said I would have said she (Ms A) looked lovely, or looked nice and I would have kissed her on the cheek, not on the mouth
61. When questioned about the photograph with Miss A and the two male Officers, it was put to her that she intentionally put her hand on Ms A's bottom – she said the photo looks like we are both in a pose with the boys. She was asked if she would do that. She responded in the negative confirming not even if she was so drunk. She stated 'I certainly wouldn't be looking to put my hand up her skirt'. Its not my personality. I have been. If I touched Ms A- was inappropriate. I would never do it intentionally.
62. In cross examination she was asked about her memory and referred to her earlier evidence during the Crown Court trials, and evidence during the present hearing that she had no memory of Be at One and stated I don't remember actually leaving the bar.

63. It was put to her that it was inappropriate to touch someone's genitalia in a public space and the fact Ms A's leg is there wouldn't make it appropriate to touch someone's genitalia. It was also put to her that the fact there are kisses at the end of messages between her and Ms A, wouldn't make it appropriate to touch her genitalia. It was further put to her that the fact that someone had 3, 4, 5 drinks wouldn't render it appropriate to touch them.

64. She was reminded that she gave a 'no comment' interview until she viewed the CCTV and it was put to her that she had no expertise in viewing the CCTV. It was further put to her that she provided a prepared statement which was not fully candid and this didn't mention she had no memory. A/PS Bright stated she relied on legal advice and she didn't think to mention it but she acknowledged that each of the allegations, if true, would be inappropriate.

Findings of fact

65. 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.

66. The Panel remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the Appropriate Authority 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.

67. The Panel started by considering the independent evidence including the CCTV footage and the photographs.

68. The Panel then moved to consider Ms A's evidence. The panel noted that whilst there were some discrepancies across her accounts, it did not find these sufficiently significant to undermine her credibility. The Panel also considered that whilst she had been drinking, her account remained clear. On the whole, it found Ms A to be a credible witness. The Panel noted she did not wish to name A/PS Bright when she first raised the allegation, as set out in the statement of Inspector Croucher, which added to her credibility.

69. In contrast, the Panel was mindful of the fact that, by her own admission in the present and earlier proceedings and, as set out in her Regulation 31 response, A/PS Bright could not remember the events of that evening due to her level of intoxication. The Panel therefore treated her account with that limitation in mind, recognising that it was necessarily based upon her own perception of events to the evidence as presented rather than a specific recollection of what had occurred. The Panel considered this alongside her account of how she believed she would behave and had previously behaved under the influence of alcohol. The Panel also heard from PC Dodson, whose recollection of events was somewhat limited.
70. In relation to Allegation 4(a), the Panel considered the accounts given by both Ms A in her statement and A/PS Bright in her Regulation 31 response and found that there was some commonality between them. The hug was accepted and, with respect to the words allegedly used, both accounts referred to the use of the word 'love', albeit Ms A provided a lengthier narrative. The allegation was that A/PS Bright hugged Ms A and told her that she loved her. The Panel found that both the hug and the phrase 'I love you' were made out.
71. In terms of appropriateness, the Panel considered the tone and nature of the communication between Ms A and A/PS Bright. It found that their communication had been friendly and informal during the course of their working relationship and that A/PS Bright often complimented Ms A's work. The Panel gave weight to Ms A's account on the bodyworn footage that she respected A/PS Bright and the support she was given at work. In Ms A's initial account in relation to the evening, the reference to the phrase 'I love you' was used as part of the conversation where A/PS Bright was complimenting her work.
72. The Panel also considered the nature of the interactions between those present at the event and found that the mood of the evening was highly tactile, with those present behaving in a particularly familiar and informal manner as could be seen on the CCTV.
73. The Panel gave significant consideration to whether the conduct alleged was inappropriate, both generally and in the particular context of a workplace Christmas event. The Panel reminded itself that professional boundaries should be maintained both inside and outside the workplace. However, it also took account of the wider context in which the events occurred, including the highly casual and familiar manner in which the

members of the team were interacting with one in another at the Christmas event, in quite a tactile way, as evidenced by the CCTV footage.

74. Having considered the nature of the relationship and communication between Ms A and A/PS Bright on WhatsApp, the Panel did not consider that the conduct alleged in Allegation 4(a), namely the hug and the use of the words 'I love you' as part of a broader conversation praising her work, her work ethic and her victim care, crossed the threshold of inappropriate conduct. Accordingly, although the factual components of Allegation 4(a) were made out, the Panel found that the conduct did not cross the threshold of inappropriate conduct and therefore found Allegation 4(a) **not proved**.
75. In relation to Allegation 4(b), namely that A/PS Bright tried to kiss Ms A on at least one occasion, including on her lips, A/PS Bright admitted to kissing Ms A but denied attempting to kiss her on the lips. The Panel relied on the evidence of Ms A in her witness statement, alongside the bodyworn footage which was from her account the following day. In this she clearly refers to A/PS Bright trying to kiss her on the lips, and her moving her face. The Panel had no reason to doubt the credibility of Ms A and accepted her account. The Panel found that attempting kissing a colleague on the lips without consent was inappropriate. Accordingly, the Panel found Allegation 4b proved,
76. In relation to Allegation 4(c), namely that A/PS Bright deliberately touched Ms As' bottom when a photograph of a group of officers was being taken, the Panel noted that this was in issue and that A/PS Bright denied deliberately touching Ms A's bottom. The Panel preferred Ms A's account, particularly in the circumstances where A/PS Bright could not recall what had occurred. The Panel considered photograph [REDACTED]/01, including the positioning of A/PS Bright's hand, together with the account given by Ms A of what had occurred. When considering the position of A/PS Bright's hand in the photograph, the Panel found it was touching the bottom area. A/PS Bright said she was touching her waist however the Panel did not find this was plausible and therefore found the touching of the bottom was deliberate. Thus, the Panel found Allegation 4(c) proved,
77. The Panel considered Allegations 4(d) and 4(e) together.
78. In relation to Allegation 4(d), namely that A/PS Bright touched Ms A in the area of her vagina, over clothing, in an action that was deliberate:

79. The Panel viewed the CCTV in detail and was satisfied that the touch occurred as alleged. The Panel could see A/PS Bright's hand in the area between Ms A's legs and noted Ms A's facial expression at this point and A/PS Bright's hand moving away. The Panel noted that Ms A made an immediate complaint to PC Dodson and gave weight to PC Dodson's evidence as to Ms A's demeanour when recounting what had occurred; that she was 'angry and upset and had tears in her eyes'. The Panel also noted that Ms A made a complaint the following day to Inspector Croucher and was initially reluctant to name A/PS Bright and noted her sentiments in the bodyworn about what had happened which appeared genuine. The Panel gave significant weight to her immediate and consistent account both in relation to the touching and the words used.
80. Taking account of all the evidence, the Panel was satisfied that Ms A had been touched as alleged. The Panel then moved to consider Allegation 4(e), in conjunction with the question of whether the touching was deliberate.
81. The Panel first considered the words relied upon in Allegation 4(e). The Panel noted Ms A's clear account in relation to the words used, the fact that she mentioned them almost immediately to PC Dodson, and the fact that A/PS Bright could not recall what had happened. The Panel was satisfied that the words 'that's one way to get your attention' were used. Having made that finding, and considering it in conjunction with the other evidence, the Panel was satisfied that the touching was deliberate.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

82. The Panel went on to consider whether, by reason of the facts found proved, A/PS Bright acted in breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour ("SoPB") outlined in Schedule 2 of the Conduct Regulations.
83. The SoPB in relation to Discreditable Conduct requires: "Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty."
84. Any breach of the SoPB therefore must be viewed through the prism of how a member of the public would perceive a police officer engaging in such behaviour. That is inevitably a fact specific exercise.

85. The Panel found that the Officer's deliberate and non-consensual touching of a female colleague fell significantly below the standards of behaviour reasonably expected of a serving police officer. The conduct was inconsistent with the values expected of those holding the office of constable.
86. The Panel considered that the circumstances made the conduct discreditable. Ms A was a colleague and was entitled to expect appropriate professional and personal boundaries respected by the Officer, which is specifically referred to in the College of Policing current ethical guidance
87. The Panel considered that the Officer's conduct represented a serious breach of that trust. The Panel further considered that conduct of this nature, when committed by a police officer, has the potential to bring the individual officer and the police service into disrepute. Public confidence depends upon police officers being seen to respect the dignity, personal boundaries and safety of others.
88. In light of the findings made in relation to the allegations, the Panel was satisfied that each of the proven allegations, namely Allegations 4(b) to 4(e), amounted to discreditable conduct. The Panel reminded itself that the Standards of Professional Behaviour apply both on and off duty. The Panel found that the conduct in Allegations 4(b) to 4(e) fell significantly below the standards expected of a police officer.
89. Having found Allegations 4(b) – (e) proved and determined that the conduct amounted to gross misconduct, the Panel then moved to consider the Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings in order to make a preliminary assessment of seriousness. At this stage, the Panel's provisional assessment was that culpability and harm were both high. The Panel considered that, viewed individually, each of the proven allegations was sufficiently serious to amount to gross misconduct.
90. The Panel reminded itself that the purpose of sanction is to reflect the seriousness of the misconduct, protect the public, maintain public confidence in policing, uphold professional standards and, where appropriate, have a deterrent effect.

Seriousness of the misconduct

91. The panel then heard submissions from both parties as to the appropriate outcome. It had regard to the Officer's record of service and the character bundle.

Culpability

92. The Panel found the conduct was deliberate and intentional. The Officer was significantly under the influence of alcohol and she was solely responsible for this.

93. The Panel noted that Ms A was a vulnerable person due to her personal circumstances and the Officer was aware of this. The College of Policing Guidance on outcomes states where an officer has a specific responsibility to a person, there is likely to be a high level of reliance by that person on the officer, which may make that person vulnerable. The circumstances were such that A/PS Bright was in a position of trust, power and responsibility and that she acted in a manner that was overly familiar, too personal and inappropriate in relation to a more junior officer that was under her direct manager which was ultimately unprofessional.

94. Whilst the case was not presented as a sexual offence, there was clear sexual impropriety comprising multiple individual aspects across the event albeit the Panel did not find this was for sexual gratification.

95. The Panel assessed the culpability as **high**.

Harm

96. In considering harm, the Panel had regard to the impact upon Ms A. In evidence she referred to being 'violated' and in her victim personal statement she spoke about the lasting impact, stating 'the events that led to this point have had a deep and lasting impact on my life. I have lost my career, which was my dream profession, and something I worked incredibly hard for and deeply cared about. Since then, I have had to rebuild my life in circumstances that have been extremely difficult both personally and emotionally. She went on to say 'I have lived with the impact of those events every day since'.

97. The Panel also considered the potential reputational harm to the police service. Conduct involving such inappropriate behaviour by a serving police officer has the potential to cause significant damage to public confidence in the police and to the relationship between the police service and the communities it serves.

98. The Panel found A/PS Bright's conduct was discreditable in that there is an implication of moral blameworthiness, and a degree of opprobrium is likely to be conveyed to the ordinary intelligent citizen.

99. The Panel assessed harm as **high**

Aggravating factors

100. The Panel considered that the Officer was in a position of trust which was intrinsic to the circumstances of the case. It acknowledged that this was not a case where the Officer had abused her position. Nonetheless, the Officer had taken on a supervisory role and referred to coaching and growing her staff. Ms A referred to the Officer as someone she respected and it was evident from their communication that she was also someone Ms A confided in.

101. The Panel also took into account the fact that the conduct involved multiple breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

Mitigation

102. The Panel found limited general mitigation applicable to the circumstances of the offence.

Personal mitigation

103. The Panel was mindful, that purely personal mitigation is not relevant to the seriousness of the misconduct itself. Personal mitigation is to be considered after the Panel has formed an assessment of the seriousness of the misconduct. The Panel also reminded itself that testimonials and character references should not be confused with mitigation arising from the circumstances of the misconduct.

104. The Panel noted this was completely out of character for the Officer. It had regard to the Officer's eight commendations and the positive evidence placed before it as to her service. The Panel recognised that this evidence demonstrates that the Officer has made a positive contribution in the course of her policing career.

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

Sanction

106. The Panel considered the least serious available outcome first and asked itself whether that outcome would adequately mark the seriousness of the misconduct and fulfil the purposes of the disciplinary regime.

107. The Panel had regard to regulation 42 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, The Panel considered whether a Final Written Warning would be a proportionate means of marking the seriousness of the present misconduct; however given the gravity of the offending and the multiple allegations which the Panel assessed as gross misconduct the Panel found this inadequate and therefore felt the only outcome was dismissal without notice.

108. The Panel further determined that the Officer should also be placed on the barred list.

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

Right of appeal

110. 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

Metropolitan Police Service

18 September 2026

