

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Khalid Miah
Warrant No: P243774
Date of Hearing: 4th September 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct; Authority, Respect and Courtesy

Findings

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started, along with reviewing the documentary and digital communications evidence. I am satisfied that the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been served. These are matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.

The hearing was held in Public. PC Miah did not attend the hearing but was represented by his federation representative, A/PS Sarah White. The Appropriate Authority was represented by Case Manager, Mr Aaryan Sattani. PC Miah provided a Regulation 54 response. I am satisfied PC Miah has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

Under Regulation 57 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, an officer must attend the accelerated misconduct hearing. PC Miah was aware of today's proceedings and has voluntarily absented himself. I acknowledge the physical and mental impact these types of proceedings may have on officers. I understand he has been given access to additional support by his federation representative. Considering the representations by his federation representative, I do not believe an adjournment would secure the officer's attendance. In any event, I am not asked to adjourn today's hearing on the officer's behalf. Accordingly, I find that I can proceed in the officer's absence.

The Allegation

Between 29 November 2025 and 3 February 2026, you pursued an inappropriate personal and/or intimate relationship with a vulnerable female member of the public whom you met in the course of your duties as a police officer.

Particulars:

- i. On 29 November 2025, you attended CAD 2199/29NOV25 in your capacity as a police officer. The incident concerned a welfare call involving a female member of the public ("Female A") and her two-year-old child and resulted in a safeguarding referral being submitted.
- ii. Through your attendance at that incident, you obtained access to her personal contact details, including her telephone number.
- iii. Following the conclusion of the policing matter on or around 29 November 2025, you continued to communicate with Female A using your MPS-issued mobile telephone despite there being no continuing legitimate policing purpose for doing so.
- iv. Between 29 November 2025 and 3 February 2026, you exchanged numerous messages and telephone calls with Female A concerning personal matters including family life, children, housing, relationships and day-to-day activities.
- v. On or around 9 December 2025, you engaged in a 28-minute call with Female A.
- vi. On 12 December 2025, during a personal conversation with Female A, you stated words to the effect that communicating with her was "a thrill" and that you had "never done this at work" before. During that same exchange, when asked why you had given her your number, you refused to answer in writing and stated you would tell her "in person", before engaging in a telephone conversation lasting approximately 53 minutes.
- vii. Analysis of your MPS-issued device identified that a number of communications between you and Female A were subsequently deleted, including deletions on or around 12 December 2025 and 14 December 2025.
- viii. Female A ultimately blocked your number.
- ix. At all material times, you knew or ought to have known that Female A was vulnerable, having attended a welfare-related incident involving her and her young child and having access to safeguarding information concerning her circumstances.

Professional Standards of Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that your actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police

(Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 and 2025), namely:

- (i) Discreditable Conduct
- (ii) Authority, Respect and Courtesy

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.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Mr Sattani, and the representations made on behalf of PC Miah through his Police Federation representative.

Facts

The main issue of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the allegation against PC Miah. I set out the relevant facts below.

PC Khalid Miah joined the Metropolitan Police Service on 27 March 2017 and is a response officer attached to NE Patrol South Team D.

On the 29th November 2025, PC Miah was assigned to a CAD as the attending officer. The incident related to a concern for the welfare of a two-year-old child, the child of Female A. The child was assessed by attending officers and found to be safe and well cared for, and a safeguarding referral was subsequently submitted.

Later that same day, PC Miah and Female A exchanged messages and calls concerning a handbag that had been left behind in the police vehicle. PC Miah assisted in locating the bag and the matter was resolved. That initial interaction appears appropriate and in keeping with the circumstances.

However, following the conclusion of that policing matter, communication between PC Miah and Female A continued beyond what would ordinarily be expected following a welfare-

related call, through PC Miah's MPS-issued mobile telephone. Over the following days and weeks, the messages became increasingly conversational and personal, including discussions of family life, children, housing, relationships and day-to-day matters. There was no continuing legitimate policing purpose for this contact.

On the 9th December 2025, PC Miah engaged in a call with Female A lasting approximately 28 minutes.

On the 12th December 2025, during a personal exchange, PC Miah made comments indicating his awareness of the nature of the interaction, including that it was "a thrill" and that he had "never done this at work" before. When asked why he had given Female A his number, he declined to answer in writing and stated he would tell her, "in person". This was followed by telephone calls, including an incoming call lasting approximately 53 minutes.

System data recovered from PC Miah's MPS-issued device shows that a number of the communications between PC Miah and Female A were subsequently deleted, including deletions on or around the 12th December 2025 and 14th December 2025. Contact continued into December 2025 and January 2026, with further messages sent and deleted and a further attempt at contact in early January 2026 to which no response was recorded. The final identified interaction was a brief telephone call on the 3rd February 2026.

Female A was spoken to during the investigation. She confirmed the contact she had with PC Miah via messages and calls and stated that she felt uncomfortable [REDACTED], following which she blocked his number. She confirmed there was no further contact. She did not feel significantly affected by the interaction and indicated she would not support misconduct proceedings.

Female A is a vulnerable young mother. Background information indicates that she had previously come to police attention in 2024 as part of a concern for welfare, [REDACTED]. Through his attendance at the welfare incident and his access to the associated safeguarding information, PC Miah knew or ought to have known of Female A's vulnerability and personal circumstances.

If this allegation is proven, then I must decide whether it amounts to a breach of the following standards of behaviour:

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.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy – Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy. Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.

Officer's position

PC Miah provided a Regulation 54 response in which he accepts that his behaviour amounts to gross misconduct in respect of both "Discreditable Conduct" and "Authority, Respect and Courtesy". PC Miah does not dispute the allegation nor the substance of the particulars. However, he does not accept that he took a screenshot and sent or took it with his personal number.

However, it is noted that PC Miah did not initiate the initial contact. It is suggested that PC Miah did not abuse his position as a police officer at the outset or at all.

Moreover, it is submitted that PC Miah the messages were not sexualised messages nor does the Appropriate Authority suggest that there have been any such messages.

Further, it is averred that Female A is not a vulnerable individual in the circumstances of this case. Whilst she is young, she was not a categorically vulnerable young woman. She is someone who is more than capable of undertaking day-to-day activities and living her life, caring for her child.

PC Miah is remorseful of his actions and fully acknowledges the impact of his actions.

Following a brief adjournment, the Appropriate Authority in agreement with those representing PC Miah apply to amend particular v) of the allegation, removing the wording relating to the screenshot. In line with my case management powers under Regulation 61, I grant the amendment by agreement.

Decision on Finding

I have applied Regulation 61(15) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 and have carefully considered the documentary and digital communications evidence provided to me, together with the representations made on behalf of PC Miah and PC Miah's own admissions.

The evidence in this case, in my judgment, is compelling and incontrovertible. It derives from Lawful Business Monitoring of an MPS ICT system used by PC Miah and the full data download of the communications between PC Miah and Female A. That evidence establishes that, following a legitimate welfare-related policing contact on the 29th November 2025, PC Miah continued to communicate with Female A using his MPS-issued mobile telephone in circumstances where there was no continuing legitimate policing purpose, and that the contact developed into a personal and inappropriate exchange over a period of approximately two months. PC Miah has, in any event, admitted the conduct.

Accordingly, I am satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the facts are proved as outlined by the Appropriate Authority, and I find the allegation proven.

Breach of Professional Standards

In line with Regulation 61(16), I bear in mind that the burden of proving a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour rests upon the Appropriate Authority and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden and that the conduct did breach the Standards of Professional Behaviour as to Discreditable Conduct and Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

An officer who exploits access obtained through his policing role in order to pursue an inappropriate personal relationship with a vulnerable member of the public abuses his authority, fails to respect the rights of that individual, and behaves in a manner which brings discredit upon the police service and undermines public confidence in it.

Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make a provisional assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, and to mitigating and aggravating factors. I have carefully considered the submissions made by the Appropriate Authority and on behalf of PC Miah.

Culpability is high – PC Miah’s conduct amounted to an abuse of the trust and authority placed in a police officer, directed at a vulnerable member of the public whom he had encountered through a safeguarding matter. As a result of being called to a safeguarding matter, PC Miah would have been aware of the intelligence surrounding Female A’s circumstances, which make her inherently vulnerable. PC Miah’s conduct was intentional and deliberate and was sustained over a period of approximately two months. He used his MPS-issued mobile telephone and exploited access to Female A’s personal contact details which he had obtained solely through the performance of his duties as a police officer. There was no continuing legitimate policing purpose for the contact. PC Miah knew or ought to have known that Female A was vulnerable. His own words that the contact was "a thrill" and that he had "never done this at work" before, demonstrate his awareness of the impropriety of his conduct. The deletion of communications from his device indicates an attempt to conceal that conduct.

Harm – is high. PC Miah’s conduct did on the evidence before me clearly impact Female A – PC Miah made her uncomfortable and she blocked him not desiring any further contact. Such conduct causes serious harm to the reputation of the police service and undermines public confidence in policing, particularly at a time when the police and specifically the Metropolitan Police are seeking to demonstrate how seriously they are treating higher standards, and the protection of vulnerable women and girls, following highly publicised and damaging incidents. The public are entitled to expect that police officers will not exploit their position or the vulnerability of those they encounter in the course of their duties.

Aggravating features – I am mindful not to double count or take into consideration any factors that have already featured in my determination of culpability and harm. I nevertheless consider that the deletion of communications from the MPS-issued device represents an aggravating feature, in that it demonstrates an attempt to conceal the wrongdoing. Further, I consider the sustained nature of the conduct to be particularly serious.

Mitigating features – I have taken into account that PC Miah made admissions and accepted at the earliest opportunity, through his Regulation 54 response, that his conduct amounts to gross misconduct. I have also taken into account the representations in relation to PC Miah’s his mental health and self-destructive behaviour at the time the conduct occurred.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the *Standards of Professional Behaviour* so serious as to justify dismissal. Applying that definition, and having undertaken an assessment of seriousness, I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards do amount to gross misconduct. That is, in any event, accepted by PC Miah.

Following my findings, I have gone on to carry out another full assessment of seriousness (as per the provisional assessment above) and taken into account any personal mitigation advanced on behalf of PC Miah.

Personal mitigation

Personal mitigation was advanced on behalf of PC Miah by A/PS White, including reference to PC Miah's own vulnerabilities. Moreover, I received 11-character references which speak to his knowledge, ability and effectiveness as a police officer, his confident and supporting nature. I accept that PC Miah is remorseful and his actions are deeply regrettable. However, I am mindful of the limits to the weight I should attach to personal mitigation as identified in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings, and that the interests of the police service, and the protection of the public, are more important than those of the individual officer.

Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I bear in mind that the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025 ("the 2025 Regulations") came into effect on 28 May 2025. The 2025 Regulations amend Regulation 62 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ("the PCR") so that, where gross misconduct is proven against a serving officer, the officer must be dismissed unless there are exceptional circumstances.

I have considered the officer's record of service. This case is based upon what amounts to incontrovertible evidence, namely the digital communications recovered from PC Miah's MPS-issued device, together with PC Miah's own admissions.

I have carefully assessed the seriousness of the conduct and the mitigation advanced, as set out above, and I do not find any exceptional circumstances. Therefore, the only available

sanction is dismissal without notice and I am satisfied that it is the only appropriate sanction in this case.

OUTCOME:

Having considered the matter fully and having regard to the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour, the sanction I impose is **dismissal without notice** and the officer should be placed on the College of Policing's barred list.

Former Commander Katie Lilburn

Metropolitan Police Service

4th September 2026