

## **Misconduct Hearing of PC Leah Bishop held on 28th - 30th July 2026**

1. This hearing was held on 28-30 July 2026 at Palestra House, London. The Panel consisted of Commander Brigid Beehag-Fisher (Chair), Ms Fiona Bennett and Ms Patricia Richardson Independent Panel Members. Ms Dale Simon was the Legally Qualified Advisor to the Panel.
2. The Appropriate Authority (the AA) was represented by Mr Edmund Garnett and the officer concerned was represented by her Police Federation representative PC Lisa Hayden.

### **THE ALLEGATION**

3. The allegation facing PC Bishop is set out in the Regulation 30 Notice served upon her under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020. These are:
  1. On about 30 August 2022 you completed a recruitment vetting form as part of your application to join the Metropolitan Police Service.
  2. You also submitted medical vetting forms which had been signed by a Dr Thompson.
  3. The medical vetting forms that you submitted had been altered from those originally signed by the doctor, and they gave a negative response to questions  
[REDACTED]
  4. You knew, when you submitted the altered medical vetting forms as part of your

application to join the Metropolitan Police Service, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

5. Your application to join the Metropolitan Police Service, based upon the responses given in the forms that you provided, was successful, and you started as a student officer in November 2022.
6. In the circumstances, following your attestation to join the Metropolitan Police Service, you were bound to observe and comply with the Standards of Professional Behaviour from November 2022.
7. Notwithstanding that your application to join the Metropolitan Police Service had been successful, you knew, following your attestation, that you had provided incomplete or inaccurate information at the time of your application to join the service, and specifically with regard to your medical history.
8. In May 2023 you admitted to other officers that the medical vetting forms that you had submitted as part of your application to join the Metropolitan Police Service had been altered, and that you had known that at the time of your application.

#### Allegation 1

9. Your failure to declare, prior to May 2023, that you had submitted false information in the medical vetting forms which had been submitted as part of your application to join the Metropolitan Police Service was dishonest and showed a lack of integrity. You thereby breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour of **Honesty and Integrity**: Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

And take notice that the matter set out above amounts to gross misconduct and is so serious as to justify dismissal.

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

10. On 9 May 2023, an anonymous email was submitted to MPS, indicating that PC Bishop had lied on her vetting form when she applied to become a police officer, by altering the medical forms signed by her doctor. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



- The submissions made on behalf of the AA and PC Bishop.
- The legal advice provided by the LQA

## THE PANEL'S APPROACH

14. In considering the facts, the Panel was aware 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. 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.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

15. There is no dispute that PC Bishop submitted the vetting form knowing that it contained inaccurate information [REDACTED], there is also no dispute that PC Bishop did not disclose this inaccuracy before 24 May 2023. Therefore, the issue for the panel to determine was whether PC Bishop had acted dishonestly or with a lack of integrity.

16. The AA puts its case on the basis that PC Bishop's dishonesty and lack of integrity arise from her failure to disclose the error in her vetting form when she signed her attestation and became a police officer in November 2022 and by her continued failure to disclose the inaccuracy before the 24 May 2023.

17. In oral evidence PC Bishop adopted the content of her MG14 statement dated 5 September 2023. She stated that she joined the MPS when she was 18, and that prior to that she had worked at Tesco's with her ex-partner. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] She stated that her relationship with her ex-partner ended in January 2023 shortly after

he left the MPS and she started her relationship with her current partner in April 2023.

18. PC Bishop stated that she met her ex-partner when she was 17 in September 2021, this was her first serious relationship. She stated that during the relationship she lost her support network and her friends because her ex-partner would make her feel guilty if she wanted to see her friends and family. She stated that when her ex-partner was dismissed from Tesco's for fighting, he pushed her to join the MPS with him even though she did not feel ready to start a career with the police at this time. When she joined the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) she was in the same training cohort as her ex-partner. She states that she didn't make any friends during this period because of his controlling behaviour which had led to her isolation. An example of which was being made to sit next to him during classes and he didn't like her speaking to male colleagues. She gave further examples of the controlling behaviour by being called a name in front of her class and making a false allegation of drug taking which led to a with cause drug test.

19. PC Bishop also described catching him deleting and unfriending messages to her friends on her phone. She states that [REDACTED] as this was her first relationship she had nothing to compare his behaviour to.

20. She stated that after her GP completed the Medical Vetting form she took the form home and showed it to her ex-partner. [REDACTED] her ex-partner read this and told her that her answers weren't good enough and she would not get into the police with that answer. He then took the form away and changed it, but she doesn't know exactly how he changed it, he possibly scanned something. She saw the form again when she handed it in, she was aware that the form had been changed and that it was wrong to do so, but she was too afraid to challenge him. [REDACTED]

21. After the relationship ended in late January 2023 her ex-partner stated that between that time and May 2023 her ex-partner kept turning up at the home addresses of her

mother and Nan even when she was not there. He would also send her messages and emails until she blocked him. She unblocked him in May 2023 because she was planning to move in with her new partner and she wanted her ex-partner to return her TV. She described going to meet him to collect the TV and being told that he had sold it. He also told her that if she didn't go for a drink with him she should "*remember the form*". She stated that his comment jogged her memory about the vetting form.

22. In response to cross examination PC Bishop confirmed that she knew that the information on the medical vetting form was incorrect when she submitted it. She also confirmed that she completed her MPS training in February 2023. PC Bishop was asked when she had forgotten about the medical vetting form, she stated that between January and May 2023, she did not have a clear head and was dealing with other things and the form didn't enter her mind again until her conversation with her ex-partner in May. She stated that [REDACTED] he didn't think about the form until her ex-partner brought it up. She stated that she panicked after her memory had been jogged but she didn't tell anyone about the submission. She stated that she was going to report that she had made a false submission at some time in the future but her line manager initiated the conversation with her first.

23. In response to questions from the panel PC Bishop stated she did not understand the process and consequences and what it would lead to at the time of submission. She thought it might result in some type of misconduct. She also confirmed that she knew that making a false submission was wrong when she was sworn in as an officer in November 2022. When PC Bishop was asked what had prevented her from reporting the error in the submission after January 2023, she stated that she wasn't thinking about that at the time because she was dealing with the aftermath of her relationship. She stated that she believed that her conversation with her ex-partner was about a week before 24 May 2023 and that it was her intention to say something.

24. PC Bishop stated that after her relationship ended in January 2023 her support network improved. She spoke to a colleague about her relationship with her ex-partner and they told her that his behaviour wasn't right. She made better relationships with her work colleagues [REDACTED]
25. Arising from panel questions counsel for the AA put it to PC Bishop that she was fully aware of the consequences for making a false declaration because the declaration that she signed clearly states what the consequences are. PC Bishop confirmed she had read the declaration before she signed it.
26. PC Bishop was asked by her representative to explain what she would do differently if she knew then what she knows now. She stated that she was a different person now and she wouldn't have put herself in a position that allowed her ex-partner to influence her.

#### Panel determination

27. In assessing PC Bishop's credibility as a witness, the panel had regard to her good character and the positive character statements submitted on her behalf. Her oral account of the coercive and controlling nature of her relationship with her ex-partner was consistent with her written account and was supported by the evidence of her colleagues. The panel accepted her account of her relationship and her reasons for not challenging the action of her ex-partner in altering the medical vetting form. Further, the panel accepted her account of being in fear of her ex-partner as being the basis for not disclosing the inaccuracy in the medical vetting form before January 2023 when their relationship was ongoing. However, the panel found that PC Bishop's overall credibility as a witness was undermined by the lack of plausibility of her explanation for not disclosing the errors in her medical form between January 2023 and May 2023 when her ex-partner had left service and she had ended the relationship with him.
28. The panel noted that PC Bishop's regulation 31 response and written statements provided no explanation for her failure to disclose the inaccuracies in her vetting form between January 2023 and May 2023. In oral evidence PC Bishop accepted

that she had always known that it was wrong to have made a false statement, and that she was undergoing her police training between November 2022 and March 2023. The panel determined that the importance of complying with the standards of professional behaviour is an important aspect of police training; therefore, the panel found PC Bishop's assertion that the issue had gone out her mind until her memory was jogged in May 2023 to be implausible. The panel also found no evidence to support PC Bishop's assertion that she was planning to disclose her false submission in the period between her meeting with her ex-partner and her discussion with her line manager on 24 May 2023.

29. The panel found that PC Bishop knew that it was wrong to submit the medical vetting form containing false information and that she decided not to disclose her wrongdoing. During the period between January 2023 and May 2023, PC Bishop ended her relationship with her ex-partner and blocked communications with him, she built a new network of work colleagues, repaired her [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and started a new relationship with her current partner. The panel noted that soon after ending the relationship she had disclosed to her colleagues the coercive and controlling nature of her relationship with her ex-partner, however, in spite of the positive responses and support that she received from them she did not disclose that he had also forced her to submit the medical vetting form containing a false statement. In the opinion of the panel, PC Bishop's circumstances during this period had, by her own evidence, improved and were clearly more favourable than the circumstances that existed during her [REDACTED] coercive and controlling relationship with her ex-partner. The panel, therefore, concluded that a more likely explanation for her non-disclosure during this period was fear of the potential negative consequences of disclosure on her new life.

30. Having rejected PC Bishop's explanation for not disclosing the false statement in her medical vetting form prior between January 2023 and 24 May 2023 the panel went on to consider whether her non-disclosure was dishonest. The Panel applied the two-stage test provided in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos UK Limited* [2017] UKSC 67. The Panel first considered PC Bishop's actual state of knowledge and belief when she failed to disclose the false statement. The panel concluded for the reasons detailed above that PC Bishop knew that it was wrong to make a false

statement in her medical vetting form and that she deliberately failed to disclose the false statement between January 2023 and 24 May 2023. The Panel next considered whether PC Bishop's conduct in light of her knowledge or belief was dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people. The Panel concluded that PC Bishop's conduct would be considered dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people.

## BREACH OF STANDARDS

31. Having found that PC Bishop had acted dishonestly when she failed to disclose the false statement in her medical vetting form between January 2023 and May 2023. The Panel went on to consider whether PC Bishop's conduct breached the professional standard of Honesty and Integrity as alleged by the AA. The standard provides:

### Honesty and Integrity

Police officers are honest, act with integrity and do not compromise or abuse their position.

32. The Panel having found that PC Bishop's conduct was dishonest also concluded that such dishonest conduct clearly breached the standard of honesty and integrity.

## GROSS MISCONDUCT OR MISCONDUCT

33. Having found a breach of the standard of honesty and integrity, the panel carefully considered whether the breach amounted to gross misconduct, misconduct or neither. Misconduct is defined in the Regulations as meaning a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action. Gross misconduct is defined as a breach of the standards of professional behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal. The Panel reminded itself of the circumstances of this case, the breach of the standard found proved, the need to protect public confidence in, and the reputation of the Police Service, the need to maintain high professional standards

and the need to protect the public and officers and staff by preventing similar misconduct in the future.

34. In assessing the seriousness of PC Bishop's conduct the Panel had regard to the outcome guidance which provides that Panels should assess the seriousness of the proven conduct by reference to the officer's culpability for the misconduct, the harm caused by the misconduct, the existence of any aggravating factors and the existence of any mitigating factors.
35. The Panel determined that PC Bishop was in a coercive and controlling relationship between August 2022 when the form was submitted and January 2023, her culpability during this period was therefore low. However, the relationship having ended in January 2023, she deliberately chose not to disclose the false submission until challenged on 24 May 2023 therefore her culpability during this period was high.
36. In respect of harm the panel found that public confidence in the police was likely to be significantly undermined if the public were aware of the circumstances of this case. There have been a number of high-profile cases that have led to significant public concern due to weaknesses in the MPS vetting process. The panel therefore found that the level of potential reputational harm to the police service was high.
37. The panel found that an aggravating factor in this case was that PC Bishop had failed to raise her concerns or seek advice on what to do from colleagues.
38. In terms of mitigating factors, the panel found that PC Bishop had expressed genuine remorse. The panel acknowledged that PC Bishop had been in a coercive and controlling relationship and accepted that her failure to disclose the false statement prior to the 23 January 2023 was not dishonest. However, the panel had received no evidence to support a finding that the domestic abuse suffered by PC Bishop had impacted on her ability to distinguish between right and wrong. The panel therefore concluded that her abusive relationship could not be taken into account to the panel's assessment of seriousness.

39. In light of the above findings the panel concluded that the level of seriousness in this case was high. The panel therefore determined that the breach of the standard amounted to gross misconduct.

## OUTCOME

40. In determining the appropriate and proportionate sanction the panel have had regard to PC Bishop's service record, the facts found proved, the submissions made on behalf the AA and PC Bishop and the legal advice received from the LQA. The panel applied the three-stage procedure set out in the outcome guidance. The Panel assessed the seriousness of the misconduct, keeping in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions and chose the sanction which most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.
41. Counsel for the AA reaffirmed his earlier submissions in respect of seriousness and submitted that in light of the seriousness of the factors already identified by the panel the only appropriate sanction was dismissal without notice. It was submitted on behalf of PC Bishop that in light of the circumstances of this case and the positive character references submitted on behalf of the officer a sanction of final written warning was appropriate in this case.
42. The panel reconsidered its assessment of seriousness in light of the further submissions made. For the reasons detailed above the panel found that the level of seriousness of the misconduct found proved was high.
43. The panel kept in mind at all times the threefold purpose of imposing sanctions, namely: (a) maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; (b) upholding high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; (c) protection of the public. Of these, the maintenance of public confidence in and the reputation of the police service is paramount.
44. In line with the outcome guidance at paragraph 7.4, the panel considered the least severe outcome first. There is significant public concern arising from recent high-profile incidents involving the falsification of vetting information within the MPS; therefore, the panel determined that a final written warning would be neither

proportionate nor appropriate to address the seriousness of the misconduct found proved and to uphold high standards in policing and deter other officers from acting in a similar manner.

45. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that the only appropriate sanction in this case was dismissal without notice.

T/Commander Brigid Beehag-Fisher (Chair)

Patricia Richardson (IPM)

Fiona Bennett (IPM)

30<sup>th</sup> July 2026