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

SC Rajay Campbell

PANEL FINAL DECISION

Introductions:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for SC Rajay Campbell (the Officer). The outline of the Panel decisions on facts and outcome was provided to the Officer during the hearing.

2. The Panel was chaired by Commander Brigid Beehag-Fisher (Chair), with independent members Ms Sarah Chambers and Ms Purnima Uppal. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Olivia Kong.

3. The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by Mr Russell Fortt (AA's representative). The Officer was not legally represented but was supported by his Federation representative, Ms Parminder Attwell .

4. The hearing was held from 5 October 2026 to 8 October 2026 at the Patrick Dunne House, Sutton Police Station, 6 Carshalton Road, Sutton, SM1 4RF.

5. At the outset of its determinations, and throughout the hearing, the Panel has remained mindful of the overarching purpose of police misconduct proceedings, namely:

    i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;

    ii. To uphold high standards of professional conduct and deter misconduct;

iii. To protect the public.

The Allegations:

6. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of the Officer containing the allegations and proposing that his conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct, namely:

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

It is alleged that SC Campbell, whilst an officer serving with the Metropolitan Police, engaged in conduct that fell below the expectations of a serving police officer in such a way that contravened the Standards of Professional Behaviour. This conduct, whether taken individually or cumulatively, was so serious that it amounted to gross misconduct and his dismissal would be justified.

Allegation 1

At around 3am on 26 August 2023, SC Campbell attempted to rape Ms A when he intentionally pushed her head down and tried to penetrate her mouth with his penis, causing her lips to touch his penis. Ms A did not consent, nor did SC Campbell reasonably believe that she did so consent.

Allegation 2

Shortly after Allegation 1, SC Campbell raped Ms A when he intentionally penetrated her vagina with his penis. Ms A did not consent nor did SC Campbell reasonably believe that she did so consent.

Allegation 3

Later in the morning on 26 August 2023, prior to leaving the hotel, SC Campbell sexually assaulted Ms A when he repeatedly and intentionally tried to kiss and touch her. Such touching was sexual, Ms A did not consent and SC Campbell did not have a reasonable belief in consent.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

It is alleged that the above conduct, taken individually or cumulatively, breached the following Standard of Professional 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.

The alleged conduct constitutes sexual violence against women and girls and is criminal in nature. Conduct of this nature is a matter of local and national concern. Such conduct would fundamentally undermine public confidence in the police service

Preliminary Issues

Special measures

7. The AA's representative applied for the Ms A, Ms B, Ms C and Mr D to be anonymised and for Ms A to give evidence via video link. The Officer raised no objection to the application.

8. The Chair directed that a video link be granted for Ms A. Ms A, Ms B, Ms C and Mr D are to be anonymised throughout these proceedings. Permission is given for the Victim Support Unit to attend to provide support for Ms A.

The Panel's Approach

9. 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.

10. The Panel remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the AA 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.

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

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

    a. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 ("the Regulations"), particularly the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2;

    b. The 2018 Home Office Guidance ("HOG"), with specific reference to Chapter 1, which summarises the Standards;

    c. The definition of misconduct under Regulation 3(1): "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour";

    d. The definition of gross misconduct under Regulation 3(1): "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified".

13. 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.

Evidence

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

    a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice and Regulation 31(MG14) response) consisting of 356 pages;

    b. AA's opening note consisting of 6 pages;

    Video evidence:

    c. Hotel CCTV – 34 mins 37 seconds

    d. VR1 redacted - 53 mins 37 seconds

e. First account redacted – 37 mins 16 seconds

f. Restaurant CCTV – 20 mins

15. The Panel also heard from the following live witnesses:

    a. Ms A

    b. The Officer

Case Summary

16. On 25 August 2023 at approximately 17:30 hours, Ms A and her friend, Ms C, attended the Premier Inn on Western Avenue, Greenford, where they had booked a room to spend the evening. While at the hotel, Ms A contacted the Officer and invited him to join them for a movie night. The Officer agreed and arrived at the hotel at around 22:30 hours.

17. The three of them consumed vodka and lemonade, though not to excess. At approximately 03:00 hours, Ms C fell asleep, leaving Ms A and the Officer awake in the room.

18. Ms A alleged that the Officer asked her to engage in sexual activity, which she declined. She stated that he then climbed on top of her, pushed her arms down with force, and grabbed her head, pushing it towards his penis in an attempt to compel her to perform oral sex.

19. It is further alleged that the Officer then pulled down his shorts, moved her underwear aside, and penetrated her without consent. Ms A stated that the penetration continued for approximately five minutes against her will, after which the Officer ejaculated onto her and the clothing she was wearing.

Finding of Facts & Breaches

20. The Panel considered the closing submissions advanced by the AA's representative and the Federation Representative, together with the legal advice provided. The Panel followed that advice throughout and remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the AA. The applicable standard is the balance of probabilities.

21. The final hearing bundle was agreed by both parties. The Panel has considered all of the evidence contained within it. The Panel also heard live evidence from Ms A and the Officer.

22. It is not in dispute that the Officer and Ms A engaged in sexual activity on the night in question. What is in dispute is whether Ms A consented to that sexual activity and whether the Officer reasonably believed she had consented.

The witnesses

Ms A

23. The Panel carefully considered the evidence of Ms A, in her visually recorded interview which she adopted at the hearing. Her oral testimony was broadly consistent with her VRI. Her account was detailed, coherent, and the Panel was satisfied as to her overall truthfulness and reliability.

24. Ms A stated that Ms C had booked a room at the Premier Inn to spend the night there and had invited Ms A to stay with her. They were watching films and decided to invite the Officer to join them. Miss A contacted the Officer, and he agreed to come to the hotel. Ms C went downstairs to meet him as she was also going for a cigarette, and they returned to the room together.

25. Ms A said that the three of them sat on the bed watching a film and television programs until around 3:00 am, describing the atmosphere as friendly and relaxed. When Ms C became tired, she turned away and fell asleep. Ms A said that she and the Officer were play fighting and tickling each other in a jokey manner before Ms C fell asleep.

26. Ms A stated that once Ms C was asleep, the Officer put his arm around her shoulder and pushed her head down under the blanket towards his penis, attempting to get her to perform oral sex. His penis touched her lips but did not penetrate her mouth. Ms A told the Officer she did not want to do that and sat back up, choosing not to escalate the situation because Ms C was in the bed.

27. Ms A said she noticed the Officer checking whether Ms C was asleep. He then pulled Ms A's legs down, positioned himself over her, and sat on her legs. She said she immediately felt something was going to happen. The Officer repeatedly said "It'll be quick,". Ms A said to him " I don't want it, please like, just leave me alone". She repeatedly told him that she did not want to have sex, having made clear to him previously that she did not want sexual activity, having recently come out of a relationship.

28. Ms A said she tried to push him off, but he held her down by her arms, using his elbow to restrain one arm and his other hand to cover her mouth, muffling her attempts to speak. She said he continued whispering "It'll be quick," separated her legs, moved her underwear aside, and attempted to insert his penis. She stated she was resisting with her free hand on his shoulder.

29. Ms A said the Officer became visibly frustrated when penetration did not occur. He removed his hand from her mouth and used it to assist insertion. She said that at this point she felt she had no choice. The Officer then penetrated her while repeating "It'll be quick." She said that when she asked him to stop, he went faster and then asked if he could ejaculate inside her. She refused and pushed him off, and he ejaculated over her clothing.

30. Ms A said the Officer then went to the bathroom. When he left the bathroom Ms A went to the bathroom herself, where she stayed for around half an hour. She changed her underwear and left the soiled pair in the bathroom. When she came out, the Officer was on the sofa. She asked him to sleep there, but he did not, and she ended up lying between him and Ms C until the early morning.

31. Ms A said she texted Ms C "I don't wanna be next to RAJAY, can you please not let me next to RAJAY", though Ms C did not see the message immediately. In the morning, she said the Officer was jumping on her and kissing her in what appeared to be a jokey manner, and Ms C intervened at one point to pull him away.

32. Later that day, Ms A disclosed what had happened to Ms C during their taxi journey home and later told Ms B. A few days later she relayed the incident to her tutor, Mr D.

The Officer

33. The Officer adopted his record of interview and gave oral evidence. He stated that any sexual activity between himself and Ms A was consensual. He broadly agreed with Ms A's account of events in terms of the general sequence of the evening, but disputed her account of the nature of the sexual activity, maintaining that the sexual contact was consensual throughout.

34. The Officer said that he and Ms A engaged in kissing and touching, which then progressed to her initiating oral sex on him followed by consensual sexual intercourse. He stated that, the following morning, they were "making a bit of fun about it," and that Ms A gave him a hug. He said they each booked separate taxis home. Before leaving, Ms A asked him to text her when he arrived home; he said he did so, and she replied to confirm she was home as well.

35. The Officer denied using any force on Ms A. He said he asked Ms A for permission before kissing her breasts, and that she consented. He further stated that before penetrating Ms A, he asked whether he could do so, and she said yes. He said he also asked Ms A whether he could ejaculate inside her.

36. The Officer stated that when he asked to kiss Ms A's breasts, Ms C said, "I don't mind," before turning away with her back facing them. He said that both he and Ms A assumed Ms C had fallen sleep.

Finding of facts

37. In assessing the evidence, the Panel first took account of the Officer's good character. He has no previous findings of misconduct, and this positive feature of his record was considered when evaluating both his credibility and the likelihood of him having acted as alleged. The Panel recognised that good character does not determine the outcome and cannot outweigh clear, reliable evidence; however, it forms part of the overall evidential landscape and has been given appropriate weight in reaching the Panel's findings.

38. The Panel recognised that this was a difficult case. There were no witness statements from Ms C, Ms B or Mr D, and therefore no direct independent account supporting either Ms A or the Officer. However, the absence of formal statements did not leave the Panel without supporting material. The Panel noted the WhatsApp messages sent by Ms A to Mr D within a week of the incident, in which she described what had happened. This disclosure was consistent with her assertion that she shared her experience with those close to her shortly after the event. The Panel considered this to be a significant supporting feature of her account.

39. In contrast, the Panel identified several inconsistencies and contradictions within the Officer's evidence which materially undermined his credibility.

40. Firstly, the Panel noted a stark inconsistency between the Officer's Form 164H2025 and the account he gave in interview and in oral evidence. In his Form 164H2025, he stated categorically that no sexual intercourse took place. Yet in both his interview and his oral evidence, he accepted that sexual intercourse did occur and maintained that it was consensual. The Officer explained this discrepancy by saying that his aunt completed the form, to which he had a quick scan and signed it, and that this was why it differed from his other accounts. The Panel did not find this explanation credible. The Officer was a young adult and a serving special constable; he would have understood the importance of an official document of this nature. The Panel was not persuaded that he would have signed the form without reading it or appreciating its contents.

41. Secondly, in his oral evidence, when asked why he did not simply wait and invite Ms A to attend his home address to have sex, the Officer stated that he "would not bring females back to his home as his niece also lives there." However, in his

interview, he told the interviewing officer that he and Ms A had already made plans for her to visit his home when his aunt was away.

42. Thirdly, the Panel considered the aftermath of the incident. It was agreed by both parties that Ms A blocked the Officer on her phone shortly afterwards. The Officer described his relationship with Ms A as "intimate," stating that they spoke regularly and sometimes fell asleep on the phone together. In those circumstances, the Panel found it surprising that he made no attempt to find out from Ms A's friends why she had blocked him, if, as he claimed, everything that had occurred at the hotel was consensual. His lack of curiosity or concern was inconsistent with the nature of the relationship he described.

43. Fourthly, the Panel observed that during cross examination the Officer was unable to recall many details of the night in question. Given that he was sober/had little to drink, had been interviewed under PACE, and had been subject to criminal investigation, the Panel considered the incident to be a significant event in his life. Although three years had passed, the Panel found his level of non-recall to be inconsistent with genuine memory lapse and instead drew the inference that he was being evasive.

44. In contrast, Ms A provided a detailed, coherent and compelling account of the events. Her evidence was internally consistent, was supported by text messages of recent complaint to Mr D and her description of the aftermath aligned with her behaviour in blocking the Officer and confiding in friends.

45. Having considered all the evidence, the Panel found Ms A to be the more reliable witness. The inconsistencies in the Officer's account, his contradictory statements, his implausible explanation for the Form 164H2025, his lack of recall, and his behaviour following the incident collectively undermined his credibility. The Panel therefore preferred Ms A's account to that of the Officer. The panel found that the sexual activity was non-consensual and the Officer did not have any reasonable grounds to believe consent had been given.

46. For all of these reasons, and having carefully assessed the totality of the evidence, the Panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Allegations 1, 2 and 3 are proved.

Breach of the Standards

47. In light of the above findings, the Panel concluded that the Officer's conduct engaged the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct.

Discreditable Conduct

48. The standard of Discreditable Conduct requires police officers to behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in the police service.

49. The panel found the allegations proven. The Officer's conduct on the night in question, namely engaging in nonconsensual sexual activity fell far below the level of behaviour expected of a police officer. Behaviour of this nature, if known publicly, would plainly diminish confidence in the police service and adversely affect its reputation. The Panel therefore finds that the Officer's actions discredited the police service and undermined public confidence in it, amounting to a breach of the Standard of Discreditable Conduct.

Misconduct or Gross Misconduct

50. Under the *Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings*, misconduct is defined as:

"A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action."

51. Gross misconduct is defined as:

"A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal."

52. The Panel carefully considered the threshold between Misconduct and Gross Misconduct with reference to the above assessment on seriousness. The Panel determined that the Officer's conduct meets the threshold for Gross Misconduct for the following reason:

53. The conduct involved non-consensual sexual activity, causing serious harm to Ms A and representing a fundamental breach of the standards expected of a police officer. Behaviour of this nature is wholly incompatible with continued service and would seriously undermine public confidence. Its gravity is such that dismissal would be justified, and it therefore meets the threshold for Gross Misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

54. The panel reminded themselves of the 3 stages to determining outcome; namely:-
    a. To assess the seriousness
    b. Keep in mind the purpose of imposing the sanctions

c. Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

Stage 1: Overall Assessment of Seriousness

Assessment of Culpability

55. The Officer's culpability is high based on the following factors:

56. The conduct was deliberate, involving intentional sexual activity in circumstances where Ms A did not consent and the Officer did not reasonably believe she had consented.

57. The conduct is akin to a criminal offence.

58. The Officer used physical force to restrain Ms A.

59. The behaviour constituted sexual misconduct directed towards a woman, which is inherently serious. Such behaviour by a police officer fundamentally undermines the trust that women and girls must be able to place in those who hold public authority.

Assessment of Harm

60. The panel concluded that the level of harm was high based on the following:

61. Ms A experienced significant emotional distress, both during and after the incident.

62. Ms A suffered a scratch and bruising to her arms.

63. Sexual misconduct by a police officer causes substantial harm to public confidence, particularly in the context of Violence against Women and Girls, where public trust is acutely sensitive.

64. The panel were careful not to double count and therefore have found no additional or mitigating factors.

Aggravating Factors

65. None

Mitigating Factors

66. None

Stage 2: The purpose of imposing sanctions

67. The Panel have taken into account the threefold purpose for imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (maintaining public confidence in and the reputation of the police service; upholding the high standards in policing and deterring misconduct; and protecting the public).

Stage 3: Appropriate sanction

68. The Panel is mindful that the most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole.

69. The Panel gave these matters appropriate weight when considering the overall proportionate outcome. However, the Panel remained mindful that personal mitigation carries limited weight, including the Officer's service record and the positive character evidence, and does not diminish the seriousness of the misconduct itself.

70. The Panel began by considering the least severe sanction, namely a final written warning. However, having assessed the nature and gravity of the proven breaches, the Panel concluded that the conduct was so serious that dismissal without notice was the only appropriate and proportionate outcome.

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

Right of Appeal

72. 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.

Commander Brigid Beehag-Fisher

8 October 2026