

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Dawid Lewicki

Warrant No: P263118

Date of Hearing: Friday 28th August 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct

Finding

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started. I am satisfied that the required notices under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 and the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025) have been served. These are matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.

I have considered representations from the Appropriate Authority as to whether this hearing should be held in private or public. I have determined that this hearing is to be held in **Public**

PC Dawid Lewicki is a serving police constable attached to the South West BCU of the Metropolitan Police Service. He has been suspended from duty since his arrest in June 2025. PC Lewicki attended the hearing and was legally represented by Mr Majeks Walker. His Federation Representative, A/PS Steven Stewart, also attended.

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Mr Silas Lee. The allegations against PC Lewicki are as follows:

Allegation-Restraining Order

On 12th June 2026 at Westminster Magistrates' Court a Restraining Order was issued to PC Lewicki. The order was made for the protection of his former partner and prohibits any direct or indirect contact with her, as well as attendance at her home address and workplace. The order remains in force until 11th June 2028.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that PC Lewicki's 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), namely:

- Discreditable Conduct

In that his 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, his conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct and his dismissal may be justified.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide are whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the following:

In respect of Allegation 1, that on 12th June 2026 at Westminster Magistrates' Court a Restraining Order was issued to PC Lewicki, made for the protection of his former partner, prohibiting any direct or indirect contact with her and attendance at her home address and workplace, remaining in force until 11th June 2028.

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether they amount to a breach of the following standard 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

PC Lewicki was served with the Regulation 17 notice, (F 163) on 25th July 2026. He has responded under Regulation 54 (Conduct) Regulations and his position was set out at the hearing. PC Lewicki's position was that:

- He accepted he had contacted his former partner but denied it was stalking or harassment as she had also been in contact with him
- He understood why the restraining order was imposed but he did not want anything to do with his former partner
- His conduct did not amount to misconduct or gross misconduct

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered all the documentary evidence, including the Restraining Order issued by Westminster Magistrates' Court on 12th June 2026, the witness statements of DC Karen Thorniley dated 12th June 2026 and 30th July 2026, the screenshots of communications from PC Lewicki to the complainant (Exhibits ND/01/1 to ND/01/7), and the Lloyds Bank statements for June 2025.

I remind myself that the burden of proving the case is on the Appropriate Authority and the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is, on the balance of probabilities.

Restraining Order was imposed on PC Lewicki by District Judge Clarke at Westminster Magistrates' Court on 12th June 2026. The order prohibits direct or indirect contact with the complainant and attendance at her workplace and home address, and remains in force for two years until 11th June 2028. The existence and terms of the order are established by the court record and are not in dispute.

I find the particulars of the allegation **proven**.

Breach of Standards of Professional Behaviour

I then have to consider whether the facts proved amount to a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour. It is for the Appropriate Authority to prove breach of standards on the balance of probabilities.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden and that the actions of PC Lewicki as described above did breach the Standards of Professional Behaviour as to Discreditable Conduct. My reasons for this are as follows:

A serving police officer who engages in conduct that results in a court-imposed restraining order for the protection of a member of the public brings the police service into disrepute and damages the relationship of trust and confidence between the police and the public.

I now go on to make a provisional assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm.

Culpability – High

PC Lewicki bears responsibility for his own actions. As a serving police officer, he would be expected to understand the law on harassment and the significance of a person's withdrawal of consent to contact.

I assess the culpability as High

Harm – High

The imposition of a court order on a serving officer, undermines public trust and confidence in policing and the Metropolitan Police Service. Officers are responsible for upholding the law protecting people from harassment.

I assess the Harm as High

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the *Standards of Professional Behaviour* so serious that it could justify dismissal. Applying that definition, I am satisfied that PC Lewicki's breach of the standard of Discreditable Conduct does amount to gross misconduct.

Outcome Decision

In making my decision on outcome I adopt the three-stage process, as outlined in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings to determine the appropriate sanction.

The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the conduct.

This is assessed by reference to:

- The officer's culpability
- The harm caused by the misconduct
- The existence of aggravating factors
- The existence of mitigating factors

The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime.

I remind myself this has three elements:

- To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
- To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and
- To protect the public.

I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole.

The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils that purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.

I start by assessing the seriousness of the conduct:

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

Culpability

PC Lewicki bears responsibility for his own actions. As a serving police officer, he would be expected to understand the law on harassment and the significance of a person's withdrawal of consent to contact.

I assess the culpability as High

Harm

The imposition of a court order on a serving officer, undermines public trust and confidence in policing and the Metropolitan Police Service. Officers are responsible for upholding the law protecting people from harassment.

I assess the Harm as High

Aggravating Factors

When considering aggravating factors, I am mindful not to double count matters that have already formed part of my assessment of harm and culpability.

Mitigating Factors

I have considered whether there are any mitigating factors.

The criminal proceedings for stalking and harassment were discontinued after the complainant withdrew her support for the prosecution. No criminal conviction resulted. I note this, but it carries limited weight in the context of these proceedings, where the civil standard of proof applies and where the court nonetheless considered a restraining order necessary.

PC Lewicki did not contest the existence or terms of the court order. Some of his messages to the complainant expressed apology. However, these matters carry limited weight given the seriousness and persistence of the conduct.

Conclusion on Seriousness

Taking all these matters into consideration, I assess the seriousness of the conduct as High.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

I have reminded myself of the threefold purpose of the police misconduct regime carefully in considering the appropriate outcome in this case.

I further remind myself that the police misconduct regime is not designed to punish police officers – it is about the reputation and standing of the profession as a whole. I do acknowledge that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect: accordingly, the outcome should be no more than necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

I have considered PC Lewicki's record of service.

I have considered the matter fully, including the nature and severity of the breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

As the matter came to the attention of the Appropriate Authority after the implementation of the 2025 Regulations which came into force on 28th May 2025, I have to consider whether there are exceptional reasons which would rebut the presumption of dismissal. I have found that there are not. The seriousness of the conduct is high. The imposition of a restraining order on a serving police officer for the protection of a member of the public from harassment is fundamentally incompatible with continued service. No exceptional circumstances have been identified or advanced that would justify departing from the presumption of dismissal.

OUTCOME:

Therefore, the sanction I impose on PC Lewicki is dismissal **without notice** and that he be placed on the College of Policing's barred list.

Assistant Commissioner Rachel Williams

Metropolitan Police Service

28th August 2026