

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: Officer A

Warrant No: P228729

Date of Hearing: 9 September 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct, Orders and Instructions, Honesty and Integrity

Findings

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 have been served. These are matters which have not, in any case, been disputed before me.

The hearing was held in public.

Officer A attended the hearing and was legally represented by Counsel Heather Oliver. Officer A provided a Regulation 54 response. The Appropriate Authority was represented by Counsel, Mr Jim Olphert and Case Manager, Ms Melissa Gordedo.

I am satisfied Officer A has been properly served with the papers and Regulations 51 to 53 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 have been complied with.

Amendment of Allegation

At the start of the hearing, the Appropriate Authority applied to amend Allegation 2, removing the date '20 June 2023' and 'this conduct is said to be in clear contravention of the MPS Guidance on the Use of Sex Workers and Sexual Services (...)'. Further, the Appropriate Authority withdraw the alleged breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour as to Orders and Instructions. Moreover, the Appropriate Authority apply to narrow the scope of the alleged breach of the Standard of Professional Behaviour to integrity only.

The application was not opposed. I have considered my case management powers under Regulation 61 and reminded myself of the principles of fairness. In my view, it is in interests of justice to permit the amendments to Allegation 2.

The Allegations

Allegation 1

It is alleged that, whilst serving as a police officer, on more than one occasion you received sexual services as part of, or in addition to, paid massage treatments. By doing so you engaged the services of a sex worker.

Particulars:

On 5 August 2025, during a [Redacted] interview conducted via Microsoft Teams, you disclosed that you had received "sexual extras" during paid massages on five occasions over a four-year period, the most recent being approximately six months before the interview. This

consisted of the service provider masturbating you on four occasions and providing oral sex on one occasion.

In you MG14 response under caution dated 13 July 2026, you stated: “on three occasions between February 2023 and October 2023, following the massage, I was offered a hand job by the masseuse. On three occasions, I agreed to the suggestion.”

You subsequently identified, to the best of your recollection, the following three dates and corresponding cash withdrawals as relating to the three occasions on which you received the “sexual extras”:

- (i) 27 March 2023, with a cash withdrawal of £70;
- (ii) 23 May 2023, with a cash withdrawal of £80; and
- (iii) 20 June 2023, with a cash withdrawal of £100.

Your conduct was contrary to the standards expected of a police officer and incompatible with the responsibilities and obligations of your office, irrespective of the precise implementation date of the relevant guidance.

Allegation 2

It is further alleged that your conduct was contrary to the NPCC Sex Worker National Police Guidance published in June 2023.

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, namely:

- (i) Discreditable Conduct; and
- (ii) Honesty and Integrity (Integrity only)

In that the 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 individual or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct, and your dismissal may be justified.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, the conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct and dismissal may be justified.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and the representations made on behalf of Officer A by his legal representatives, and I have considered the documentary evidence.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities the allegations against Officer A.

I set out below the factual background as I have found it, drawing upon the investigation report and the wider documentary evidence before me, including Officer A's Regulation 54 response.

Officer A is a serving officer who joined the Metropolitan Police Service [Redacted].

This matter arose entirely from Officer A's own disclosures. [Redacted].

In that interview, [Redacted] and which the officer approached with candour, the events of 2023 came to his mind, and he disclosed them.

The Appropriate Authority submit that Officer A's own admissions are such that a factual finding can properly be made on Allegation 1.

[Redacted]

The matter was brought to the attention of the Appropriate Authority on the 23 March 2026 A Regulation 17 notice (Form 163) was served on Officer A on the 27 May 2026. Officer A submitted an MG14 response under caution on the 13 July 2026.

As to Allegation 2, the Appropriate Authority asserts that Officer A's suggestion that there were more than three occasions allows for the irresistible inference that such occasions took place after publication of NPCC Sex Worker National Police Guidance published in June 2023.

Officer's position

Officer A accepts that on three occasions in 2023 he was masturbated during a paid massage. He accepts that this amounts to discreditable conduct within the meaning of the Regulations. Officer A does not accept that his conduct amounts to gross misconduct but rather misconduct only. He does not accept a breach of integrity.

As to Integrity, the officer submits the basis of this allegation is opaque. The proceedings arise solely from the officer's own candour in his [Redacted] interview.

Officer A gave evidence and also relied on his account as set out in his MG14 and his Regulation 54 response, as follows:

[Redacted], he turned to exercise, training in the gym five times a week. This exertion placed a strain on his body, and he began looking for a sports masseuse to help relieve the resulting pain and tension. He used Google and Gumtree to find masseuses, identifying one in [Redacted] and, when she no longer advertised, another in [Redacted]. They advertised their services solely as masseuses; they were not advertising erotic massage. He was seeking a normal sports massage. However, on three occasions, at the end of the massage, the masseuse offered to masturbate him and he agreed. He recognises these as moments of significant misjudgement and personal weakness.

The officer avers he did not visit a brothel or a known sex worker. The women were beauty therapists working in salon conditions within their own homes, offering a range of services including hair treatments, nail treatments, waxing and massage. They were of a similar age to the officer. They were not apparently vulnerable; they worked for themselves in professional environments with no indication of exploitation or criminal activity.

In relation to oral sex, the officer recalls one occasion on which a masseuse began to perform oral sex, unprompted and unsolicited, in the course of otherwise manual masturbation. He asked her to stop and she did.

The events took place in the officer's private time when he was off duty. The women were unaware that he was a police officer.

The officer cannot be certain of the exact dates on which these events occurred. He believes they may have occurred on the 27 March, 23 May and 20 June 2023 but cannot be sure. He is confident that all three occasions pre-dated September 2023.

Material from the College of Policing change log indicates that the NPCC guidance was published on the 23 June 2023.

Officer A does not accept the complete accuracy of the [Redacted] interview record. He disputes that he said the activity occurred on five occasions over four years; he believes he told the interviewer that there were three occasions "going back 3 or 4 years". He does not accept that the most recent occasion was six months before the interview; the last occasion was at some point in 2023. He disputes that the "sexual extras" consisted of masturbation on four occasions and oral sex on one; the masturbation occurred on three occasions, and on the one occasion oral sex was initiated by the masseuse he asked her to stop. He also disputes that a [Redacted] massage in [Redacted] involved any sexual element. [Redacted].

On behalf of Officer A, it is further submitted that dismissing an officer on the basis of his own honesty sets a problematic precedent that disincentivises the transparency [Redacted].

Decision on Finding

I have applied Regulation 61(15) and carefully listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the documentary evidence provided to me, including Officer A's own evidence and the representations on his behalf.

Allegation 1

Discreditable Conduct

Officer A admits that on three occasions in 2023 he received sexual services in the form of masturbation in the course of paid massages. This is admitted, and it is properly conceded by the officer to amount to discreditable conduct. Using the services of anyone offering or providing a sexual service is wholly incompatible with the role of a police officer, and such conduct, if publicised, would be likely to undermine public confidence in policing and bring discredit upon the service, whether on or off duty. I accept that there is a genuine dispute as to the number of occasions, however it does not materially alter the finding. This was not a single, isolated lapse of judgement. Officer A received sexual services on three separate and distinct occasions. That return on these distinct occasions demonstrates a deliberate and considered pattern of behaviour, rather than a spontaneous or one-off error, with each occasion representing a fresh decision by the officer to engage the services of a sex worker.

The officer's own admission in evidence and in his MG14 as well as his Regulation 54 response that the conduct occurred on three occasions is sufficient. Accordingly, I find Allegation 1 as to Discreditable Conduct proven.

Honesty and Integrity (Integrity only)

At the outset, I note that the conduct disclosed no element of dishonesty. In any event, it is not suggested by the Appropriate Authority that there was an element of dishonesty.

This matter came to light because Officer A proactively and voluntarily disclosed it himself [Redacted].

Here, I am concerned with the nature of the conduct itself. As set out above, this was not a single, isolated lapse of judgement, but a repeated pattern of behaviour. I have carefully considered the evidence before me, and I am of the view that the underlying behaviour is fully captured by the proven Discreditable Conduct limb. To plead both standards in respect of the same conduct creates duplication and risks conflating two distinct standards.

Therefore, in my view the Appropriate Authority has not discharged its burden on the balance of probabilities in respect of Honesty and Integrity (Integrity only).

Allegation 2

Turning to Allegation 2, on the evidence before me, the guidance was published on the 23 June 2023, as confirmed by the College of Policing change log. The officer has dated the three occasions, and it appears accepted that the occasions pre-dated the MPS's own policy of November 2023.

On the evidence before me, the Appropriate Authority has not established on the balance of probabilities that the conduct post-dated the publication of the NPCC guidance on the 23 June 2023. I am not satisfied that the conduct occurred at a time when the relevant guidance was in force such as to constitute a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour as alleged by Allegation 2. Therefore, I do not find Allegation 2 proven.

Breach of Professional Standards

In line with Regulation 61(16), I bear in mind that the burden of proving a Breach of Standards 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 in respect of Discreditable Conduct as to Allegation 1.

Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make a provisional assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors.

Culpability

Culpability is high – Officer A made a deliberate choice on each of the three occasions to accept sexual services at the conclusion of paid massages.

He was an experienced [Redacted] officer. His role demanded the highest standards of integrity, discretion and professional judgement.

The conduct was repeated, rather than an isolated lapse, and was incompatible with the responsibilities and obligations of his office.

I take into account that he did not seek out a brothel or a known sex worker and was approached at the end of otherwise legitimate massages, and that there was no apparent exploitation. However, this does not in my view lower Officer A's culpability.

Harm

Harm – is high. The use of sexual services by a serving police officer, [Redacted], is capable of causing serious harm to the reputation of the police service and undermining public confidence.

[Redacted].

This conduct undermines public confidence in policing at a time when the police, and specifically the Metropolitan Police, are seeking to demonstrate how seriously they are addressing standards following highly publicised and damaging incidents.

I accept that there was no operational compromise, that the women did not know Officer A was a police officer, that no one else was told, and that the matter emerged only through his voluntary disclosure.

Those matters reduce the evidence of actual operational harm, but they do not remove the serious reputational harm or the risk inherent in the conduct.

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 identify as aggravating features the repeated nature of the conduct on three occasions and the officer's rank and seniority. [Redacted].

Mitigating features

The conduct came to light solely through Officer A's transparency [Redacted]; he made early and consistent admissions and has demonstrated genuine remorse, insight and reflection; the conduct was confined to a short period in 2023, is now approximately three years old and has not been repeated; [Redacted]. There was no apparent exploitation, abuse of position or operational compromise. I take these matters into account.

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 the assessment of seriousness set out above, I have carefully considered the proven breach of Discreditable Conduct, both individually and in the context of the circumstances as a whole.

I am satisfied that the proven breach of Discreditable Conduct is so serious as to amount to gross misconduct. I make clear that this finding rests on Discreditable Conduct alone.

Following my findings, I have gone on to carry out another full assessment of seriousness (as per the provisional assessment above).

Personal mitigation

I have been provided with personal mitigation on behalf of Officer A. He has served with the Metropolitan Police Service [Redacted]. He has never previously been the subject of a complaint or misconduct allegation. He has remained at work throughout these proceedings, continuing to serve professionally and to a high standard.

I have been provided with character references which speak to Officer A's professionalism, integrity and commitment. He is described as an officer with "outstanding professionalism, integrity and commitment" and "a person of exceptional professional integrity" reflecting "the very best qualities of public service" and as someone who "can still contribute strongly to our organisation and make an impact for London" [Redacted].

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 Officer A's record of service and the submissions made on his behalf. I have carefully assessed the seriousness of the conduct and the personal mitigation advanced.

I give significant weight to the fact that the matter came to light through Officer A's own candour and transparency [Redacted]. He volunteered information about conduct that was embarrassing and adverse to him. This is a genuine mitigating feature and reflects the public interest in an effective vetting process. It does not, however, remove the risks and seriousness of the conduct disclosed.

[Redacted].

I have also taken into account his otherwise unblemished [Redacted] career with the Metropolitan Police Service, the two BCU Commander Commendations and the strong character references speaking to his professionalism, integrity, commitment [Redacted]. These matters are significant personal mitigation, but good service and character cannot outweigh the seriousness of this breach, the obligations of his [Redacted] office or the need to maintain public confidence.

Finally, I have taken into account his remorse, insight and reflection, together with his early and consistent admissions and his continued professional service. They are properly given weight, but they do not eliminate the reputational harm, the repeated nature of the conduct [Redacted].

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

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.

T/Commander Brigid-Beehag Fisher

Metropolitan Police Service

9 September 2026