

IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Police Constable Idominik Efeotor

REGULATION 63(1) NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS and OUTCOME

Introduction

1. On 14th September 2026, I chaired an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing (AMH) for Police Constable Idominik Efeotor (the 'Officer'). I submit this report on my findings, reasons, and outcome to the Appropriate Authority (the 'AA') in accordance with Regulation 63(1) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (the 'Regulations').
2. The hearing was held in public at the Misconduct Hearings Unit, 4th floor, Palestra House, 197 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8NJ.
3. Those present at the hearing were:
 - a) Police Constable Idominik Efeotor – (the 'Officer')
 - b) Lawrence Davies – Solicitor on behalf of the Officer
 - c) Aaryan Sattani - Case Manager
 - d) Nasreen Shah – Counsel for the Appropriate Authority (AA)
 - e) Edward Barham – Legally Qualified Adviser (LQA)
4. Prior to the hearing I received and read/viewed all of the following:
 - a) The case bundle and video footage of exhibits;
 - b) An opening note on behalf of the AA;

- c) The Officer's Regulation 54;
- d) A supplementary statement submitted by the Officer;
- e) An opening note for the Officer.

Preliminary Matters

Pre hearing decisions

- 5. Prior to the hearing I considered representations from the AA and the Officer as to whether this hearing should be held in public or private and determined that the hearing was to be held in public. I also made directions in relation to the anonymisation of an individual within these proceedings who is to be referred to as Mr A.
- 6. At the start of the hearing, I was notified by the Officer that an application was being made under Regulation 50 for the matter to be dealt with under Part 4 of the Regulations (i.e. not an AMH). I was advised by my LQA that an application under Reg 50 is not a matter for the Chair conducting the AMH, but rather a matter for the AA.
- 7. I was informed that the AA had received and considered the matter and that the case remains certified under Regulation 49. That being the case, and the Chair having no jurisdiction under Regulation 50, I was content to proceed.

Procedural matters raised in the hearing

- 8. On behalf of the Officer, I was told that the Regulation 17 that was provided in relation to Allegation 1 only categorised the conduct under investigation as 'misconduct' and not 'gross misconduct', and that the allegation was 'double jeopardy' for a previous misconduct meeting against the Officer where the allegations were not proven.
- 9. This matter arrived at the AMH following the investigator making a statement under Regulation 21(3) because she believed that the AA would be likely to determine that the special conditions in Regulation 49 were satisfied. The AA then certified the case as being suitable for an AMH under Regulation 49(2).

Therefore, the fact that the initial severity assessment placed the matter at misconduct is no bar to the allegation being heard within this AMH.

10. In relation to the earlier misconduct meeting, the allegations heard there were in relation to media content uploaded that DPS became aware of in 2023, whereas the media content cited in this case all stems from after 18 October 2024, and so there is no overlap.
11. In relation to Allegation 4, it was submitted on behalf of the Officer that the anonymisation of Mr A was not part of the original Regulation 17 served on the Officer. However, I am satisfied that the Officer was made aware of the allegation against him through pre-hearing disclosure, and that he was able to present his account through his written submissions and Regulation 54 response. There was no prejudice to the Officer, as he clearly understood the case and mounted an extensive defence to it.

The Allegations

12. The following allegations were read into the record:

Allegation 1

Whilst a serving officer of the Metropolitan Police Service, your conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Discreditable Conduct and Orders and Instructions, in that:

Between 2024 and 2026, you published podcasts and social media content on TikTok, YouTube and other platforms under the “TGTBTU / The Good, The Bad, The Ugly Podcast” brand, in breach of the Metropolitan Police Service social media (Standards) Policy (October 2024), in which you:

- i. Identified yourself as a serving Metropolitan Police officer whilst publishing content critical of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS), the Directorate of Professional Standards (DPS) and senior police leaders.
- ii. Made derogatory and disparaging comments about the MPS, the DPS, senior leaders and other officers.

- iii. Published content likely to discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it.

Particulars:

- a) On or about 9 October 2024, you stated: "I get told I'm bringing the Metropolitan Police into disrepute with the videos that I do. But there are mandem literally walking around with fake evidence and just planting it or doing whatever madness with it." In doing so, you acknowledged awareness that your content was alleged to bring the MPS into disrepute whilst continuing to publish such content.
- b) On or about 11 March 2025, you stated: "This is whatever Rowley's Metropolitan Police... There's no way he can convince me that he actually cares about violence against women and girls, racism."
- c) In a video titled "Bun the DPS!!! Restrictions restriction Restrictions #metpolice #policeuk #corruption", you stated: "All you people, to which restrictions are being put on you inappropriately, that are infringing on your human rights. Tell them Dom said to tell you SYM." In doing so, you encouraged others to disregard restrictions imposed upon them and expressed contempt towards the DPS.
- d) On multiple occasions, you used derogatory language towards officers and police staff and published content which was capable of undermining confidence in the police service.

The Appropriate Authority relies upon the following provisions of the MPS social media (Standards) Policy (October 2024):

- a. "You must not post any content on social media ... which otherwise discredits the police service or undermines public confidence in it."
- b. "All officers and staff should be respectful to others when making any statement or expressing an opinion on social media and be aware that they are personally responsible for their communications, ensuring that their profile, interactions and postings do not directly or indirectly discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it."

Such conduct, individually and cumulatively, is so serious as to amount to gross misconduct.

Allegation 2

Whilst a serving officer of the Metropolitan Police Service, your conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Orders and Instructions, in that:

Following the revocation of your authority to continue the TGTBTU Podcast business interest on 17 August 2023, you deliberately continued to operate, promote and publish content through the podcast and associated social media accounts.

Particulars:

- i. Your business interest in the TGTBTU Podcast was approved on 6 June 2023, subject to conditions including that the activity must not cause embarrassment to the Commissioner or detriment to the image and dignity of the MPS.
- ii. On 17 August 2023, you were informed that your authority to continue the business interest had been revoked and that continuing it could result in disciplinary action.
- iii. Following the revocation of your business interest, you continued to publish content through the TGTBTU Podcast and associated social media accounts notwithstanding the conditions previously imposed and the subsequent withdrawal of authority.
- iv. On 7 June 2024, following previous misconduct proceedings concerning social media use, you were reminded regarding your future use of social media and MPS policies. You nevertheless continued publishing substantially similar content.

Such conduct, individually and cumulatively, is so serious as to amount to gross misconduct.

Allegation 3

Whilst a serving officer of the Metropolitan Police Service, your conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Authority, Respect, and Courtesy, in that:

You repeatedly used offensive, insulting and derogatory language towards serving and former police officers, DPS staff and named individuals, including describing officers as “corrupt”, “liars”, “frauds”, “wastemen” and “batty holes”, and publicly encouraged others not to trust certain officers.

Particulars:

- i. On or about 18 October 2024, you referred to the DPS as “absolute wastemen” and “that cess pit”.
- ii. On or about 21 May 2026, you referred to DPS investigator [REDACTED] as “a batty hole liar”.

Such conduct, individually and cumulatively, is so serious as to amount to gross misconduct.

Allegation 4

Whilst a serving officer of the Metropolitan Police Service, your conduct breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in respect of Confidentiality, in that:

You improperly disclosed, discussed and published information relating to misconduct proceedings, police investigations and police officers on publicly accessible social media platforms.

Particulars:

- i. On or about 14 May 2025, you published a TikTok video discussing a misconduct case whilst displaying the image of an officer who had been anonymised within those proceedings.

- ii. You sarcastically stated words to the effect of “this is not the officer I am talking about” whilst displaying the officer’s image and captioning the video:
- iii. “THIS IS... Not the officer I am talking about”
- iv. By doing so, you undermined and/or circumvented the Chair’s direction regarding anonymity and published material capable of identifying the officer concerned despite the anonymity direction being in place.

Such conduct, individually and cumulatively, is so serious as to amount to gross misconduct.

13. The Officer’s position, as set out in his Regulation 54, was as follows:

- a) *“Allegation 1 – Denied as pleaded and denied that the conduct amounted to gross misconduct;*
- b) *Allegation 2 – Denied. Gross misconduct denied.*
- c) *Allegation 3 – Individual words may be admitted where accurately reproduced. Their context, the Appropriate Authority’s characterisation and the gross-misconduct threshold are disputed. Gross misconduct denied.*
- d) *Allegation 4 - The publication and display of the image are admitted where established by the evidence. I deny that the Appropriate Authority has established breach of a continuing confidentiality obligation of the scope pleaded and deny gross misconduct.”*

The Evidence

‘TGTBTU’ podcast

14. It was not disputed that the Officer was the ‘owner’ of an online profile called ‘TGTBTU’. I was informed that ‘TGTBTU’ stood for ‘The Good, The Bad, The Ugly’ and referred to the Good/Bad/Ugly aspects of the MPS and policing that the Officer wanted to highlight in order to improve recruitment and retention of black officers. It was also not in dispute that the Officer had a sizeable following

with 5,825 followers by 7 May 2026, and had accrued 46,600 'likes'. I was told of the success of the podcast, and that it is nominated for awards.

Language used by the Officer

15. I was referred by the AA to the Social Media policy, which acknowledges that all persons, including those who serve or work within the MPS, have rights to respect for their private and family life (Article 8) and freedom of expression (Article 10). The policy goes on to say that officers and staff should be respectful towards others when making any statement or expressing an opinion on social media.
16. The AA said that Article 10 may be restricted where the language is abusive. In addition, whilst some language may be protected, this does not license public abuse of colleagues. The AA also submitted that the Officer was aware that people felt that he was bringing the service into disrepute, as in one of his videos he said *"I get told I'm bringing the Metropolitan Police into disrepute with the videos that I do."*
17. On behalf of the Officer, I was told that even if some of the comments were *"on the edge of freedom of speech"* the podcast was 99% *'fantastic'* and *'innovative'* in its attempt to improve recruitment but that *"If you take 1% [of the content] and cherry pick, you will find words that you get upset by."* I am told on behalf of the Officer that his language was not to be taken as being offensive, although some was *'robust'* and that only those with a *'thin skin'* would be offended. It was submitted that *"there is nobody operating in Social Media who doesn't get complaint"* and that the absence of complaints regarding the podcast meant that there was no evidence that anyone had been offended or that public confidence had been undermined.
18. In addition, I was told that the Officer had a philosophical belief regarding anti-racism, anti-sexism/VAWG and in the honesty and integrity in the police.

19. I was advised by my LQA that there is no requirement for a person to have submitted a complaint in order for me to find that a breach of the standards of professional conduct have occurred. The decision is an objective decision for me, as to whether words that have been spoken are discourteous or disrespectful (in relation to authority, respect and courtesy), or discreditable (in relation to discreditable conduct), or fail to adhere to the social media policy (in relation to orders and instructions). I accept that advice.
20. In relation to Article 10, on behalf of the Officer I am told that the language used is protected by his right to freedom of expression. On behalf of the Appropriate Authority I am told that there is a distinction to be drawn between freedom of expression and the repeated use of insulting and abusive language directed towards colleagues. The MPS Social Media Policy recognises the balance between Article 8 ECHR rights to privacy and Article 10 rights to freedom of expression. I have been referred to case law by both parties and have received legal advice from my LQA. Having considered the authorities of *Higgs v Farmor's School*, *University of Bristol v Miller* and *Page v NHS Trust Development Authority*, I am satisfied that there is no universal protection for all expressions made under the umbrella of a protected or philosophical belief. Those authorities draw a distinction between the legitimacy of the underlying belief or subject matter and the manner in which it is expressed.

The Business Interest

21. Police officers are required to notify business interests to the DPS via their line manager for consideration and approval. Where a business interest is approved, varied or withdrawn, the officer is required to comply with that determination. The evidence relating to the Officer's Business Interest is summarised below.
22. The Officer states that he informed the former Commissioner of his intention to operate a podcast, and she gave guidance to the Officer to apply to register it as a business interest. The bundle contains a copy of a Business Interest declaration form, dated 12 May 2022. The approval records that the Officer is a freelance videographer and producer of media and lists the Instagram,

YouTube, and Twitter/X accounts associated with TGTBTU as part of that business interest.

23. On 6 June 2023, DCS Lilburn approved a renewal application for the Business Interest until March 2024. The approval email reminded the Officer of expectations regarding his conduct including that his activities must not cause “embarrassment to the Commissioner or become detrimental to the image and dignity of the MPS”.
24. On 17 August 2023, the Business Interest application was then reviewed due to a change in circumstances. As a result, it was refused following the Officer's suspension. The Officer was invited to make representations, which he stated he did. The Officer states that a meeting with DCS Lilburn took place on or about 23 October 2023, he explained that TGTBTU was not part of his commercial business activities and that DCS Lilburn advised him to submit a further Business Interest application in the future separating TGTBTU from his freelance media work. On 18 December 2023, the Officer submitted a further Business Interest application stating that his business activities had no association with TGTBTU, which he described as a non-profit podcast independent of his freelance work. This application was not reviewed or approved as the Officer remained suspended.

June 2024 misconduct meeting

25. I was told that the 7 June 2024 record of the misconduct meeting relates to conduct that predated the withdrawal of his business interest authority and these current proceedings. The matters concerned his posting disparaging content online that came to notice of the DPS in 2023. The misconduct was not proven however the meeting did not ‘exonerate’ the officer, as asserted by the Officer’s representative. The senior officer chairing the meeting stated he could not access the relevant content to make an informed decision and therefore determined that the misconduct was not proven. The Chair goes on to say that the decision does not mean that the Officer has not breached any standards, but that it is not possible to make a decision, and the Officer is reminded of the social media and confidentiality agreements.

The anonymity order

26. It is not disputed that in 2025 the Officer published content on his social media platform discussing the proceedings involving Mr A. In doing so, he displayed an image of Mr A on screen, including a visible name badge, whilst discussing the allegations and circumstances arising from those proceedings. During the publication, the Officer also made repeated references to the effect that the individual displayed was "not" the officer he was discussing.
27. The Officer says that he was not aware of the anonymity direction in respect of Mr A that was made at the time of the hearing in 2023. It was accepted that the Officer had attended the hearing venue, as he was the partner of the officer involved in those proceedings, but that he did not enter the hearing room itself.
28. On behalf of the Officer, I was told that he understood that the anonymity order applied to the media and during the proceedings. That because he is not a member of the media and that the material was published following proceedings it did not apply to him. It was also advanced whether the anonymity was an enduring direction and therefore whether applied when in 2025 when he posted the relevant content subject to these proceedings.

Findings of Fact and breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

29. I assessed all of the evidence that had been placed before me, and considered the submissions made by both parties. In assessing the case I was reminded that my determination of facts is based on the balance of probabilities (i.e. whether something is more likely than not to have occurred).
30. In relation to the Officer's assertion that the language used is protected by his right to freedom of expression. I accept that the Officer was entitled to discuss matters of public interest, including racism, misconduct in policing, police culture, recruitment and retention, leadership and violence against women and girls. I further accept that Article 10 protects speech that may offend, shock or disturb. However, Article 10 is a qualified right and, as a serving police officer, the Officer remained subject to the Police Regulations, the Standards of Professional Behaviour and MPS policies governing conduct both on and off duty.

31. My findings do not arise because the Officer discussed controversial or sensitive topics, criticised policing or expressed strongly held views. Rather, they arise from the manner in which those views were expressed. The evidence demonstrates repeated use of insulting, abusive, derogatory and accusatory language directed towards named and identifiable police officers, including allegations of dishonesty and corruption. In my judgment, that conduct went beyond robust criticism or the expression of strongly held views and constituted personal attacks on colleagues whilst publicly identifying as a serving police officer.
32. I have therefore balanced the Officer's Article 10 rights against the obligations and responsibilities attaching to the office of constable, including the need to maintain public confidence in policing, uphold professional standards and respect the rights and reputations of others. I am satisfied that any interference with the Officer's Article 10 rights arising from these proceedings is justified, necessary and proportionate.

Allegation 1

33. There is no dispute that the officer published media content to the internet under the title TGTBTU.
34. I found that the Officer originally set out with positive intentions with recruitment and retention within the Metropolitan Police during a time of low confidence by discussing legitimate policing topics (e.g. racism, sexism, police powers, and culture (amongst others)). I acknowledge that these are legitimate topics for discussion with significant public interest. This can contribute towards efforts to build public trust and confidence as well as recruiting and retaining officers when presented by a person with lived experiences as a serving officer in discussing these matters.
35. I did not see or hear content published by the Officer that is not contained in evidence, and so I cannot say whether, as asserted on behalf of the Officer, that '99%' of the overall content is '*fantastic*'; however, even if I accepted that only a relatively small part of TGTBTU podcast content forms part of the AA's case, on the Officer's own case, '1%' of the content contains words that can '*upset*' and therefore relevant to these proceedings.

36. In relation to the 4 matters within the Allegation:

- a. I am satisfied that the Officer was aware of the potential impact of his conduct as he himself has said that he has been told that he is bringing The MPS into disrepute;
- b. The officer asserts that his comments about ‘*Commissioner Rowley*’ (“*[...] There’s no way he can convince me that he actually cares about violence against women and girls, racism*”) is fair personal criticism of a CEO. Whilst the office of the Commissioner of the Metropolis, and MPS should rightly be held publicly accountable, the tone and language used by a serving Met Officer directed personally towards the Commissioner, is disrespectful and capable of causing embarrassment to the MPS and undermine public confidence in the Metropolitan Police. I add that public confidence in policing with women and girls, and the police response to violence against women and girls is a particular concern and legitimate topic for discussion, however serving officers making such public statements at a time when the MPS is seeking to protect public confidence potentially undermines the work to achieve these goals.
- c. The “Bun the DPS !!!” post, which includes the ‘hashtags’ “#metpolice #policeuk #corruption” seeks to undermine the misconduct regime by encouraging officers who are under DPS restrictions to ignore those restrictions. The post is clearly disrespectful of the DPS and of greater concern the Officer in this post seeks to encourage officers to ignore legitimate restrictions on their duties that are designed to protect the public and the officers whilst a misconduct investigation takes place. Therefore it is capable of undermining the public confidence in the Metropolitan Police that the restrictions seek to protect.
- d. Other content that the Officer had uploaded between 2024 and 2026 fell within paragraph (d) of Allegation 1. As I have said, I have watched all of the footage that the AA relies upon, which contain significantly more comments that fall below the Standards of Professional Behaviour made by the Officer than the three specific comments referenced in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of Allegation 1 including:

- i. *“You know I don’t normally name names but I hold that for the very, very special absolute batty holes and [REDACTED] is one of them”;*
 - ii. *“This absolute batty hole is from the Director of Professional Standards, yeah, the same wastemen Dom’s always cussing out yeah.”; and*
 - iii. In relation to Croydon CSU *“these officers are corrupt”*.
37. Having listened to and read the content of the social media posts provided as part of the AAs case, I was more than satisfied that the on viewing this content that there is further content on social media that breached the social media policy, names individual police officers, and is insulting and disrespectful towards them. This content discredits the police service and can undermine public confidence in it.
38. I was further satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of repeated content that discredits the service, by undermining public confidence, and is capable of placing the public service provided by serving officers at risk through inappropriate public exposure. For example, the repeated use of derogatory, insulting, and disrespectful language directed at the Community Safety Unit in Croydon and individual officers who serve there. We know that the trust and confidence of domestic abuse victim/survivors and other offences is a critical factor in protecting women and girls; the videos that reference officers from Croydon CSU are capable of undermining confidence in officers performing public protection functions and therefore capable of deterring the public from seeking help.
39. I was satisfied that the conduct fell seriously short of the Standards of Professional Behaviour of Orders and Instructions and Discreditable Conduct because the content is not in line with the instruction in the social media policy that officers do not post on social media any content that discredits the police service or undermines the public confidence in the MPS and that officers should be respectful towards others when making any statement or expressing an opinion on social media and anywhere else.

40. I was satisfied that the TGTBTU podcast was originally declared and approved as part of the Officer's Business Interest application dated 12 May 2022. Permission to undertake and publish content through TGTBTU was therefore expressly included within that approval. On 6 June 2023 the Officer was reminded by DCS Lilburn that his activities must not "cause embarrassment to the Commissioner or become detrimental to the image and dignity of the MPS". That approval was subsequently withdrawn on 17 August 2023 following his suspension.
41. I carefully considered the Officer's submissions regarding his discussions with DCS Lilburn following the withdrawal of that approval, together with the subsequent Business Interest application submitted in December 2023. The Officer's position was that TGTBTU operated on a non-profit basis and should therefore be distinguished from his commercial videography and media activities.
42. However, the issue for me is not whether the Officer personally believed that TGTBTU fell outside the Business Interest regime. The issue is whether that position had been formally considered, reviewed and approved through the appropriate MPS process. The purpose of the Business Interest framework is that such matters are determined by the DPS via their line manager rather than by the officer concerned.
43. Even accepting the Officer's account of his discussions with DCS Lilburn in its entirety, at its highest the evidence establishes is that he was advised to separate TGTBTU from his commercial media activities and submit a fresh application. At its highest, that advice recognised that the status of TGTBTU required further consideration. It did not amount to approval of the activity itself, nor did it constitute a determination that TGTBTU fell outside the Business Interest framework.
44. The Officer's contention that TGTBTU should properly be regarded as a non-profit activity required assessment through the new application process. Until that process had been completed and a determination communicated by the appropriate authority, it was not open to the Officer to assume that no approval was required or that he was entitled to continue operating the podcast following

the withdrawal of his previous approval (which had included TGTBTU). Such clarity and authority could only arise from the outcome of the formal review process. No such approval was ever granted.

45. I note that notwithstanding the withdrawal of approval, the Officer continued operating the podcast and publishing content. By June 2024 he was invited to a misconduct meeting arising from content published through that platform prior to the business interest revocation in 2023.
46. Whilst I have not treated the outcome of that misconduct meeting as evidence of misconduct, I do consider it relevant that the Officer had by then been expressly reminded of the standards expected of a serving police officer, including matters relating to social media use and confidentiality. Notwithstanding those reminders, he continued to operate the podcast and publish content without ever obtaining a determination approving the revised position he contended for, and content that now forms the subject of these proceedings.
47. In my view, the Officer has demonstrated a willingness to proceed in the absence of formal authority rather than await determination through the appropriate Business Interest process. The Police Regulations contemplate the notification and determination of Business Interests by the DPS. In circumstances where the previous approval had been withdrawn and no replacement approval had been granted, I am satisfied that the Officer did not hold the requisite authority to continue operating TGTBTU under the Business Interest framework.
48. Accordingly, I find that by continuing that activity following the withdrawal of approval on 17 August 2023, the Officer failed to comply with a lawful instruction and thereby breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Orders and Instructions.
49. I therefore find Allegation 2 proven.

Allegation 3

50. I rejected the submission that the words used by the Officer should be viewed merely as robust debate and not offensive. Measured objectively, and applying

the ordinary meaning of the words used, including descriptions such as *"batty hole liar"*, *"absolute wastemen"* and *"cess pit"*, I was more than satisfied that the language was insulting, derogatory and disrespectful towards other serving officers. This was not confined to criticism of policies, decisions or organisational culture. The Officer repeatedly directed personal remarks at identifiable officers, referring to officers as *"frauds"*, *"categorical liars"*, *"corrupt"*, *"a corrupt piece of batty crease"*, and stating that named officers could not be trusted and should be removed from investigations. In respect of one officer he stated, *"Croydon doesn't need you"...* *"remember bun the DPS, always bun the DPS, Croydon CPS are liars and [REDACTED] is a fraud, do not trust her. If she is doing your victims right to review you need to have her removed"*; in relation to others he alleged they had *"perverted the course of justice"* and repeatedly encouraged listeners not to trust them. The Officer also made repeated derogatory comments about groups of officers, describing members of the Directorate of Professional Standards as *"absolute wastemen"*, referring to the DPS as a *"cess pit"*, and alleging corruption and dishonesty within both DPS and Croydon CSU. I found that these comments constituted personal attacks on serving police officers and police teams rather than legitimate criticism of policing. The fact that such language may be encountered on social media platforms does not make it compatible with the Standards of Professional Behaviour expected of a serving police officer.

51. I was also satisfied that the conduct breached the standards of professional behaviour in relation to Authority, Respect and Courtesy. The language used demonstrated a lack of respect and courtesy towards colleagues and viewed cumulatively, was inconsistent with the self-control, tolerance and professionalism expected of a serving police officer.

Allegation 4

52. There is no dispute that the first 3 points of the particulars occurred. The dispute lies in whether the officer believed that the restriction only applied to the media and was uncertain whether it applied to him.
53. I am satisfied on the evidence that that the officer knew of the Chair's direction and the Officer still chose to circumvent the direction by publishing content through his own social media platform to his many followers.
54. I am satisfied that the Officer subsequently chose to publish content relating to the proceedings which included an image of Mr A in which his name badge was visible, whilst discussing the underlying allegations and proceedings. This conduct could identify the officer who had been granted anonymity.
55. I also consider that whilst displaying the image, the Officer repeatedly stated words to the effect that the individual shown was "*not*" the officer concerned. Rather than assisting the Officer, I find that those comments demonstrate his awareness that identification of the officer was an issue requiring consideration. The repeated disclaimer is difficult to reconcile with the submission that the Officer did not consider anonymity to be relevant to his publication at all.
56. I found it implausible that on the one hand, the Officer can think the anonymity direction only apply to the media, but on the other hand thought that this did not apply to his own social media platform. The purpose of an anonymity direction is to prevent identification of the individual concerned. The Officer's platform provided a public means of communication to a substantial audience. If his interpretation were correct, the protection afforded by such a direction could readily be defeated through publication on personal social media accounts. I therefore reject that explanation.
57. This allegation is not about making any judgment or giving any views on the case itself. The issue is considerably narrower. It is about an anonymity direction that was granted and whether the Officer subsequently presented or published content capable of identifying Mr A in contravention of that direction.
58. I also reject the suggestion that the anonymity protection ceased to have effect simply because the hearing had concluded. The obvious purpose of the

direction was to protect the identity of the individual concerned. Publishing material capable of identifying that individual whilst discussing the proceedings would undermine that purpose. The Officers use of Mr A's identifiable image coupled with repeatedly stating it was "*not*" the officer whilst he pointed at him, underlines the point that on the balance of probabilities he knew anonymity for Mr A in those proceedings remained in place.

59. I have therefore found this allegation proved and a breach of the standards of professional behaviour of confidentiality.

Seriousness

60. Having found that the officer breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour, as set out above, I considered the seriousness with reference to the staged approach set out in the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes (the 'Guidance').

Culpability:

61. I assessed the culpability as – High.
62. The conduct was intentional, targeted, and deliberate as it was produced by the Officer himself on his own social media platform, discussing specific cases and naming serving officers directing insult and accusations towards them.
63. The officer demonstrated an awareness on his content that this may bring the MPS into disrepute with these videos. Therefore, he was aware of the potential harm to individuals and the MPS that these could cause.
64. The Officer is a serving MPS firearms officer which requires a significant level of commitment and training and carries a significant level of trust and responsibility to perform that role. This content was produced, presented and posted publicly from a trusted position which carries a considerable level of responsibility to the MPS, the viewing audience and wider public to uphold high standards.
65. Furthermore, I also take into account that the Officer repeatedly identified himself as a serving Metropolitan Police officer whilst publishing the content. The comments therefore carried an additional degree of legitimacy and

authority derived from his position as a serving police officer, increasing their potential impact on both the public and those officers who were the subject of his comments.

Harm

66. I assessed the harm as - High.
67. Whilst topics of racism, police culture, misconduct, amongst others are legitimate topics for public debate the individual targeting of serving officers using insulting words and language would risk reputational harm and loss of confidence in policing with one colleague publicly criticising and insulting another. Some of the officers named by the Officer work in the areas of public protection. This is an area of policing where to gain the trust and confidence of victims is particularly important. The naming and targeting of those officers for insults and criticism is capable of undermining public trust.
68. Whilst the Officer has raised important considerations around Article 10 ECHR and Freedom of Expression it is important to balance that right with the rights of individual officers under Article 8 ECHR who are named publicly without warning and without protections or consideration for their individual rights and the potential distress that his media content may cause to those individuals.
69. Public confidence is likely to be undermined by an officer who may well have started with positive intentions but has subsequently chosen to use the platform to criticise and insult serving colleagues which is likely to undermine the confidence the public have in the police service.
70. The fact that there does not appear to have been complaints from those individuals does not diminish my assessment of the potential for harm to have occurred and the gravity of that harm that could have resulted.
71. I also take a view that the areas on which the officer comments are of national concern in policing and, as already indicated, it is how those matters are discussed and ensuring that when doing so, are in line with the standards of professional behaviour and relevant policies.

72. In relation to the anonymity allegation, I also take into account the potential harm caused by identifying, or facilitating the identification of, an individual who had been granted anonymity within misconduct proceedings. Such directions are made for a purpose, and their effectiveness would be significantly undermined if participants were free to circumvent them through publication on social media platforms.

Aggravating factors

73. I take into account that there are multiple allegations found.
74. I also consider the volume of comments that are made by the officer within the videos that demonstrate regular, repeated, and sustained behaviour over a period of at least 2 years. Whilst there are specific comments quoted in Allegations 1 and 3, Allegation 1(d) applies to all of the content provided by the AA between 2024 and 2026.
75. I found that the repeated nature of the comments, the fact that they were directed towards named or identifiable officers and police teams, and the public forum in which they were made significantly aggravated the seriousness of the conduct.
76. The Officer continued his conduct when he was aware or ought to have been aware that the conduct was in breach of the professional standards; he was warned following his misconduct meeting on 7 June 2024; he commented in a post that he was being told that he was bringing the Metropolitan Police into disrepute; and the Social Media Policy, Business Interest forms, and conditions and reminders set made the level of conduct required from the Officer explicitly clear. Despite this, the conduct continued.

Mitigating factors

77. I have not seen the entirety of the Officer's content, but I do not dispute that a large amount of content was originally for a good purpose. The officer has highlighted instances of engaging with senior officers on earlier posts

discussing key topics in policing, and has been nominated for an award, and other positive commentary on the positive aspects of his podcast. I accept that his original objectives included the recruitment and retention of Black officers in the Metropolitan Police which is a positive and worthy intention.

Level of misconduct

78. In considering whether the conduct amounted to misconduct or gross misconduct, I have considered the cumulative effect of the conduct rather than viewing each allegation in isolation. I take into account the repeated nature of the conduct, the public forum in which it occurred, the targeting of named and identifiable officers, the breach of confidentiality, the continuation of the activity over a prolonged period and the Officer's public identification as a serving Metropolitan Police officer.
79. I have determined that the conduct that I have found proved in each of the allegations, breached the standards of professional behaviour as alleged and amounts to gross misconduct.
80. I do not find gross misconduct because the Officer posted content discussing legitimate policing topics concerning racism, sexism, police culture, misconduct, retention or VAWG.
81. I find gross misconduct because the Officer used the platform he created to target individual serving officers and express views about the MPS using offensive words, language and tone. Furthermore, using his platform to breach a confidentiality direction of an anonymised witness in misconduct proceedings, and ignore other directions and policy concerning his business interest and social media production. All of which amounted to serious breaches of professional standards.

Outcome

82. In relation to the relevant provisions that apply, I am advised that matters that come to the attention of the Appropriate Authority after 28 May 2025 fall to be determined under the amended regulations, whereas matters that come to the

attention of the AA prior to that date, fall under the 'old' regulation. The difference being that the amended Regulation 62 contains a presumption of dismissal following a finding of gross misconduct unless there are exceptional circumstances that warrant a sanction of final written warning (or reduction in rank, which is not applicable in this case).

83. I consider that Allegations 1, 3, and 4 contain conduct that falls under the amended regulations, whereas Allegation 2 does not. In the circumstances, I am satisfied that as I have found Allegations proved that relate to the amended Regulations, I should proceed under the amended Regulation 62.
84. I had regard to the Outcomes Guidance and was reminded that in reaching my decision I must have regard to the need to maintain public confidence and the reputation of the police service, to uphold high standards in policing, and to deter misconduct and to protect the public. I considered the outcome in accordance with the Regulations and with the factors identified by Mr Justice Popperwell in *Fulgers* by assessing the seriousness of the misconduct, keeping in mind the purpose of disciplinary action, and choosing the sanction which most appropriately fulfils the purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.
85. In considering the seriousness of the misconduct, I had regard to the same factors that I found above. Whilst I recognise the positive motivations that appear to have existed in relation to parts of the Officer's past work, I also take into account that throughout these proceedings the Officer continued to justify much of the language used and did not demonstrate meaningful acceptance that such language was inappropriate or incompatible with the Standards of Professional Behaviour.
86. I read the character references, from which I acknowledge that he is a trusted friend to many who has supported people in tough times, and received tributes to the good parts of his podcasts.
87. I noted the submissions of the AA in respect of misconduct proceedings that relate to four of the authors of the character statements; however, I am prepared to accept that the comments made by those individuals in relation to the support offered by the Officer that was beneficial to them is capable of

being considered to his credit. I also had regard to the Officer's personal record and previous voluntary service as a member of the Special Constabulary.

88. Whilst I had regard to the personal mitigation, I reminded myself that it carries limited weight in police misconduct hearings because of the overriding public interest in maintaining public confidence in the police service (*Salter -v- The Chief Constable of Dorset* [2012] EWCA Civ 104 at [73]).
89. I have considered whether there are exceptional circumstances in this case. I was advised that there is no legal definition for 'exceptional circumstances' and that it was a matter for me taking into account the everyday meaning of the words. I considered the Officer's service record, the character evidence, the positive aspects of past podcast content and the fact that some of the matters discussed were issues of legitimate public interest. Having done so, I was not satisfied that those matters, whether individually or cumulatively, amounted to exceptional circumstances capable of displacing the presumption of dismissal following a finding of gross misconduct.
90. For the avoidance of doubt, had I considered the matter under the pre-amendment Regulations, I would not have been satisfied that a final written warning was a sufficient sanction for the conduct that I found proved.
91. I am satisfied that dismissal is the only outcome capable of maintaining public confidence in policing and upholding proper standards of professional behaviour. My decision is that the Officer be dismissed without notice and that his name be placed on the barred list.

Report

92. I received submissions in relation to my report and direct that there be no publication of the name of any officer, save for PC Efeotor, who was named within the hearing or my report.

Right of Appeal

93. The Officer has a right to appeal this decision in accordance with the Police Appeals Tribunal Rules 2020. If the Officer wishes to appeal, he should provide

notice of his intention to appeal to the Appropriate Authority within 10 working days of receipt of this written determination.

Signed: Commander Colin Wingrove

Date: 21 September 2026