

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Lloyd Hunter

Warrant No: P266908

Date of Hearing: 26 August 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Authority, Respect and Courtesy; Equality and Diversity; Discreditable Conduct

Findings

I have had the benefit of the papers in advance of today and read them carefully before the hearing started, along with viewing the video and audio material.

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. PC Hunter attended the hearing and provided a Regulation 54 response. PC Hunter was represented by Counsel, Mr Luke Ponte KC and his federation representative, PS Joshua King and welfare officer, Louis Marsh.

The AA was represented by Counsel, Mr Stephen Morley and Case Manager, Melissa Gordedo.

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

The Allegation

On or about 23 November 2024, you were off duty at an unknown location in Central London, having a drink with a Detention Officer who was, unknown to you, a BBC reporter recording the conversation. During that conversation you said the following (or very similar):

- (i) “I can’t wait to Taser someone”, suggesting that the first time you used your Taser it would be on a homeless person;
- (ii) that Taser was “just so much fun” and suggested that when you actually got to use it on someone you would “love it”; and
- (iii) when you were told that a colleague had suggested “burning” the homeless people in Oxford Street, you did not challenge or disagree with the comment, but said “we should bin them off, I hate them”.

Your language trivialised the use of force and suggested that you would enjoy using force on members of the public. Your language suggested that you “hated” homeless people, who are a vulnerable section of society that police officers regularly come into contact with.

Your behaviour breached:

- a) Authority, Respect and Courtesy, because your language indicated a lack of respect for homeless people;
- b) Equality and Diversity, because your language suggested discriminatory and derogatory views about homeless people; and
- c) Discreditable Conduct, because your language was likely to bring discredit upon the police service and/or undermine public confidence in it.

Your breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour were so serious that they amount to gross misconduct.

The Hearing

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority and the representations made on behalf of PC Hunter, and by PC Hunter himself.

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 PC Hunter.

The evidence derives from covert footage (exhibit COV120_20241123) recorded by an undercover BBC journalist, Mr Bibb, who was working as a Designated Detention Officer at Charing Cross Police Station custody suite.

On 23 November 2024, PC Hunter was recorded in conversation with Mr Bibb, off duty, at what appeared to be a public house. The footage was provided to the IOPC by the BBC as unaired and unedited footage.

On the footage, in response to a discussion about the manner in which officers can be assaulted, PC Hunter said “I cannot wait to Taser someone”. When Mr Bibb asked who he thought he would Taser first, PC Hunter replied “Probably a homeless man. I cannot wait. I cannot wait to do it... love it.” He spoke of having completed the Taser training and of wanting to be the one to use it.

Later in the same conversation, PC Hunter spoke about wanting to create an operation to arrest all of the homeless people on Oxford Street for vagrancy, describing a plan to serve them with notices over successive weeks and then to arrest “every single one of them”. When Mr Bibb said “[Redacted] on my team reckons we should just burn them”, PC Hunter responded “What? Just burn them? I think we should get rid of them all, we should just bin them off. I hate them.”

If these allegations are proven, then I must decide whether it amounts to breach of the following standards of behaviour:

- **Authority, Respect and Courtesy** – Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.
- **Equality and Diversity** – Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.
- **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.

Officer's position

PC Hunter provided a Regulation 54 response. In short, he accepts what he said, and that he greatly regrets it. He accepts that he breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as alleged. However, he denies that the breaches amount to misconduct or gross misconduct and contends that they can properly be addressed through the Reflective Practice Review Process.

PC Hunter submits that the comments must be placed in their proper context. He describes them as flippant remarks made towards the end of a very long off-duty conversation, when in drink. In his Regulation 54 response, he states that he had only a couple of drinks but does not metabolise alcohol well, and that it affects him more than most. He submits that he was targeted by the undercover reporter, who had emailed him out of the blue, texted his personal number, repeatedly contacted him and pestered him to go out. He submits that the reporter repeatedly steered the conversation towards inflammatory subjects and that he, PC Hunter, repeatedly declined to take the bait.

By way of background, PC Hunter joined the Metropolitan Police in May 2023, completing part of his probation on the response team at Hammersmith before moving to the Charing Cross and West End Policing Team on the 19 May 2024 as part of his probationary rotation. He found the environment at Charing Cross difficult and unpleasant, that he made repeated efforts to return to Hammersmith, and that his unhappiness at Charing Cross is evident throughout the covert recording. PC Hunter further emphasised his unhappiness when he addressed me in the hearing and described he was trying to be friends with Mr Bibb.

As to the specific comments, PC Hunter submits that the Taser comments were extremely clumsy and flippant. In his Regulation 54 response he avers that he meant, in a light-hearted way, that officers chase adrenalin and welcome challenging situations, and that he did not mean that he wished to hurt a member of the public. Again, he reiterated in the hearing that he did not hate homeless people and did not wish them harm.

He points out that he has never had any complaints for use of force and has always been very reluctant to use it. He relies upon an earlier exchange in the same conversation in which, when the reporter said, “you’ll get to Taser someone”, he replied “I hope I don’t... I fucking hope I don’t, with all the paperwork it involves”. As to the reference to a “homeless man”, he submits that this was a flippant call-back to earlier remarks about the number of homeless people in the area, and to a recent incident involving a homeless man who had undergone an episode of Acute Behavioural Disorder in custody, had assaulted various officers, and had

tried to bite PC Hunter's fingers. He describes the remark as dark humour and says he did not genuinely wish to Taser a homeless person.

As to the "burn them" comment, he submits that his facial reaction shows that he regarded it as a stupid comment and that he did not agree with it.

In line with Regulation 61(7) and Regulation 61(8), I have carefully considered submissions from the Appropriate Authority, from those representing PC Hunter, and from PC Hunter himself.

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 and digital evidence provided to me, including the covert footage, the transcript, and PC Hunter's Regulation 54 response, together with the evidence he has given.

The conduct is, in substance, admitted. PC Hunter accepts that he made the comments and accepts that he breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as alleged. Having viewed the footage and read the transcript, I am satisfied that the words were spoken as set out by the Appropriate Authority. Accordingly, I find the facts proven.

I have considered with care PC Hunter's account of the context in which the comments were made. I accept that the comments were made off duty, in what he believed to be a private conversation, at a time when he had been drinking and did not know that he was being recorded.

I also accept, having regard to the wider transcript and to the Regulation 54 response, that PC Hunter declined to engage with a number of inflammatory topics raised by the reporter over the course of the conversation, and that at an earlier point he indicated that he hoped he would not have to use his Taser. To that limited extent I accept his account, and I bear it in mind below.

However, the context advanced does not, in my judgment, reduce the conduct below the threshold of misconduct, still less render it suitable for the Reflective Practice Review Process.

The comments were not a single isolated slip: PC Hunter returned to the subject of the Taser more than once, and separately developed, at some length and in specific terms, a description of an operation to arrest homeless people so that "there's no homeless people" on Oxford Street. His expressed enthusiasm — "I cannot wait... I cannot wait to do it" — is not readily reconciled with the suggestion that these were merely weary or reluctant remarks. His explanation that the reference to a homeless man was dark humour, and a call-back to a genuinely difficult custody incident, may explain the choice of target, but it does not diminish the fact that he expressed, to a colleague, a desire to use force on, and stated that he "hated", a group of people who are vulnerable by reason of their homelessness. Nor do I accept that

his response to the “burn them” comment amounted to a clear rejection of it; on the words spoken, he adopted the sentiment that the group should be “got rid of” and stated that he hated them. I therefore find that the context, while relevant to mitigation, does not displace the seriousness of what was said.

I also reject the suggestion that being homeless was or is a criminal offence and the officer’s suggestion on how to address it. The Vagrancy Act 1824 (before its repeal on the 29 June 2026) made rough sleeping and begging criminal offences but not homelessness.

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.

Discreditable Conduct: The comments, if known to the public, are plainly capable of bringing discredit upon the police service and of undermining public confidence in it. Public confidence would be undermined where an officer is perceived to be excited about the prospect of using a Taser and to wish to target, and express hatred towards, a vulnerable group. I am satisfied that this standard is breached.

Authority, Respect and Courtesy: PC Hunter’s comments about wanting to use his Taser on a homeless person, about arresting all homeless people, and stating that he “hated” them, demonstrate a lack of the self-control, tolerance, respect and courtesy required of an officer towards members of the public. I am satisfied that this standard is breached.

Equality and Diversity: The comments expressed negative and derogatory views about a category of people who may also be considered vulnerable and are incompatible with the requirement to act with fairness and impartiality and not to discriminate unfairly. I am satisfied that this standard is breached.

I am satisfied that the Appropriate Authority has discharged that burden and the conduct did breach the standards of professional behaviour as to Discreditable Conduct, Authority, Respect and Courtesy, and Equality and Diversity.

Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make a provisional assessment of seriousness by reference to Culpability and Harm, mitigating and aggravating factors. I have had regard to the College of Policing’s Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings.

Culpability is high –PC Hunter’s comments were of an inflammatory nature, and he chose to make them with no apparent legitimate reason. They were deliberate, repeated over the course of the conversation, and developed by him rather than merely elicited.

Harm is high - Although the comments were not made in the presence of members of the public, had they become known to the public, they would be likely to cause serious damage

to public trust and confidence in the officer, in the Metropolitan Police Service, and in policing more broadly, at a time when the service is seeking to demonstrate how seriously it takes higher standards following a number of highly publicised and damaging incidents. The comments are also causing particular harm to the confidence of those experiencing homelessness, who may fear that they will be over-policed, treated unfairly, or subjected to excessive force.

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 find the following aggravating features: PC Hunter made several such comments over the course of the conversation, rather than a single remark; the comments suggest a willingness to abuse his position and the powers it affords him; the comments about using a Taser and “binning off” the homeless were directed towards a group who are vulnerable by virtue of their homelessness.

Mitigating features – PC Hunter has admitted the conduct at the earliest opportunity and has expressed genuine and repeated remorse. The comments were made off duty, in a private conversation, when he had been drinking and was unaware that he was being recorded, and after persistent contact and provocation by the undercover reporter. The wider record shows that he declined to engage with a number of other inflammatory topics and indicated at one point that he hoped not to have to use his Taser. He is a young and relatively inexperienced officer, and there is no suggestion of any previous misconduct finding, nor any complaint against him for his actual use of force.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious to justify dismissal. Applying that definition and having undertaken an assessment of seriousness, I am satisfied that the breaches of professional standards, taken individually and cumulatively, do amount to gross misconduct.

Following my findings, I have gone on to make an assessment of seriousness. I have considered culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating factors, and arrived at the same determination as previously set out.

Personal mitigation

I have taken into account the personal circumstances and background advanced on PC Hunter’s behalf, including his youth, his service history, and the difficult working environment he describes. I have also considered his volunteer service with the salvation army and the character references provided to me, where he is described as keen and hard-working; someone who has shown empathy and sound judgement when dealing with vulnerable persons.

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 the 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 panel must dismiss the officer unless there are exceptional circumstances.

I have considered the officer's record of service and the personal mitigation advanced on his behalf, together with his admissions and his expressed remorse.

I have weighed these matters carefully against the nature and seriousness of the conduct. 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.

Therefore, the only available sanction is dismissal without notice and I am satisfied that it is the only appropriate sanction in this case.

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.

Deputy Assistant Commissioner Carl Galvin

Metropolitan Police Service

26 August 2026