

IN THE MATTER OF MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE
(CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020

BETWEEN:

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

The Appropriate Authority

-and-

PC Meerub ASHER

The Officer Concerned

**NOTICE OF OUTCOME ACCELERATED POLICE MISCONDUCT HEARING
(REGULATION 63 POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020)**

Officer concerned: Police Constable (PC) Meerub Asher

Date of hearing: 2nd September 2026

Name of person chairing: Former Commander Kate Lilburn

[References in this decision to the Regulations are to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020, as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 and the Police (Conduct, Performance and Complaints and Misconduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2025. The Appropriate Authority is referred to as AA].

The Decisions of the Accelerated Misconduct Hearing

Summary

1. The Allegations were found proved. It was determined that PC Asher's conduct had fallen below the standards expected of a serving police officer such as to contravene

the Standards of Professional Behaviour and to amount to gross misconduct. It was determined that PC Asher should be dismissed and her name added to the barring list.

Attendees

2. The following individuals were in attendance:

- i. PC Asher attended the hearing and was represented by Federation Representative [REDACTED] and supported by Welfare [REDACTED]
- ii. The AA's case was presented by Miss Hannah Clarke
- iii. The Chair was assisted by a legally qualified adviser, Miss Elisabeth Acker. [She introduced herself to PC Asher and her representatives in advance of the hearing convening and drew their attention to the Rules providing for her role in hearings concerning senior officers only, but explained the AA provide a legally qualified advisor in all accelerated hearings, who's role is as laid out in the rules for senior officers – to advise on the applicable law but take no part in decision making. PC Asher and her representatives confirmed they understood and were content with her fulfilling that role in this hearing.]

Allegations

3. The allegations against PC Asher were as follows:

On 12 September 2025, you were convicted of a criminal offence namely misuse of a Blue Badge under Section 117(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

You did not attend the hearing but entered a guilty plea by post and as a result of your conviction you were fined a total of £1243.90 in penalties and costs.

Professional Standards of Behaviour:

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that your actions breached Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in the Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 and 2025, namely:

- Discreditable conduct

In that you behaved in a manner likely to bring discredit upon the police service and undermine public confidence. As a result of that stated herein, if proven, your conduct amounts to gross misconduct and your dismissal may be justified.

Preliminary matters

Public/Private proceedings:

4. The Chair confirmed that in advance of the proceedings, she had been supplied with the hearing documents in accordance with Regulation 56 of the Police Conduct Regulations 2020 (as amended) and had determined that the hearing ought to be held in Public.
5. Having reviewed PC Asher's response, the chair considered the reason you properly held a Blue Certificate, the specific circumstances of that day, and some other personal matters was information relating to your private and family life. Therefore, the Chair determined these elements of the hearing should be in private and redacted from any published decision.

Notice and service requirements:

6. The Chair was satisfied that the requirements at Regulations 51 to 53 of the Conduct Regulations as to service had been complied with. PC Asher was in attendance and represented. She had provided a Regulation 54 response.

Amendment of allegation:

7. The AA applied to amend the allegation to remove: "...", leaving only the allegation as laid out at paragraph 3 above. There was no objection to this course.
8. The chair was advised that in making any amendment she must have in mind fairness to the respondent. If the amendment could not be made without prejudice to the respondent, it should not be made. The chair should consider whether the amendment changed the gravamen of the charge, whether it would have any impact of the special considerations considered met by Commander Daniel Ivey for this to proceed to an accelerated hearing, and the timing of the application. The chair may choose to allow or refuse the amendment and if making, may also consider whether an adjournment was required in the circumstances. While it might be relevant there was no objection to the amendment, ultimately it was the chair's decision and fairness was paramount.
9. The chair considered the amendment reduced rather than increased the substance of the charge and did not change the gravity of the misconduct alleged. She bore in mind the defence did not object and their response was unchanged by the amendment. She considered the amendment could be fairly made and the newly drafted charge more concisely and properly captured the alleged misconduct, which was the conviction.

Findings on the facts

10. The Legal Adviser advised the the standard of proof was the civil standard, and the burden of proof rested with the AA.
11. Advice was provided in relation to the statutory definition of “gross misconduct” and “misconduct” by reference to Regulation 2(1)¹ and “Discreditable conduct” by reference regulation 5 schedule 2².
12. Wrongful use of a disabled person badge is a summary only offence.
13. The Chair was advised that no finding could be made that the alleged conduct amounted to gross misconduct unless the officer admitted that was the case or the Chair was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that was the case (Regulation 61(16)).
14. In the circumstances of this case the Chair noted that PC Asher accepted misconduct but having heard the legal advice on indictable only versus other offences and gross misconduct/misconduct and taken legal advice from her representative, left it to the chair to decide gross misconduct.
15. The offence preferred and pleaded to in the Magistrates Court was contrary to section 117 of the Road Traffic Act 1984³. Guilt (whether by plea or conviction after trial) to that offence incorporates displaying the lawfully held badge in circumstances not in accordance with the regulations.

¹ “gross misconduct” means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal, and for the purposes of these Regulations conduct which has resulted in conviction of an indictable-only offence is to be taken to constitute such a breach
“misconduct”, other than in regulation 23(2)(a) and the first reference to “misconduct” in regulation 23(2)(b), means a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify disciplinary action

² 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

³ Wrongful use of disabled person’s badge.

(1) A person who at any time acts in contravention of, or fails to comply with, any provision of an order under this Act relating to the parking of motor vehicles is also guilty of an offence under this subsection if at that time—

(a) there was displayed on the motor vehicle in question a badge purporting to be in valid form, within the meaning given by section 21(1A) of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970, and

(b) he was using the vehicle in circumstances where a disabled person’s concession would be available to a disabled person’s vehicle,

but he shall not be guilty of an offence under this subsection if the badge was issued under that section and displayed in accordance with regulations made under it.

16. This matter was not charged under the Fraud Act 2006 as would be the case where dishonesty and gain were alleged by the Crown Prosecution Service.
17. The AA plead Discreditable conduct only here, not dishonesty.

The Chair's Findings on the facts alleged, any breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour and on Misconduct or Gross Misconduct

18. Careful consideration was given to all of the documentary material together with the submissions made by the AA and the advice provided by the Legal Adviser.

Alleged Facts

19. It is not in dispute that PC Asher was convicted by her own plea (in writing) of the offence under section 117 of the Road Traffic Act.
20. It is maintained she filled out the form incorrectly (appearing to admit the offence where she meant to indicate she “appealed” it) and then received poor legal advice so did not contest the position.
21. It is maintained she may have had a defence as to her use of the badge on the day - that the relevant person was on their way to be with her/in the vehicle in which the blue badge was displayed and that she outlined these circumstances to the enforcement officer at the scene.
22. To date (2nd September 2026, the conviction was on 12th September 2025) an appeal against her conviction has not been lodged. The chair was told PC Asher has been advised and intends to appeal, but this has not been done yet.
23. The Chair did not and could not question or relitigate the conviction which remains extant.
24. She therefore did not address the dispute as to whether there were in fact in place circumstances which warranted the display of the blue badge that day (providing a defence and contrary to the import of her conviction) and that this was communicated to the enforcement officer (contrary to his statement). This would be to go behind the conviction.
25. The Chair found PC Asher was convicted of a criminal offence contrary to 117 of the Road Traffic Act. In so finding, she had in mind the collection order documentation and emails from a representatives of HMCTS confirming the conviction and sentence.

The defence did not contest the import of these documents – that PC Asher was convicted of an offence contrary to 117 of the RTA.

26. (The Chair noted a certificate of conviction would have been preferable but based on what she saw and bearing in mind it was accepted by the defence; she was satisfied of the conviction on the balance of probabilities. The Chair asks the AA to obtain and provide PC Asher with the Certificate of Conviction.)

Private Reasons

- 27. [REDACTED]
- 28. [REDACTED]
- 29. [REDACTED]
- 30. [REDACTED]
- 31. [REDACTED]
- 32. [REDACTED]
- 33. [REDACTED]
- 34. [REDACTED]

Breach of standards

- 35. The Chair was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the actions of PC Asher breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour: Discreditable Conduct.
- 36. For a serving police officer to be convicted of a criminal offence is discreditable to the police, liable to affect the reputation of the police, and fundamentally undermines confidence in policing.

Gross misconduct

- 37. The Chair reminded herself that gross misconduct is a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious as to justify dismissal. She noted the legal advice that whether that definition is met remains in her discretion, as this was a summary only not indictable only offence. She therefore considered the seriousness of PC Asher's breach, firstly in relation to her culpability and secondly in relation to the harm caused.
- 38. Culpability: PC Asher's conduct by her criminal conviction was not intentional, deliberate, targeted, or planned. However, in displaying a Blue Badge in circumstances

in which she was not permitted to do so (the basis of the conviction upon which the Chair must assess her conduct), she is culpable. [REDACTED] She was therefore accountable for complying with the regulations attendant on that entitlement. It was her responsibility to ensure she was displaying it correctly and as permitted. In displaying it in circumstances not in accordance with the regulations, she was culpable for the failing to comply with the regulations and use that entitlement (designed to assist those that need it) appropriately.

39. The Chair noted that a criminal conviction is especially serious (Outcome Guidance 4.14-17) – it is unacceptable for police officers enforcing law to break the law themselves.
40. As Chair of an accelerated misconduct hearing predicated on an extant conviction that is yet to be appealed, the Chair could not question the conviction but she did consider the circumstances of the offending.
41. The Chair did not consider or decide upon the dispute that PC Asher was in fact entitled to display the blue badge in the circumstances now averred and therefore is not guilty of the offence, as this would be to go behind the conviction on which her finding is based.
42. She did consider this was one-off failure to comply with the regulations, which was not dishonest and which took place in stressful circumstances.
43. She considered this medium to high culpability on the basis PC Asher has a criminal conviction for which she bears culpability.
44. Harm: The reputational harm incurred is high. An officer who is criminally convicted fundamentally harms the public confidence in the police – a police officer should not break the laws they are charged with upholding. Whilst it has not resulted in harm to any individual, it undermines discipline and good order for an officer to have a conviction.
45. The Chair found no aggravating factors.
46. The Chair considered the following mitigating factors: remorse and open admission, and stress and mental state at that time and on the day of the contravention. (She was persuaded PC Asher was under considerable stress at the time due to various factors in her working and personal life and due to the circumstances of the day, both outlined in private).
47. These mitigating factors applicable to the circumstances of the day did not change the assessment of gross misconduct.

48. The chair noted a colleague said PC Asher parked in the same location in the same way in the past. [REDACTED] The AA's allegation and case for discreditable conduct was based on the conviction for misuse of the badge on a single date. It is on this basis the Chair considered matters, assessing a single offence on a single day and not a pattern of behaviour. Nor was the Chair deciding on PC Asher's account which may provide a defence/appeal, and to which having behaved similarly in the past might be relevant (as explained this would be to go behind the conviction). Therefore, the Chair did not give any weight to the colleague's account of previous similar parking behaviour but relied only on the single occasion leading to the conviction in assessing the breach and misconduct.
49. In all the circumstances, on the balance of probabilities, the Chair found the single breach by her conviction was at the standard of gross misconduct.

Findings on outcome

50. A copy of PC Asher's service record was provided by the Appropriate Authority and the references provided by PC Asher. The Chair was also made aware that PC Asher is due to receive a commendation in the coming weeks.
51. The Chair received the advice of the Legal Adviser and was advised to consider the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings. The Chair was advised to adopt the 'three stage process' as outlined within the College of Policing Guidance, namely, to assess the seriousness of the misconduct; to keep in mind the purpose of imposing sanctions; and to consider the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question.
52. The Chair was also advised as to the wording of Regulation 62 of the Police Conduct Regulations 2020 (as amended) and the indicated outcome unless there were exceptional circumstances.

The Chair's Decision on Outcome

53. Careful consideration was given to all of the documentary materials together with the submissions made on PC Asher's behalf and by the Appropriate Authority and the advice provided by the Legal Adviser. In making her decision on outcome, the Chair adopted the three-stage process, as outlined in the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes.

54. *Seriousness*: The Chair bore in mind that the first stage in determining the appropriate outcome is to assess the seriousness of the conduct. This is assessed by reference to: (i) the officer's culpability; (ii) the harm caused by the misconduct; (iii) the existence of aggravating factors; (iv) The existence of mitigating factors.
55. *The purpose of the police misconduct regime*: The second stage requires the Chair to keep in mind the purpose of the police misconduct regime. She reminded herself that this has three elements: (i) to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of the police service; (ii) to uphold high standards and to deter misconduct, and (iii) to protect the public. She further reminded himself 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.
56. *Appropriate Sanction*: The third stage is to choose the outcome that most appropriately fulfils that purpose given the seriousness of the conduct in question.
57. The personal mitigation in this case is substantial, and the circumstances are to be regretted.
58. However, the chair did not consider these are exceptional such that they allowed her to deviate from the course set out in regulation 62 (as amended).
59. She did not find mitigation on the day of the contravention that adequately mitigates PC Asher's culpability for using a blue badge outwit of the regulations. Further, it is noted that none of those factors prevented her from working or attending university at the time.
60. Many good officers are under considerable stress at work and/or at home. In all but those that are truly exceptional this cannot deviate from the seriousness and therefore concomitant outcome of an officer convicted of criminality.
61. The Chair had in mind the purpose of this regime to i) to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of the police service; (ii) to uphold high standards and to deter misconduct, and (iii) to protect the public. She did not consider the first two purposes would be fulfilled if she deviated from the presumption of dismissal.
62. PC Asher's personal mitigation and circumstances significantly mitigated her conviction (and on a separate note, for consideration elsewhere, what she says was happening on that day may well be relevant to a criminal appeal should PC Asher pursue one). However, they do not make out exceptional circumstances for this conviction as it stands and thereby allow the chair to deviate from the presumed outcome.

Decision on Publication

63. Having further considered the submissions on publication from the AA, it is further directed that this decision shall be published in accordance with Regulation 63(5) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended).

64. However, it is directed that the following aspects should not be reported or published:

- i) [REDACTED]
- ii) [REDACTED]
- iii) [REDACTED]
- iv) [REDACTED]

Chairperson's signature: Former Commander Katie Lilburn

Date: 2 September 2026

Right of Appeal

A police officer has a right of appeal against any disciplinary finding and/or disciplinary outcome imposed at an Accelerated Misconduct Hearing held under the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended). Notification of this right of appeal is provided in accordance with Regulation 63(2) of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended).