

Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name: PC Timothy Robson

Warrant No: P257559

Date of Hearing: 7th August 2026

Alleged Standards Breached: Discreditable Conduct. Authority, Respect & Courtesy, Duties and Responsibilities

Finding

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

The hearing was held in **Public**

PC Robson attended the hearing, therefore I am satisfied that he was aware of this hearing and had been served the required notice of hearing. He was represented by his Federation Representative PC Ria Harrington.

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Shane Hanna. PC Robson attended the hearing and relied on his Regulation 54 response of 7th August 2026, which was supplemental to his MG14 response dated 22nd April 2026, which admitted the facts and breaches of professional standards but to the level of misconduct only.

The Allegations

On 10th September 2025, you attended a sudden death during your capacity as a serving police officer. You subsequently captured a photograph of a heavily decomposed body via your personal mobile phone, without a legitimate policing purpose.

On 8th January 2026 the Forensic laboratory completed an extraction from your personal mobile phone confirming that the image of the deceased individual had been captured.

Seven witness statements from serving officers confirm that you either showed or offered to show the photograph to them.

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:

Discreditable Conduct

Authority, Respect and Courtesy

Duties and Responsibilities

In the 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.

Facts

The main issues of fact which I have to decide is whether the Appropriate Authority has proved on the balance of probabilities whether PC Robson

On 10th September 2025, attended a sudden death during his capacity as a serving police officer. He subsequently captured a photograph of a heavily decomposed body via his personal mobile phone, without a legitimate policing purpose.

On 8th January 2026 the Forensic laboratory completed an extraction from his personal mobile phone confirming that the image of the deceased individual had been captured.

Seven witness statements from serving officers confirm that he either showed or offered to show the photograph to them.

Breaches of Professional Standards

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

Discreditable Conduct – Police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty

Authority, Respect and Courtesy - Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy. Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.

Duties and Responsibilities – Police officers are diligent in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities

Decision on Finding of Facts

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered the evidence provided to me from both sides in both documentary and Body Worn Video form. This included a large bundle of character evidence which I took into account at Stage 1. I remind myself that the burden of proving the Facts lies with the Appropriate Authority to the civil standard.

I find this proven both on the papers and by admission

I find this proven both on the papers and by admission

I find this proven both on the papers and by admission.

Breach of standards

The burden of proving breach of professional standards also falls on the Appropriate authority to the civil standard. I find the breaches of the Standard of Discreditable Conduct, Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Duties and Responsibilities proven both on the papers and by admission.

Provisional Assessment of Seriousness

I go on to make a provisional assessment of Culpability and Harm.

Culpability – PC Robson alone was responsible for his actions. The taking of the photo of the deceased on his personal mobile phone was an intentional and deliberate act. If the officer *had* wanted to process the trauma of the scene by capturing it for later reflection he had other means of doing so – for example by reviewing the Body Worn Video footage later at the police station or, if there were a proper policing purpose for doing so, on his MPS device. Whilst there is no evidence as to when the officer took the decision to take the photograph on his mobile phone, I note that the photograph was taken at 20.51 hours once the more senior officers had left the scene and whilst the Officer was awaiting the arrival of the undertaker when the Officer was in a position of responsibility and trust and the body already the property of the coroner. This action contravened the dignity of the deceased, and this action was compounded by showing or offering to show the photograph to colleagues on the following days. Where harm is unintentional, culpability will be greater if the officer could reasonably have foreseen the risk of harm. Although the officer has not been charged with any criminal offence the conduct was criminal in nature and had the potential to compromise the legal/ coronial process. I therefore assess the Culpability as High

Harm – There is a significant risk of harm to public confidence should this conduct become known. There is the potential for psychological distress to the deceased's friends and family should this conduct become known. The deceased was entitled to be treated with respect and dignity. There is risk of harm to the reputation of the MPS and national concern about conduct of this type, with recent high-profile cases which demonstrate this. I therefore assess the Harm as High

Aggravating Factors

I am mindful not to double count however I am mindful that these are multiple breaches of standards which took place over a number of days. This also constitutes a significant deviation from instructions and MPS guidance.

Mitigating Factors

I am mindful of the effect of the traumatic scene on the officer [REDACTED] and appreciate that this could be a triggering incident. I am also mindful of the officer's full cooperation with the investigation including providing the PIN to his personal phone and early admissions as to an error of judgment.

Gross Misconduct

I have reminded myself that gross misconduct is a breach of the *Standards of Professional Behaviour* so serious that it could justify dismissal. Applying that definition, I am satisfied that the breaches of Professional standards both individually and cumulatively does amount to gross misconduct.

Outcome Decision

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

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

This is assessed by reference to:

The officer's culpability

The harm caused by the misconduct

The existence of aggravating factors

The existence of mitigating factors

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

I remind myself this has three elements:

To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service

To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and

To protect the public.

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

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

I start by assessing the seriousness of the conduct:

Stage 1: the seriousness of the conduct

Culpability

I have already made a provisional assessment of Culpability, and I adopt that assessment here.

In this case, the Culpability is therefore High

Harm

I have already made a provisional assessment of Harm and I adopt that assessment here.

In this case, the harm is therefore High

Aggravating Factors

Addressed above and adopted herein

Mitigating Factors

I have been addressed directly by the Officer who demonstrates genuine remorse and insight into the potential consequences of his actions on that day and subsequent days. He has also taken remedial steps [REDACTED]. He was not able to explain why he took the photograph save as to assist with processing the trauma, however I am cognisant of the fact that he was fit for duty on that day and the following days and that the Body Worn Video footage shows him dealing with the situation in an otherwise professional manner.

Conclusion on Seriousness

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

Personal Mitigation

I note PC Robson's substantial number of character references, and I am of the view that these significant lapses of judgment (i.e. not simply the taking of the photograph but repeated showing or offering to show the photograph to fellow officers) are out of character and in all other respects he is a good officer. 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.

Stage 2: the purpose of the misconduct regime

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

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

I do acknowledge that the outcome imposed can have a punitive effect: accordingly, the outcome should be no more than necessary to satisfy the purpose of the proceedings.

Stage 3: the appropriate outcome

I have considered the officer's record of service.

As these matters came to the attention of the Appropriate Authority after 28th May 2025, having found this to amount to Gross Misconduct, I have to consider whether there are exceptional circumstances which would justify a sanction other than dismissal without notice. I find that there are not.

OUTCOME:

Therefore the sanction I impose is dismissal **without notice** and placed on the College of Policing's **public** barred list

Former Police Commander Katie Lilburn

Metropolitan Police Service

7th August 2026