Notice of Outcome of Police Misconduct Hearing

(Regulation 43 Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020) as amended by the Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024

Officer Concerned: Former PC Cara Power
Date of Hearing: 15-16 December 2025

Allegations

Being a member of the MPS between 9th November 2023 and July 2024 you were party to various conversations on various dates with FPC [REDACTED] and that;

1. your contributions were inappropriate and/or offensive and/or derogatory and in doing so failed to challenge

and that;

2. you failed to challenge the comments made by FPC [REDACTED].

These actions breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out, namely;

a) Discreditable Conduct
b) Challenging & Reporting Improper Conduct

Finding

1. Failure to Challenge proven at Misconduct.
2. Discreditable Conduct proven at Gross Misconduct

Outcome

1. No Sanction (Former Officer)
2. No Sanction (Not Dismissed – Former Officer)

Background

1. The misconduct hearing for Former PC Power ('FPC Power') was held in public between 15 and 17 December 2025 at Patrick Dunne House, Sutton. A notice of hearing was published in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ("the 2020 Regulations").

2. The Panel comprising Commander Nicholas John (Chair), Christine Nwaokolo and Sadhana Patel (Independent Panel Members), attended by Legally Qualified Advisor Tiffany Nestour, was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of FPC Power which alleged that her conduct amounted to gross misconduct, namely that she sent and received the following messages over WhatsApp:

   A. On 29th November 2023:

[REDACTED] ([REDACTED]): Yeah mate you'll defo get locked up for some weird child fetishes
Cara Power (CP): I'll take you down with me
[REDACTED]: Hahaha just associating yourself with me will be enough [laughing face emoji x2]

B. On 26.02.2024
[REDACTED]: Right then let's save the sackable chat for tomorrow [laughing face emoji x2]
CP: Yeah no digital footprint

C. On 8th March 2024:
[REDACTED]: 'So happy I had you there today though mate, genuinely. Wanted to give you a
hug but didn't want you to feel awkward [laughing face emoji x6] 'You were such a
good rock for me today.'
CP: 'Yeah I'm a bit Harvey price like that! But always here if you need a chat or wine and call someone a cunt'

D. On 9th March 2023:
[REDACTED]: 'I assume all your time is shoving bits of lego up your arse like the sad cunt you are?'
CP: 'Yeah I've decided that anal with Lego is the way to go! How's life touching kids?'
[REDACTED]: 'Touching kids is alright but the cozzy livs1 is making the price of sweets skyrocket. It's tough to keep up with the price rises.'
CP: Ahhh yeah! You need to get to Costco and bulk buy the sweets if you can!
[REDACTED]: Think I'll just turn to rohipnol instead.
CP: Ahhhh yeah! Good ole rohipnol

3. The Appropriate Authority alleged that her conduct in participating in the messages above was in breach of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:
    - Discreditable Conduct in that her conduct was plainly inappropriate and would not be expected of a police officer by members of the public.
    - Failure to challenge and report improper conduct in that she did not challenge or take action against the conduct of a colleague which had fallen below the standards of professional behaviour expected.

4. The conduct alleged above, whether individually or cumulatively, was alleged to amount to gross misconduct.

Findings on Gross Misconduct/Misconduct

5. The Panel considered the messages individually in turn as follows:

    A. On 29th November 2023:
    [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]): Yeah mate you'll defo get locked up for some weird child fetishes
    Cara Power (CP): I'll take you down with me
    [REDACTED]: Hahaha just associating yourself with me will be enough [laughing face emoji x2]

6. The Panel acknowledged that FPC Power conceded that the exchange of messages breached the standard expected of a Police Officer in respect of discreditable conduct and reporting inappropriate behaviour.

7. The Panel found that the failure by FPC Power to challenge FPC [REDACTED]'s comment and her subsequent continuation of the exchange amounted to misconduct, not gross misconduct as alleged. The Panel took the view that a member of the public would not expect a serving police officer to make light of inappropriate sexual thoughts or behaviour regarding children. Her failure to challenge FPC [REDACTED]'s comment was aggravated by her comments in reply which actively engaged in the behaviour. The Panel did think that the public would be concerned about the exchange had it come to light, and that it would be found harmful to the reputation of police officers and trust and confidence in the Met Police Service.

8. The Panel took into account FPC Power's stated view that she was not offended by FPC [REDACTED]'s statement and that was why she did not challenge it. However the Panel felt that as an experienced police officer she should have known at the time of the exchange that had the messages become public they could have caused harm to the reputation of the police. The Panel made its finding of misconduct on the basis that whilst disciplinary action would have been justified, the levels of harm and culpability involved did not reach the standard required for dismissal to be justified.

9. The Panel reached this decision based on the fact that whilst reputation and trust and confidence would have been harmed, due to this being a failure to challenge rather than a direct comment by FPC Power the harm would have been at the lower level.

B. On 26.02.2024
[REDACTED]: Right then let's save the sackable chat for tomorrow [laughing face emoji x2]
CP: Yeah no digital footprint

10. The Panel acknowledged that there was no evidence before it as to what went before or after this exchange and that therefore they had to read it without further context. In evidence, FPC Power was unable to recall what had gone before or after and no evidence was provided by the AA as to the context of this conversation.

11. Without any context the Panel did not find, on the balance of probabilities, that the allegation of discreditable conduct or failure to report or challenge was proven. No finding of misconduct was therefore made. However, the Panel did consider that the exchange, which FPC Power admitted took place, demonstrated strong evidence that FPC Power was aware that messages exchanged between herself and FPC [REDACTED] in this way could be capable of leading to dismissal. Indeed, they found that FPC Power's reference to 'no digital footprint' demonstrated evidence of her awareness that private chats could be accessed and be held accountable for.

C. On 8th March 2024:
[REDACTED]: 'So happy I had you there today though mate, genuinely. Wanted to give you a

hug but didn't want you to feel awkward [laughing face emoji x6] ‘You were such a
good rock for me today.’
CP: ‘Yeah I’m a bit Harvey price like that! But always here if you need a chat or wine and call someone a cunt’

12. The Panel heard evidence from FPC Power that she thought a word had been omitted and the message should have said ‘I’m a bit *like* Harvey Price’, because her explanation was that she was referring to her perception of Mr Price after watching several documentary programmes about him, that he did not like to be touched except by his mother. The Appropriate Authority’s case was that she was in fact referring to Mr Price’s cognitive disabilities which are well known publicly and could be said to be the first thing most people would assume when hearing a reference to him. This was particularly because of previous cases which were reported in the media concerning discriminatory comments made by others in his regard.

13. The Panel considered carefully the evidence before them in the bundle and given orally by FPC Power. Evidence was provided which corroborated her account in that it mentioned that FPC Power has a reticence to be touched by those she does not know. The message itself however was the most persuasive evidence to the Panel, as FPC Power said ‘I’m a bit Harvey Price like that’. The words ‘like that’ in the Panel’s view, when read in conjunction with FPC [REDACTED]’s reference to giving her a hug, clearly alluded to the reticence to touching and so the Panel found that on the balance of probabilities, FPC Power was indeed referring to this in her message and not to Mr Price’s disabilities. The message was therefore not derogatory, offensive or inappropriate and accordingly no finding of misconduct was made.

D. On 9th March 2023:
[REDACTED]: ‘I assume all your time is shoving bits of lego up your arse like the sad cunt you are?’
CP: ‘Yeah I’ve decided that anal with Lego is the way to go! How’s life touching kids?’
[REDACTED]: ‘Touching kids is alright but the cozzy livs1 is making the price of sweets sky
rocket. It's tough to keep up with the price rises.’
CP: Ahhh yeah! You need to get to Costco and bulk buy the sweets if you can!
[REDACTED]: Think I'll just turn to rohipnol instead.
CP: Ahhhh yeah! Good ole rohipnol

14. The Panel noted that FPC Power did not accept that the first part of the exchange concerning Lego, constituted discreditable conduct or failure to challenge or report inappropriate behaviour. However, she did concede this in respect of the rest of the exchange.

15. The Panel considered the exchange in its entirety as the Appropriate Authority’s case framed it as one allegation of discreditable conduct and failure to report/challenge inappropriate behaviour. After reading the evidence and listening to FPC Power’s evidence at the hearing, the Panel found that the exchange as a whole did amount to

discreditable conduct and failure to report/challenge inappropriate behaviour. They found that this was at the level of gross misconduct.

16. However, the Panel found that the exchange regarding Lego, if it had been taken by itself, whilst capable of offending some people, was a matter that could have been entirely private as they concerned reference only to FPC Power and a lawful (and on the evidence fictitious) sexual practice, therefore not likely to affect public perception of the police as a whole. Had this allegation been standalone the Panel would not have found that it constituted discreditable conduct or failure to report inappropriate behaviour.

17. In respect of the rest of the exchange, the Panel heard evidence from FPC Power that her reference to 'touching kids' was supposed to be a jokey reference to the fact that FPC [REDACTED]'s work as a youth officer positively touched the lives of children. The Panel preferred the assertion of the Appropriate Authority and found that the exchange was inappropriate, offensive and derogatory in nature.

18. The Panel considered that FPC Power's initial comment 'How's life touching kids' made light of child sexual abuse. The reference to Rohypnol, commonly known as a 'date rape' drug, in the specific context of an exchange referencing 'touching kids' was, even if a misplaced 'joke', a wholly inappropriate and distasteful comment making light of the abuse of children. They felt that these messages would, had they been seen by members of the public, seriously undermine confidence in the Police. They took into account that at the time the messages were sent, there was a climate where the police service was facing loss of public confidence and felt that harm to the police's reputation and trust and confidence from the public could be significant.

19. The Panel considered both mitigating and aggravating factors when reaching its decision. In terms of mitigation, they considered FPC's medical history which was discussed in private session. Although those factors did explain FPC Power's conduct to a certain extent, the Panel felt strongly that they did not justify or excuse it. They considered also the fact that this was a single conversation, there was no element of threat or provocation and that stress was a factor. FPC Power had made admissions that the conduct amounted to discreditable conduct and failure to report inappropriate behaviour. She also, in evidence at the hearing, accepted that had the messages come to light they would have caused significant harm to the reputation of the Police.

20. In terms of aggravating features, the Panel considered the fact that this was not one comment ignored or one comment made, it was an inappropriate exchange started by FPC Power, with regards to the comment on "touching kids", continued by FPC [REDACTED] and escalated by their reference to Rohypnol. They considered that there was a serious failure to raise concerns in view of the fact that FPC [REDACTED]'s job was as a Youth officer, and that FPC Power would have been aware of the scale of public feeling at the time of the messages about trust and confidence in the Police.

21. In its deliberations the Panel had regard to the provisions of the Police Regulations, Home Office Guidance and the Guidance from the College of Policing on Outcomes and applied their provisions to the facts before it.

22. They also had regard to the authorities cited by the Appropriate Authority as follows:

    a) BC v Chief Constable Police Scotland (2020) CSIH61
    b) COBBAN & another v Director of Public Prosecutions (2024)EWHC 1908 (Admin)

    which had been raised at the Preliminary Hearing of the matter on 29 September 2025 and which were not challenged by FPC Power's representative. These cases provided legal authority for the principle that police officers should have no reasonable expectation of privacy in respect of personal WhatsApp messages. Having considered the cases cited the Panel agreed with the Appropriate Authority that FPC Power's private WhatsApp messages could be the subject of misconduct or Gross misconduct proceedings if they breached the standards of conduct required of Police Officers.

23. Whilst the Panel did take into account FPC Power's assertion that the messages were private, never meant to be seen by anyone other than FPC [REDACTED] and did not personally denigrate or refer to anyone but themselves, they had in mind the Guidelines from the College of Policing particularly Part 4 regarding assessment of seriousness. It is for all these reasons that the message exchange of 9 March 2023 amounted to gross misconduct.

Finding on outcome, including any aggravating or mitigating factors affecting the seriousness failures of the in standards

24. Having made a finding of misconduct in respect of allegation 1, as a former officer there is no sanction which can be imposed by the Panel on FPC Power in respect of that matter, although the finding of misconduct is noted.

25. In respect of the finding of gross misconduct on allegation 4 the Panel heard from the Appropriate Authority, who referred to the College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Hearings, in particular part 4 on Seriousness. He asked us the Panel to consider the scale and depth of local and national concern at the time the messages were sent as well as the standing and reputation of policing as a whole. He invited the Panel to find that if FPC Power was still a serving officer, she should have been dismissed.

26. Counsel for FPC Power reminded the Panel that the Appropriate Authority in its case had itself had placed the seriousness of the messages sent as 'medium'. He referred the Panel to the question of 'harm' and reminded the Panel that they must consider how the public would view the messages in 'all the circumstances', that is while knowing everything that the Panel now knew about the circumstances, as an 'informed observer'. He sought to persuade the Panel that dark humour was a legitimate form of humour and that it was not universally abhorred by society in the same way as comments that were racist, misogynistic or discriminatory in respect of other protected characteristics.

27. The Panel was reminded that there were mitigating features within the facts to be considered and were referred to 4.4.and 4.5 of the College of Policing guidance in that regard. In this case, to note that the exchange of messages was of brief duration. [REDACTED] stress were factors. FPC Power had made early admissions that her conduct was a breach of the Professional Standards and the Panel was told that her remorse was genuine and that she had attended and given evidence in order to show that. Finally, the Panel was referred to the personal mitigation presented in the form of FPC Power's letters of support from former colleagues and her HR record.

28. The Panel was then directed by their Legally Qualified Advisor to the threefold purpose of imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings as laid down in 2.3 of the College of Policing guidance:

    a) to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service
    b) to uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
    c) to protect the public

29. They were also reminded that, as the Regulation 30 Notice in this case was served before 28 May 2025, the Panel must consider the outcome under the 2020 Regulations which meant that they must use as their starting point the lowest appropriate sanction in the circumstances before considering whether there were factors which would justify a higher sanction. They must also have in their minds that the sanction should be that which the officer would have received had they still been in post and not be influenced by the fact that they could only impose a sanction on FPC Power today if their conclusion was that she should have been dismissed.

30. The Panel, as directed, considered firstly the seriousness level of the matter. In doing so they considered culpability and found that FPC Power had actively engaged in the messaging, and although they recognised that there was no intention on her part to offend or cause harm she should have known that her messages if seen would be likely to cause reputational damage to the Metropolitan Police Service and to undermine public confidence in the police as a whole. FPC Power had already admitted in evidence that if made public, the messages would have caused significant harm to the reputation of the Metropolitan Police Service.

31. In respect of mitigating factors they found that the behaviour was of a brief duration. They agreed that [REDACTED] stress were factors, however whilst they did go some way towards explaining the behaviour they did not excuse it. They did feel that the remorse displayed by FPC Power was genuine and took into account her decision to attend and give evidence. The Panel also considered that the behaviour was not targeted to a specific individual and there was no evidence of intention to cause upset, distress or harm. No specific aggravating features were found by the Panel. They concurred with the assessment of seriousness as medium put forward by the Appropriate Authority.
32. As required by Regulation 42(14) of the 2020 Regulations, the Panel considered FPC Power's record of service and noted that there had been no criticism made of her performance as a Police Officer in respect of duties to the public. There was no

suggestion that she was in any way a danger to the public and indeed they noted that during her service she had placed herself in harm's way to defend colleagues and had suffered a serious injury as a result. Further, they took into account the statements presented by way of personal mitigation as character references.

33. The Panel felt very strongly that the messages found to have breached the standards of professional behaviour, both in discreditable conduct and failure to report were inappropriate, derogatory and offensive. Simply put, they were not acceptable in anyway whatsoever. They should not have been sent or received without challenge by a police officer and whilst it was described as "dark humour" the Panel did not accept the assertions of FPC Power's counsel that dark humour in these circumstances is any less offensive to the general public than discriminatory or otherwise offensive 'jokes' would be.

34. Having taken all the above into consideration the Panel's decision was that the appropriate sanction had FPC Power been a serving officer today, was that she would have received a final written warning for the maximum period of five years. However, as she is no longer a serving police officer the Panel can impose no sanction upon her although the finding of Gross Misconduct is noted.

Decision on Publication

No representations made on publication.

The Panel
Chair: Commander Nick John
IPM1: Sadhana Patel
IPM2: Christine Nwaokolo

17 December 2025