Accelerated Misconduct Hearing Finding and Outcome

Officer Name:	PC George Massey
Warrant No:	P 238950
Date of Hearing:	22nd December 2025
Alleged Standards Breached:	Discreditable Conduct

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.

The hearing was held in **Public**

PC Massey attended the hearing and was represented by his Federation Representative PS Alan Dove. The Officer supplied a response to the Regulation 54 Notice dated 18th December 2025.

I am therefore satisfied that he had notice of the hearing.

I have listened to the case presented on behalf of the Appropriate Authority by Aaryan Sattani.

The allegation against PC Massey is that:

On 14th November 2025, at Bexley Magistrates Court, you pleaded guilty to drink driving. On the same date, you were sentenced to a 12-month driving ban, £120 fine, £85 in costs, and victim surcharge of £48.

Particulars

On 29th October 2025, you failed a roadside breath test and were subsequently arrested. In custody you provided a breath specimen that contained 43 micrograms/100 ml of alcohol, which is over the legal limit. You were subsequently charged and bailed to attend Court, where you pleaded guilty and were therefore convicted of Driving with excess alcohol ("Drink Drive") contrary to Section 5 of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

Standards of Professional Behaviour

In the circumstances, the Appropriate Authority contends that PC Massey's 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

In that his conduct may bring the police service into disrepute and damage the relationship of trust and confidence between the police and the public.

As a result of that stated herein, if proven, his conduct individually or cumulatively amounts to gross misconduct and his 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

On 14th November 2025, at Bexley Magistrates Court, PC Massey pleaded guilty to drink driving. On the same date, he was sentenced to a 12-month driving ban, £120 fine, £85 in costs, and victim surcharge of £48.

Particulars

On 29th October 2025, he failed a roadside breath test and was subsequently arrested. In custody he provided a breath specimen that contained 43 micrograms/100 ml of alcohol, which is over the legal limit. He was subsequently charged and bailed to attend Court, where he pleaded guilty and was therefore convicted of Driving with excess alcohol ("Drink Drive") contrary to Section 5 of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

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

Decision on Finding

I have listened to the case presented by the Appropriate Authority and carefully considered all the documentary and video evidence in the form of Axon Body Worn Video. I also considered the submission made on behalf of the Officer concerned.

I remind myself that the AA has the burden of proving the case and that the standard of proof is on the balance of probabilities.

I find the particulars proven on the papers before me including the Officer's Regulation 54 response and by the Officer's Guilty plea.

Breach of Professional Standards

I bear in mind that the burden of proving this rests upon the AA and that it must satisfy me on the balance of probabilities.

I find this **proved**. The breach is accepted by PC Massey in any event.

I now go on to make a provisional assessment as to Seriousness

Culpability

PC Massey has pleaded Guilty to a criminal offence. Officers are there to uphold the law and not to break it. PC Massey was responsible for his own actions.

I assess the culpability as High

Harm

There was a risk of harm to other road users. There is significant harm to public trust, if this behaviour became known.

There is also harm to the reputation of the Police and to the Metropolitan Police in particular if Officers break the law in this way.

I assess the Harm as High

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 PC Massey breached the standard of Discreditable Conduct and that this breach does amount to gross misconduct. PC Massey accepts this in any event.

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:

i. The officer's culpability
ii. The harm caused by the misconduct
iii. The existence of aggravating factors
iv. 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:

i. To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
ii. To uphold high standards and deter misconduct, and
iii. 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

PC Massey has pleaded Guilty to a criminal offence. Officers are there to uphold the law and not to break it. PC Massey was responsible for his own actions.

I assess the culpability as High

Harm

There was a risk of harm to other road users. There is significant harm to public trust, if this behaviour became known.

There is also harm to the reputation of the Police and to the Metropolitan Police in particular if Officers break the law in this way.

I assess the Harm as High

Aggravating Factors

When considering aggravating factors, I am mindful not to double count matters that have already formed part of my assessment of harm and culpability.

The officer is subject to a live Final Written Warning for Discreditable Conduct, which relates to a domestic incident.

Mitigating Factors

The Officer accepted full responsibility for his actions and remorse. He states that the incident was out of character. The Officer states that he is committed to learning from this and that this behaviour is not repeated by accepting necessary referrals.

Conclusion on Seriousness

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

Personal Mitigation

No personal mitigation was advanced but in any event, 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 the matter came to the attention of the Appropriate Authority after 28th May 2025 I have to consider whether there are any exceptional reasons for me to find against the presumption of Dismissal without notice. There is no Home Office Guidance on what amounts to exceptional reason. I find that there is not.

OUTCOME:

Therefore, the sanction I impose on PC Massey is **dismissal without notice** and that he be placed on the College of Policing's **public** barred list.

Stephen Clayman

Commander

Metropolitan Police Service

22nd December 2025