IN THE MATTER OF THE MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020 (AS AMENDED BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024)

BETWEEN

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

and

Former PC John Marsh

PANEL FINAL DECISION

Introductions:

1. This is the written final decision in respect of the misconduct hearing for Former PC John Marsh (the Former Officer). The outline of the Panel decisions on facts and outcome was provided to the Former Officer during the hearing.

2. The Panel was chaired by Commander Jason Prins, with independent members Ms Amanda Harvey and Mr Mark Dent. The Legally Qualified Adviser to the Panel was Ms Olivia Kong.

3. The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented at the hearing by Mr Julian Waters (AA's rep). The Former Officer was neither present nor legally represented; however, PC O'Shea, the Former Officer 's Federation Representative (Fed Rep) attended on his behalf.

4. The hearing was held from 2 to 4 December 2025 at the Empress State Building, West Brompton, London.

5. At the outset of its determinations, and throughout the hearing, the Panel has remained mindful of the overarching purpose of police misconduct proceedings, namely:
    i. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service;
    ii. To uphold high standards of professional conduct and deter misconduct;
    iii. To protect the public.

The Allegations:

6. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of the Former Officer containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct, namely:

REGULATION 30 NOTICE

Allegation 1

1. Between 26 May 2020 and 26 July 2023, being a member of the Metropolitan Police Service, whether on or off duty, you repeatedly or continuously engaged in behaviour towards Ms A that was controlling or coercive at a time when you and Ms A were personally connected. This behaviour included, but is not limited, to:

1.1 Repeatedly or continuously checking up on who Ms A was with, what she was doing and where;
1.2 Accusing Ms A of being unfaithful or of planning to be unfaithful;
1.3 Accessing Ms A's personal mobile phone without her consent;
1.4 Attempting to isolate Ms A from friends and family;
1.5 Attempting to dissuade her from socialising;
1.6 Accusing Ms A of sharing intimate images online or with others;
1.7 Attending Ms A's place of work uninvited;
1.8 Following Ms A home; and
1.9 Being verbally aggressive towards Ms A.

2. Your behaviour had a serious effect on Ms A.

Breach

3. By reason of the matters above, whether taken collectively or individually, your behaviour did not meet the standards required by the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as to Discreditable Conduct.

4. Your behaviour amounted to gross misconduct.

Allegation 2

5. Between 31 July 2023 and 2 September 2023, being a member of the Metropolitan Police Service, whether on or off duty, you behaved towards Ms A on two occasions or more in a manner that caused her alarm or distress. This behaviour included, but is not limited, to:

5.1. Sending Ms A number of letters;
5.2. Sending a letter to Aletta Shaw Solicitors;
5.3. Attending Ms A's home address; and
5.4. Sitting outside Ms A's home in your car.

Breach

6. By reason of the matters above, whether taken collectively or individually, your behaviour did not meet the standards required by the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as to Discreditable Conduct.

7. Your behaviour amounted to gross misconduct.

Allegation 3

8. On 3 November 2023, being a member of the Metropolitan Police Service, whether on duty or off, you repeatedly referred to a member of the public as a "cunt" in the presence of another member of the Metropolitan Police Service.

Breaches

9. By reason of the matters above, you failed to act with self-control, composure, respect or courtesy and your behaviour did not meet the standards required by the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as to Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

10. By reason of the matters above, your behaviour was capable of discrediting the police force or undermining public confidence in policing and did not meet the standards required by the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2 to the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as to Discreditable Conduct.

11. Your behaviour amounted to gross misconduct.

12. The Former Officer addressed all allegations during an interview under caution on 16 February 2024, and subsequently in a written Regulation 31 response. In summary, he denies each allegation with the exception of allegation 2. However, while he accepts the factual basis of allegation 2, he disputes that it amounts to a breach of the professional standard of *Discreditable Conduct*.

Preliminary Issues

7. Anonymity of Witnesses
   Prior to the hearing, anonymity was granted to Ms A, Ms B and Ms C, who are the witnesses in the allegations, due to the sensitive nature of the case.

8. Private or Public Hearing
   Prior to the hearing, an application was submitted on behalf of the Former Officer, seeking that the proceedings be conducted in private. The Former Officer's application was advanced on the grounds of his health and the potential stress arising from the outcome of the case. Further applications were submitted on behalf of Ms A, Ms B and Ms C, also seeking that the proceedings be conducted in private on the grounds of the sensitive nature of the case and concerns for their welfare.

9. Upon consideration, the Chair determined that the Former Officer's application did not meet the high threshold required for the hearing to be held in private. The Chair also determined that the concerns of Ms A, Ms B and Ms C could be adequately addressed through the granting of anonymity and the implementation of appropriate special measures.

10. Proceed in absence
    The Former Officer did not attend the hearing, and the Fed Rep confirmed that he had received no specific instructions from the Former Officer. He stated that he had spoken with the Former Officer the day before the hearing, and that the Former Officer was content for the proceedings to continue in his absence.

11. The AA's Rep applied for the hearing to proceed without the Former Officer. The Fed Rep raised no objection to this application.

12. In considering the application, the Panel noted that the Former Officer had not sought an adjournment and that there was no realistic prospect of his attendance at any future date. Having weighed the interests of fairness and the need for the matter to be determined without undue delay, the Panel granted the application.

The Panel's Approach

13. The Panel reminded itself of its core responsibilities:

    a. To assess the facts of the case and make findings in relation to each allegation;

b. To determine whether those findings amount to a breach of the relevant Standards of Professional Behaviour;
c. To decide whether the conduct found proven constitutes misconduct, gross misconduct, or neither.

14. The Panel remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the Appropriate Authority throughout the proceedings. The applicable standard is the balance of probabilities—that is, whether the alleged conduct is more likely than not to have occurred.

15. In reaching its decisions, the Panel considered the purpose and nature of police misconduct proceedings. The primary aim is not to punish the Former Officer, but to uphold public confidence in the police service and protect its reputation by ensuring accountability and making clear that improper conduct will not be tolerated. A secondary aim is to affirm and promote high professional standards. A further purpose is to protect the public, the Complainant, and police staff by preventing recurrence of similar misconduct. In doing so, the Panel had regard to the principles established in *Bolton v Law Society* [1994] 1 WLR 512; *Chief Constable of Dorset v PAT, Salter (Interested Party)* [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin); and *R (Williams) v PAT* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).

16. The Panel also considered the relevant regulatory framework and guidance, including:

    a. The Police (Conduct) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 ("the Regulations"), particularly the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2;

    b. The 2018 Home Office Guidance ("HOG"), with specific reference to Chapter 1, which summarises the Standards;

    c. The definition of misconduct under Regulation 3(1): "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour";

    d. The definition of gross misconduct under Regulation 3(1): "a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour so serious that dismissal would be justified".

17. The Panel thoroughly reviewed the documentary evidence including viewing of the video interview, CCTV and the Ring doorbell footage presented. It considered the totality of the evidence and submissions. While it does not propose to address every individual point raised, the Panel sets out its principal findings and conclusions.

Evidence

18. The Panel had been provided with the following documents:

a. Final Bundle (including Regulation 30 notice) consisting of 275 pages
b. AA's opening note consisting of 9 pages
c. Ms A's video interview – 1 hour 22 minutes 40 seconds
d. The CCTV footage – 14 minutes 48 seconds
e. The Ring doorbell footage – 19 seconds

19. No oral evidence was heard from any of the live witnesses by the Panel.

Case Summary

20. The Former Officer and Ms A were in a relationship for around three and a half years, beginning in March 2020 and finally ending in July 2023 after a brief reconciliation. The relationship was initially stable but began to deteriorate in late 2022 when the Former Officer accused Ms A of infidelity, claiming he had received anonymous calls and later alleging he had seen indecent images of her. Ms A denied these allegations, but the Former Officer became increasingly aggressive and controlling.

21. Following their separation in March 2023, the Former Officer confronted Ms A at her workplace, showed her photographs he claimed were of her, and made threatening remarks. Ms A reported the incident to Kent Police, describing unwanted texts, demands for money and gifts, and attempts to isolate her from friends. Although she did not want police action at that time, the matter was recorded and referred to the Metropolitan Police Service. The couple briefly reconciled but further disputes followed, including anger from the Former Officer when Ms A went on holiday with friends.

22. The relationship ended definitively in July 2023 after further confrontations. Days later, during a meeting intended to resolve holiday arrangements, the Former Officer shouted derogatory remarks, accused Ms A of cheating, and left their holiday photographs in a public place. Ms A retrieved and discarded them, blocked further contact, and reported to Kent Police that the Former Officer had engaged in controlling and coercive behaviour. She described him monitoring her communications, demanding immediate responses, undermining her trust in friends and family, and following her home from her workplace late at night.

23. After the separation, Ms A reported receiving several letters from the Former Officer demanding repayment of money. One was hand-delivered to her home at 5 a.m. He also threatened to disclose personal information to her ex-husband.

Finding of Facts & Breaches

24. The Panel had full regard to all the relevant evidence in the bundle, the video interviews, the CCTV, the ring doorbell footage, the witnesses' evidence, the AA's opening note and the closing submissions of both the AA's rep and the Fed Rep in making its findings.

25. The Panel followed the legal advice throughout and remained mindful that the burden of proof rests with the AA. The applicable standard is the balance of probabilities.

26. The Panel notes that no witnesses gave oral evidence. The Former Officer was absent having been unwell and the Fed Rep confirmed the Former Officer had expressly consented to the case proceeding in his absence. While the AA's witnesses were in attendance, the AA's representative elected to rely exclusively on the documentary evidence. The Panel confirmed with the Fed Rep that he had received no instructions from the Former Officer and did not propose to ask witnesses any questions. Consequently, no cross-examination of the AA's witnesses was undertaken.

Ms A

27. Ms A provided her account by way of written statement. She explained that she and the Former Officer began a relationship on 23 March 2020. For the first two years, she described the relationship as positive. However, from 2022 onwards, she and her friend Ms C began to notice concerning behaviours. Ms A stated that the Former Officer became increasingly aggressive and moody, used demeaning language, monitored her movements in a controlling manner, and repeatedly accused her of infidelity based on information he claimed to have received from an anonymous caller.

28. Ms A recounted a particularly distressing incident in which the Former Officer, while attached to a school, told her he had discovered images of her breasts on a pupil's phone. She described this as degrading, leaving her feeling "sick," "ashamed", and as though she was "losing her mind." Despite this, he assured her that he "still loved her."

29. She recalled numerous occasions where the Former Officer checked up on her, including chastising her for not reporting her arrival at a local Harvester, and following her home from work in the early hours of 14 February 2023. Ms C, a friend, observed Ms A becoming withdrawn and distrustful of friends and family as a result of the Former Officer's behaviour.

30. Ms A stated that she ended the relationship on 12 March 2023. However, on 16 March 2023, the Former Officer attended her workplace, prevented her from closing her car door, and showed her alleged images of her breasts. As he left, he threatened to "play dirty" and suggested her ex-husband would be interested in certain details. Ms A reported the incident to police the following day.

31. Although they briefly reconciled, Ms A described further difficulties, including the Former Officer making her trip to Norfolk in June 2023 "very difficult" and ultimately separating from him on 23 July 2023 after he demanded to know her whereabouts when she went out with a friend.

32. On 25 July 2023, during a meeting at Costa Coffee to discuss holiday arrangements, Ms A described the Former Officer as verbally aggressive, shouting at her, accusing her of infidelity, admitting he had accessed her phone, and threatening to contact her ex-husband. She felt "humiliated" and "scared." He discarded personal photographs in the street and later sent her text messages. Ms A contacted police again on 27 July 2023.

33. She described periods of feeling frightened, degraded, humiliated, and reliant upon the Former Officer due to his behaviour. Following their final separation, she received four letters from him dated 1 August, 15 August, 31 August 2023, and one undated letter received between late July and late August 2023.

Ms B

34. Ms B, a neighbour of Ms A since the mid-1990s, provided her account by way of written statement. She explained that she had known of the Former Officer since approximately 2020, though she did not know him personally. At that time, he was in a relationship with Ms A, initially as her boyfriend and later as her fiancé.

35. Ms B recalled an occasion, around two years ago, when she encountered the Former Officer outside Ms A's home. During what she described as a casual conversation, the Former Officer remarked that he wished he could access Ms A's Ring doorbell camera. Ms B stated that she did not respond to the comment, nor attach any particular significance to it at the time, and the conversation ended naturally before she returned indoors.

Ms C

36. Ms C, a long-standing friend of Ms A whom she has known for over twenty years, provided evidence concerning her observations of the Former Officer's behaviour during his relationship with Ms A. Ms C first encountered the Former Officer around 2021, following the COVID-19 lockdowns, and came to know him

only through Ms A. She described the Former Officer's conduct as increasingly controlling, noting that Ms A, previously outgoing, became withdrawn over time.

37. Ms C recalled numerous occasions where the Former Officer persistently monitored Ms A's whereabouts, telephoning or messaging her when she was out with friends, sometimes only minutes after seeing her. She described incidents in which the Former Officer required Ms A to report her movements, questioned her upon return home, and appeared to check her phone without permission. Ms C recounted Ms A's distress when the Former Officer claimed to have received anonymous calls alleging infidelity, which Ms C believed to be fabricated.

38. Further, Ms C described occasions where the Former Officer made degrading remarks, attempted to isolate Ms A from her friends and family, and displayed aggressive behaviour in public, including shouting at Ms A in front of others. She also referred to incidents abroad where the Former Officer's conduct was hostile and unreasonable. Ms C noted that Ms A became increasingly distraught, questioning her own relationships and support network, and ultimately ended the relationship in 2023. Ms C's evidence was not given orally but was taken from her written statement. The Panel acknowledges that her account represents her recollection of events, and while she accepted that precise dates and chronology may not be exact, the matters described were presented to the Panel as her genuine observations and concerns.

PS Halsall

39. PS Halsall provided his account by way of written statement. He explained that on 3 November 2023 he served Form 163 upon the Former Officer and administered the formal caution. As he read through the form to ensure the Former Officer's understanding, the Former Officer became increasingly agitated. When invited to sign, the Former Officer did so, and PS Halsall countersigned. The Former Officer stated that he would cooperate with the investigation, wished to speak with a Police Federation representative, and confirmed that he had reported the matter to the South East-Professional Standards Unit. He added that he had nothing to hide and remarked that Ms A owed him over £1,000, explaining that he had sent her letters on the advice of his legal representative.

40. PS Halsall described the Former Officer's demeanour as volatile: he became angry, shouted, and repeatedly referred to Ms A as a "cunt" while talking about her. He was visibly shaking, at times crying, and then returning to anger. During the encounter, the Former Officer threw down his warrant card, police

identification, and training records, declaring his resignation from the Metropolitan Police Service. Although he attempted to leave, PS Halsall instructed him to remain. The Former Officer insisted he would resign and later stated he would raise the matter with a senior Officer, though he ultimately did not resign.

41. The Former Officer also alleged that Ms A was doing this to 'get back' at him because he had refused to allow her to go on a holiday to Disneyland, which he claimed to have paid for but not attended. He muttered comments under his breath, refused to clarify them when asked, and told PS Halsall abruptly that it was not his business. PS Halsall reassured him that his welfare was a concern and sought to ensure he was emotionally stable.

PC Washington/PC Journet-Exon

42. In February 2023, colleagues of the Former Officer who were also attached to the school began to notice concerning behaviour. PC Washington described the Former Officer as 'quite aggressive.' He recalled the Former Officer admitting that he believed Ms A was having an affair and that he had taken Ms A's phone without her consent on multiple occasions, reviewing her private text messages in order, in his words, 'to catch her out.' PC Washington stated that the Former Officer showed him photographs taken on his personal phone of Ms A's text exchanges with her mechanic friend, repeating that he wanted to catch her out.

43. PC Journet-Exon also recalled the Former Officer raising concerns that Ms A was being unfaithful. He described the Former Officer as repeatedly bringing up issues about Ms A and found him to be 'a little obsessive.' On 28 February 2023, PC Journet-Exon observed the Former Officer asking Former PC Shead how to use an iPhone to locate archived or deleted WhatsApp messages, while again stating that he suspected Ms A of cheating on him.

The Former Officer

44. The Former Officer was served with a Regulation 17 Notice on 3 November 2023. In response, he asserted that his actions were taken in accordance with legal advice, specifically in relation to recovering funds he claimed were owed to him by Ms A. He was interviewed under caution on 16 February 2024. During that interview, the Former Officer stated that he himself had been 'gaslit' and 'isolated', alleging that Ms A's friends had turned her against him. He relied upon anonymous calls he claimed to have received concerning Ms A's alleged infidelity, but denied ever accessing her phone.

45. He accepted that he had attended Ms A's home in the early hours of February 2023, but maintained that this was solely to deliver fishing tackle. He acknowledged checking in on her whereabouts but characterised this as genuine concern for her safety, denying any attempt to isolate her. He further asserted that they had never argued. He denied entirely that he had shown Ms A an image from a child's phone or accused her of being depicted in such material.

46. The Former Officer contended that Ms A's account of the relationship being negative was retrospective, designed to manipulate proceedings, harass him, and avoid repayment of money. In his Regulation 31 response, he argued that conduct arising from a genuine belief in adultery should not amount to misconduct.

47. In relation to the letters sent to Ms A, the Former Officer maintained that these were issued on the advice of his legal representative as part of efforts to recover funds. He accepted that he had referred to Ms A as a 'cunt,' but explained this was said out of frustration and argued that such language should not be considered misconduct, claiming that swearing was commonplace among Officers in the Metropolitan Police Service.

CCTV

48. The CCTV footage shows Ms A approaching her vehicle in the car park. As she got inside the car, the Former Officer is seen running towards it. The footage depicts the Former Officer holding the car door open after Ms A had attempted to close it, positioning his body so that the door could not be shut. He then appears to kneel beside the vehicle, speaking to Ms A, before subsequently walking away.

Ring doorbell footage

49. The CCTV footage depicts the Former Officer holding a folded piece of paper or envelope as he approaches the door. He appears to place the item through the letterbox before walking away. The entire clip lasts approximately 19 seconds.

Allegations

50. The panel have taken the allegations at paragraph 1 [a] to [d] of the Regulation 30 notice (as set out above) in order:

Allegation 1

51. Between 26 May 2020 and 26 July 2023, being a member of the Metropolitan Police Service, whether on or off duty, you repeatedly or continuously engaged in behaviour towards MS A that was controlling or coercive at a time when you and MS A were personally connected. This behaviour included, but is not limited, to:

1.1 Repeatedly or continuously checking up on who MS A was with, what she was doing and where;

52. Ms A gave a clear account in her video interview. Ms A described an incident in which the Former Officer instructed her to telephone him upon arrival at a restaurant, explaining that he worried about her. She recalled that he telephoned her approximately twenty minutes before she left, asking her to call once she had arrived. Having reached the restaurant and begun greeting friends, she forgot to do so. Around half an hour later, the Former Officer telephoned her, demanding to know where she was and chastising her for failing to call as instructed. Ms A apologised, reassured him that she was safe, and promised to call when she left.

53. Ms A explained that this was the first occasion on which she began to feel uneasy, noting that a friend (Ms C) present also expressed doubts about the Former Officer's behaviour. She recounted that the Former Officer would frequently instruct her to 'ring me when you get there' or 'text me when you get home.' She recalled a conversation in which his aunt had told him that such demands were controlling. The Former Officer denied this, insisting it was motivated by care and concern for her safety. Ms A stated that while she recognised the apparent concern, she also felt frustrated and resentful at having to 'answer to somebody,' given her independence.

54. Ms C's evidence was consistent with and corroborated Ms A's account. She confirmed that she had personally witnessed Ms A receiving telephone calls from the Former Officer on several occasions while they were together socially. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel was satisfied that this allegation is proved.

1.2. Accusing MS A of being unfaithful or of planning to be unfaithful;

55. The Panel has considered the account provided by Ms A. She stated that in January 2023 the Former Officer informed her he had received a series of telephone calls from a female. According to him, the caller alleged that Ms A was "not good enough" for him, that he was "not good enough" for her, and that she would ultimately be unfaithful. Ms A reported that the Former Officer claimed to have received three further calls of a similar nature. In the final call,

the caller allegedly referred to one of Ms A's male friends and asserted that she had sent him explicit text messages. Ms A denied this allegation. She stated that the Former Officer responded with verbal aggression, accusing her of infidelity, dishonesty, and deceit.

56. The Panel notes that the relationship ended on 23 July 2023. Ms A believes the Former Officer initiated the break-up because she had begun questioning inconsistencies in his previous accounts, which he was unable to sustain. Following the separation, they agreed to meet in a public café to discuss a holiday booking. Ms A stated that the Former Officer was verbally aggressive from the outset of the meeting. She emphasised that he never physically assaulted her, but that he frequently displayed verbal aggression.

57. During the café meeting, the Former Officer accused her of promiscuity, alleging that she preferred married men and suggesting that their wives should be informed. Ms A stated that the Former Officer then became increasingly animated, shouted further accusations of infidelity, and left the café, continuing to shout allegations as he departed. The Panel notes that Ms A consistently denies all allegations of unfaithfulness. Her account highlights repeated verbal aggression and unsupported accusations. She distinguishes clearly between verbal aggression and physical conduct, noting that no physical assault occurred. The chronology demonstrates an escalation from alleged third-party phone calls to direct confrontation and public verbal aggression.

58. The Panel considered the written statements of independent witnesses, namely PC Journet-Exon, PC Washington, and an email from PC Shead. In those statements, each confirmed that the Former Officer had told them he suspected Ms A of being unfaithful. The Panel attached weight to the consistency of these accounts, noting that they were independent of one another and provided without apparent motive to fabricate or exaggerate. The Panel was satisfied that the statements corroborated Ms A's evidence of repeated accusations of infidelity. Applying the civil standard of proof, the Panel was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the Former Officer did make these allegations to colleagues, and accordingly found the allegation proved.

1.3. Accessing MS A's personal mobile phone without her consent;

59. Ms A stated that during a meeting in a public café on 25 July 2025, the Former Officer accused her of being unfaithful. When challenged to provide proof, he asserted that the evidence was "on [her] phone" and admitted that he had gone through her phone. Ms A emphasised that this was the third occasion on which he had accessed her phone without her consent.

60. He claimed to have seen a message on her phone which, in his view, demonstrated she was "messing about." Ms A asked him to show her the alleged message and indicated she would apologise if it existed. No such

message was produced, and Ms A stated that the individual he referred to was not even in her contacts.

61. The Panel concludes that the Former Officer accessed Ms A's personal mobile phone on multiple occasions without her consent. This finding is supported by consistent and independent witness statements (PC Washington, PC Journet-Exon), which corroborate Ms A's evidence. The Former Officer's admissions to colleagues, his production of photographs of Ms A's private text messages, and his request for technical assistance to retrieve deleted WhatsApp messages demonstrate a deliberate and repeated intrusion into her personal communications. Taken together, this evidence establishes a clear pattern of unauthorised access. The Panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the Former Officer did access Ms A's phone without her consent.

1.4. Attempting to isolate MS A from friends and family;

62. Ms A explained that during the period when the Former Officer claimed to be receiving anonymous telephone calls, he insisted that the caller was providing information about her alleged infidelity. Although he said he did not recognise the female voice, he repeatedly pressed Ms A to consider which of her friends or family members might be responsible. This placed her in a position where she began to doubt those closest to her. At one stage, she even suspected her own daughter, because the details the Former Officer claimed to have received matched information her daughter would have known. As a result, Ms A became withdrawn from her daughter and stopped sharing information with her, despite their previously close relationship. She described this as heartbreaking.

63. This account is supported by Ms C's evidence. Ms C, a long-standing friend of Ms A, described how the Former Officer's behaviour was controlling and how Ms A became increasingly withdrawn over time. Ms C recalled that the Former Officer frequently telephoned or messaged Ms A when she was out with friends, often asking to speak to people he did not know. She interpreted this as an attempt to monitor Ms A's social interactions and to check who she was with. Ms C also recounted occasions when the Former Officer claimed to have received phone calls alleging Ms A was cheating, including references to her mechanic. Ms C stated that she did not believe these calls existed and considered that the Former Officer was fabricating them to turn Ms A against her friends and family. She described Ms A as being in tears and distraught, questioning which of her friends might betray her, which alarmed Ms C and reinforced her view that the Former Officer was deliberately trying to isolate Ms A.

64. Taken together, Ms A's account and Ms C's corroborating observations demonstrate a clear pattern of behaviour in which the Former Officer sought to undermine Ms A's trust in her closest relationships. By fabricating allegations and presenting them as information from supposed third parties, he caused Ms

A to doubt her friends and even her daughter, leading her to withdraw from them. The Panel finds that this conduct supports the allegation that the Former Officer attempted to isolate Ms A from her friends and family.

1.5. **Attempting to dissuade her from socialising;**

65. Ms A described an incident in June 2023 when she arranged a weekend trip to Norfolk with two female friends. Although the Former Officer did not explicitly forbid her from going, she stated that he was moody and difficult in the days leading up to the trip, creating tension and making her feel pressured. On their return, when he collected them, he was openly angry, and one of her friends remarked that his manner towards Ms A in the car was "really uncalled for." When challenged, the Former Officer admitted he had not wanted her to go, explaining that he disliked the idea of her and her friends "talking about him." Ms A emphasised that the trip was simply an opportunity to catch up with friends, and that no derogatory comments had been made. Nevertheless, she reported that his behaviour made the weekend unnecessarily difficult both before and after the trip.

66. This account is consistent with the wider pattern of behaviour described by Ms C. Ms C observed that the Former Officer frequently sought to monitor and control Ms A's social interactions. She recalled occasions when he telephoned or messaged Ms A while she was out with friends, sometimes asking to speak to people he did not know, which she interpreted as an attempt to check who Ms A was with. Ms C also described how Ms A, once an outward and sociable person, became increasingly withdrawn under the Former Officer's influence. She noted that Ms A was often quizzed about her whereabouts and companions, and that the Former Officer's behaviour caused her distress and undermined her confidence in socialising freely.

67. Ms A's account of the Norfolk trip, supported by Ms C's corroborating evidence, reveals a consistent pattern of behaviour in which the Former Officer sought to discourage and inhibit Ms A's social activities. Through creating tension, expressing disapproval, and monitoring her interactions, he attempted to dissuade her from spending time with friends and to restrict her independence. The Panel finds this allegation proved.

1.6. **Accusing MS A of sharing intimate images online or with others;**

68. Ms A stated that the Former Officer repeatedly alleged she had shared intimate photographs of herself. He claimed that while reviewing a pupil's mobile phone at a school, he discovered an image of her breasts, insisting he recognised her distinctive necklace engraved with her children's names. Ms A denied this, but he suggested she may have taken and sent the image while drunk, attempting to reassure her by saying "everybody makes mistakes" and that he still loved her.

69. On another occasion, he produced his own mobile phone and showed Ms A fleeting glimpses of two images: one of a woman in a pink bra wearing a silver necklace, and another of a naked woman in a bath. Ms A emphasised that neither image was of her, as the necklace was indistinct and the woman's face was not visible. Despite this, the Former Officer continued to insist the images were hers, raising the allegation on more than one occasion. Ms A described feeling terrified, ashamed, and confused, explaining that his persistence made her feel as though she was "losing [her] mind." She believed he was deliberately trying to control her by undermining her confidence and making her reliant on his reassurance.

70. This account is supported by PC Shead's evidence. In her email, PC Shead recalled the Former Officer telling her that he had previously gone through his girlfriend's phone and seen text messages with her mechanic, and later claiming to have seen an image of her breasts on a student's phone. The Former Officer insisted he recognised her blue lace bra and distinctive necklace. PC Shead noted that the Former Officer became agitated when discussing how messages could be deleted or hidden, and repeatedly asked for technical advice on how to search an iPhone and WhatsApp for archived messages. She also described the Former Officer's intention to record the contents of Ms A's phone to "catch her out".

71. Ms A's account, alongside PC Shead's corroborating evidence, establishes a clear pattern in which the Former Officer accused her of sharing intimate images online or with others, despite the absence of proof. The Panel finds this allegation proved.

1.7. Attending MS A's place of work uninvited;

72. Ms A stated that following the breakdown of the relationship in March 2023, the Former Officer attended her place of work without invitation approximately a week later. As she was getting into her car, he ran towards her vehicle, prevented her from closing the door, and insisted on speaking to her. Ms A explained that she did not wish to engage with him, but he pressed her to "patch things up" and demanded the return of gifts he had given her during the relationship. She reported that he would not allow her to leave, physically holding the car door open against her attempts to close it.

73. CCTV footage from the workplace car park corroborates Ms A's account. The footage shows Ms A approaching her vehicle and getting inside. The Former Officer is then seen running towards the car, holding the door open after Ms A attempted to shut it, and positioning his body so that the door could not be closed. He is observed kneeling beside the vehicle, speaking to Ms A, before eventually walking away.

74. Ms A reported this incident to the Kent Police on the following day.

75. The Panel finds that the Former Officer attended Ms A's workplace uninvited, confronted her in the car park, and physically prevented her from leaving. The Panel finds this allegation proved.

1.8. Following MS A home;

76. Ms A described an incident in February 2023 when she finished a late shift at 2:20 a.m. She stated that after driving home and parking outside her house, the Former Officer suddenly pulled up directly behind her. When challenged, he claimed he was returning items she would need the following morning. Ms A told him not to come inside as her children were asleep and asked him to leave the items and go. During this exchange, he remarked that she had "left the car park like a bat out of hell," which revealed that he had been present at her workplace car park and had observed her departure. Ms A later reflected that his car had not been parked nearby, meaning he must have concealed his presence and then followed her home.

77. Ms C's evidence supports this account. She recalled that the Former Officer was persistently monitoring Ms A's movements, often demanding to know where she was, who she was with, and why she had not responded to his calls or messages. On one occasion, Ms C noted that the Former Officer questioned Ms A about the precise time she had finished work and why she had left the car park quickly, which indicated that he had been physically present and watching her. Ms C described this behaviour as controlling and observed that Ms A, once sociable and outward-looking, had become increasingly withdrawn under such scrutiny.

78. The Panel finds that the Former Officer deliberately concealed his presence at Ms A's workplace, followed her home in the early hours, and confronted her outside her house. His actions were intrusive, unwanted, and controlling, and they caused Ms A distress. The Panel finds this allegation proved.

1.9. Being verbally aggressive towards MS A

79. Ms A explained that following the breakdown of the relationship on 23 July 2023, she agreed to meet the Former Officer in a public café to discuss a holiday booking. She stated that from the outset of the meeting he was verbally aggressive. He accused her of promiscuity, insinuating that she was "sleeping around" and preferred married men, and suggested that their wives should be told. When challenged to provide proof, he claimed to have seen incriminating messages on her phone, asserting that he had accessed it without her consent. Ms A asked him to show her the alleged message and offered to apologise if it

existed. No such message was produced, and she confirmed that the individual he referred to was not even in her contacts. She described how he became increasingly animated, shouting further accusations of infidelity as he left her sitting in the café.

80. Ms C's evidence supports this account. She observed that Ms A, once an outward and sociable person, became withdrawn under the Former Officer's influence. Ms C described how he frequently telephoned or messaged Ms A when she was out, often quizzing her about her whereabouts and companions. She interpreted this behaviour as controlling and noted that Ms A was subjected to repeated insinuations and questioning, which undermined her confidence and wellbeing.

81. PC Shead's evidence further corroborates the pattern of behaviour. She recalled the Former Officer repeatedly referring to alleged messages between Ms A and her mechanic, insisting that she was hiding them, and becoming agitated when discussing how messages could be deleted or concealed. She described how the Former Officer sought technical advice on how to search an iPhone and WhatsApp for hidden or archived messages, and even spoke of recording the contents of Ms A's phone to "catch her out". This demonstrates the Former Officer's fixation on unfounded allegations of infidelity and his readiness to confront Ms A with them.

82. Ms A reported the incident in the café to the police a few days later.

83. The Panel finds that the Former Officer was verbally aggressive towards Ms A, making baseless accusations of infidelity, shouting at her in public, and subjecting her to repeated insinuations. The Panel finds this allegation proved.

Your behaviour had a serious effect on MS A

84. The Panel finds that the Former Officer's behaviour had a significant and damaging impact on Ms A. His repeated allegations of infidelity were unfounded, humiliating, and manipulative, forming part of a wider pattern of control. He made baseless accusations, shouted at her in public, and subjected her to repeated insinuations designed to undermine her confidence. His conduct was intimidating, degrading, and controlling, leaving Ms A distressed and fearful.

85. Ms A described how his actions were intrusive and unwanted, including accessing her phone without consent, confronting her at her workplace, and following her home late at night. These behaviours were manipulative and designed to humiliate her, reinforcing a pattern of control that eroded her independence. By creating tension, expressing disapproval of her social activities, and monitoring her interactions, he attempted to isolate her from her social network and limit her autonomy.

86. Ms C's evidence corroborates this impact. She observed that Ms A, once an outward and sociable person, became increasingly withdrawn during the relationship. Ms C described how the Former Officer constantly checked on Ms A's whereabouts, telephoned or messaged her when she was out, and quizzed her about her companions. She interpreted this behaviour as controlling and noted the visible change in Ms A's demeanour, from confident and sociable to anxious and withdrawn.

87. The Panel is satisfied that the Former Officer's behaviour had a serious effect on Ms A. His repeated verbal aggression, unfounded allegations, and controlling actions undermined her dignity, damaged her relationships, and caused her significant emotional distress. Overall, the Panel find in light of the incidents described in Allegation 1, the Former Officer's behaviour was controlling and coercive towards Ms A.

Allegation 2

88. **Between 31 July 2023 and 2 September 2023, being a member of the Metropolitan Police Service, whether on or off duty, you behaved towards MS A on two occasions or more in a manner that caused her alarm or distress. This behaviour included, but is not limited, to:**
89. **5.1. Sending MS A a number of letters;**
90. **5.2. Sending a letter to Aletta Shaw Solicitors;**
91. **5.3. Attending MS A's home address; and**
92. **5.4. Sitting outside MS A's home in your car.**

93. The Former Officer accepted that the incidents in 5.1 to 5.3 occurred but denied any breach of professional standards. He maintained that his actions were reasonable and undertaken in the context of recovering a debt, which he asserted would be secured against property as part of Ms A's divorce proceedings. He stated that he was unsure how his conduct could amount to a breach of standards, given that he believed he was acting lawfully in relation to money owed. He explained that he had hand-delivered information to Ms A's address as part of those proceedings.

94. The Panel does not accept this explanation. It found that the Former Officer's decision to write directly to Ms A's ex-husband's solicitor was menacing in tone and intent. The Panel concluded that this was not a legitimate attempt to recover a debt, but rather a deliberate act designed to cause Ms A distress.

95. The letter that the Former Officer dated 1 August 2023 did not exclusively deal with the alleged recovery of a debt, it included a further 2 pages about the relationship with Ms A which was not relevant.

96. The impact of this behaviour is supported by Ms C's evidence. Ms C, a long-standing friend of Ms A, observed that Ms A became increasingly withdrawn and distressed during the relationship, and described how the Former Officer's actions undermined her confidence and wellbeing. The Panel finds 5.1-5.3 proved.

97. In respect of allegation 5.4, the Panel finds that there is no evidence to substantiate the allegation. Accordingly, the Panel determines that allegation 5.4 is not proved.

Allegation 3

98. **On 3 November 2023, being a member of the Metropolitan Police Service, whether on duty or off, you repeatedly referred to a member of the public as a "cunt" in the presence of another member of the Metropolitan Police Service.**

99. The Former Officer admitted that he used the word "cunt" but denied that this amounted to a breach of professional standards. He argued that swearing was commonplace within police stations and suggested that if "the walls had ears" then many Officers would be subject to misconduct proceedings. He maintained that his use of the term was an expression of frustration, linked to his belief that allegations had been made against him to obstruct his attempts to recover a debt. He emphasised that the comment was made within the confines of a police station and that no member of the public was present or overheard it.

100. This behaviour was witnessed by PS Halsall, who provided a clear and credible account of the incident, including the Former Officer's demeanour at the time. His evidence demonstrated that the Former Officer's language was not only offensive but also reflective of his anger and lack of self-control.

101. The Panel does not accept the Former Officer's explanation. Police Officers are expected to conduct themselves in a respectful and professional manner, even in stressful circumstances. The use of such offensive language about a specific person in the presence of a colleague falls far below the standards of behaviour required and undermines the integrity of the service. The Panel finds this allegation proved.

Conclusion

102. The Panel has the benefit of Ms A's video recorded interview and found Ms A to be a clear, measured, and detailed witness. Her account was precise, for example in her description of the Former Officer showing her an image on his phone, including specific detail about the bra, the female figure, and the necklace. As noted previously, she did not seek to embellish her evidence but gave a straightforward account of events.

103. Her testimony was corroborated by other witnesses, police evidence, and documentary material. The Panel considered that Ms A had no reason to fabricate her account; in fact, by coming forward she exposed herself to scrutiny. Both Ms A and the supporting witnesses attended the hearing and were available for cross-examination.

104. By contrast, the Former Officer's version of events was provided only in interview. It was self-serving and unsupported by any independent evidence. The Former Officer did not attend the hearing and was not available for cross-examination. His non-attendance at the hearing meant the Panel was unable to clarify inconsistencies or obtain further explanation from him if required.

105. In light of the clear, corroborated evidence presented, and the absence of credible supporting material for the Former Officer's account, on the balance of probabilities, the Panel is satisfied that the allegations are proved.

106. **The Panel therefore find all allegations (except allegation 5.4) against the Former Officer proved.**

Breach of the Standards

107. In light of the above findings, the Panel concluded that the Former Officer's conduct engaged the Standards of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct and Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

Misconduct/Gross Misconduct

108. The Panel carefully considered the circumstances of the case, and the breaches found to assess whether the breaches amount to misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

109. Under the *Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings*, gross misconduct is defined as:

110. *"A breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious that dismissal would be justified."*

111. The Former Officer's conduct meets this threshold for the following reasons:

112. It was intentional, deliberate and targeted behaviour over a number of months towards Ms A.

113. It falls within types of misconduct to be considered especially serious in relation to harassment and violence against women and girls.

114. Emotional harm was caused to Ms A and the behaviour would significantly undermine confidence in policing generally and the reputation of the MPS more specifically.

115. For these reasons, the Panel is entirely satisfied that the misconduct is properly to be categorised as **gross misconduct**.

Decision on Outcome

116. The Panel reminded itself of the 3 stages to determining outcome; namely:-

(i) To assess the seriousness
(ii) Keep in mind the purpose of imposing the sanctions
(iii) Choose the sanction that most appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question

Stage 1: Assessment of Seriousness

Culpability

117. The Former Officer's culpability is assessed as high, based on the following factors:

118. Conduct that is intentional, deliberate, targeted or planned will generally be more culpable than conduct that has unintended consequences. The Former Officer's conduct was intentional, deliberate and targeted at Ms A over a number of months.

119. The Former Officer's behaviour involved conduct that should be considered especially serious

120. Misconduct involving violence, intimidation or sexual impropriety is serious and can significantly undermine public trust in the profession. This includes cases involving bullying or harassment which the Panel find the Former Officer's conduct to be.

121. The Former Officer's conduct involves violence against women and girls, which includes acts of abuse. This will always have a high degree of culpability, with the likely outcome being severe.

Assessment of Harm

122. The harm is assessed as high, based on the following reasons.

123. The Former Officer's conduct caused emotional harm to Ms A.

124. Ms A described feeling terrified, ashamed, and confused, explaining that his persistence made her feel as though she was "losing [her] mind."

125. Ms C observed that Ms A, once an outward and sociable person, became withdrawn under the Former Officer's influence.

126. There is legitimate concern about behaviour of this type by police officers. The Former Officer's behaviour would undoubtedly undermine public confidence and damage the reputation of policing

Aggravating factors

The Panel consider the following to be aggravating factors:

- The Former Officer continued with the behaviour after he should have realised that it was wrong

- There is significant national and local public concern about this type of conduct by male police officers. Policing has come under national scrutiny through high-profile cases where there has been a failing to prevent or protect women and girls from abuse and violence committed by those serving within the police service.

- Multiple proven allegations and breaches of standards

Mitigating factors

- There are no mitigating factors present in this case.

127. The Panel assessed the overall level of seriousness to be high.

Personal mitigation factors

- No previous misconduct findings

Stage 3: Appropriate sanction

128. The Panel have taken into account the personal mitigation. However, the Panel is mindful that the most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole.

129. The Panel have considered whether to impose a Final Written Warning. The issue here is that this case concerns two categories of misconduct which are identified in the Guidance as being especially serious, namely misconduct involving violence, intimidation and sexual impropriety, which includes bullying and harassment, and violence against women and girls.

130. The panel considered that a final written warning would fail to properly address the Former Officer's conduct which is deemed serious and involved multiple breaches of the standards of professional behaviour.

131. The panel considered the only outcome which would be appropriate in this case is that the Former Officer would have been dismissed without notice if he had still been a serving police Former Officer.

132. The panel orders publication pursuant to regulation 43 (6) of The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020.

Right of Appeal

133. In accordance with Regulation 43(2), the Appropriate Authority shall provide the Former Officer with a copy of this report and a notice of the right of appeal. The Former Officer is reminded he has a right to appeal to the Police Appeals Tribunal. ("PAT"). The PAT may increase or decrease any penalty or overturn this decision.

Commander Jason Prins – Chair

Mark Dent – Independent Panel Member

Amanda Harvey – Independent Panel Member

10th December 2025