



In the matter of the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020;

APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY FOR  
THE BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE

V

DC ANDREW CHAPMAN [2832]

[CASE REF CM/54/25]

---

**Regulation 43 Outcome Report**

---

**Location:** PSD Offices, Ivason House, 8A London Bridge Street, London, SE1 9SG

**Date:** 23<sup>rd</sup> March – 30<sup>th</sup> March 2026

**Legally Qualified Chair:** Maurice Cohen

**Independent Panel Member:** Iain Christie

**BTP Superintendent:** Sam Blackburn

**Outcome** Gross Misconduct

**Sanction:** Final Written Warning

**IN THE MATTER OF THE BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS  
2020**

**CONCERNING**

**APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY FOR THE BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE**

**v**

**DC ANDREW CHAPMAN [2832]**

**DECISION OF THE PANEL**

1. Maurice Cohen (Legally Qualified Chair), Superintendent Sam Blackburn (Assessor) and Mr Iain Christie (Independent Panel Member).

**INTRODUCTION**

2. The misconduct hearing for DC Chapman was held in public between 23-30 March 2026 at 8a London Bridge St, London SE1 9SG. A notice of this hearing was published in accordance with the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 ("the regulations").

**THE ALLEGATIONS**

3. The Panel was referred to a Regulation 30 notice in respect of the Officer containing the allegations and that his conduct amounted to gross misconduct. The allegations are as follows:

Being a police officer with British Transport Police, on dates between 2023 and 2025 you breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour set out in Schedule 2

to the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 by behaving inappropriately as particularised below.

### **Factual particulars**

#### **(1) Remarks to and about PC Caraher**

1. In September 2023 you asked for someone to take a witness statement from a sexual assault victim. PC Caraher was a new recruit and on his first operational shift. His tutor PC Kasparian volunteered to go with PC Caraher to the victim to give him practice in taking a statement. PC Caraher duly took the statement.
2. On his next shift on 23 September PC Caraher was asked to transcribe the statement online. While PC Kasparian was helping him with this you came into the room where there were a number of other officers and shouted at PC Caraher 'Where's the twin?' and words to the effect 'That statement wasn't in fucking English'. You then walked away laughing.
3. PC Caraher's twin brother also worked at the station.
4. PC Caraher was embarrassed by your remarks and considered your behaviour to be unpleasant.
5. PC Kasparian reported the incident to T/PS Sanders.

#### **(2) Remarks about a female police sergeant**

6. In March 2025 you were talking to PC Noto. PC Kasparian was also in the room. You criticised a female police sergeant's decision to make an urgent call for help. You mimicked her by saying 'Urgent assistance, urgent assistance' in a high-pitched voice.
7. PC Kasparian said to you that you should not be talking about the sergeant's decision to call for urgent assistance in that manner. You told him sternly and abruptly that 'This has nothing to do with you'.

(3) Remark to PC Kasparian in March 2025

8. About three days following the exchange you had with PC Kasparian about the female police sergeant you saw him in a corridor and said to him 'Oh the pantomime dame'.
9. PC Kasparian had been open about his sexuality and at the time you knew or believed that he was gay.
10. Your remark referred to his sexuality.

(4) Remarks to and about PC Kasparian in April 2025

11. On 8 April 2025 you heard PC Kasparian, PC Prince and T/PS Jenkins talking about the fact that it was National Pygmy Hippo Day. You said 'You would all be baby hippos'. You then said to PC Kasparian 'but you'd be a baby reindeer'. You left the room and when in the corridor said in a loud and high-pitched voice 'like it up the bum'.
12. This was a reference to the Netflix series of the same name ('Baby Reindeer') and to PC Kasparian's sexuality. The main character is nicknamed 'baby reindeer'. He is struggling with his sexuality and in the past has been raped by a male. At one point a female friend says to him 'I've never taken it up the chuffer, but I might make concessions for you'. 'Chuffer' is a slang word for anus.
13. You made these remarks in an area where a number of people could have heard you.
14. PC Kasparian felt targeted and embarrassed by your behaviour towards him in March and April 2025.
15. On the same day, 8 April 2025, PC Kasparian complained to the Police Standards Department alleging that your remarks had been homophobic.

(5) Email remark to all people based at Bournemouth and Southampton British Transport Police Station.

16. On 11 April 2025 the Station Support Officer sent an email to everyone in the station informing them that people had left dirty and smelly towels in the shower room and asking them to take their towels home.

You responded to all recipients of the email that '97% of them belonged to Matt Bevan, the other Jez Adlam, please make sure all your jabs are up to date'.

Mr Bevan and Mr Adlam were, or had been, police officers based at the station.

(6) Remark to PC Pope and T/PS Tenciu

17. In May 2025 you joined in a conversation which PC Pope and T/PS Tenciu were having about films. You said that you didn't watch films like 'Top Gun' as they were 'too homoerotic'.

18. At the time you knew or believed that T/PS Tenciu was a member of the LGBT community.

19. T/PS Tenciu felt the remark referred to his sexuality. It prompted him to leave the room.

(7) Behaviour towards PC Kasparian in July 2025

20. By July 2025 you knew that PC Kasparian had reported your alleged homophobic remarks and other alleged inappropriate behaviour towards him and other police officers to the Professional Standards Department.

21. On 8 July 2025 while walking in the corridor at the British Transport Police Station you saw PC Kasparian in the writing room and smirked at him.

**Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour**

22. The matters set out above breach the Standards of Professional Behaviour of:

- a) **Authority, Respect and Courtesy** in that you failed to act with self-control and tolerance and treat colleagues with respect and courtesy by:
  - i. making the remarks to PC Caraher, a new recruit, as set out in paragraph 2 ('Where's the twin?' and 'That statement wasn't in fucking English') which in substance and manner were offensive, unprofessional, embarrassing and demeaning.

- ii. making the remark about a female police sergeant, as set out in paragraph 6 (mimicking her by saying 'Urgent assistance, urgent assistance') which was offensive, unprofessional, demeaning and derogatory towards women.
- iii. making the remark to PC Kasparian, as set out in paragraph 7 ('This has nothing to do with you') which was unprofessional and dismissive.
- iv. making the remark to PC Kasparian, as set out in paragraph 8 ('Oh the pantomime dame') which was demeaning and homophobic.
- v. making the remarks to PC Kasparian, as set out in paragraph 11 ('You would all be baby hippos', 'you'd be a baby reindeer', 'like it up the bum') which were offensive, homophobic and embarrassing.
- vi. making a remark, as set out in paragraph 16, emailed to everyone in the station about police officers Bevan and Adlam ('please make sure all your jobs are up to date'). The remark was unprofessional, offensive and demeaning.
- vii. making a remark to PC Pope and T/PS Tenciu, as set out in paragraph 17 (that you didn't watch films like 'Top Gun' because they were 'too homoerotic'), which was homophobic and embarrassing.
- viii. making a facial expression (a smirk) directed at PC Kasparian, as set out in paragraph 21, which was unprofessional, demeaning and vindictive.

b) **Equality and diversity** in that by:

- i. making your remarks about a female police sergeant, as set out in paragraph 6, you failed to show respect towards women, in particular one of senior rank to you; and

- ii. making homophobic remarks about PC Kasparian, as set out in paragraphs 8 and 11, and a homophobic remark in the presence of T/PS Tenciu, as set out in paragraph 17, you failed to treat gay and/or LGBT people fairly, impartially and with respect.
- c) **Discreditable Conduct** in that your remarks and behaviour as set out above are capable of undermining public confidence in, and bringing discredit on, the British Transport Police.

And take notice that the matters above amount, individually and/or collectively, to gross misconduct and justify dismissal.

### **REPRESENTATION**

4. Counsel for the Appropriate Authority (AA) was Ms Cecily White and Ms Leila Gaskin represented DC Andrew Chapman.
5. The Panel thanks the representatives for their assistance throughout the case, including the provision of the AA's opening note and closing submissions on behalf of DC Chapman.

### **REGULATION 30 NOTICE**

6. On the first morning of the hearing the Regulation 30 Notice, as set out above, was read out by AA counsel and entered into evidence.
7. Ms Gaskin responded to the same relying on the regulation 31 notice responses, which made partial admissions to the allegations but denied that they amounted to a breach of the Regulations or misconduct or gross misconduct.

### **Preliminary applications**

8. The chair was asked to make several rulings in respect of the admissibility or otherwise of similar fact evidence which matters were determined prior to the commencement of the hearing.

9. On day 3 of the hearing, Ms Gaskin made an application to limit the extent of Ms White's cross-examination of DC Chapman in line with the chair's rulings and the similar fact evidence that had been admitted as evidence. The chair acceded to that submission and directed that Ms White's cross-examination be limited to the 2 aspects of similar fact evidence that had been entered into evidence and which was the core subject matter of the 15 page similar fact evidence bundle.
10. It was intended to call Former DS Knight to give evidence before the panel. The AA made significant efforts in order to make contact with DS Knight and arrange for him to give evidence for the panel but unfortunately those efforts were ultimately fruitless. In the light of the same, DS Knight's witness statement and electronic pocket notebook entry (ePNB) were admitted into evidence by the panel, but they determined that they would attach what weight was deemed fit to them in due course having considered the totality of the evidence.

## **Evidence**

11. Included in the AA's 80 page bundle were witness statements, Investigating Officer's report; ePNB's, DC Chapman's written account; further response from DC Chapman; email from DC Chapman and the Regulation 30 and 31 notices.
12. The Panel was additionally provided with a 15 page bundle of similar fact evidence (SFE) and a 32 page bundle of character evidence and evidence of courses undertaken.
13. The panel were additionally provided with an opening note on behalf of the Appropriate Authority (AA) and closing submissions on behalf of the subject officer.

## **Background**

14. DC Chapman is originally from the traveller community. He had a variety of jobs previously including working on funfair rides at Butlins and labouring. He was subsequently encouraged to undertake an access to university course and achieved an HND. DC Chapman's brother works for Thames Valley

Police and encouraged DC Chapman to pursue a career in the police service. He subsequently became a Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) and then joined the British Transport Police as a police officer on 1 June 2015.

15. The panel heard that over the course of his life including while serving in the police service, that DC Chapman experienced and observed discrimination directed towards the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities. He subsequently arranged for a branch of an association representing these communities to be founded within the BTP.
16. The evidence contained within the SFE bundle indicates that in June 2020, DC Chapman's performance was deemed unsatisfactory as a result of numerous reported matters. Those with which the panel were concerned were referring to an all-female crewed police car as being a "Bra Car" and referring to other inexperienced officers as being "wet behind the ears". DC Chapman's conduct was considered to have breached The College of Policing Code of Ethics in respect of Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Equality and Diversity. He was initially given a first warning written improvement notice. He appealed against this decision and based upon evidence provided and clear remorse for the 2 incidents, the notice was removed. He received a Management Action File Note and was encouraged to complete ethical dilemma training at the next opportunity. The panel learned that he did not subsequently undertake this training until he did similar self-learning in late 2025 and early 2026, shortly before this misconduct hearing.
17. The incidents being the subject matter of the allegations occurred between September 2023 and July 2025. The majority occurred in 2025.
18. In September 2023, PC Kasparian and PC Caraher who had only been on the job for 2 days at that juncture, had attended an alleged victim of a sexual assault in order to take a statement from her. The statement was handwritten and could not be found by DC Mahoney on the system. The statement was uploaded and it is stated by DC Chapman that within the confines of the CID office, that DC Mahoney was highly critical of the statement both as being

illegible and not being in compliance with recognised standards known as NO ELBOWS and ADVOKATE. DC Chapman states that DC Mahoney told his colleagues in CID that he had used the phrase, "is this even in English?" when speaking to PC Kasparian and PC Caraher.

19. DC Chapman indicates that he was subsequently assigned as OIC (officer in charge) of the case. On his way out of the office at the end of the shift, he popped his head into the writing room, where the PCs including PC Kasparian and PC Caraher were based. He indicated that he could not see the latter and called out, "where's the twin?" since PC Anthony Caraher was a non-identical twin of Oliver Caraher who was also undertaking police training and was to be based at Southampton. DC Chapman states that he could not see PC Caraher and the latter confirms this to be likely. DC Chapman then, as he was leaving the room, exclaimed words to the effect of, "is this statement even in English" or "that statement wasn't in fucking English". At this juncture, PC Caraher retorted, "why didn't you do it yourself then?" which DC Chapman indicated he was impressed with. He however observed that PC Kasparian appeared livid. He went off down the corridor laughing to himself.

20. When he got to the car, DC Chapman reflected on what had occurred and PC Kasparian's reaction and returned to the police station. He found PC Kasparian and PC Caraher in the office of PS Saunders, complaining about DC Chapman's behaviour. He apologised for offence caused and they were all invited to shake hands and conclude that the matter had been satisfactorily ended.

21. In March 2025, PC Kasparian alleges that DC Chapman was talking to PC Noto. During that conversation he is said to have mocked a female sergeant's decision to make an urgent call for help mimicking her by saying, "urgent assistance, urgent assistance" in a high-pitched voice. PC Kasparian challenged DC Chapman indicating that he should not be talking about the sergeant's decision to call for urgent assistance in that manner. DC Chapman is said to have responded that it had nothing to do with PC Kasparian. DC

Chapman denies making this comment. The panel found it extremely unfortunate that the AA did not seek to take a statement from PC Noto in respect of this allegation.

22. Also in March 2025, PC Kasparian alleges that DC Chapman saw him in the corridor and said to him, "Oh, the pantomime dame". PC Kasparian is gay and states that he has been open about his sexuality and that at the appropriate time DC Chapman knew or believed that he was gay and therefore that the comment was homophobic since it referred to his sexuality. DC Chapman denies this incident occurring. He states that he is a fan of the panto, which he attends with his family approximately 3 times per year and so frequently discusses it and may have mentioned pantomime dame in that context. Furthermore, he denies any knowledge of the fact that PC Kasparian was gay.
23. On 8 April 2025, PC Kasparian, PC Prince and T/PS Jenkins were discussing national pygmy hippo day/baby hippos. DC Chapman walked in on the conversation. He is alleged to have said, "you would all be baby hippos" but then addressing PC Kasparian, "but you'd be a baby reindeer". He left the room and is alleged to have said in the corridor in a loud and high-pitched voice, "like it up the bum". These are again said to be homophobic remarks towards PC Kasparian. DC Chapman states that he believed the officers were talking about baby animals and so he referred to Baby Reindeer, the TV programme. He indicates that his later reference to "up the bum" was a reference to/catchphrase from the programme which was misinterpreted.
24. On 11 April 2025, the station support officer, Paul Hylton (Station Support Officer), sent a jocular email to everyone in the police station inviting anyone who had a towel in the shower room to remove it as the room had gotten smelly. DC Chapman responded to everyone on the email indicating that, "97% of them belonged to Matt Bevan, the other Jez Adlam please make sure all your jabs are up to date". These officers no longer worked at the police station. Nonetheless, the remarks are said to be disrespectful.

25. In May 2025, DC Chapman again joined in a conversation, this time between PC Pope and T/PS Tenciu discussing Top Gun soon after the actor Val Kilmer had died. DC Chapman knew T/PS Tenciu to be gay. DC Chapman indicated that he didn't watch films like Top Gun as they were "too homoerotic". T/PS Tenciu is said to have been prompted to leave the room. DC Chapman indicates that his remark was a reference to the Quentin Tarantino rant in the film, Sleep With Me. He indicates that he had watched Top Gun and enjoyed it. His actions are again however said to be homophobic in nature.
26. Finally, following a complaint being made by PC Kasparian to the Professional Standards Department (PSD) following the Baby Reindeer incident, DC Chapman was placed on restricted duties on 19 May 2025. The restrictions stated that he would be deployed on non-public facing duties in a team and location that was not in the evidential chain. On 8 July 2025, DC Chapman entered BTP Southampton, where several of the witnesses including PC Kasparian were present. DC Chapman indicated that he had attended to collect his PIP 2 certificate having completed the course on 15 May 2025. PC Kasparian alleges that whilst leaving the station, he looked in to the writing room where he was located and smirked at him. DC Chapman denies this allegation.

### **Hearing**

27. The panel heard live evidence either in person or by video link from PC Kasparian, PC Caraher, T/PS Saunders, PC Prince, PS Tenciu, PC Pope and DC Chapman.
28. During the course of that evidence, PS Tenciu indicated that he had previously worked with DC Chapman in 2020 for a while. He had been open about his sexuality. There were 4 or 5 gay officers in Southampton Police Station. He had not taken offence at DC Chapman's Top Gun remark. He stated that PC Kasparian was open about his sexuality. He did not know if

everyone in the station was aware that PC Kasparian was gay or if DC Chapman knew.

29. PC Kasparian indicated that he could not be sure if DC Chapman knew that he was gay or not despite him being open about his sexuality from the time that he joined Southampton Police Station.

**Panel analysis**

30. In respect of PC Caraher, T/PS Saunders, PC Prince, PC Tenciu and PC Pope the Panel found them to be honest, open and frank witnesses who gave evidence to the best of their recollection and belief. If they did not know an answer or could not recall one, they said as much. It was not felt by the panel that any of them had an axe to grind against DC Chapman.

31. PC Kasparian was considered by the panel to be somewhat guarded. He appeared reluctant to stray beyond anything contained in his witness statement. He frequently referred to his witness statement in order to refresh his memory and what he had stated therein and then reiterated it before the panel. Whilst the panel had no cause to question his honesty, they considered that he was not as frank and open before them as they would have desired. Nonetheless, to his credit, he made a key admission, being that he conceded that it was possible that DC Chapman did not know that he was gay, despite the fact that when he joined Southampton he was open about his sexuality. The panel heard evidence from numerous witnesses concerning there being 2 distinct camps within the police station being CID on the one hand and uniformed officers on the other with there being limited occasions or desire for them to mix. DC Chapman on occasion attended the PC's writing room as it was where the printer was located.

32. Whilst the panel accepted much of DC Chapman's evidence, there were aspects of his evidence which it found to be incredible, implausible and did not accept. In particular, the panel rejected DC Chapman's claim that he did

not call PC Kasparian a pantomime dame. It did not accept that he would have been talking about pantomime dames in March. He had history with PC Kasparian. They were clearly very different characters. They had clashed in the past. The panel considered that it was likely, on the balance of probabilities, that DC Chapman made this remark and that he did so as a snipe at PC Kasparian due to his character and behaviour but not with any reference to his sexuality which the panel accept that he did not know.

33. In respect of the “Baby Reindeer” incident, the panel adopts similar reasoning. The panel finds that DC Chapman found PC Kasparian to be difficult, forthright and prickly. DC Chapman said that PC Kasparian had a tendency to interrupt people and that he would tell him not to interfere. The panel finds that DC Chapman entering a room where there was a discussion about pygmy hippos or baby hippos had no cause whatsoever to mention baby reindeer. There is no correlation between the animal being discussed and a television programme which does not relate to animals in any way. The panel find that DC Chapman, not infrequently, has a tendency to make jokes, possibly at other people’s expense, which he, of his own accord, finds hysterical but which in effect is misguided, misplaced, inadvisable and liable to cause offence. There is a pattern of him making such a remark followed by him rapidly exiting the room before the effects of the same can be determined. His comments to the panel that if anyone had taken offence that they could chase after him down the corridor was considered to be entirely unrealistic.
34. The tendency of DC Chapman to make provocative comments sometimes in order to get a reaction is confirmed in some of the witness statements which were produced as character evidence (T/DC Ewen Roberts and T/DC Philip James). The panel took into account the entirety of the character evidence, both those which attested to this characteristic and those which did not, as to propensity. To be fair to DC Chapman, many of these were of a positive nature and did not allude to this characteristic.

35. It was in the above circumstances, that DC Chapman is said to have made the remark to the others present, “you would all be baby hippos” and then singling out PC Kasparian, “but you’d be a baby reindeer”. The panel find that this was an opportunity to have a “dig” at PC Kasparian, not with any reference to his sexuality but again due to their history, clashes and huge disparity in personalities.
36. Following the above, the panel finds that DC Chapman, as he admits, left the room walking down the corridor calling out “up the bum” as a misguided reference to a very small part of Baby Reindeer and one in which he misquotes, “up the chuffer” but which would correlate to his “take away” from the programme an element which he found to be amusing. The panel note that the iteration “up the bum” is the version first quoted by PC Kasparian in his ePNB and this is corroborated by the account given by PC Jenkins. The panel was unable to determine why DC Chapman made this comment but does not find that this comment was directed at PC Kasparian or was related to his sexuality or was homophobic. The panel notes that the character in the programme who refers to taking it up the “chuffer” was female and straight in this regard.

## Findings

37. The panel reminded itself that the burden rests with the AA and the standard of proof is the civil standard being the balance of probabilities.
38. The panel has regard to its analysis above. With that in mind the panel turned to the allegations.

### Remarks to and about PC Caraher

39. DC Chapman admits calling out “where’s the twin?” and “is this even in English?” but denies swearing and any malign intent in doing so and denies any breach of the Regulations.
40. The panel, noting that DC Chapman had never met PC Caraher and called this remark out in a room full of people, was considered to be discourteous

and to show a lack of respect to the newly appointed officer who had been in post for just 2 days.

41. In respect of the “is this even in English” comment, the panel firstly finds that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that DC Chapman swore when making this statement as the only evidence of swearing emanates from PC Caraher and is not confirmed by PC Kasparian.
42. DC Chapman indicates that DC Mahoney had been critical of the work of both PC Caraher and PC Kasparian and that it was he who originally made this remark. In his evidence before the panel he indicated that he quoted this remark and that it was meant to be indicative of the fact that he now had been allocated the case and that he was to be of assistance to them and that they were not to worry. The panel rejected this claim. The panel considered that DC Chapman reiterated this quote from DC Mahoney since he found it to be amusing. He did so in order to belittle the 2 officers. He was being the opposite of supportive in making this remark in a room full of their colleagues. His behaviour in making the remark and immediately leaving the room and walking down the corridor was symptomatic of behaviour demonstrated by DC Chapman on other occasions of making an inappropriate, ill-advised remarks which was possibly amusing to himself as he was leaving the room in order to avoid facing any ill consequences.
43. The fact that DC Chapman subsequently realised that his behaviour and actions had been wrong, was demonstrated by the fact that he observed PC Kasparian who was “livid”.
44. The panel find that DC Chapman’s actions, found proved demonstrated a lack of respect and courtesy for his fellow officers. This is further underlined by the fact that both officers felt compelled to immediately attend T/PS Saunders office in order to make a complaint.

45. The panel find that DC Chapman's actions in going to the car, reflecting on his actions and behaviour and subsequently returning to the office where he found PC Caraher and PC Kasparian registering a complaint is taken as being indicative of the fact that, with hindsight, DC Chapman realised himself that his actions were wrong and inappropriate.

Remarks about a female police sergeant

46. As noted above, it is unfortunate that no statement was taken from PC Noto in respect of this incident. Furthermore, there was no evidence before the panel of a female sergeant having made any such urgent assistance call around the time claimed.

47. The panel found the evidence in respect of this claimed incident to be lacking and inconclusive. The allegation is written as if it occurred at the time, whereas the evidence before the panel appeared to suggest that it was retrospective.

48. The conversation is said to have been a private one occurring between DC Chapman and PC Noto and was merely overheard by PC Kasparian. The panel found that he may simply have misinterpreted what he heard.

49. The panel based upon the evidence before it, found the allegations concerning this incident to be not proved.

Remark to PC Kasparian in March 2025

50. The panel has regard to its analysis above. It notes the significant personality clash between DC Chapman and PC Kasparian. The panel noted that DC Chapman observed that PC Kasparian not infrequently had the habit of interjecting in other people's conversations and to be told in effect to "butt out". The panel rejected DC Chapman's excuse of enjoying the pantomime and frequently discussing it in the office and find this to be highly unlikely to have occurred in March. The panel find that DC Chapman did consider that PC Kasparian had a tendency to overreact, particularly to remarks made by

him and accepts the evidence of PC Kasparian that DC Chapman did indeed exclaim, "Oh the pantomime dame" with reference to him. As indicated above however, the panel does not accept that the comment was made in the knowledge that PC Kasparian was gay or that it was homophobic.

51. The panel find this action to be disrespectful and insulting.

Remarks to and about PC Kasparian in April 2025

52. The panel has regard to its analysis in respect of this allegation above and finds it to be proved for the reasons set out therein. The panel find that DC Chapman said "up the bum" rather than "like it up the bum".

53. Following its conclusions and reasoning above, the panel however does not find that the remarks were targeted at PC Kasparian in the knowledge that he was gay or that they were homophobic but that they were instead directed at him because DC Chapman considered him to be prickly, forthright and difficult and because there was a personality clash between them.

54. The panel find that DC Chapman's comments found proved in this allegation amount to bullying and were insulting and disrespectful.

Email remark to all people based at Bournemouth and Southampton British Transport Police Station.

55. The panel note the tone of the email initially sent by Paul Hylton was jocular in nature. DC Chapman responded in kind. The panel accept that he was merely indicating that the towels would have been festering in the shower room for several years since the officers who had most frequently used the shower had not worked at the station for a significant period of time. In these circumstances the reference to making "sure your jabs are up to date" is not taken by the panel as being an insult directed at the named officers and is not considered to be a breach of the regulations in any way.

Remark to PC Pope and T/PS Tenciu

56. The panel accept DC Chapman's evidence that his remark on not liking films like 'Top Gun' as they were 'too homoerotic' was a reference to the Quentin Tarantino rant in Sleep With Me. It accepts his evidence that he had watched the film previously and liked it. It further notes that neither T/PS Tenciu nor PC Pope were offended by the comment.

57. The panel observes that at this time, there appears to have been an atmosphere of rumour and gossip concerning DC Chapman in the office and find that it was in this atmosphere that the comment was "blown up" and for example got lost in translation at one point and turned into a reference to Brokeback Mountain.

58. The panel finds that the factual allegation found proved in this matter does not amount to any breach of the Regulations.

Behaviour towards PC Kasparian in July 2025

59. The panel accepts that DC Chapman had good cause to be in Southampton Police Station on this date in order to collect his certificate.

60. The panel note that DC Chapman was being escorted out of the building by DC Ryan Smith. There is no written statement from DC Smith to support this allegation.

61. The panel have been provided with a hand drawn image of the layout of the writing room produced in the hearing by PC Prince (GP2).

62. The panel find based on the layout of the room and the limited evidence provided in respect of this allegation that it is not proved.

### **Breaches of the regulations**

63. In respect of the allegations found proved relating to factual particulars 1-5; 8 and 11-15 the panel find that DC Chapman's actions individually and cumulatively breached the following standards of professional behaviour:

**Authority, Respect and Courtesy** in that DC Chapman failed to act with self-control and tolerance and treat colleagues with respect and courtesy.

**Discreditable Conduct** in that DC Chapman's remarks and behaviour as set out above are capable of undermining public confidence in, and bringing discredit on, the British Transport Police.

### **The Panel's Decision on Misconduct/Gross Misconduct**

64. The Panel next considered whether the allegations found proved amount to misconduct or gross misconduct.

65. In making this assessment, the Panel had regard to the College of Policing Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings (2023). Thus, the Panel assessed the seriousness of the proven conduct by analysing DC Chapman's culpability for that conduct and the harm caused by that conduct.

### **Culpability**

66. DC Chapman was entirely responsible for his own actions. There was no provocation causing him to act in the manner found proved.

67. The panel find that DC Chapman's actions were intentional, deliberate and targeted but not planned.

68. Whilst the Panel has not found DC Chapman's behaviour to be discriminatory based on sex or sexual orientation, his conduct has elements of bullying in

that he singled out younger, less experienced officers (in the case of PC Caraher only on his second day on duty), in order to embarrass or humiliate them in front of others. They were in a relative position of vulnerability compared to his status as a CID officer.

69. The potential harm caused by DC Chapman's actions was entirely foreseeable.

70. In light of the above, the panel find that culpability in this case is high.

### **Harm**

71. The panel find that actual harm in the form of emotional distress was caused to PC Kasparian by DC Chapman's actions found proved. It may well be that the offending comments were not made due to homophobia or in the knowledge that DC Kasparian was gay, but nonetheless that is how they were taken and upset was caused. This was sufficient to cause DC Kasparian and others to make complaints against DC Chapman on numerous occasions. A less robust officer than PC Caraher might well have concluded on his second day at work that if this is the way more experienced officers behave, police service was not for him. It is very bad role-modelling.

72. A further consequence of DC Chapman's actions is potential reputational harm.

73. The panel considers that the public would be disapproving if they learnt of DC Chapman's actions and behaviour. The public would be concerned to learn that a serving officer with the BTP was making such comments. In the light of other recent exposes of the way the police conduct themselves within the confines of a police station, there is a degree of national concern about such conduct.

74. In the light of the above, the panel find that DC Chapman's actions found proved caused a medium degree of harm.

75. In the light of the factors noted above, the panel finds that DC Chapman's actions and breaches of the code of conduct are of such seriousness that they could lead to his dismissal. They amount to gross misconduct.

## Appeal Notice

You have a right of appeal to the Appropriate Authority, but may only appeal on the following grounds:

- The finding or disciplinary sanction imposed was unreasonable;
- There is critical new evidence that could not have reasonably have been considered at the misconduct hearing; or
- There was a serious breach of the procedures set out in the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 or other unfairness which could have materially affected the finding or decision on disciplinary action

If you wish to appeal you must do so in writing to the British Transport Police Authority. Please email [btpa-enquiries@btp.police.uk](mailto:btpa-enquiries@btp.police.uk) within 10 working days of receipt of this letter. Your letter should state the grounds for appeal, whether you require a transcript of the hearing in whole or part and whether or not you consent to the appeal being dealt with without a hearing.

**In addition to the above, it is important you are aware that following the conclusion of this misconduct hearing which has resulted in a formal final written warning in accordance with the Authorised Professional Practice (APP) for Vetting section 8.50.1<sup>1</sup>, PSD will undertake a review of your vetting clearance. The vetting review will take into consideration your suitability to retain your level of vetting clearance relevant to the substantive role you undertake. The result of this process could result in no change to your existing clearance level or potentially the removal of the vetting clearance which in turn may impact on your continued ability to continue in your role with BTP.**