



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

APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY FOR THE BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE

V

Special Police Constable Muhammad Farooq [5569]

CASE REF CM/77/25

Regulation 43 Outcome Report

Location:

British Transport Police Headquarters, 200 Buckingham Palace Road, London

Dates:

3rd – 5th August 2026

Legally Qualified Chair: Christopher McKay

Independent Panel Member: Lorna Beckford

BTP Superintendent: Detective Superintendent Sam Painter

Outcome: Gross Misconduct

Sanction: Dismissal Without Notice

BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE MISCONDUCT CASE
(Held under the British Transport Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 as amended)

NOTICE OF DECISION

DATES OF HEARING: 3RD, 4TH, 5th and 6TH August 2026.

OFFICER CONCERNED: Special Police Constable Farooq

CHAIR: Christopher Mckay

LAY MEMBER: Lorna Beckford

POLICE MEMBER: Detective Superintendent Sam Painter

1. ALLEGATIONS: see Regulation 30 Notice attached.

2. OUTCOME SUMMARY: Dismissal without notice.

3. BACKGROUND:

Special Constable Farooq joined the British Transport Police on 31st January 2021. On the 30th May 2025 two police officers from the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) attended at the home he shared with his wife, in South London. They attended following a phone call his wife had made to the police after a disagreement between her and SPC Farooq. She had alleged that the officer had taken possession of items belonging to her which she had packed in her car in preparation for a visit to see her parents over the Eid festival. She complained that her husband had 5 bags of her belongings that he had removed from her car. The bags included valuable gold jewellery which had been gifts from him and from family and friends to her. He also had her car keys and designer handbag. His wife was angry with him because he was stopping her leaving to see her parents. She alleged that this was not the first time that he had prevented her visiting family and friends. She said that he had prevented her seeing family and friends on previous occasions by taking her keys and shouting at her. She said he had threatened to make her life hell if she didn't obey him. PC Miah and PC Williams from the MPS spent an hour and a half with the couple trying to resolve the dispute. Eventually their patience ran out and they arrested SPC Farooq. The events which occurred on the 30th May 2025 form the basis for the 4 allegations against SPC Farooq in allegation 1, while the previous alleged behaviour of SPC Farooq towards his wife has resulted in the 3 sub-allegations in allegation 2.

4. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

At the pre-hearing on 9th July 2026 it was decided to anonymise the officer and the complainant to avoid them being identified. This was because the circumstances of the case involved their personal relationship when SPC Farooq was off duty. To preserve their anonymity ciphers will be used instead of their names in this determination. The complainant will be referred to as Witness A and the officer as Officer B. This anonymisation will be reviewed at the conclusion of the case. The Panel is aware of the desirability for the proceedings to be open and transparent where this can be achieved without causing undue harm to the participants.

5. FINDINGS OF FACT

In considering the allegations against Officer B the Panel bore in mind that the burden of proof was on the Appropriate Authority (AA) and the standard of proof was the balance of probability. This means that the Panel must be satisfied that it is more likely than not that an allegation is true before it can find it to be true. Prior to the hearing the Panel read the hearing bundle consisting of 119 pages. The Panel also viewed copies of the records contained in the body worn video cameras of PC Miah and PC Williams, which showed what happened when they attended at the home of Witness A and Officer B on 30th May 2025. The AA called no live witnesses but relied on the written evidence of Witness A, PC Miah and PC Williams. This was hearsay evidence and required the Panel to exercise caution when assessing its credibility. Because the Panel had not heard direct evidence from the AA's witnesses, it had been unable to see them being questioned, assess them or question them. In contrast Officer B had given oral evidence and the Panel had the opportunity to assess him. However, it should be pointed out that Officer B made a number of admissions to the allegations against him in his interview under caution at Sutton Police Station on 31st May 2025 and in his oral evidence to the Panel on 3rd August 2026. In considering the evidence of Officer B the Panel took account of the good character of the officer. The relevance of this was twofold, first, it supports his credibility when the Panel considers his written and oral evidence. Second, the fact he has no previous convictions or adverse disciplinary findings may mean it is less likely that he committed the misconduct alleged against him. It should be pointed out that Witness A made her first witness statement on 30 May 2025 upon which the allegations against Officer B are based. She subsequently withdrew that statement on 28 August 2025. In the second statement she explained that she did not wish to have any further involvement in the process. However, she stated that the account she provided in her first statement was factually correct. The Panel have decided to use the evidence provided in her first statement as evidence which they could rely on subject to it being treated with caution as it was hearsay. However, due to the significant admissions which Officer B made in his oral evidence, the evidence of Witness A was not vital evidence.

Allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c) and 1(d)

The Panel finds these are all proved. These allegations were contained in the witness statement of Witness A dated 30th May 2025. The Panel found this statement to be credible. The Panel saw Witness A confirm many of the details, which she set out in her subsequent statement, on the BWV recordings from the 30th May 2025. When the allegations were put to him at the start of the hearing, Officer B admitted 1(a) and made partial admissions to 1(b) and 1(c). However, he made clear admissions to all these allegations when he gave oral evidence in the hearing.

Allegation 2(a)

The Panel finds this allegation proved. The Panel accepts the evidence from Witness A in her written statement about this matter. In his oral evidence Officer B admitted withholding her keys to try and stop her running away from arguments.

Allegation 2(b)

The Panel finds this allegation proved. Witness A gave evidence in her written statement of 30th May 2025 about Officer B becoming agitated and confrontational when she wished to spend time with her family and friends. When the Panel viewed the BWV of PC Miah and PC Williams it was apparent that Officer B became agitated and was confrontational when he disagreed with the officers about issues

they raised with him. This provided confirmation of Officer B's inclination to respond in a confrontational way when challenged.

Allegation 2(c)

The Panel finds this allegation proved. Witness A referred to this in her written statement which the Panel has accepted as accurate. Most importantly, Officer B admitted saying this when giving oral evidence.

6. Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour.

Honesty and Integrity

The AA have not alleged that Officer B behaved dishonestly. The AA does allege that he acted with a lack of integrity in the way in which he acted in allegations 1(a) and 1(b).

The Panel applied the definition of Integrity as "doing the right thing". The Panel finds that Officer B did not do the right thing when he took possession of his wife's jewellery without her permission and then refused to return it when asked to do so. He explained that he had paid for it and didn't want her to sell it. However, the Panel is satisfied that the jewellery was an unconditional gift to his wife and was hers to deal with as she saw fit.

Discreditable Conduct

The definition of discreditable conduct in Schedule 2 of the regulations is that police officers behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty. The Panel finds that Officer B breached the Standard of Discreditable Conduct in his actions which have been found proved in relation to Allegations 1(c), 1(d), 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c). The Panel has decided that Officer B's actions set out in those allegations constituted controlling and coercive behaviour by him towards his wife, Witness A.

7. Misconduct/ Gross Misconduct

The Panel next considered whether the breaches of Standards of Professional Behaviour which it has found proved against Officer B constitute misconduct, gross misconduct or neither.

Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of behaviour which is so serious as to justify disciplinary action.

Gross Misconduct is defined as a breach of the Standards of Professional Behaviour that is so serious as to justify dismissal.

In deciding whether the breaches of Standards of Professional Behaviour are misconduct or gross misconduct or neither the Panel assessed the seriousness of the findings which the Panel have made. The Panel followed the guidance of Mr Justice Popplewell in the case of *Fuglers LLP v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2014] EWHC 179 (Admin). The Panel took into account the submissions of Ms Clarke for the AA and those of Officer B.

Culpability.

The Panel first considered the officer's culpability for the misconduct. The Panel decided that Officer B was solely responsible for what happened. It was not a momentary decision by him to take and retain his wife's jewellery. It took two police officers about an hour and a half to recover the gold from him. In the Panel's

judgement Officer B never admitted that Witness A was entitled to have the gold returned to her. His degree of culpability was high.

Harm.

The Panel finds that Witness A suffered some psychological distress when she found that her husband had accessed her car and removed her jewellery without her permission. Her level of distress is considered by the Panel to be moderate at that stage. However, the proven allegations also cover earlier abusive behaviour by Officer B towards his wife when he behaved in a controlling and coercive manner towards her. The Panel is satisfied that Witness A was adversely affected by the officer's abusive behaviour over a significant period of time and that this elevates the level of harm to high.

The Panel finds that the reputation of the police service has suffered harm. If members of the public knew what had happened in this case and about the attitude of Officer B towards his wife they would be concerned. To have a police officer working for the British Transport Police who had been proved to have behaved in a coercive and controlling manner towards their partner would cause grave concern. The public would wonder whether such an officer would approach dealing with a complaint by a member of the public who was a victim of similar behaviour with the appropriate objectivity and concern. Because of this the actions of Officer B were likely to undermine public trust and confidence in the police service.

Aggravating factors

The Panel finds the following aggravating factors:

- (i) The officer took deliberate action when he behaved in a controlling and coercive way towards his wife. The removal of the gold from her car and its subsequent retention were clearly deliberate acts by him.
- (ii) The officer behaved in an abusive way towards his wife. Abusive behaviour towards women and girls is considered to be a serious matter.
- (iii) There is national concern about violence or abuse towards women and girls.
- (iv) This case involves multiple proven allegations and breaches of Standards of Professional Behaviour.

Mitigating factors

There are no mitigating factors relating to the misconduct itself.

Conclusion on Misconduct/Gross Misconduct.

The Panel is satisfied on the balance of probability that the breaches of Standards of Professional Behaviour which it has found proven are so serious that they should be categorised as Gross Misconduct.

8. Outcome

The Panel has taken into account the Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings published by the College of Policing (the guidance). The Panel has been guided by the judgement of Mr Justice Popplewell in the case of Fuglers LLP referred to earlier in this decision. The Panel have already assessed the seriousness

of the conduct of the officer in relation to its consideration of whether the case is one of misconduct, gross misconduct or neither. The Panel repeats those conclusions in relation to outcome.

The Panel has borne in mind the purpose of police misconduct proceedings which is threefold:

1. To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service
2. To uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
3. To protect the public

Personal mitigation

The higher Courts have made it clear that personal mitigation has limited impact in misconduct proceedings. In the case of *R (on the application of the Chief Constable of Dorset) v The Police Appeals Tribunal and Mr Neil Salter (interested party)* [2011] EWHC 3366 (Admin), Lord Justice Maurice Kay said, "As to personal mitigation, just as an unexpectedly errant solicitor can usually refer to an unblemished past and the esteem of his colleagues, so will a police officer often be able to do so. However, because of importance of public confidence, the potential of such mitigation is necessarily limited." This is particularly the case where a lack of integrity has been found, according to the judgement in the case of *R (on the application of Williams) v Police Appeals Tribunal* [2016] EWHC 2708 (Admin).

The Panel have taken account of the personal mitigation advanced by Officer B. He experienced a family bereavement about 6 months prior to May 2025. The Panel accept that the loss of his mother would have impacted on his mental wellbeing but the inappropriate attitudes he displayed towards his wife cannot be explained by that loss. He behaved in a very disrespectful manner towards his wife over a period of time. In the Panel's judgement Officer B's actions have revealed an attitudinal problem in dealing with people who challenge him. He becomes verbally aggressive and dictatorial. This is confirmed by viewing the BWV from both officers who attended the incident. Officer B was very resistant to their suggestions that he should return the jewellery to his wife. In addition, Officer B volunteered the information on the BWV that his father-in-law referred to him as "Mugabe". This was a reference to the well-known African dictator. The attitude displayed by Officer B towards his wife, PC Williams and PC Miah was wholly inappropriate for a police officer.

Conclusion on Outcome.

The guidance says that the Panel should consider the least serious outcomes first. There are only two possible outcomes because the Panel have found gross misconduct established in this case. The Panel first considered a final written warning. The Panel decided that the aggravating factors in this case are particularly serious. Officer B behaved in an abusive way towards his wife and was reluctant to allow her to have her jewellery back even after the intervention of two police officers. She disclosed a history of inappropriate behaviour towards her by her husband. The Panel is satisfied that she was subject to controlling and coercive behaviour by Officer B over a period of time. Today he has expressed remorse, but the Panel is not satisfied that this remorse is genuine. When he made submissions to the Panel he appeared to still blame Witness A for what had happened.

In all the circumstances the Panel is satisfied that the only outcome which is proportionate to the seriousness of the misconduct in this case is dismissal without notice. This is the only outcome which fulfils the purpose of the proceedings.

9. Anonymity

At the conclusion of the case the Panel was invited by the AA to further consider the question of anonymity. At the start of the hearing both SPC Farooq and his wife were granted anonymity to protect their identities. This was because the allegations concerned personal matters between them, when SPC Farooq was off duty, which were at that time unproven. However, all the allegations have now been found proved and SPC Farooq's wife has agreed that her anonymity be revoked. Regulation 39(1) states that subject to paragraph 39(3) a misconduct hearing must be in public. Subsection (3) permits the chair to restrict publication of the proceedings as well as making other directions. The Home Office Guidance relating to Conduct, Efficiency and Effectiveness (2020) states that the presumption is that misconduct hearings must be held in public and open to the public and the media to attend. This is in keeping with a general principle that discipline proceedings should be as open, transparent and fair as possible for both the public and parties to the procedures. Anonymity is not specifically covered but the same principles apply. The allegations against SPC Farooq have been proved and his wife has agreed that her name can be published. Her name is Sabena Khan. In the Panel's judgement SPC Farooq's name should also be published. There is no good reason to continue his anonymity in the circumstances.

SIGNED:

CHAIR – Chris McKay

IPM – Lorna Beckford

POLICE REPRESENTATIVE – Detective Superintendent Sam Painter

Appendix: Regulation 30 Allegations

It is alleged that:

- (1) On the 30th of May 2025, you:
 - (a) deliberately took possession of jewellery that belonged to your wife, Sabina Khan, without her permission;
 - (b) refused to return that jewellery when she asked you to do so;
 - (c) stated that you would withhold her jewellery until she, “behaved positively”;
 - (d) deliberately took possession of her car key, preventing her from leaving your home address.
- (2) On a number of occasions before the 30th of May 2025, you:
 - (a) Prevented Ms. Khan from leaving your home address by withholding her keys;
 - (b) Would become agitated and confrontational when Ms. Khan indicated that she wished to spend time with her family and friends;
 - (c) Threatened to “make her life hell”, or words to that effect.

In behaving in the manner described at paragraph 1(a) and (b) above, you have breached the Standard of Professional Behaviour relating to Honesty and Integrity.

In behaving in the manner described at paragraphs 1(c) – (d) and (2), you have engaged in conduct which amounts to coercive and controlling behaviour. Such conduct breaches the Standard of Professional Behaviour relating to Discreditable Conduct.