



Outcome

In the matter of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 and in the matter of

Police Constable Samir Khan

Decision of Sir Stephen Watson, Chief Constable

Tuesday 12th August 2025

Preliminary matters

1. I have today conducted an accelerated misconduct hearing at Unit A, GMP Force Headquarters, and have given consideration to various breaches of the standards of professional behaviour as pertain to PC Samir Khan.
2. PC Khan was in attendance and was represented by Mr Aftab Bakhat. PC Khan in his Reg 54 response does not accept that he has misconducted himself by accessing police systems without authority. Whilst admitting the unauthorised access to police systems, he maintains that he did so out of an urgent and genuine concern for the safety of his family. I, having heard the evidence however have determined that the breaches alleged namely; Honesty and Integrity; Orders and Instructions; Confidentiality; and Discreditable Conduct, are proven and that they do amount to gross misconduct.
3. In coming to a determination as to the most appropriate outcome, I have taken cognisance of the submissions of the appropriate authority as contained within the bundle of evidence submitted to me prior to this hearing, with elements of the same being amplified in invited verbal submissions by the representative of the appropriate authority, Ms Dzikira.

4. Mr Bakhat made a series of submissions on behalf of PC Khan. These submissions collectively sought to describe the broader context; namely a hostile culture replete with racism, which underpinned the officer's admitted misconduct in accessing police systems. PC Khan himself responded to various questions from the Chair in seeking to highlight those elements of the afore-described context which specifically justified, or underpinned his sense of being justified, his having accessed the relevant data.
5. In assessing the seriousness of the misconduct found, it is a matter of fact that PC Khan at 1406 hours on 11th August 2024, completed a PNC check in respect of a private motor vehicle which was the property of a serving GMP Police Inspector. The reason for the search on the PNC was entered as "moving vehicle". This input was a false representation of the grounds for the search. Notwithstanding the determination of the investigating officers not to pursue formal criminal proceedings; the admitted unauthorised access to police systems in this case amounts to a criminal offence contrary to the Sec 1 (1) and (3) of the Computer Misuse Act 1990.
6. The particulars of the index misconduct in this case reflect the actions of PC Khan who on the day in question (11th August 2024) was subject to a management intervention at around 1227 hours. This intervention amounted to a meeting with Insp Flores, PS Akhtar (PC Khan's Line Manager) and PC Khan. The meeting was designed to seek an explanation from PC Khan as to his whereabouts given PS Akhtar's earlier inability to trace the officer who should have been at work and completing designated duties. Following the meeting, PC Khan claimed to be feeling unwell and he booked himself off duty as he was unfit for work. The PNC check in question was subsequently conducted at a location some distance away from the police station at Bury.
7. I should make it clear that I consider that PS Akhtar was correct in escalating the issue of PC Khan's being unaccountably missing from the workplace. It follows that Insp Flores was similarly perfectly entitled to seek an account from PC Khan. Whilst I note the allegation of an inappropriate comment or threat being made toward the officer in the moments prior to the commencement of the meeting proper, I have to weigh the validity of the same with the fact that the officer admitted to perpetrating a series of untruths during the course of the meeting. I see no evidence to suggest that the meeting itself was conducted inappropriately. PC Khan's

explanations as to his movements on the day in question were, as he seems to have accepted in this hearing, entirely implausible and I would expect the circumstances to have given rise to further disciplinary investigation as was the case. I make the point that I have found the officer's own testimony in this hearing to be entirely unconvincing to the extent that he has, to my mind, damaged his own credibility irrecoverably. It is in the light of this evidenced impression that I approach PC Khan's broader narrative with a degree of scepticism.

Outcome

8. In considering the appropriate disciplinary action to be imposed, I received written and verbal submissions from the AA that the appropriate disciplinary outcome, in this case would be dismissal without notice together with his details being entered onto the College of Policing's Barred List.
9. Mr Bakhat has made verbal submissions to suggest that an alternative to dismissal would better reflect the full circumstances. These submissions are amplified in that recorded by PC Khan in his Regulation 54 response.
10. In determining the appropriate disciplinary action, I have had regard to the relevant provisions of the College of Policing's Guidance on Outcomes in Misconduct Proceedings. I do recognise that it does not automatically follow that where breaches of the code of conduct are found to be so serious as to justify dismissal, that dismissal can be the only sanction implied. Nevertheless, it remains very powerfully the case that the principal objective in the conduct of these hearings must be to preserve public confidence in the police service.
11. At the forefront of my mind has been the purpose of misconduct proceedings – these are expressly set out in the College of Policing's Guidance.
12. My approach has been to "adopt" the "3 stage approach" referred to in the same Guidance.
13. I have assessed the seriousness of the conduct. I consider that PC Khan's culpability must be regarded as very high. The nature of his admitted

misconduct is such that it constitutes a criminal offence. His actions were deliberate, persistent and carried out in the full knowledge that they were unlawful and contrary to the clearest of instructions.

14. Despite repeated and persistent questioning in this regard, I was unable to obtain from PC Khan a clear and specific explanation as to why he felt compelled to conduct the unauthorised check. Even if one were to accept PC Khan's general assertions at face value, which I do not, the conducting of a PNC check would not logically fulfil the purpose which PC Khan has broadly attempted to ascribe to the action namely; to eliminate the possibility that a serving GMP Inspector was somehow 'targeting' his family or to ascertain whether his personal data had been accessed.
15. I am entitled to draw a clear and negative inference from the fact that PC Khan; when initially interviewed by officers from the Professional Standards Department; chose to repeatedly answer 'no comment' to all of the questions posed. The narrative which the officer now seeks to advance has not hitherto been raised. This is a clear factor in undermining further the credibility of his account.
16. With regard to the aggravating factors set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, I repeat my comment that PC Khan's admitted misconduct amounts to the commission of a criminal offence. The officer's actions involved a deliberate breach of policy, procedure and instructions which make it abundantly clear that care and respect should always be afforded to information on police systems.
17. I cannot determine precisely what PC Khan's intentions were in accessing the data in question but the level of his obfuscation in seeking to justify the same leads me to assume that he had in mind a potentially malign purpose.
18. PC Khan, far from accepting his culpability, has sought to portray himself as a victim of racism and a toxic culture. He claims to be a whistleblower upon whom some form of inappropriate revenge is being sought. I find no substance in these assertions and reject the same as without foundation. PC Khan has made no protected disclosure; the evidence suggests that he has merely, and belatedly, lashed out at his supervisory officers and the wider organisation for properly taking him to task for shoddy personal performance. His attempting to duck a personal responsibility whilst seeking to blame others constitutes an aggravating feature in this matter.

19. In respect of harm, the harm to the reputation and standing of the service is self-evidently clearly established. Whilst not entirely of PC Khan's doing, it cannot be ignored that public concern surrounding the professional behaviour of police officers is demonstrably at a particularly heightened state at present. These concerns do not imply the application of a different standard of judgement, but they do weigh very heavily in seeking to calculate the point at which public confidence in policing is affected. I also note the anxiety and distress caused to the Inspector in this case in consequence of the intrusion into her personal data.
20. With regard to mitigating circumstances set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, I take into account PC Khan's record of service. Notwithstanding the officer's submissions, I am unable to find any compelling mitigation which goes to the heart of this matter.
21. I reiterate the point that the core purpose of these proceedings is to sustain public confidence in the police. There can be no doubt that the facts of this case have the grave potential to diminish public confidence in the police. In conclusion, I consider that the level of seriousness in this case must be very high.
22. PC Khan's offending behaviour was simply unacceptable. His accessing confidential police data is a tangible manifestation of a distinct lack of integrity, discipline and common sense which additionally point to him being manifestly unsuited to the office of constable. Despite his having so obviously misconducted himself, PC Khan's insistence that he accessed the relevant data for a compelling and genuine purpose does him no credit and flies in the face of the evidence considered by this hearing.
23. I have determined that PC Khan should be dismissed from the service with immediate effect.
24. I order that Mr Khan's name be added to the College of Policing's Barred List.
25. This concludes today's hearing.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'S. Watson', with several long, sweeping strokes above the name.

Sir Stephen Watson QPM
Chief Constable