



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

Former PC Forhan Ahmed

Decision of Chief Resources Officer Lee Rawlinson MBE

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 Former Police Constable Forhan Ahmed.
2. The Appropriate Authority is represented by Alastair Murray. The Former Officer was not in attendance and had not requested any representation in the hearing.
3. Former Officer Ahmed accepts that his conduct amounts to gross misconduct as indicated in his regulation 54 response he has also indicated that he does not intend to provide any documentation to this hearing.
4. The allegations put forward by the Appropriate Authority were read into the room but in summary pertain to the inappropriate contact of a domestic abuse victim by Former PC Ahmed for the pursuance of a romantic or sexual relationship and that this behaviour was unacceptable in that it constitutes discreditable conduct in that police officers should behave in a manner which does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty.
5. I, having considered the evidence, have determined it is appropriate for me to hear this case in that there are sufficient grounds, based on the evidence contained in the bundle and the further oral submissions that have been made, for me to determine whether the actions of Former PC Ahmed amount to gross misconduct.
6. The actions of Former PC Forhan Ahmed do indeed amount to gross misconduct in that I am satisfied that the AAs assertion that the former officer appears to be attempting to pursue a romantic or sexual relationship with a vulnerable victim of domestic violence. This behaviour is completely unacceptable and is at odds with The

college of policing Guidance on "maintaining a professional Boundary between police and members of the public", which clearly states that the professional relationship between a member of the police service and the public depends on trust and confidence. It is wholly unacceptable for police officers to contact victims of domestic violence in an inappropriate, unprofessional or unnecessary manner, given the inherent vulnerability of such individuals and the duty placed upon officers to protect, safeguard and maintain public confidence. His conduct represents a serious departure from the standards expected of a police officer.

7. In reaching this decision I have considered the evidence in full, and I note that Former PC Ahmed in his prepared statement claims he thought he was messaging a different person than the victim of Domestic abuse, Ms A, I find this to be a very unlikely scenario and the truth is more likely than not that Former PC Ahmed had purposefully contacted Ms A after meeting her during the concern for welfare incident.
8. Further, having considered the evidence submitted by Ms A in her statement of complaint Former PC Ahmed has indeed made the contact and comments alleged.
9. I again note that in his regulation 54 response Former Officer Ahmed accepts his behaviour amounts to gross misconduct.
10. It therefore follows that I am satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, the breaches of professional standards are proven in respect of the discreditable conduct and that the conduct of the officer amounts to gross misconduct due to the serious nature of the breaches.
11. In coming to a determination as to the most appropriate outcome, I have taken into account 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 provided in invited verbal submissions by the representative of the appropriate authority. I am unable to take into account any further submissions on behalf of the officer due to his decision not to engage with this hearing.

Outcome

12. In determining the appropriate outcome, I have had regard to the relevant provisions of the College of Policing's guidance on outcomes in misconduct hearings. 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.
13. I have also scrutinised and taken into account Former PC Ahmed's personal record.

14. 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.
15. 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.
16. My approach has been to "adopt" the "3 stage approach" also referred to in the College of Policing's Guidance.
17. I have assessed the seriousness of the conduct. I am satisfied that the seriousness in this case must be regarded as high
18. I consider that Former PC Ahmeds culpability was intentional and deliberate and that he targeted Ms A. Paragraph 4.10 of the guidance tells us that in cases where the Conduct was intentional, deliberate, targeted or planned will generally be regarded as more culpable than conduct that has unintended consequences.
19. The College of Policing Guidance at paragraph 4.14 and onwards refers to the types of misconduct that should be considered especially serious. This includes Violence, intimidation or sexual impropriety.
20. Under this section heading we read Paragraph 4.41 that tells us "this includes cases involving bullying or harassment, either in the police service or towards members of the public. Give attention to the degree of persistence, the vulnerability of the third party, the number of people subjected to the behaviour and whether the officer was in a specific position of authority or trust. More serious action is likely to be appropriate where the officer has demonstrated predatory behaviour motivated by a desire to establish a sexual or improper emotional relationship with a colleague or member of the public.
21. Paragraph 4.43 states that the presence of any of these factors is likely to increase the seriousness of the misconduct, although the treatment of a single individual can be sufficiently serious to amount to gross misconduct.
22. Paragraph 4.44 Abuse of position of trust or authority states that the nature of the office of constable means that all police officers are in a position of trust and authority in relation to members of the public. An officers misconduct will be more culpable where it involves an abuse of this position. The abuse of position for sexual purpose is a form of corruption defined as any behaviour by a police officer whether on or off duty that takes advantage of their position as a member of the police service to misuse their position, authority or powers in order to pursue a sexual or improper emotional relationship with any member of the public. Such conduct can cause substantial damage to public trust and confidence in the police and is particularly serious where the subject of the officer's behaviour is a vulnerable person.

23. Paragraph 4.49 of the guidance under the heading Misconduct involving a vulnerable person states, Many people come into contact with the police when they are at a particularly difficult or distressing point in their lives and they are entitled to be treated professionally.
24. Paragraph 4.50 states that Officers must not, under any circumstances, use their professional position to initiate or pursue a sexual or improper emotional relationship with a vulnerable person.
25. Paragraph 4.52 lists as factors that may give rise to vulnerability the line "experience of crime, including harassment or domestic abuse"
26. For the purpose of clarity I find that in this case the Former Police Officer Forhan Ahmed has indeed abused his position of authority and contacted a vulnerable victim of domestic abuse through intentional deliberate actions specifically targeting Ms A for the purpose of establishing a romantic or sexual relationship.
27. With regards to Harm there are two areas here that cause concern. Firstly, Ms A has suffered Harm from the actions of Former PC Ahmed in that she was distressed by his unwanted contact. Ms A has stated that she "felt uncomfortable and uneasy" that she was worried what would happen and she has stated she is now frightened to have a male officer at her address. I also note Ms A was so concerned she had to move herself and her children temporarily from her home for fear of Former PC Ahmed showing up at her house.
28. Secondly the significant harm to the police service and the effect on public confidence.
29. College guidance Paragraph 4.64 tells us of a number of ways harm can be caused including, Psychological distress and also reputational harm
30. Paragraph 4.66 states Harm will likely undermine public confidence in policing. Harm does not need to be suffered by a defined individual or group to undermine public confidence. Where an officer commits an act that would harm public confidence if the circumstances were known to the public take this into account. Always take misconduct seriously that undermines discipline and good order within the police service, even if it does not result in harm to individual victims.
31. At present there is heightened public awareness and concern over inappropriate behaviour of police officers particularly regarding cases such as this where officers could be seen to be abusing their position of trust and authority for sexual or emotional purposes. Whilst I do not claim the officer's actions are solely accountable for this nationally heightened concern they do indeed contribute to the public's concern for policing behaviour. Paragraph 4.70 of the guidance tells us we must consider this in our determinations. As such I regard the harm in this case as high.

32. With regards to the aggravating factors set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, there are a number of criteria that apply in this case that are listed from Paragraph 4.76 which states that factors that indicate a higher level of culpability and or harm include, Premeditation, planning, targeting or taking deliberate predatory steps. Malign intent such as sexual gratification, financial gain or personal advantage, abuse of trust, position, powers or authority. Continuing the behaviour after the officer realised or should have realised that it was improper (as evidenced by the request to conceal and delete the messages), and the vulnerability of the victim. All are relevant in this case.
33. As regards mitigating circumstances, of those set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, I have taken into account Former PC Forhan Ahmeds record of service and the evidence submitted in the bundle. With regard to Former PC Ahmeds prepared statement he claims that he messaged Ms A unintentionally and thought it was someone else. I find it highly improbable that this reasoning is likely and I feel the majority of a reasonably minded public would not accept the Former Officers version of events as true. As the officer has chosen not to engage with these proceedings I am unable to consider any further mitigations
34. I reiterate the point that the core purpose of these proceedings is to sustain public confidence in the police. As articulated above, there is no doubt that the facts of this case have the obvious potential to seriously and substantially diminish public confidence. In conclusion, again I therefore consider that the level of seriousness in this case is very high.
35. Former PC Forhan Ahmeds behaviour was clearly below the standards expected of a police officer. I am satisfied that the evidence presented clearly shows he has breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour and constitutes breaches of standards for discreditable conduct. He has actively sought out a vulnerable individual for his own personal gains. He has caused distress to Ms A and has potentially harmed the reputation of policing through his actions
36. I have considered all options in this case I do not feel that it would be appropriate or in the public interest for such behaviour to receive any sanction other than dismissal. Had Former PC Ahmed not resigned from policing I would have dismissed him with immediate effect. I order that Former PC Forhan Ahmeds name be added to the College of Policing's Barred List.
37. This concludes today's hearing.

22nd September 2026



Lee Rawlinson MBE
Chief Resources Officer