

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

Former Police Constable Masood Meah

Decision of Sir Stephen Watson, Chief Constable

14th July 2026

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 Mr Masood Meah.
2. Mr Meah was not in attendance nor was he otherwise represented. Mr Meah, in his Regulation 54 response has accepted that his conduct was inappropriate and that it constituted a breach in the standards of professional behaviour. He does not accept that the misconduct in question amounts to gross misconduct.
3. In so far as my own assessment of the allegations set forth, I have determined that the allegations do amount to gross misconduct. Accordingly, I have found the breaches alleged proven and that the same relates to Orders and Instructions; and Discreditable Conduct.
4. 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 Hulley.

Outcome

5. 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 matter, had the former officer not resigned, would have been dismissal without notice.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. My approach has been to "adopt" the "3 stage approach" referred to in the College of Policing's Guidance:
9. I have assessed the seriousness of the conduct. It is a matter of fact that Mr Meah had, over a protracted period, actively 'followed' and submitted commentary and 'emojis,' across various social media platforms as relate to a known 3rd Party (female A). The former officer had first come into contact with female A in the course of his duties and was thus aware of the fact that she was the victim of domestic abuse. That female A was therefore particularly vulnerable is not in dispute.
10. The former officer had been confronted by (a personal friend of female A) and warned as to the inappropriate nature of the contact that he had sought to initiate at that juncture. Mr Meah, during the course of this conversation, denied that he had made the contact in question, sought to suggest that his daughter may have done so; and asserted that

he was a long-married man who would not conduct himself in the manner alleged. In short, I am clear that Mr Meah was in no doubt that such contact was entirely inappropriate and that he knew that such was entirely incompatible with his role as a constable. Despite this conversation, Mr Meah subsequently continued to engage with female A via various platforms. His conduct online included friend requests and responses to various posts by female A. Such responses included various emojis and commentary which can only be interpreted as intimately familiar and designed to flatter.

11. Notwithstanding the officer's denial of motive or intent, it is my clear determination, on the balance of probabilities, that the messaging was rendered grossly inappropriate given their character, which I conclude to have been designed to evince some form of emotional or sexual relationship with female A.
12. I consider that Mr Meah's culpability must be regarded as high. His conduct was persistent, unforced, and occurred over a protracted period of time. Mr Meah knew that given the acknowledged vulnerability of female A, that his conduct was reprehensible and morally indefensible, and contrary to the standards and values of the Force.
13. With regard to the aggravating factors set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, I have already pointed to the fact that the misconduct was deliberate and unforced. By definition, the breach clearly implies a significant deviation from that properly expected of a well conducted officer. I reiterate the point that I do find that the officer's conduct was substantially informed by his apparently seeking or encouraging some form of emotional or sexual relationship with a highly vulnerable person. I should be clear that even if a member of the public were found not to be especially vulnerable, the character and content of the messaging under consideration in this case; would equally be held to be wholly inappropriate.
14. It is also clear that this type of behaviour falls squarely into that which understandably concerns the public greatly in the light of contemporary failures of police standards, discipline, and behaviour.
15. In respect of harm, I refer to the potential harm to the reputation and standing of the service. If the full facts of this case were to be fully

understood by the general public, I consider that it would be inevitable that Mr Meah's conduct and actions would bring the profession into disrepute and damage the trust that the public have a right to expect of their police.

16. Additionally, female A was rendered substantially vulnerable and found herself in circumstances where the police were summoned to render legitimate assistance. The circumstances set forth in this hearing demonstrate that a breach of professional standards occurred which will have damaged female A's trust in the police. An abuse of the trust reposed in an officer; particularly when the same was apparently in pursuit of an emotional or sexual relationship with a vulnerable person is simply intolerable.
17. With regard to mitigating circumstances, as set out in the College of Policing's Guidance, I have taken into account Mr Meah's record of service. I note that the former officer expresses both remorse and claims insight. I have not however been persuaded that any mitigation exists that might mitigate the evidenced misconduct found.
18. 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 grave potential to substantially diminish public confidence. In conclusion, I consider that the level of seriousness in this case is very high.
19. Mr Meah's conduct in this matter clearly falls far below the behaviours and standards that the public have every right to expect. Notwithstanding the fact that the officer only partially accepted that he had misconducted himself, the fact remains that he has demonstrably breached the standards of professional behaviour.
20. I have come to the conclusion that the nature of this officer's misconduct is such that his ever continuing in the office of constable is entirely incompatible with the sustaining of public confidence in the integrity and professionalism of our officers.
21. I have accordingly determined that had Mr Meah not resigned, I would have dismissed him from the service with immediate effect.

22. I order that Mr Meah's name be added to the College of Policing's Barred List.
23. This concludes today's hearing.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Watson', with a stylized flourish above the name.

Sir Stephen Watson QPM
Chief Constable