

IN THE MATTER OF MISCONDUCT PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
REGULATIONS 2020.

B E T W E E N:

THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF POLICE
FOR GREATER MANCHESTER

Appropriate Authority

And

PC 19237 MOHAMMED ABID

Allegation

PC 19237 MOHAMMED ABID

In or around January 2023, whilst a police officer serving with Greater Manchester Police, you engaged in conversation with PC Y about her hair style, which she was wearing in braids. During the conversation about her hair, you insulted PC Y by commenting that her hair looked like a mop. You then smiled and walked away.

It is alleged that the conduct set out above constitutes a breach of the following Standards of Professional Behaviour:

a. Authority, Respect and Courtesy

Police officers act with self-control and tolerance, treating members of the public and colleagues with respect and courtesy.

Police officers do not abuse their powers or authority and respect the rights of all individuals.

b. Equality and Diversity

Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.

c. Discreditable Conduct

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 breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour are so serious as to justify your dismissal from Greater Manchester Police and, therefore, have been assessed as amounting to gross misconduct.

The Evidence – (In relation to PC Abid)

1. The evidence was put forward in a 552-page bundle.
2. The panel had the benefit of a Note dated 8th August 2026 (12th August 2026), which outlined how the AA put its case.
3. The panel considered the bundle in its entirety.
4. The AA called oral evidence from PC Y, PC Azam, PC Green, and PC Cooper-Fox.
5. Each of the Officers were called to give oral evidence.

PC Y

6. PC Y confirmed the contents of her statements dated 13th December 2023, 20th December 2023, 29th July 2024 and an undated statement which appears to have been made on 8th August 2025. (Contained at pages 58, 63, 67 and 71 of the Bundle). Those statements stood as evidence in chief within these proceedings. The 4 statements provided by PC Y provided the basis for the allegations against each Officer as outlined above.
7. PC Y was then cross examined by Mr Byrne on behalf of PC Abid. It was put to PC Y that PC Abid had made no comment about her hair, and that he had never said that her hair “looked like a mop”. PC Y stated that when PC Abid had made that comment to her, found it quite upsetting but considered that she might be being over-sensitive and so she had spoken to her sister about it. Mr. Byrne asked if her hair was untidy, ie looking like a mop. PC Y said that she did not believe that her hair was untidy. She acknowledged that she had not raised it at the time or challenged PC Abid’s behaviour. PC Y confirmed as per her statement that she had initially considered the comment to be “a bit weird – a bit odd” as she did not consider that her hair in any way looked like a mop.
8. PC Y confirmed that the alleged comment by PC Abid was a single incident, but said that her hair had been important to her and PC Abid had asked her about her hair previously. She felt like PC Abid had only come over to her to insult her and make people laugh. PC Y did not recall anybody else being present at the time, although there might have been people there.
9. PC Y was then cross examined about the statements that she made following her initial statement and why more detail had been provided in her latter statements. PC Y accepted that her memory would not have been as good when she made her later statements, but confirmed that she did recall the comment being made as it had “stayed with me”.

10. PC Y confirmed that the first time she had raised that issue was during her “stay interview” and that although she had worked with PC Abid, they had not always worked on the same shifts.

PC 19237 MOHAMMED ABID

11. It was alleged that in or around January 2023, PC Abid engaged in conversation with PC Y about her hair style, which she was wearing in braids, and PC Y by commenting that her hair looked like a mop.
12. The Officer denied using discriminatory behaviour towards PC Y. The Officer denied engaging in conversation with PC Y about her hairstyle and insulting PC Y by commenting that her hair looked like a mop, smiling and then walking away.
13. The Panel noted that the allegation in relation to PC Abid was based upon the evidence of PC Y alone. PC Abid had been consistent from the moment when the allegation was made to him that the comment regarding PC Y’s hair had not been made and that he had never stated that PC Y’s hair looked like a mop. The Panel therefore had to consider whether it preferred PC Y’s evidence or PC Abid’s evidence.
14. The Panel noted that PC Y had made a statement in relation to the comment and then had provided further context and detail in relation to the statement and the discussion about her hair in a later statement made almost a year after the alleged conversation had taken place.
15. The Panel found that in light of the consistency of PC Y’s evidence in relation to other matters and the Panel’s findings in that regard and the level of detail provided by PC Y in relation to the circumstances and context around the comment allegedly made by PC Abid, that it could rely upon the evidence of PC Y.
16. It was submitted on behalf of PC Abid that PC Y’s statements were inconsistent and did not provide sufficient evidence upon which the Panel could find that PC Abid had made the comment in relation to PC Y’s hair.
17. The Panel noted that PC Y had initially disclosed the conversation with PC Abid within her Stay interview on 1st November 2023.
18. The details of that conversation were outlined in PC Y’s first statement dated 13th December 2023, where she outlined that in January 2023 PC Abid who was not

within the D Relief Team, but in the E Relief Team, when he asked about how long it took for her to do braids in her hair. She described the conversation as very nice and chatty before PC Abid said that hair looked like a mop and smiled. She outlined that she had thought the comment “a bit weird” and had told her sister who had told her that she should have challenged the comment.

19. PC Y provided further detail about that conversation in her 4th statement which was provided in August 2025. That statement had clearly been prompted by the Professional Standards Department who had asked PC Y to provide more specific evidence and the context of her conversation with PC Abid.
20. PC Y had explained that she did not consider there to be much context to the conversation which would have explained why PC Abid said what he said. PC Y may have added extra information regarding the conversation during that statement, but that was what she had been asked to do. The Panel found that this was a perfectly appropriate form of investigation from the Professional Standards Department, and that the information provided by PC Y in her final statement did not materially change what she had alleged in her first statement in December 2023. The Panel found as a fact that PC Y’s statements were consistent with each other and that the material facts had not changed.
21. Further, it was submitted that the Panel should have consideration to the delay in the reporting of the conversation by PC Y. The Panel noted that PC Y had not chosen to report any of the behaviours which are the subject of these proceedings until she had been asked about general matters within her stay interview on 1st November 2023. However, the Panel again found that this did not mean that her evidence could not be relied upon.
22. As outlined previously, the Panel found PC Y to be a reliable, consistent and truthful witness. She had not chosen to embellish or exaggerate any of the allegations and had made the disclosures about the officers’ behaviour reluctantly and with the clear wish that none of the officers should lose their jobs over what she had alleged. In the circumstances, the Panel found no reason to disbelieve PC Y’s account of the conversation with PC Abid.
23. The Panel therefore found as a fact, on the balance of probabilities, that PC Abid had made the comment that PC Y’s hair “*looked like a mop*”.
24. The Panel found that by making that comment PC Abid had breached the Standards of Professional Behaviour in relation to Authority, Respect and Courtesy and Discreditable Conduct.

25. The Panel accepted PC Y's evidence that PC Abid had asked PC Y about her hair previously. The Panel found that the interest in PC Y's hair was related to the fact that her hairstyle was culturally significant to her and which she was sensitive about. The Panel found that PC Abid's comment would have been potentially offensive to any person, but in relation to PC Y, it concerned a protective characteristic relating to her ethnicity and race. As such the Panel considered PC Abid's comment to be a racist comment and therefore the comment breached the Professional Standard of Behaviour of Equality and Diversity.
26. The panel have not found that PC Abid's behaviour was a deliberate targeting of PC Y by reason of her race. The panel have found that the misconduct as found caused unintentional harm to PC Y, and that the harm caused was reasonably foreseeable had he considered his conduct.
27. In the circumstances the Panel found that PC Abid's comment represented gross misconduct.

Outcome

28. In determining Outcome, the panel have adopted the structured 3 stage approach outlined in the Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings.

The Purposes of Imposing Disciplinary Action

29. The panel reminds itself that the primary purpose of imposing disciplinary action is to protect the public confidence in the reputation of policing. When considering outcome, the panel must remember that the most important purpose of imposing disciplinary sanctions is to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the policing profession as a whole.
30. The panel understands its duty when imposing disciplinary action in police misconduct proceedings, to maintain high professional standards by demonstrating to other officers that misconduct of a certain kind and /or of certain seriousness will be dealt with by disciplinary action.
31. The panel must consider the appropriate sanction in the particular circumstances in each case.

32. The panel had regard to PC Y's wishes in relation to sanction when considering each officers outcome.
33. The panel also considered that there was clear local and national concern about racist or discriminatory behaviour within the Police Force, and that any race related misconduct whether intentional or not, would severely damage its reputation.

The Seriousness of the Misconduct

Culpability

34. The panel found that the officer was entirely culpable for his comment that PC Y's hair "*looked like a mop*". It was clearly targeted, deliberate and offensive.
- The panel have found that PC Abid had previously enquired about PC Y's hair
 - if he had not been aware of the cultural significance of his comment he should have been and should also have been aware that his comment was highly likely to cause offence.
 - It was insulting and highly personal in nature.
 - PC Y had stated that PC Abid had laughed after making the comment.
35. Accordingly, the panel found the officer's culpability to be high.

Harm

36. PC Y outlined in her statement (using her words):
- *"When PC ABID had previously asked questions about my hair other officers on my shift would have been present. I know this, as I know when it was just the two of us, he would not generally ask the direct questions or comment on my hair, and we would get along well. I think when he was in a group, he felt stronger, it felt like bullying."*
 - *this made me feel conscious of my hair.*
 - *The "Mop" comment stands out to me, as it was more personal than the direct questions he would ask about my hair, this comment felt like him insulting me, so it sticks in my mind.*
37. The panel found that the public trust in policing will have been damaged by the officer's words, which the panel found to be linked to PC Y's race, and that there will have been reputational damage.
38. The panel found that although the harm caused was not intentional, in this case it was foreseeable and highly likely.

Aggravating Features

39. The panel did not find any aggravating features in relation to PC Abid.

Mitigating Features

40. The panel accepted that PC Abid's comment represented a single incident.
41. The panel took account of the officer's service record during his time as a police constable and his previous good character

Personal Mitigation

42. The panel had regard to the character references put forward in the officer's behalf, in particular the comments provided by the referees Inspector Jones and PC Richardson.

Seriousness

43. The panel found, after considering the officer's culpability, the harm caused and the potential for harm, the mitigating features that the officer's misconduct was **very serious**.
44. As stated previously the panel had regard to the Purposes of Imposing Disciplinary Action in Police misconduct proceedings.

Appropriate Disciplinary Action in this Case

45. The panel considered the sanctions available to it. As it is required to do, the panel considered whether the lesser sanction put forward by Mr Byrne was appropriate in this case. In particular, the panel considered whether it could take a step back from the ultimate sanction not to dismiss in this case. The panel found that it could not.
46. It found that the most appropriate sanction in this case and that which reflected the evidence, the officer's culpability and the very serious nature of these findings, the panel had no alternative but to find that **dismissal without notice** was the most appropriate sanction.