

**IN THE MATTER OF THE POLICE (CONDUCT) REGULATIONS 2020, AS AMENDED  
BY THE POLICE (CONDUCT) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2024**

**CONCERNING**

**Former Officer Daniel John**

---

**OUTCOME REPORT**

---

**Introduction**

The Misconduct Hearing for former Police Constable Daniel John (FPC John) was held in public from 22-25 June 2026 at 21 New Street, London EC2M 4TP. A notice of hearing was published in accordance with the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (the '2020 Regulations') as amended.

The Panel was chaired by Commander Umer Khan, with Independent Panel Members Ms Rachel O'Connell and Dr Nigel Westwood. The Legally Qualified Person acting as legal adviser to the Panel was Ms Alice Moller.

The Appropriate Authority (AA) was represented by Mr John-Paul Waite and FPC John was represented by Mr Jonas Milner. The former Officer was also supported by his Federation Representative Inspector Hannah Sydney.

A Regulation 30 Notice had been issued on 13 April 2026 under the 2020 Regulations. It was alleged that FPC John's actions had breached the professional standard related to Discreditable Conduct and that this amounted to Gross Misconduct.

The particulars of the AA's Allegation against FPC John were as follows:

1. *On 16.6.24 you arranged to meet (and met with) a woman (known as "Jasmin") at a hotel in Watford who you knew or ought to have known was a sex worker (namely a person who provided sexual services in return for the payment of money), with the purpose of acquiring her services as a sex worker.*
2. *On the same date you proceeded to have sexual relations with the woman in question in her capacity as a sex worker.*
3. *Your actions as set out in paragraphs 1 and/or 2 above was a serious breach of the following professional standard and therefore amounted to gross misconduct:*

### **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.

### **Regulation 31 Response**

1. In his Regulation 31 response, FPC John denied the allegations in the Regulation 30 notice and denied breaching the Standard of Professional Behaviour alleged. FPC John also denied Gross Misconduct in relation to the allegations in the Regulation 30 notice.
2. FPC John accepted that he had met a woman on 16 June 2024 at an hotel in Watford. He denied the allegation that he had knowingly met with a sex worker on 16 June 2024. DJ said that he did not know or suspect that the woman he met was, or may have been, a sex worker.
3. FPC John said that he and the woman who identified herself as 'Jasmin' spent some together in the bar of the hotel before he left the hotel and that he was

never alone in a room with this woman. FPC John stated that he did not, at any point, pay to have sex with, or have sex with the person he met.

## **Misconduct Hearing of FPC John held on 22-25 June 2026**

### **Background**

4. At times relevant to the Allegation, including 16 June 2024, FPC John was in a relationship with another police officer, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] ended the relationship on 24 July 2024.
5. On the evening of 24 July 2024 FPC John and his then partner [REDACTED] were staying at the home of [REDACTED] mother [REDACTED]. FPC John was sleeping in a spare room following an argument with [REDACTED]. He was woken in the middle of the night by shouts/commotion coming from [REDACTED] bedroom.
6. When he went to investigate, he discovered that [REDACTED] had been viewing messages on his smartphone without his permission. He saw [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] looking through his messages. He retrieved his phone and some, but not all, of his property before leaving the house.
7. It transpired that [REDACTED] had captured images using her smartphone of various messages on FPC John's smartphone. These images were provided to the AA by [REDACTED] and were included in the hearing bundle.

### **Evidence**

8. Before the hearing, the Panel was provided with, and considered, a 403-page evidence bundle. It was indexed and contained redactions agreed by both counsel.
9. Key documents included the following:
  - Images of FPC John's messages on his smartphone captured by [REDACTED] using her smartphone on 24 July 2024
  - Transcript of interview with FPC John conducted on 29 August 2024
  - Digital Exploitation Service Information Report dated 1 May 2025

- Statements from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], witnesses for the AA – July 2025
  - Statement of DC Curtis Downs dated 24 February 2026
  - Regulation 30 Notice dated 13 April 2026
  - Regulation 31 Response dated 13 May 2026
  - Testimonials and Service Record provided in June 2026.
10. Mr Waite identified in his opening note pages within the bundle that were relevant to the AA's case.
  11. Mr Milner provided a 14-page bundle of testimonials relevant to FPC John's good character.
  12. The AA called three witnesses known to FPC John to give oral evidence, namely [REDACTED] and DC Curtis Downs

13. [REDACTED] stated:

- "On 24th July 2024 at around 03:00hrs, I discovered Dan had been using prostitutes"
- "Dan had left his mobile phone next to my bed and I looked through it as I knew his passcode"
- "I took the phone to show my mum [REDACTED] who was sleeping in her room."
- "I have googled some of the numbers above and they are all linked to sex workers."

14. [REDACTED] stated;

- that she had said to FPC John "You can't deny you've been sleeping with prostitutes - I've seen the messages on your phone"
- "After a pause he admitted it was true and said "I'm sorry [REDACTED] yes"

15. DC Downs gave evidence related to enquiries based on data taken from/linked to the smartphone/number belonging to FPC John.

16. FPC John gave evidence and answered questions in cross-examination. He gave an account of events that was largely consistent with his Regulation 31 response.
17. FPC John denied the allegation in its entirety. He said he did not knowingly meet with a sex worker on 16 June 2024. He also said that he did not at any point pay to have sex with, or have sex with, the person he met.
18. FPC John also denied saying “I’m sorry, yes” in response to [REDACTED] alleged assertion to him that he had been sleeping with prostitutes. He added that [REDACTED] had said she would ‘destroy’ him as he left in the early morning of 24 July 2024.
19. He maintained that he had been searching on various platforms for someone to provide deep tissue massage to help manage his stress, which in turn would improve a skin condition. He was too embarrassed to go to high street massage services as these are often staffed by young attractive females. He stated that any reference to prices on his phone related to the cost of massage. FPC John explained that he had been unhappy in his relationship with [REDACTED] and had accessed Tinder, the dating app, for someone to ‘talk to’ and that it was through Tinder that he had met ‘Miss J’; FPC John said they met at the hotel for a ‘date’, talked for about 45 mins in the bar area, and he never saw her again. In his interview in August 2024 FPC John had identified the person he met as Jasmin, or Ms J, but in oral evidence he stated that he had made a mistake in interview and she had told him her name was ‘NJ’.

## **Submissions**

20. The Panel read and heard the submissions from Mr Waite and Mr Milner.
21. FPC John was unable to attend on Day 1 of the hearing, when the AA called its witnesses; there was no application to adjourn or delay proceedings. Mr Milner indicated that FPC John was content for the hearing to start in his absence, and that he would be attending to give evidence the following day.
22. In addition to his opening note, Mr Waite provided written submissions in relation to how the Panel should interpret the words in brackets at paragraph 1 of the

Allegation. Mr Milner also provided written submissions in relation to the interpretation of the Allegation.

23. There was no application to amend the Allegation by (either) counsel. However, Mr Milner reminded the Panel of the importance of FPC John being clear as to the scope of the Allegation against him before giving evidence. The Panel accepted this submission and, accordingly, before FPC John gave evidence the Chair announced: *'Counsel for the AA has asked questions based on you (former officer) making contact with a person known as Jasmin and the Panel will approach the fact finding on the basis that this name **is** pertinent to its decision.'*
24. Both counsel made detailed written and oral submissions on the facts.
25. The Panel's legal advisor gave advice as to the approach to be adopted, including:
  - The Panel is required to determine whether the facts alleged, or any of them, have been proved.
  - The burden of proving disputed facts is on the Appropriate Authority. The former Officer does not need to disprove anything in the Charge and is only obliged to answer specific allegations against him and no others: *Roomi v GMC [2009] EWHC 2188 (admin)*.
  - The standard of proof is the civil standard, the balance of probabilities. Where an event is inherently improbable, it may take better evidence to persuade a panel that it has happened. This goes to the quality of evidence: *Byrne v GMC [2021] EWHC 2237 (admin)*.
  - The Panel should consider all the evidence, including oral evidence in the context of documentary evidence, before drawing conclusions about credibility.
  - Clear reasons should be given if the evidence of one witness is preferred over that of another in relation to a central issue in dispute.
  - The panel should analyse the evidence fairly and impartially.
  - The panel may take account of conflicts in evidence between witnesses, denials or reasons why an allegation could not be true: *Khan v GMC [2021] EWHC 374 (admin)*.

- Although it does not provide a defence, good character is an important factor capable of assisting the former Officer in two ways: in relation to credibility and/or propensity.
- The panel must consider, separately, the evidence in relation to each allegation. If it finds one allegation proved, or not proved, it does not follow that the panel will reach the same conclusion in relation to other allegation/s. The panel must be satisfied that each element of an allegation has been made out before finding a specific allegation proved.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

26. The Panel accepted the legal advice it received; it accepted that the burden of proof is on the AA and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is the balance of probabilities.
27. The Panel had to determine whether FPC John arranged to meet (and met with) a woman (known as 'Jasmin') on 16 June 2024 at a hotel in Watford and that he knew, or ought to have known, 'Jasmin' was a sex worker (a person who provides sexual services in return for the payment of money) with the purpose of acquiring her services as a sex worker.
28. In its analysis, the Panel considered evidence from all witnesses for the AA as well as that from FPC John, in the context of relevant documents, images and submissions from both counsel, including as to the correct interpretation of Allegation paragraph 1.
29. The Panel did not give weight to the oral evidence of [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. There was no evidence of collusion between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], nor any other reason to doubt that each gave an account in accordance with their recollections.

[But the Panel was aware that one or both may have had a grievance against FPC John, which may have had an impact on their perceptions. Also, an honest witness may not always have a clear memory of events.] Although [REDACTED] said that she had elicited an "confession" from FPC John, in the presence of her daughter, that he had been using prostitutes, [REDACTED] did not say that she had heard

this “confession”. Therefore, uncorroborated evidence from [REDACTED] was not given weight by the Panel. Other assertions by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were not relevant to any central issue in dispute. [The fact that [REDACTED] and FPC John had broken up in late July 2024 was agreed.]

30. However, the photographs taken of messages on the smartphone of FPC John (exhibited by [REDACTED] were considered to be directly relevant to key issues in dispute. Their provenance was uncontested.
31. The Panel accepted the veracity of evidence from DC Downs. He made concessions during cross-examination, which the Panel took as an indication that DC Downs was endeavouring to give truthful and accurate evidence. However, the Panel was aware that DC Downs is not an expert witness in matters related to information technology, electronic devices, software or platforms providing “adult” content, such as escort services. The Panel, however, accepted the Digital Exploitation Information Report, which was not challenged and was authoritative.
32. In his Regulation 31 response dated 13 May 2026 FPC John consistently denied the allegation and reiterated his denials in oral evidence on 23 June 2026.
33. The AA accepted that FPC John was entitled to a full good character direction. The Panel took account of the fact that he is a former police officer, a profession requiring high levels of integrity, and he has no recorded history of wrongdoing. However, the Panel found important elements of his evidence to be implausible. In particular:
  34. The data linked to his smartphone wholly undermined his denial of Allegation paragraph 1. This is because of the inherently sexual nature of much of the data associated with his phone/number. His explanations as to the origin of much of the data were implausible.
  35. In view of the implausible nature of some assertions by FPC John, the Panel did not accept his evidence on key facts in dispute in relation to Allegation 1. Although he was acknowledged to be a person of good character, his account

was unsupported by other evidence, and the Panel concluded that much of his evidence was not credible.

### **Allegation 1 - proved**

36. The Panel found that 'Jasmin' using phone number ending '918' was a sex worker at relevant times. This assertion by the AA was not disputed by counsel for FPC John. A report conducted by the Digital Exploitation Service found reviews of sexual services provided by a woman using this mobile telephone number. The author of the report said:

*'I then undertook a standard internet search of the phone number and had the following results returned that appear to indicate a link to the provision of sexual services and links to both 'curvysweetone' and 'throat goat' handles.'*

37. The Panel considered whether FPC John knew, or ought to have known, that the woman identifying herself as Jasmin he met was a sex worker [as alleged and denied]. Taken as a whole, the Panel found that the photographic and other evidence undermined his claim that he wanted with a "date" in order to chat with "Jasmin," as opposed to obtaining sexual services. The messages between them were transactional and business-like in nature: FPC John received directions as to the time and place of the meeting from Jasmin, which was set by "Jasmin" at 15:30 at the Hilton Watford as she had a "deposit paid booking 2.30 1 hour".
38. Counsel for FPC John submitted that he has dyslexia but did not provide any clinical evidence of this condition. The Panel did not consider that the abrupt and transactional nature of FPC John's communications with "Jasmin" was (or could be) attributable to dyslexia.
39. In the context of meeting in the hotel in Watford, the natural inference – from abrupt, transactional messages, data retrieved from FPC John's phone and other evidence – is that "Jasmin" was offering sexual services for money. It is not credible that an experienced police officer would be oblivious of this.

40. The Panel found that the location of their meeting, being a hotel with bedrooms, rather than a café, bar, restaurant or other meeting place for non-sexual social interactions was more consistent with the provision of sexual services for money than a “first date”.
41. Messages indicate that the former officer was directed by Miss J to floor two, with room number to be provided by phone on his arrival. The Panel inferred that as FPC John did not question the location, his intention was to obtain sexual services in return for money and that the location for the encounter would be provided once the meeting had been confirmed on his arrival. The Panel determined on the balance of probabilities that the former Officer understood that “Jasmin” did not want to reveal the number of her hotel room in an electronic message because she was using the room to operate as a sex worker; telling him on the phone was more private.
42. In his interview, FPC John confirmed that he was aware that sex workers used hotels for work.
43. The Panel placed weight on FPC John’s interview in August 2025, when he alluded to an earlier paid ‘*deposit*’ in a message to him from Miss J on 16 June 2024. The context implies that Miss J was referring to an appointment for paid sex earlier that day and the Panel found that FPC John would be aware of this.
44. The Panel also took account of the wider context of the evidence submitted by the AA including the following:
- The presence in the contacts section of FPC John’s phone of individuals whose names or descriptions indicate that they were operating as sex workers.
  - The evidence that FPC John scrolled through and visited several webpages on the *AdultWork* website. He browsed several profiles, albeit briefly, which had no reference to massage.
  - FPC John had deleted his Tinder messages and WhatsApp messages and, in July 2024, he requested that Paypal delete all his data. The Panel inferred from these actions that FPC John was covering his tracks.

45. It was FPC John's evidence that he had visited "adult" websites in order to identify persons who provide "deep tissue massage" services in order to ameliorate a diagnosed skin condition. He said that he had chosen adult websites as he felt embarrassed by his skin condition and that high street massages services typically employed young and attractive females. The Panel, however, did not find it plausible that FPC John would be less embarrassed to receive massage services from a person advertising on adult websites than from a qualified masseur/se or health professional. Instead, the Panel inferred that FPC John was messaging sex workers with a view to obtaining their services as sex workers.
46. The fact that FPC John stored Jasmin's contact number with the heading '*curvy sweet one*' in a Samsung note also suggests that he was aware of her status as a sex worker.
47. When interviewed under caution FPC John was asked to clarify the identity of the person he met at the hotel on 16 June 2024. He replied: 'she told me her name was Jasmin' or 'Miss J', which could be an abbreviation for Jasmin.

## **Findings of Fact**

48. The Panel identified certain factors as highly pertinent, including:
- FPC John in a recorded interview in August 2024, following a caution stated that the person he met in the Watford Hilton on 16 June 2024 gave her name as Jasmin;
  - His Regulation 31 response did not refer to errors or mistakes having been made at that interview;
  - FPC John confirmed he met Miss J in a hotel (having been invited to her room), as opposed to a local bar or café, on 16 June 2024;

- At interview and in oral evidence FPC John admitted to '*cheating*', implying a sexual motivation for his actions. The Panel considered the word to indicate proposed infidelity;
  - FPC John's explanation for his actions in relation to seeking deep-tissue massages to assist with a skin condition was not plausible;
  - FPC John's deletion of data from his smartphone, including his PayPal account, indicated an intention to cover his tracks.
49. The Panel concluded, in all the circumstances, that it was more likely than not that FPC John arranged to meet and met a woman, known to him as Jasmin, at a hotel in Watford on 16 June 2024, whom he knew, or ought to have known, was a sex worker with the purpose of acquiring and paying for her services as a sex worker.
50. **Allegation 1 was found proved.**

Allegation 2 – not proved

51. The Panel then considered whether the AA had established that it was more likely than not that FPC John had "sexual relations" with Jasmin on 16 June 2024. It took account of the lack of any direct evidence, such as confirmation in messages, CCTV footage of entry to room, or a review by FPC John posted on Jasmin's web sites. The Panel was aware that '*sexual relations*' is not restricted solely to sexual intercourse and may connote other acts of a sexual nature.
52. The AA invited the Panel to infer from various messages and context that FPC John had had sexual relations with Jasmin as intended. However, the Panel concluded that the AA had not discharged the burden on it to demonstrate this allegation to the civil standard.

**Allegation 2 was found *not* proved.**

#### BREACH OF STANDARDS

**Allegation 3 – proved**

53. The Panel had to consider whether a serving police officer who had knowingly arranged to meet, and met with a sex worker, with the purpose of acquiring her services had breached the professional standard relating to Discreditable Conduct.

54. After considering the evidence and context, the Panel concluded that FPC John's actions as set out in paragraph 1 of the Allegation did breach that professional standard. This is because FPC John behaved in a manner that would undermine public confidence in the police and bring discredit the police service. One consequence of this could be to deter sex workers from reporting crimes against them, such as assault or trafficking, increasing the risk of physical or psychological harm to vulnerable people.

55. **Allegation 3 was found proved.**

#### MISCONDUCT

56. The Panel next determined whether the Discreditable Conduct found proved in this case constituted Misconduct or Gross Misconduct (or neither) taking account of submissions from both counsel. Misconduct is a breach of standards that is so serious that disciplinary action is required. Gross Misconduct is conduct which is so serious as to justify dismissal.

57. In assessing the level of seriousness of breaches of standards, the Panel adopted a structured approach, applying principles in *Fuglers LLP v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2014] EWHC 179.

## Culpability

58. The Panel assessed the level of culpability of FPC John to be high. FPC John was responsible for his actions, which were planned and acted upon, as indicated by his messages relating to his encounter with Jasmin on 16 June 2024.

## Harm

59. The actions of FPC John on 16 June 2024 would undermine public trust and confidence in police officers and could discourage complaints by victims of crime (or witnesses) to police.

## Aggravating Circumstances

60. The Panel considered FPC John's actions on 16 June 2024 to have been planned and deliberate. It also took account of the scale and depth of public concern about exploitation of sex workers.

## Mitigating Circumstances

61. The Panel took account of the fact that the AA's allegation relates to a single event and that no evidence was placed before the Panel of any other previous or subsequent instances of FPC John eliciting the services of sex workers.

## Conclusion on Misconduct

62. In all the circumstances, including the need to maintain public confidence in police, the Panel determined that the breach of the standard in this case is sufficiently serious to justify dismissal.
63. The Panel concluded that a finding of Gross Misconduct is required to protect members of the public, uphold standards and maintain public confidence in police officers.

## Outcome

### Submissions

64. Mr Waite submitted that there were two possible outcomes in respect of a former officer following a finding of gross misconduct: disciplinary action or no disciplinary action. He submitted that, given the Panel's findings on fact and misconduct, the Panel should find that FPC John would have been dismissed if he were still a serving Officer. This is required to protect the public, uphold standards and maintain public confidence in police officers.
65. Mr Milner submitted that a public finding of Gross Misconduct, held on record, may be sufficient to uphold standards, maintain confidence and protect the public. An outcome which precludes FPC John qualifying as a signaller, as intended / hoped, could be seen as disproportionate, given his significant efforts to train as such and the public requirement for such work.

### Legal Advice

66. The Panel's legal adviser advised that the Panel should take account of submissions by both counsel, in the context of the College of Policing's *Guidance on Outcomes* in police misconduct proceedings. Any deviation from principles in the *Guidance* should be justified: *GMC / PSA v Bramhall [2021] EWHC 2109*.
67. The Panel should take account of the reputational and financial consequences of a sanction, as well as the need to protect members of the public, uphold standards and maintain confidence in the police. Personal circumstances may be of limited relevance where the Panel is required to protect the public and uphold professional standards: *Green [2004] UKHL 6*.

The Panel should adopt a proportionate approach and consider the least restrictive option first. Where the panel finds that the conduct amounted to gross misconduct, it has only two options: disciplinary action or no disciplinary action. Where the finding is gross misconduct and disciplinary action is imposed, this can only be that the former officer would have been dismissed if still serving. No other sanctions can be enforced. If the finding is gross misconduct but the panel determines that dismissal is not justified, then no action will be taken and the gross misconduct will be recorded.

## Decision on Outcome

### Background

- 68. FPC John had a good service record, prior to this case. He submitted positive testimonials, in relation to character.
- 69. However, the Panel has found that a finding of gross misconduct is necessary to maintain public trust and confidence, uphold standards and protect the public.

### Analysis

- 70. FPC John accepted in cross-examination that 'using' a sex worker was likely to result in the loss of his job, indicating that he was aware that using the services of sex workers was incompatible with police work.
- 71. The Panel accepted submissions by the AA's that sex workers are vulnerable to abuse and exploitation and that they look to the police for protection from this. Even if the former Officer had not read the *Sex Work National Police Guidance* published in 2023 by the National Police Chief's Council, the Panel concluded that he knew at the material time that his conduct with was incompatible with his role as a police officer.

72. The Panel took account of FPC John's good service record and positive testimonials. It recognised the potential impact of an adverse finding on his employment, finances and reputation.
73. However, personal circumstances are likely to be of limited relevance where actions by a (then) serving officer are likely to undermine public confidence in the police. The seriousness of FPC John's actions is indicated by the Panel's determination that his actions on 16 June 2024 amounted to gross misconduct.
74. FPC John made no admissions and the Panel was not provided with any evidence of insight into catalysts for his actions, or the consequences, including damage to the reputation of the police service. An officer may demonstrate insight into the gravity of misconduct linked to sex work and potential consequences for those involved and public confidence in the police, even if the specific allegations were (or are) denied. However, FPC John did not do so.
75. In reaching a decision on outcome, the Panel took account of culpability, harm, aggravating and mitigating circumstances.

### **Culpability**

76. In all the circumstances, the Panel assessed the level of culpability of FPC John to be high. Former Officer DJ was responsible for his actions, which were planned and acted upon.

### **Harm**

77. Actions by FPC John on 16 June 2024 would undermine public trust and confidence in police officers and could discourage complaints by victims of crime (or witnesses) to the police.

### **Aggravating Circumstances**

78. The Panel found that FPC John's actions were planned and deliberate. It also took account of the scale and depth of public concern about exploitation of sex workers. In addition, the Panel took account of FPC John's lack of insight into the potential consequences of his actions and absence of any evidence of remediation.

### **Mitigating Circumstances**

79. The Panel was aware that the facts found proved by the Panel concerned a single course of action and took account of this.
80. The Panel started with the least restrictive outcome and adopted a proportionate approach, balancing the interests of FPC John with the need to protect the public, uphold standards and maintain confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service.
81. It was aware that an outcome is not intended to be punitive although it may have a punitive effect.
82. Taking account of all the evidence provided and the submissions of both counsel, the Panel determined that imposing no disciplinary action in respect of the gross misconduct found would not satisfy the need to maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of, the police service; uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct, *and to* protect the public.
- The Panel concluded that the appropriate and proportionate outcome was to find that FPC John would be dismissed if he were still a serving police officer.

### **Publication - Barred List**

83. The Panel decided that this Decision is to be published.

In addition, the Panel directed that FPC John's name should be included on the (College of Policing) Barred List.

### **Notification of Right of Appeal**

84. A police officer has a right of appeal against any disciplinary finding or disciplinary outcome at a police misconduct hearing.

FPC John has a right of appeal against this decision to the Police Appeals Tribunal.