



Summary of IOPC Conclusions

Operation Turton – 2020/138174	2
Operation Turton 2 – 2020/139739.....	23
Operation Gascoyne – 2020/137384, 2020/138858, 2021/149306	34

This report contains language which readers may find offensive.

Investigation name:	Operation Turton
IOPC reference:	2020/138174

Summary of IOPC conclusions

A summary of our conclusions and our rationale is set out below. For each allegation, we applied The College of Policing's (CoP) 'Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings', which states that when assessing the seriousness of misconduct, culpability and harm must be considered as well as any aggravating or mitigating factors.¹

> PC Jamie Lewis

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to show diligence in his duty to protect the inner cordon of a crime scene by taking 'selfie' style photographs of himself and the bodies of two murdered women at the scene of a murder (on his mobile phone).

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

2. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to show diligence by taking photos at a crime scene without a legitimate policing purpose.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

3. It is alleged that PC Lewis behaved in a manner, which could bring discredit on the police service or undermine public confidence in policing by taking 'selfie' style photographs at a high-profile murder scene where the bodies of two sisters remained.

This allegation was updated and covered in allegation nine

4. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to show diligence by sharing photographs from a crime scene of an ongoing murder investigation to others.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

5. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to treat photographic evidence from the scene of an ongoing murder investigation, showing two murdered sisters, with respect.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

6. It is alleged that PC Lewis disclosed/shared photographic evidence from the scene of an ongoing murder investigation to others without a valid policing purpose.

¹ All allegations for PC Jamie Lewis and PC Deniz Jaffer were dealt with via accelerated proceedings. This took place before we issued our decision maker document to the Appropriate Authority.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

7. It is alleged that PC Lewis acted dishonestly and without integrity by failing to notify the IOPC that he had taken his own photographs at the scene of the murder of two women.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

8. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to report the conduct of another officer after they disclosed photographs of the two deceased women and the crime scene to him via WhatsApp while at the scene.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

9. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to show diligence in his duty to protect the inner cordon of a crime scene and behaved in a manner which could bring discredit on the police service or undermine public confidence in policing by using the photo sent to him by PC Jaffer to create a 'selfie' style photograph of himself and the bodies of two murdered women at the scene of a murder (on his mobile phone).

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

10. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to show diligence in his duty to protect the inner cordon of a crime scene and behaving in a manner which could bring discredit on the police service or undermine public confidence in policing by subsequently sharing the created 'selfie' photograph, with PC Jaffer via WhatsApp.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

11. It is alleged that PC Lewis used disrespectful and derogatory language when referring to the female murder victims which would be deemed offensive by the public.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

12. It is alleged that PC Lewis behaved in a manner which could bring discredit to the police service or undermine public confidence in policing by using disrespectful and derogatory language when referring to the female victims.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

13. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to act diligently by entering the deposition area of a crime scene.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

14. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to act diligently, by compromising the crime scene and adversely impacting the evidential opportunities for an ongoing murder investigation by entering the deposition area within the inner cordon.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

15. It is alleged that PC Lewis demonstrated an acceptance of offensive and discriminatory language in a WhatsApp chat.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

16. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to take a proactive approach to opposing discrimination by agreeing with offensive and discriminatory language in a WhatsApp chat, specifically the racist term "*paki*".

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

17. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to demonstrate an attitude of respect and fairness, in line with his role as a police officer, when agreeing with a racist term used by a colleague.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

18. It is alleged that PC Lewis failed to challenge and report the conduct of a colleague who used a racist term.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

> Summary of rationale

Allegation 1:

PC Lewis admitted that he deliberately saved and then shared the 'selfie style' image of himself with the bodies of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry in the background with PC Jaffer for no policing purpose.

We reviewed the forensic evidence in relation to PC Lewis and believe the evidence clearly supports the admission made by PC Lewis that he created, using the App Snapchat, saved and sent a 'selfie style' image to PC Jaffer with the bodies of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry in the background. While he may not have 'taken' the photograph, the edited image presents itself as a 'selfie' with PC Lewis' face in the foreground, pulling an expression with his face contorted. The image in the background shows the bodies of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry and the condition in which they were left post-mortem by their killer.

The culpability for this conduct rests solely with PC Lewis and therefore he bears the responsibility for his actions. PC Lewis stated he did not intentionally create the selfie however his conduct following this, saving the image and showing/sharing with others suggests intentional or deliberate behaviour which denotes a higher degree of culpability.

We considered the scale and depth of national concern about the behaviour in question as evidenced by the public reaction. Importantly, there has been a high degree of harm and distress caused to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry's families and this cannot, in our view, be overstated. The grief caused by the murders themselves has been significantly compounded by the lack of respect shown to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry which, on any view and particularly in the view of the family, robbed them of their dignity in death. We considered that the creation of the selfie added an additional layer of degradation to the taking of the photographs.

We considered the serious psychological impact on the family of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry, and the deviation from instructions while in a position of trust protecting the scene of the murder and the potential for the conduct to amount to a criminal offence of Misconduct in a Public Office.

Allegation 2:

PC Lewis stated in his first criminal interview he was 95% certain that at no point had he taken any photographs himself of the Ms Smallman and Ms Henry's bodies. PC Lewis was asked about the '5%' and why he would not remember, to which he replied, *"Because I think if I did and I've said that I haven't then I would be lying to you, but I'm really confident that I didn't."* Contrary to his account, the forensic examination of PC Lewis' phone provides strong evidence that he did take two photographs of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry. The second photograph, taken at 5.10am, was within the deposition site and clearly showed Ms Smallman and Ms Henry and which remained on his personal phone up until the date of his arrest on 22 June 2020.

PC Lewis provided a prepared statement following his interview on 8 July 2020. He stated, *"I accept the images are on my phone but I've no memory of taking them"*. Given the circumstances of the incident, it is considered more likely than not that PC Lewis would have remembered whether or not he had taken photographs at the scene of a double murder and that his account of only being 95% certain that he did not is unlikely to be considered credible.

Allegation 3:

See allegation nine.

Allegation 4:

The initial anonymous allegation made regarding PC Lewis' conduct suggested he had taken a selfie photograph with the victims Ms Nicole Smallman and Ms Bibaa Henry in the background and showed the photographs to others.

PC Lewis admitted in interview on 22 June 2020 that he showed the photographs from the crime scene to at least one colleague; PC F in the yard of Forest Gate police station. He believed it was possible two further colleagues may have also seen the images as they were standing close by; PC A and PC B.

PC Lewis admitted creating the selfie style image with Ms Smallman and Ms Henry visible in the background and sharing this with PC Jaffer via WhatsApp. The digital evidence supports the account provided by PC Lewis in interview. There appears to be no policing purpose for sharing the edited selfie-style image with PC Jaffer. PC Lewis' only explanation was that it was to show PC Jaffer what had happened with the photograph. He stated it was a situation, *"...as in, oh shit like, I, look what this has just done and that's it"*.

PC A's account suggested PC Lewis was *"jovial"* as he showed her what was believed to be a selfie image. The evidence from both PC F and PC A suggests PC Lewis was proactively attempting to show the photographs taken at the murder crime scene including the selfie image which PC Lewis stated he created *"unintentionally"*.

The evidence that PC Lewis sent a message in another WhatsApp group which said, *"Got pics"* is also concerning. We have taken this to read that PC Lewis was informing the group he had pictures of the two victims and therefore was suggesting he could share them, and he had done this believing that one of the victims was a child. We have noted that when he is asked by a member in the group why he had pictures, there was no further text from PC

Lewis (and therefore there is no evidence with regard to whether he provided any explanation and, if he did, what that explanation was).

Allegation 5:

The SoPB 'confidentiality' states police officers should, *"..treat information with respect, and access it or disclose it only in the proper course of police duties."* At the time of his attendance at the scene and for several weeks thereafter, there was an active murder investigation underway and an outstanding suspect. PC Lewis was expected to act diligently as a police officer and treat photographic evidence from the scene of a live murder investigation, showing two murdered sisters, with respect. Instead, he created a selfie image with the victims in the background and shared this with others. One witness has stated he was *"jovial"* as he shared the photograph. When asked whether he had treated the photographs with respect, he stated he respected the situation and the selfie photograph was not sent with the intent to disrespect, it was the curiosity of the situation, but he also accepted, *"..but no, that's not respect"*.

The family of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry have stated the grief caused by the murders themselves has been significantly compounded by the lack of respect shown by the officers, which, on any view and particularly in the view of the family, robbed them of their dignity in death. The mother of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry referred to the traumatising nature of the photographs.

Allegation 6:

When asked in interview about this standard PC Lewis stated confidentiality was broken immediately once the photographs had been taken, regardless of the sharing of them.

PC Lewis admitted creating the selfie style image with Ms Smallman and Ms Henry visible in the background and sharing this with PC Jaffer via WhatsApp. The digital evidence supports the account provided by PC Lewis in interview. There appears to be no policing purpose for sharing the edited selfie-style image with PC Jaffer. PC Lewis' only explanation was that it was to show PC Jaffer what had happened with the photograph. He stated it was a situation *"...as in, oh shit like, I, look what this has just done and that's it"*. PC Lewis also admitted showing PC F the scene photographs. PC A has also confirmed that PC Lewis proactively showed her the selfie image.

Once an image has been shared there is no control of where that photograph may be shared further and this could have undermined the murder investigation if it had been released wider to the public (the IOPC and MPS approached members of the public who had received the images and ensured they were not retained or shared wider).

Allegation 7:

PC Lewis stated in his first criminal interview he was 95% certain that at no point had he taken any photographs himself of the Ms Smallman and Ms Henry's bodies. PC Lewis was asked about the '5%' and why he would not remember, to which he replied, *"Because I think if I did and I've said that I haven't then I would be lying to you, but I'm really confident that I didn't."* Contrary to his account in interview where he stated he was 95% certain he had not taken any photos of Ms Smallman or Ms Henry, the forensic examination of PC Lewis' phone provides strong evidence that he did take two photographs of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry.

Police officers are expected to be honest and act with integrity at all times. The forensic download strongly suggests PC Lewis had, in fact taken two photographs of deposition area; one of which clearly showed Ms Smallman and Ms Henry. When asked to account for this during his second interview PC Lewis declined to comment. His prepared statement

provided at the end of the interview stated, *"I accept the images are on my phone but I've no memory of taking them"*. Given the circumstances of the incident, it is considered more likely than not that PC Lewis would have remembered whether or not he had taken photographs at the scene of a double murder and that his account of only being 95% certain that he did not is unlikely to be considered credible.

Allegation 8:

Both officers have stated they felt they should have challenged or reported the actions of the other but did not do so. When asked, PC Lewis stated he felt he should have reported or challenged PC Jaffer's actions but being newer in service he felt unable to. The SoPB for police officers expects officers to *"...report, challenge or take action against the conduct of colleagues which has fallen below the Standards of Professional Behaviour."*

It is suggested PC Lewis may not have reported PC Jaffer's behaviour as he himself was actively seeking photographs of the victims and showing the photographs of the murder scene to others.

Allegation 9:

In order to achieve the photographs which appear to have been taken by PC Lewis, the evidence from MPS DI Green, is that PC Lewis would have had to have moved from the position he had been allocated to stand and go within the deposition site.

PC Lewis admitted in interview he had not been diligent in relation to his attendance at the crime scene. However, it is also significant, when considering whether PC Lewis may have entered the deposition site, that he acknowledged the officers should have just *"stood there"* and *"none of this would have happened"*.

Although PC Lewis stated that the selfie image was created by accident rather than deliberately, it is notable that the expression on PC Lewis' face appears to be a deliberate reaction to what is depicted in the scene behind him. In addition, PC Lewis has admitted subsequently saving this image to his phone which it suggests indicates that it was created deliberately or that having created it either deliberately or accidentally he made a deliberate decision to save it thereby retaining the image.

Allegation 10:

PC Lewis admitted creating the selfie style image with Ms Smallman and Ms Henry visible in the background and sharing this with PC Jaffer via WhatsApp. The digital evidence supports the account provided by PC Lewis in interview. There appears to be no policing purpose for sharing the edited selfie-style image with PC Jaffer. PC Lewis' only explanation was that it was to show PC Jaffer what had happened with the photograph. He stated it was a situation *"...as in, oh shit like, I, look what this has just done and that's it"*.

At the time of his attendance at the scene and for several weeks thereafter, there was an active murder investigation underway and an outstanding suspect. PC Lewis was expected to act diligently as a police officer and treat photographic evidence from the scene of a live murder investigation, showing two murdered sisters, with respect. Though it is accepted that he had no policing reason for creating the selfie and taking photographs at the scene himself.

Ms Henry and Ms Smallman's family have stated the grief caused by the murders themselves has been significantly compounded by the lack of respect shown to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry which robbed them of their dignity in death. The mother of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry referred to the traumatising nature of the photographs publicly in a media interview. Furthermore, the actions of PC Lewis in creating and sharing a 'selfie'

image with the victims in the background, while on duty protecting the integrity of a murder crime scene and sharing that image, are such that they have the potential to discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it.

Allegation 11:

The SoPB 'authority, respect and courtesy' expects police officers to ensure their behaviour and language could not reasonably be perceived to be offensive by the public or policing colleagues. The forensic evidence from PC Lewis' mobile phone showed at 3.54am on 8 June 2020 he referred to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry as "*dead birds*" in a WhatsApp chat (believed to contain many other officers). It is accepted that the use of language within a work group provides some indication that PC Lewis may not have viewed this language as offensive and/or discriminatory. However, in our opinion, in addition to this being a wholly inappropriate and disrespectful way to refer to murder victims, it is, in our opinion, also sexist and derogatory language and indicates that PC Lewis has a conscious bias against women.

Allegation 12:

The forensic evidence from PC Lewis' mobile phone showed at 3.54am on 8 June 2020 he referred to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry as "*dead birds*" in a WhatsApp chat.

In addition to this being a wholly inappropriate and disrespectful way to refer to murder victims, it is, in our opinion, also sexist and derogatory language and indicates that PC Lewis has a conscious bias against women. This use of language to describe two women who had been tragically murdered, has the potential to discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it.

Allegation 13:

The evidence of PS Marsh supports DI Green's evidence in that he states there were marked points 'A' to 'O' where cordon officers were placed. He confirmed the points were 'fixed points' and, "*...officers were expected not to move from the fixed points as they remained in each other's line of sight and created a 'barrier' to prevent any people or wildlife getting into the scene*". PS Marsh confirmed point 'A' was a distance of approximately 10 metres from the bodies of the victims.

He provides further evidence that points A and B were closest to the murder victims. He said, "*Sadly we needed officers positioned close to the bodies of the women to prevent wildlife interfering with the scene. These points were effectively within the inner cordon. There was a thick hedgerow where the women's bodies were positioned. It may have been possible to just about make out the bodies of the women from the fixed-point B. But this would have been tricky and you would need to know what you were looking at or leave that point. It would not have been possible to see the bodies from fixed Point A. If you wanted to see the bodies you would need to stray from fixed point A.*"

Based on the evidence above we concluded that, on the balance of probabilities that, contrary to his account that he did not, PC Lewis did move from his position and enter the deposition site in order to take the photograph of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry.

Allegation 14:

DI Green, of the murder investigation team, stated Ms Smallman and Ms Henry's bodies remained at the scene so a Home Office Pathologist could conduct a further examination of the bodies *in situ* "*so that forensic evidence was not lost or compromised*". In the prepared statement provided on 8 July 2020, PC Lewis stated at no time did he enter the deposition area of the crime scene and at no time was the integrity of the scene compromised. He

stated, when he arrived at the scene he was shown where Ms Smallman and Ms Henry's bodies were, and this was from about 15 feet away and not in the bush area. He stated, "*we remained on the grass area,*" and a forensic examination of his boots would corroborate that he went no closer.

PC Lewis was not wearing full Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) while on guard at the crime scene and DI Green stated as such any contamination of the scene could not be ruled out. DI Green explained, the search of the area was extensive and required specialist search teams with dogs trained to detect and follow blood and human scent trails as well as cadaver dogs. The teams searched the area for nearly four weeks. During the search, DI Green described how various routes were followed by the trails highlighted by the specialist dogs and led the investigation to a particular exit point in Valley Drive.

DI Green noted in hindsight, the investigating team were unable to exclude the trails being as a result of the officers stepping into an area without the required foot covering and transferring tracing of blood from their boots on to the path. She stated the investigation team knew that traces of blood were left by their suspect within the deposition site and immediately outside.

Allegation 15:

We have seen the evidence recovered from PC Lewis' phone which is unconnected to this incident but fell within the forensic examination window. This shows that he acknowledged with approval both a racist term and sentiment expressed by another police colleague during a discussion about finding a 'suitable' area to live. On 10 June 2020 in a WhatsApp conversation, the colleague (PC Harry Chandler, MPS) stated about a particular area, "*Plus no Pakis*", to which PC Lewis replied "*Exactly!!*". The inference being that, areas where people of Pakistani origin live are, for that reason, not suitable or desirable. PC Lewis has denied that he was agreeing with the term yet he failed to challenge or report his colleague's conduct and, in my view, we have taken this as clear evidence that PC Lewis has a conscious bias against members of the community he serves based on their race. We believe that, on the balance of probabilities, the appropriate authority is likely to take the same view of this evidence.

Allegation 16:

See allegation 15.

PC Lewis appeared to agree with a colleague's use of a racist term though he denied this. On 10 June 2020 as part of a conversation between PC Chandler and PC Lewis, there was a discussion about PC Chandler moving house. He discussed moving to the location where PC Lewis lived and states of the area "*Plus no pakis*". PC Lewis responds "*Exactly!!*" at 12.50pm on 10 June 2020. The evidence suggests PC Lewis' agreed with the racist term and the sentiment expressed by another police colleague during a discussion about finding a 'suitable' area to live. PC Lewis stated this was in reference to one individual and not a group. He also said he did not believe PC Chandler was racist.

Allegation 17:

See allegation 16.

The evidence suggests PC Lewis' agreed with the racist term and the sentiment expressed by another police colleague during a discussion about finding a 'suitable' area to live. The inference being that areas where people of Pakistani origin live are, for that reason, not suitable or desirable. PC Lewis is expected to take a proactive approach to opposing discrimination yet he failed to challenge or report his colleague's conduct. The evidence suggests PC Lewis has a conscious bias against members of the community he serves

based on their race and therefore failed to demonstrate an attitude of respect and fairness in line with his role as a police officer.

Allegation 18:

PC Lewis appeared to agree with a colleague's use of a racist term though he denies this. He also stated he did not believe PC Chandler was racist. On 10 June 2020 as part of a conversation between PC Harry Chandler and PC Lewis, there was a discussion about PC Chandler moving house. He discussed moving to the location where PC Lewis lived and states of the area "*Plus no pakis*". PC Lewis responds "*Exactly!!*" at 12.50pm on 10 June 2020. The evidence suggests PC Lewis' agreed with the racist term and the sentiment expressed by another police colleague during a discussion about finding a 'suitable' area to live.

PC Lewis is expected to report improper conduct and take a proactive approach to opposing discrimination yet he failed to challenge or report PC Chandler's use of a racist term and instead agreed with him. PC Lewis and his colleague both worked from Forest Gate police station, an area with a large South Asian population.

> PC Deniz Jaffer

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It is alleged that PC Jaffer failed to show diligence in his duty to protect the crime scene by taking photographs of the bodies of two murdered women at the scene of a murder (on his mobile phone).

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

2. It is alleged that PC Jaffer failed to show diligence by taking photos at a crime scene without a legitimate policing purpose.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

3. It is alleged that PC Jaffer behaved in a manner, which could bring discredit on the police service or undermine public confidence in policing by taking photographs at a high profile murder scene where the bodies of two deceased sisters remained.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

4. It is alleged that PC Jaffer failed to show diligence by sharing photographs from a crime scene of an ongoing murder investigation to others.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

5. It is alleged that PC Jaffer failed to treat photographic evidence from the scene of an ongoing murder investigation, showing two murdered sisters, with respect.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

6. It is alleged that PC Jaffer disclosed/shared photographic evidence from the scene of an ongoing murder investigation to others without a valid policing purpose.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

7. It is alleged that PC Jaffer failed to report the conduct of another officer after they disclosed to you a 'selfie' style photograph with the two deceased females in the background.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

8. It is alleged that PC Jaffer acted dishonestly by deleting images from his personal mobile phone which he was aware were evidence in an investigation, on 22 June 2020.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

9. It is alleged that PC Jaffer behaved in a manner which could bring discredit to the police service or undermine public confidence in policing by disclosing/sharing photographic evidence from the scene of a live murder investigation with members of the public, without a valid policing purpose.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

10. It is alleged that PC Jaffer acted dishonestly and without integrity by failing to notify the IOPC in interview of all the names of individuals who had been sent photographs of the murder scene.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

11. It is alleged that PC Jaffer disclosed/shared with a police officer a 'selfie' style photograph of a colleague with the two deceased females in the background, along with other crime scene photos, on 8 June 2020 for no valid policing purpose.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

12. It is alleged that PC Jaffer behaved in a manner, which could bring discredit on the police service or undermine public confidence in policing by sharing a colleague's 'selfie' style photograph with the two deceased females in the background.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

13. It is alleged that PC Jaffer used disrespectful and derogatory language when referring to the female murder victims which would be deemed offensive by the public.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

14. It is alleged that PC Jaffer behaved in a manner which could bring discredit to the police service or undermine public confidence in policing by using disrespectful and derogatory language when referring to the female victims.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

15. It is alleged that PC Jaffer stored police information and data on his personal mobile phone without a legitimate policing purpose.

We determined no case to answer

16. It is alleged that PC Jaffer failed to act diligently by entering the deposition area of a crime scene.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

17. It is alleged that PC Jaffer failed to act diligently, by compromising the crime scene and adversely impacting the evidential opportunities of a live murder investigation by entering the deposition area within the inner cordon.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

18. It is alleged that PC Jaffer used offensive and discriminatory language in a WhatsApp group chat, when referring to a group of Asian males, specifically using the racist term 'pakkis'.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

19. It is alleged that PC Jaffer failed to demonstrate an attitude of respect and fairness, in line with his role as a police officer, when using a racist term to describe a group of Asian males.

We determined a case to answer for gross misconduct

> Summary of rationale

Allegation 1:

PC Jaffer confirmed his role on 8 June 2020 was to ensure members of the public did not enter the area of the crime scene and to keep the scene preserved as much as possible. While at the scene PC Jaffer admitted taking photographs of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry's deceased bodies using his personal mobile phone and sending those images to PC Lewis. PC Jaffer stated that he had taken the images in order to, "*cover his arse*" in case anything was moved at the scene and because the bodies were not covered. He said he had no malicious intent in taking or sharing the images and it was not his intention to brag or make a joke about the images. PC Jaffer also confirmed in interview that he received the 'selfie style' image, showing PC Lewis' face with the murder victims in the background, via WhatsApp.

Police officers are expected to be diligent in the exercise of their duties. PC Jaffer stated in interview he believed he was diligent in complying with what he was supposed to do at the scene on 8 June 2020, but he accepted taking the photos was *not* "*...the greatest decision I made*". When asked whether the photographs had been taken for a policing purpose, PC Jaffer suggested it was to ensure the scene was preserved and nothing had been touched as well as for his own protection. However, PC Jaffer also confirmed he made no record of this in a police notebook and nor did he exhibit the photographs taken. Furthermore, PC Jaffer decided to share the photographs with members of the public as well as colleagues via WhatsApp and then went on to delete the images.

The evidence suggests PC Jaffer, while working to protect the integrity of the scene of a double murder has decided to leave his fixed-point post and take photographs of two murder victims. The evidence suggested PC Jaffer entered the deposition area within the hedgerow to get photographs of the victims. Though PC Jaffer stated "*...at no time did I approach the dead bodies closer than about twenty foot. I was not close to the bush area*

and I have not entered the deposition area at any time". When PC Jaffer was asked if he saw PC Lewis take any photographs he said he did not see PC Lewis "go in there". This choice of words; "go in there" is deemed significant, when considering whether PC Jaffer may have entered the deposition site himself.

In relation to this allegation, the types of harm being considered are reputational harm and psychological distress. We considered the scale and depth of national concern about the behaviour in question as evidenced by the public reaction.

Importantly there has been a high degree of harm and distress caused to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry's families and this cannot, in our view, be overstated. The grief caused by the murders themselves has been significantly compounded by the lack of respect shown to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry which, on any view and particularly in the view of the family, robbed them of their dignity in death.

Allegation 2:

In reviewing the forensic evidence in relation to PC Jaffer, the evidence shows that PC Jaffer took four photographs of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry and sent these images to PC Lewis. PC Jaffer's account is that these photographs were taken for a policing purpose in order to cover himself should there be any dispute about the movement of the bodies. However, there is no evidence that PC Jaffer raised this concern with senior (or other) colleagues and it is notable that he did not delete the images until 22 June 2020.

Police officers are expected to be diligent in the exercise of their duties. PC Jaffer stated in interview he believed he was diligent in complying with what he was supposed to do at the scene on 8 June 2020, but he accepted taking the photos was not "*...the greatest decision I made*". When asked whether the photographs had been taken for a policing purpose, PC Jaffer suggested it was to ensure the scene was preserved and nothing had been touched as well as for his own protection. However, PC Jaffer also confirmed he made no record of this in a police notebook and nor did he exhibit the photographs taken. Furthermore, PC Jaffer decided to share the photographs with members of the public as well as colleagues via WhatsApp and then went on to delete the images.

Allegation 3:

Police officers are expected to behave in a manner that does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty. PC Jaffer admitted to taking photographs at the scene of a double murder where the bodies of two deceased sisters remained and then sharing them with PC Lewis. He also received a selfie-style image from PC Lewis and sent this on to another colleague; PC D.

PC Jaffer was in a position of trust on 8 June 2020, guarding the scene and protecting the integrity of it. The evidence from DI Green suggests PC Jaffer would have had to enter the deposition site to take such photographs and this could have potentially affected the evidence at the scene. The implications of PC Jaffer's actions therefore have the potential to seriously undermine public confidence in policing.

Allegation 4:

Police officers are expected to be diligent in the exercise of their duties. PC Jaffer stated in interview he believed he was diligent in complying with what he was supposed to do at the scene on 8 June 2020, but he accepted taking the photos was *not* “...the greatest decision / made”. When asked whether the photographs had been taken for a policing purpose, PC Jaffer suggested it was to ensure the scene was preserved and nothing had been touched as well as for his own protection. However, PC Jaffer also confirmed he made no record of this in a police notebook and nor did he exhibit the photographs taken. Furthermore, PC Jaffer decided to share the photographs with members of the public as well as colleagues via WhatsApp and then went on to delete the images.

PC Jaffer admitted sending the images he had taken of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry to two friends, Ms C and Mr A. When asked to explain why he had sent the images to his friends, PC Jaffer said he wanted to show them what could happen as they are sometimes “...lax about safety” and they both had young children. This account offered by PC Jaffer is contrary to his account that he had taken the photographs to ensure the scene was preserved and nothing had been touched as well as for his own protection. It is therefore suggested there was no legitimate policing purpose for sharing the images which related to a live murder investigation.

We considered all the disclosures made by PC Jaffer and noted the forensic difficulties with obtaining evidence from PC Jaffer’s phone due to him proactively deleting content, but also noted that his disclosures have either been forensically captured on the recipient’s mobile phone or by a statement obtained from the recipient confirming the disclosure occurred.

Mr A provided a statement to the IOPC, which supports PC Jaffer’s admission in interview, in which he confirmed PC Jaffer had sent him an image of a dead body a couple of weeks to a month prior to 23 June 2020. He said from memory he believed it was one image of a body in a bush and he deleted it after receiving it. The IOPC viewed the photos in WhatsApp between PC Jaffer and Mr A and but did not locate any photographs of the victims.

Despite having the opportunity to inform the investigation team in interview of the totality of people he had shared the images with, PC Jaffer did not admit to sending the images to Mr B, nor did he mention that he offered to send the photos to the nine members of the group called ‘Covid Cunts’.

In his witness statement to the IOPC, Mr B confirmed PC Jaffer had sent him images of “two girls lying down on their side”. It is his evidence that he then forwarded these images onto his partner, Ms B, also a member of the public, and then deleted the images from his phone.

We noted that a witness statement was obtained from Ms C who was a member of the ‘Covid Cunts’ WhatsApp group. PC Jaffer’s WhatsApp chat with Ms C was not visible on his phone. However, Ms C provided a witness statement, which confirms PC Jaffer’s admission in interview, in which she states she received four (4) images from PC Jaffer on 8 June 2020. The IOPC investigator viewed the photographs on Ms C’s phone which showed they had been sent to her by PC Jaffer.

Based on the evidence above, it is our view that, on the balance of probabilities, PC Jaffer was proactively looking to share the photographs he had taken of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry with members of the public. There is no evidence this was for a policing purpose.

Allegation 5:

PC Jaffer admitted in interview that he had shared the images of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry with two members of the public via WhatsApp, namely Ms C and Mr A. The SoPB 'confidentiality' states police officers should, "...*treat information with respect, and access it or disclose it only in the proper course of police duties*". PC Jaffer stated he had shared the images with members of the public in his friendship group because they have children and he wanted to reinforce a message about personal safety.

At the time of his attendance at the scene and for several weeks thereafter, there was an active murder investigation underway and an outstanding suspect. Police officers are expected to treat the information they handle with respect, in line with the SoPB 'confidentiality' yet PC Jaffer decided to proactively and repeatedly share images of two murdered sisters with members of the public and referred to the victims as "*dead birds*".

PC D provided a statement to the IOPC in which she confirmed she received four images from PC Jaffer which showed the victims laying in the bush, one of which she believed was a selfie image showing PC Lewis' face. In interview on 22 June 2020, PC Jaffer recalled a discussion with PC Lewis and PC D about one of the victim's stomach and that potentially she had been pregnant. When questioned in interview about his reasons for sharing the images with PC D, PC Jaffer made no comment. There is no evidence therefore to suggest PC Jaffer shared the images with PC D for a policing purpose and instead the evidence suggests the officers were discussing the victim's body and whether she could have been pregnant at the time of her death.

Allegation 6:

We reviewed the forensic evidence in relation to PC Jaffer. The evidence shows that PC Jaffer took four photographs of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry and sent five images to PC Lewis. One of those images appeared to be a duplicate, therefore four unique images were sent by PC Jaffer to PC Lewis between 4.39am and 5.21am on 8 June 2020. PC Jaffer's account is that these photographs were taken for a policing purpose in order to cover himself should there be any dispute about the movement of the bodies. However, there is no evidence that PC Jaffer raised this concern with senior (or other) colleagues and, in our view, it is notable that he did not delete the images until 22 June 2020. In addition, his account does not credibly explain why it was necessary to share the photographs either with his colleagues or members of the public. We believe that, on the balance of probabilities the appropriate authority is likely to consider that PC Jaffer had no policing purpose in taking or sharing the photographs. If there is no evidence to support the account of PC Jaffer that the photographs were taken for a policing purpose, we believe that it is likely the motivation of PC Jaffer (and indeed PC Lewis) in taking the photos of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry was simply one of voyeurism.

Allegation 7:

When questioned on the selfie style image PC Jaffer received from PC Lewis, he stated he did not challenge or report the behaviour of PC Lewis. PC Jaffer felt his, "*silence said it all*".

He considered reporting the matter but did not. The SoPB for police officers expects officers to “...report, challenge or take action against the conduct of colleagues which has fallen below the Standards of Professional Behaviour.” On receiving the selfie-style photograph PC Jaffer said he “...didn’t think it was very funny”. The forensic evidence however showed that PC Jaffer sent the selfie style image on to another colleague; PC D, while at the crime scene. PC D’s witness statement confirmed this. PC Jaffer did not admit to this in his criminal interviews. When asked why PC Jaffer shared this selfie style image with a colleague if indeed he did not find it funny, PC Jaffer made no comment.

Allegation 8:

Police officers are expected to be honest and act with integrity at all times. In his interview on 22 June 2020 PC Jaffer admitted that he had deleted the images of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry’s bodies from his mobile phone on 22 June 2020, the day his colleague PC Lewis was arrested at work. He also stated he was aware of rumours that PC Lewis had been arrested.

PC Jaffer stated he may have inadvertently deleted messages from his mobile phone, “when swiping in delete mode”. He stated he did not have any intention to hamper any enquiry or pervert the course of justice. He said he, “...deleted some images purely as a routine clean up of the camera roll...”. He confirmed this also applied to any WhatsApp communication. PC Jaffer stated if he had wanted to pervert the course of justice, he would have deleted everything.

Allegation 9:

Police officers are expected to behave in a manner that does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty. PC Jaffer admitted to taking photographs at the scene of a double murder where the bodies of two deceased sisters remained and then sharing them with members of the public and a colleague.

The actions of PC Jaffer, in taking photographs of the victims while on duty protecting the integrity of a murder crime scene, are such that they have the potential to discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it. Furthermore, the repeated sharing of those images with members of the public without a valid policing purpose and sharing PC Lewis’ selfie image with a colleague could further undermine public confidence in policing.

We believe that, on the balance of probabilities, it is likely PC Jaffer had no policing purpose in taking or sharing the photographs. If there is no evidence to support the account of PC Jaffer that the photographs were taken for a policing purpose, we believe that, on the balance of probabilities, the motivation of PC Jaffer (and indeed PC Lewis) in taking the photos of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry was simply one of voyeurism.

Allegation 10:

Police officers are expected to be honest and act with integrity at all times. While PC Jaffer admitted to sending the photographs to PC Lewis and two friends, he did not tell the IOPC when asked that he had sent the images to a colleague; PC D. Nor did he disclose the ‘Covid Cunts’ group WhatsApp communication in which he offered to send the group photos of the victims. In addition, PC Jaffer did not disclose that another member of the public and friend Mr B had also been sent the photographs.

PC D provided a statement to the IOPC in which she confirmed she received four images from PC Jaffer which showed the victims laying in the bush, one of which she believed was a selfie image showing PC Lewis' face. In interview on 22 June 2020, PC Jaffer admitted he may have shown PC D the photographs on his phone but stated they were not sent to her.

PC Jaffer made no comment in his second interview about his reasons for failing to disclose the information.

Allegation 11:

The SoPB 'confidentiality' states police officers should "...*treat information with respect, and access it or disclose it only in the proper course of police duties*". The forensic evidence showed that on 8 June 2020, PC Jaffer sent three images of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry and the selfie image created by PC Lewis to PC D who was also on duty at the crime scene (four in total).

PC D provided a statement to the IOPC in which she confirmed she received four images from PC Jaffer which showed the victims laying in the bush, one of which she believed was a selfie image showing PC Lewis' face. In interview on 22 June 2020 PC Jaffer admitted he may have shown PC D the photographs on his phone but stated they were not sent to her.

Allegation 12:

The forensic evidence from PC Lewis' mobile phone showed at 3.54am on 8 June 2020 he referred to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry as "*dead birds*" in a WhatsApp chat.

In addition to this being a wholly inappropriate and disrespectful way to refer to murder victims, it is, in our opinion, also sexist and derogatory language and indicates that PC Lewis has a conscious bias against women. This use of language to describe two women who had been tragically murdered, has the potential to discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it, once made public.

Police officers are expected to behave in a manner that does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty. PC Jaffer admitted to taking photographs at the scene of a double murder where the bodies of two deceased sisters remained and then sharing them with PC Lewis. He also received a selfie-style image from PC Lewis and sent this on to another colleague; PC D.

The actions of PC Jaffer, in taking photographs of the victims while on duty protecting the integrity of a murder crime scene, are such that they have the potential to discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it. Furthermore, the repeated sharing of those images with members of the public without a valid policing purpose and sharing PC Lewis' selfie image with a colleague could further undermine public confidence in policing.

The high degree of harm and distress caused to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry's families cannot, in my view, be overstated. The grief caused by the murders themselves has been significantly compounded by the lack of respect shown to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry which, on any view and particularly in the view of the family, robbed them of their dignity in death.

Allegation 13:

At 3.55am on 8 June 2020, mobile phone data from PC Jaffer's phone confirms he initiated a conversation with a group called 'Covid Cunts' stating, *"I'm here now, will try to take pictures of the two dead birds...."* The SoPB 'authority, respect and courtesy' expects police officers to ensure their behaviour and language could not reasonably be perceived to be offensive by the public or policing colleagues. PC Jaffer referred to Ms Smallman and Ms Henry as *"dead birds."* In addition to this being a wholly inappropriate and disrespectful way to refer to murder victims, it is, in our opinion, also sexist and derogatory language and indicates that PC Jaffer has a conscious bias against women.

Allegation 14:

See allegation thirteen.

The SoPB 'discreditable conduct' expects officers to behave in a manner that does not discredit the police service or undermine public confidence in it, whether on or off duty. Referring to the two women, who had been tragically murdered, as *"dead birds"* has the potential to discredit the police service and undermine public confidence in it.

Allegation 15:

In PC Jaffer's initial interview, he referred to using his personal mobile phone to store policing information such as CAD reference numbers. It is accepted from the allegations outlined in this decision maker's document that PC Jaffer held photographs from the murder crime scene on his personal mobile phone and this amounted to police information. However, PC Jaffer's alleged breaches of the SoPB 'confidentiality' have been addressed separately from allegation fifteen and it would be repetitive to outline them again here.

Any additional evidence of policing information stored on PC Jaffer's mobile phone has been provided to the MPS DPS to deal with as a separate matter. This matter does not fall within the scope of Operation Turton.

Allegation 16:

The SoPB for police officers expects them to be diligent in the exercise of their duties yet the evidence suggests PC Jaffer, while working to protect the integrity of the scene of a double murder has decided to leave his fixed point post and take photographs of two murder victims. PC D, in her statement provided to the IOPC, stated she witnessed PC Lewis and PC Jaffer walking backwards and forwards to one another while at the scene.

The evidence suggested PC Jaffer entered the deposition area within the hedgerow to get photographs of the victims. Though PC Jaffer stated, *"...at no time did I approach the dead bodies closer than about twenty foot. I was not close to the bush area and I have not entered the deposition area at any time"*. When PC Jaffer was asked if he saw PC Lewis take any photographs. He said he did not see PC Lewis *"go in there"*. This choice of words; "go in there" is deemed significant, when considering whether PC Jaffer may have entered the deposition site himself.

In order to achieve the photographs taken by PC Jaffer, the evidence from MPS DI Maria Green, is that PC Jaffer would have had to have moved from the position he had been allocated to stand and go within the deposition site. The evidence of PS Marsh supports DI Green's evidence in that he states there were marked points 'A' to 'O' where cordon officers were placed. He confirmed the points were 'fixed points' and "...officers were expected not to move from the fixed points". PS Marsh confirmed point 'A' was a distance of approximately 10 metres from the bodies of the victims.

He provides further evidence that points A and B were closest to the murder victims. He said, *"Sadly we needed officers positioned close to the bodies of the women to prevent wildlife interfering with the scene. These points were effectively within the inner cordon. There was a thick hedgerow where the women's bodies were positioned. It may have been possible to just about make out the bodies of the women from the fixed-point B. But this would have been tricky and you would need to know what you were looking at or leave that point. It would not have been possible to see the bodies from fixed Point A. If you wanted to see the bodies you would need to stray from fixed point A."*

The SoPB for police officers expects them to be diligent in the exercise of their duties. Further, based on the evidence already set out above, and referring again to the evidence from PS Marsh, and more specifically from DI Maria Green we believe that the appropriate authority is likely to consider that, on the balance of probabilities, PC Jaffer entered the deposition site in order to take photos of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry.

The evidence suggested PC Jaffer entered the deposition area within the hedgerow to get photographs of the victims. Though PC Jaffer stated, *"...at no time did I approach the dead bodies closer than about twenty foot. I was not close to the bush area and I have not entered the deposition area at any time"*. When PC Jaffer was asked if he saw PC Lewis take any photographs. He said he did not see PC Lewis *"go in there"*. This choice of words; *"go in there"* is deemed significant, when considering whether PC Jaffer may have entered the deposition site himself.

In order to achieve the photographs taken by PC Jaffer, the evidence from MPS DI Maria Green, is that PC Jaffer would have had to have moved from the position he had been allocated to stand and go within the deposition site. The evidence of PS Marsh supports DI Green's evidence in that he states there were marked points 'A' to 'O' where cordon officers were placed. He confirmed the points were 'fixed points' and *"...officers were expected not to move from the fixed points"*. PS Marsh confirmed point 'A' was a distance of approximately 10 metres from the bodies of the victims.

He provides further evidence that points A and B were closest to the murder victims. He said, *"Sadly we needed officers positioned close to the bodies of the women to prevent wildlife interfering with the scene. These points were effectively within the inner cordon. There was a thick hedgerow where the women's bodies were positioned. It may have been possible to just about make out the bodies of the women from the fixed-point B. But this would have been tricky and you would need to know what you were looking at or leave that point. It would not have been possible to see the bodies from fixed Point A. If you wanted to see the bodies you would need to stray from fixed point A."*

The SoPB for police officers expects them to be diligent in the exercise of their duties. Further, based on the evidence already set out above, and referring again to the evidence from PS Marsh, and more specifically from DI Maria Green we believe that the appropriate authority is likely to consider that, on the balance of probabilities, PC Jaffer entered the deposition site in order to take photos of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry.

Allegation 17:

See allegation 16.

PC Jaffer was not wearing full Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) while on guard at the crime scene and DI Green stated as such any contamination of the scene could not be ruled out. DI Green explained, the search of the area was extensive and required specialist search teams with dogs trained to detect and follow blood and human scent trails as well as cadaver dogs. During the search, DI Green described how various routes were followed by the trails highlighted by the specialist dogs and led the investigation to a particular exit point in Valley Drive. DI Green noted in hindsight, the investigating team were unable to exclude the trails being as a result of the officers stepping into an area without the required foot covering and transferring tracing of blood from their boots on to the path. She stated the investigation team knew that traces of blood were left by their suspect within the deposition site and immediately outside.

The SoPB for police officers expects them to be diligent in the exercise of their duties yet the evidence suggests PC Jaffer, while working in a position of trust to protect the integrity of the scene of a double murder, has instead potentially affected the evidential opportunities.

Allegation 18:

The SoPB 'equality and diversity' expects officers to, "...*act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.*" Officers should treat all people fairly and with respect and take a proactive approach to opposing discrimination.

We further reviewed the evidence which was recovered from PC Jaffer's phone which is unconnected to the crime scene, but fell within the forensic examination window, in which he uses the term "*Pakis*" to describe Asian males on two occasions in a discussion on WhatsApp with members of his friendship group. This was in relation to a policing incident and the communication was with members of the public to whom it would be obvious he is a police officer. I have taken this as clear evidence that PC Jaffer has a conscious bias against members of the community he serves based on their race. We believe that, on the balance of probabilities, the appropriate authority is likely to take the same view of this evidence.

PC Jaffer provided no response in interview on 8 July 2020 to the questions regarding his use of the racist term. In his written response dated 15 October 2020 PC Jaffer stated he simply repeated the term used by a friend, without thinking. He denied holding racist views.

Allegation 19:

See allegation eighteen.

PC Jaffer's WhatsApp message, "*Three white fellas all arrested for ABH [actual bodily harm] but we have had a chat off the record. We will release them under investigation and close it later saying victim unwilling without contacting the pakki's*" shows not only a second use of the racist term but also indicates a corrupt attitude within policing that specifically targets people from the South Asian community. The sentiment expressed by PC Jaffer is likely to bring discredit on the police service and undermine public confidence in policing, especially but not limited to, members of the South Asian community. Concerning is PC Jaffer's reference to this as "*chit chat*" and "*gossip*".²

> Indication of criminal offence

We referred a file of evidence to the Crown Prosecution Service who authorised the charges on both officers.

In November 2021, the officers formally entered their guilty pleas to the charge of misconduct in public office and were sentenced in December to serve two years and nine months. The judge ordered half of their sentence be served in prison.

On 24 November, the MPS held an accelerated gross misconduct hearing for both officers. One officer was dismissed without notice and the other officer would also have been dismissed had he not already resigned from the service. They will be added to the barred list, preventing them from future employment within the police service.

> Organisational learning

The Police Reform Act 2002 affords the IOPC powers to issue two types of learning recommendations.

Section 10(1)(e) recommendations – these can be made at any stage of the investigation. The recipient is not required to provide a formal response to the IOPC.

Paragraph 28A recommendations – these must be made at the end of an IOPC investigation and the issue subject to learning must have come to light due to the investigation. The recipient is required to provide the IOPC a formal response. Recommendations are published on the IOPC website, along with the responses received.

² The MPS investigation into this matter determined there was no evidence this incident occurred and was fabricated by PC Jaffer.

Both recommendations were made under Section 10 during our investigation and were subsequently issued under Paragraph 28A of the Police Reform Act 2002.

Recommendation 1

The IOPC recommends the Metropolitan Police Service take steps to ensure all officers within Forest Gate Police Station conform to the expectations of their behaviour under the Code of Ethics, whilst on and off duty, and are aware that failure to do so could severely damage the public's confidence in policing.

In this investigation, there is evidence that officers serving at Forest Gate Police Station have:

Displayed a lack of respect to individuals who had lost their lives by sharing inappropriate remarks and images in a WhatsApp group containing forty policing colleagues.

Made remarks in a WhatsApp group that can be perceived as derogatory and discriminatory towards women.

Shared images and remarks in a WhatsApp group which demonstrated a lack of compassion and empathy for two women who had recently lost their lives

Used racist language over WhatsApp, which was endorsed by a fellow officer.

Recommendation 2

The IOPC recommends the Metropolitan Police Service reviews whether supervisors and senior management at Forest Gate Police Station are taking personal responsibility to identify and eliminate patterns of inappropriate behaviour, whilst simultaneously promoting a safe and open culture which makes clear to officers and staff that they are dutybound to challenge and report behaviour that does not align with the Code of Ethics.

The police Code of Ethics and Standards of Professional Behaviour apply to all officers and members of staff serving with the Metropolitan Police Service. When adhering to the 'Challenging and reporting improper behaviour' Standard of Professional Behaviour, it is outlined supervisors must ensure staff carry out their professional duties correctly and any behaviour which falls below the Standards of Professional Behaviour must be challenged and addressed.

In this investigation, there is evidence that officers serving at Forest Gate Police Station shared inappropriate and discriminatory comments and images via WhatsApp, to friends and fellow officers relating to two victims of crime who had recently lost their lives. That officers opted to share such comments and images in a WhatsApp group containing forty policing peers and for their conduct to still go unchallenged, suggests an environment within Forest Gate Police Station where staff are either unwilling or afraid to challenge inappropriate conduct. This is a matter that needs to be appropriately remedied by

supervisors and senior management. If such behaviour were to be left unaddressed, it would be hugely detrimental to the public's confidence in policing.

The [MPS responses](#) are available on our website.

Investigation name:	Operation Turton 2
IOPC reference:	2020/139739

Summary of IOPC conclusions

A summary of our conclusions and our rationale is set out below. For each allegation, we applied The College of Policing's (CoP) 'Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings', which states that when assessing the seriousness of misconduct, culpability and harm must be considered as well as any aggravating or mitigating factors.

> PC D

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It is alleged that PC D was aware that her colleague PC Deniz Jaffer had taken inappropriate and sensitive photographs of two murder victims without a valid policing purpose while on duty to protect the cordon of the murder crime scene and she failed to report or challenge his improper conduct between 8 and 24 June 2020.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

2. It is further alleged that PC D was aware that her colleague PC Deniz Jaffer held inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on his personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and she failed to report or challenge his improper conduct between 8 June and 24 June 2020.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

3. It is alleged that PC D viewed the images of the murder victims on her personal mobile device without a legitimate policing purpose and subsequently failed to report or challenge PC Jaffer's improper conduct in sharing these images with her between 8 June and 24 June 2020.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

4. It is alleged that PC D failed to show diligence as a police officer by moving from her fixed cordon point while at the scene of the murders on 8 June 2020, without a legitimate policing purpose.

We determined no case to answer in our final determinations letter

5. It is alleged that PC D deviated from the orders and instructions provided to her by moving from her fixed cordon point while at the scene of the murders on 8 June 2020, without a legitimate policing purpose.

We determined no case to answer in our final determinations letter

6. It is alleged that PC D failed to challenge and/or report the conduct of PC Lewis and PC Jaffer as they moved from their fixed cordon posts on 8 June 2020.

We determined reflective practice in our final determinations letter

> Summary of rationale

Allegation 1:

The final report sets out the evidence that PC D received photographs of the murder victims on her personal phone from PC Jaffer while on duty to protect the integrity of the scene. While PC D does not state that she saw the photographs being taken, she recognised the photographs should not have been taken and she should have reported the event to a supervisor immediately.

PC D was new in service and in the presence of more senior colleagues, however there is no evidence to suggest that PC D received and viewed the photographs for a policing purpose, nor did she believe her colleagues had a legitimate reason for doing so.

Allegation 2:

As per the information above, it is clear from the mobile phone evidence that PC D received four images from PC Jaffer's personal mobile phone via WhatsApp while at the scene on 8 June 2020. PC D has also confirmed she received the images in her statement to the IOPC. PC D has also acknowledged that she should have reported the conduct of her colleagues but feared doing so. While PC D reported her concerns to a manager on an 'MM1' form, this was only undertaken after the arrest of her colleagues, on 24 June 2020, several weeks after her attendance at the scene on 8 June 2020.

Allegation 3:

PC D acknowledged in her statement that she had received four images of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry on her personal mobile phone from PC Jaffer on the morning of 8 June 2020. When considering whether PC D viewed the images sent to her by PC Jaffer it is noted that she was able to describe the images of the victims and also recalled seeing an image with PC Lewis' face on it which she described as, "*particularly insensitive*". PC D only reported her concerns to a manager on an 'MM1' form after the arrest of her colleagues, several weeks after her attendance at the scene on 8 June 2020.

While PC D outlined her fears in reporting her colleagues, the SoPB '*challenging and reporting improper conduct*' specifically addresses this point and states where an officer feels they cannot question or challenge a colleague they have the option to report their concerns through a line manager or a force reporting mechanism. One unknown police officer did feel able to report such concerns about PC Lewis anonymously and PC D has not stated she was the officer that made the anonymous report to the MPS via their internal reporting line.

Allegation 4:

PC D disclosed in her statement of 1 September 2020 that she had swapped cordon posts with PC Jaffer and PC Lewis had shone his torch into the overgrowth so she could see the murder victims. The SoPB '*duties and responsibilities*' expects officers to be diligent in their duties and take full responsibility for, and be prepared to explain and justify their actions. PC D's actions in moving from her cordon post and viewing Ms Henry and Ms Smallman's bodies in the deposition site do not appear to be in the interests of protecting the integrity of the scene and instead appear more voyeuristic in nature. As a police officer in this role at the scene of a double murder PC D was in a trusted position and it is expected that she would act diligently at all times.

Allegation 5:

PS Barry Rookard stated officers were briefed on the fixed nature of the cordon posts but PC D stated she could not recall the exact detail of her briefing and she was not aware she could not move from her post.

I have considered PC D's length of service and inexperience as a police officer. As noted under allegation six, it is possible that due to her inexperience PC D may have been more likely to follow the conduct demonstrated by her more experienced colleagues as they moved from their cordon posts. I have also considered whether the above allegation may be more appropriately dealt with as a performance matter. However, even if PC D was unclear on the briefing given to her, it cannot be reasonably assumed that PC D believed she was permitted to swap cordon posts and view the victims' bodies as they lay in the hedgerow.

The SoPB '*orders and instructions*' states officers will follow all reasonable instructions. Any decision that transgresses policy must be able to withstand scrutiny. I am not satisfied that PC D's reason for moving from her cordon post withstands such scrutiny.

Allegation 6:

The evidence provided by PC D suggested she was not aware that she could not move from her post and therefore it is potentially plausible that PC D's would not question the conduct of PC Lewis and PC Jaffer as they moved from their fixed cordon posts.

PC D was inexperienced at the time and believed her two colleagues knew the rules of a crime scene themselves. It is possible that due to her inexperience PC D may have been more likely to follow the conduct demonstrated by her colleagues.

PC D has stated she has learned a valuable lesson from the experience and now understands the importance and seriousness of challenging inappropriate behaviour. PC D has apologised for her actions.

Given PC D's conduct in failing to challenge and report colleagues has been addressed in allegations one to three and the valuable lessons she said she learned, we deem the conduct in this allegation could be appropriately dealt with via RPRP.

> PC E

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It is alleged that PC E was aware that his colleague PC Deniz Jaffer had taken inappropriate and sensitive photographs of two murder victims without a valid policing purpose while on duty to protect the cordon of the murder crime scene and he failed to report or challenge his improper conduct between 8 and 25 June 2020.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

2. It is further alleged that PC E was aware that his colleague PC Deniz Jaffer held inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on his personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and failed to report or challenge his improper conduct between 8 and 25 June 2020.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

> Summary of rationale

Allegation 1:

PC E acknowledged in his statement that PC Jaffer had shown him a picture of the murder victims. PC E was able to describe the image he saw and he was aware it was of the murder victims. Though he does not state he witnessed PC Jaffer taking the photos and he was placed further away from him at the scene, he was shown the image on PC Jaffer's mobile phone.

Under the SoPB, *'challenging and reporting improper conduct'* police officers are expected to *"..report, challenge or take action against the conduct of colleagues which has fallen below the Standards of Professional Behaviour."* PC E reported PC Jaffer's actions after he became aware of his colleague's arrest on 25 June 2020.

There is no suggestion from PC E in his statement that he believed PC Jaffer had taken the photograph of the victims for a policing purpose. PC E said he realised he should have challenged PC Jaffer and reported his conduct to a manager sooner than he did. PC E apologised for his actions and reflected that he felt he had let the MPS down but also the family of the victims.

It is noted that the initial report of PC Lewis' conduct was made anonymously to the MPS. PC E has not suggested he was the officer who reported his colleague's conduct anonymously. The SoPB '*challenging and reporting improper conduct*' states where an officer feels they cannot question or challenge a colleague they have the option to report their concerns through a line manager or a force reporting mechanism.

Allegation 2:

While on a refreshment break from the scene at Fryent Country Park PC Jaffer passed his personal mobile phone to PC E and he saw an image of two people laying in a wooded area. PC Jaffer did not possess a work mobile phone and it is highly likely PC E knew this. PC Jaffer told him the photo was of the murder victims. There is no suggestion from PC E in his statement that he believed PC Jaffer had taken the photograph of the victims for a policing purpose. The officers were not issued work mobile phones and PC E's admission that he realised he should have challenged PC Jaffer and reported his conduct suggests he was aware that PC Jaffer should not have held the images on his phone.

> PC F

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It was alleged that PC F was aware that her colleague PC Jamie Lewis held inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on his personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and she failed to report or challenge his improper conduct.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

2. It was alleged that PC F viewed the images of the murder victims on PC Jamie Lewis' personal mobile device without a legitimate policing purpose and subsequently failed to report or challenge PC Lewis' improper conduct.

We determined a case to answer for misconduct

3. PC F witnessed colleagues viewing inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on PC Jamie Lewis' personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and failed to report or challenge their improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer

> Summary of rationale

Allegation 1:

PC F confirmed on an unknown date following 8 June 2020 PC Lewis handed his mobile phone to her and showed her an image. This was following a conversation about attendance at the murder crime scene. Though in her statement PC F said she could not make out the image on PC Lewis' phone or describe them, she had sufficiently reasoned that the image was in "*bad taste*" and subsequently wished to challenge him in the yard of Forest Gate police station. Under the SoPB 'challenging and reporting improper conduct' police officers are expected to, "*..report, challenge or take action against the conduct of colleagues which has fallen below the Standards of Professional Behaviour.*"

In his account, PC Lewis said PC F asked to see the images of the victims while in the yard of Forest Gate police station on either 11 or 12 June 2020 as she was due to undertake PoISA (Police Search Adviser) search duties at the scene. He said she took his phone and scrolled through the photographs. PC F's rota showed she was due to undertake PoISA duties on 12 June 2020. PC Lewis was asked how PC F knew he held the photographs and he stated he did not know. PC F in her account stated PC Lewis had attempted to show her the photographs earlier while on parade and subsequently, while in the yard, she called him over to ask about his phone with the intention of challenging him. PC F said she intended to say to him that she did not feel it was appropriate to have photographs from the crime scene on his mobile phone.

PC Lewis offered PC F's name in a criminal interview as being someone who he knew had seen the images. He said she had held his phone and scrolled through the images whereas PC F stated she gestured to PC Lewis that she did not want to see his phone when in the yard at Forest Gate police station. PC F stated she 'believed' she was interrupted by an immediate response call and she did not end up viewing any image on his phone or challenging him while in the yard. There has been no evidence found to suggest PC F attended an immediate response call on 11 June 2020.

It is questionable that PC F would call over PC Lewis and ask to see photos from a crime scene unprompted, unless she had prior knowledge of their existence. PC Lewis said he did not know how PC F knew to ask about the photos. Whereas PC F's account suggests PC Lewis attempted to show the image to her while on parade. PC Lewis did not offer information in his interview that he showed any colleagues the photos while on parade. Furthermore, PC Lewis' account was that PC A may have possibly seen the photos while PC F was viewing them in the yard but he could not be certain. The account provided by PC A suggests however that PC Lewis was "*jovial*" as he presented his phone to her in the yard. Again, PC Lewis only stated PC A may have seen the images.

I can find no reason why PC Lewis would state that PC F had held his phone and scrolled through the images if it was not his truthful recollection of what had happened. However, PC F does have a reason to suggest a different, less culpable version of events, so when weighing up the evidence I am minded to give more weight to PC Lewis' unprompted account under criminal caution of events involving PC F. Furthermore, PC F stated she could not make out the image shown to her as she was not wearing her glasses. It is unclear why, as per PC Lewis' account, PC F would then continue to scroll through the images if she was unable to make out the first image.

In summary, on one assessment of the evidence it could be concluded that PC Lewis showed the image(s) to PC F while on parade and this was how she was aware PC Lewis held the images. PC F and PC Lewis' accounts then corroborate one another in respect of PC F calling PC Lewis over in the yard. PC A could not recall how he came to join them in the yard.

PC Lewis' and PC F's accounts then differ. PC Lewis' suggests PC F took his phone and scrolled through the images and PC F states he attempted to show his phone to her but she gestured him away. It is of note however that the evidence suggests PC Lewis attempted to show PC A the image and he appeared 'jovial'.

It is therefore potentially implausible that PC A and PC F would not discuss the matter further especially as PC F stated she intended to challenge PC Lewis and believed the image he held was in bad taste.

Based on the evidence outlined above, it is not clear whether PC F viewed the images from the murder scene. PC F acknowledged in her statement that PC Lewis held inappropriate images however and she wished she had reported his actions to a supervisor and apologised for not doing so. Furthermore, whether the images were viewed in the yard or on parade there is sufficient evidence to suggest PC F viewed the images especially when considering this evidence alongside her reasoning that the images were in bad taste.

Allegation 2:

As per the rationale under allegation one, PC F was shown the images from the murder scene though she states she could not make out the images and she did not describe them. The officers were not issued work mobile devices, but some are provided with work tablets. PC F stated she planned on challenging PC Lewis as she did not think it was appropriate for him to have photos from the crime scene on his phone.

PC F believed the images were in "bad taste" and said she planned to challenge PC Lewis. PC F is a long serving officer with over 19 years' service so it is expected that an experienced officer would be responsible for and set the example of the acceptable level conduct within a team. PC F did not raise an MM1 with the MPS even after her colleagues had been arrested nor did she suggest she made the anonymous initial report to the MPS.

Allegation 3:

Though the evidence suggests PC F and PC A were standing together in the yard of Forest Gate police station when PC Lewis showed the image on his phone, neither officer has suggested they saw colleagues viewing the images of the murder victims. Furthermore, it has not been possible to obtain evidence to prove or disprove this from the CCTV of the yard at Forest Gate police station.

> PC A

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It was alleged that PC A was aware that her colleague PC Jamie Lewis held inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on his personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and she failed to report or challenge his improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer in our final determinations letter

2. It was alleged that PC A viewed the images of the murder victims on PC Jamie Lewis' personal mobile device without a legitimate policing purpose and subsequently failed to report or challenge PC Lewis' improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer in our final determinations letter

3. PC A witnessed colleagues viewing inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on PC Jamie Lewis' personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and failed to report or challenge their improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer

> Summary of rationale

Allegation 1 and 2:

In our provisional opinion, we noted the difficulties with the evidence regarding whether PC A did or did not view the images of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry. Our provisional view was that a misconduct meeting should make its own assessment of the available evidence.

We carefully considered the views of the appropriate authority in respect of PC A. The appropriate authority considers that there is insufficient evidence that PC A did in fact see the images. It is recognised that PC A was unable to report an image which she had not seen, or which did not cause her any concern. It is also recognised that it was only as part of the IOPC investigation that it came to light that PC A may have seen an image on her colleague's phone. In light of all the above, we concluded that there is insufficient evidence on which a finding of misconduct could be made.

We therefore concluded in our final determinations letter, PC A had no case to answer for the allegations 1 and 2.

Allegation 3:

In our opinion, there is insufficient evidence upon which a reasonable tribunal, properly directed, could find misconduct for PC A in respect of 'challenging and

reporting improper conduct' and therefore she does not have a case to answer in respect of this matter.

Though the evidence suggests PC F and PC A were standing together in the yard of Forest Gate police station when PC Lewis showed the image on his phone, neither officer has suggested they saw colleagues viewing the images of the murder victims. Furthermore, it has not been possible to obtain evidence to prove or disprove this from the CCTV of the yard at Forest Gate police station.

> PC B

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It was alleged that PC B was aware that her colleague PC Jamie Lewis held inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on his personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and she failed to report or challenge his improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer

2. It was alleged that PC B viewed the images of the murder victims on PC Jamie Lewis' personal mobile device without a legitimate policing purpose and subsequently failed to report or challenge PC Lewis' improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer

3. PC A witnessed colleagues viewing inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on PC Jamie Lewis' personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and failed to report or challenge their improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer

> Summary of rationale

Allegation 1:

In our opinion, there is insufficient evidence upon which a reasonable tribunal, properly directed, could find misconduct for PC B in respect of 'challenging and reporting improper conduct' and therefore she does not have a case to answer in respect of this matter.

The evidence provided by PC B in her statement suggested she had no knowledge of inappropriate photographs being taken by her colleagues at the murder crime scene and she did not view the photographs. PC Lewis stated in his criminal interview that PC B may have seen the photographs from the murder scene as she was standing with PC F in the yard at Forest Gate police station, but he was not

certain that she had. There is no CCTV evidence to support PC Lewis' account that PC B may have seen the images.

Allegation 2:

In our opinion, there is insufficient evidence upon which a reasonable tribunal, properly directed, could find misconduct for PC B in respect of 'challenging and reporting improper conduct' and therefore she does not have a case to answer in respect of this matter.

PC B's name was provided by PC Lewis in his criminal interview as someone who may have seen the images of the victims as she was standing near PC F when she viewed the images. PC Lewis said he did not recall any indication from PC B that she had seen the images. Furthermore, it has not been possible to identify an event from the CCTV to either prove or disprove the account provided.

PC B stated she had no doubt whatsoever that she did not know about nor view any photographs from the murder crime scene on any colleague's phone. She said she had never spoken to PC Lewis about the murders and only had a brief conversation with PC Jaffer regarding his attendance at the scene on a date following 7 June 2020.

On the balance of probabilities, the evidence suggests that PC B had no knowledge, awareness or sight of the images of Ms Smallman and Ms Henry on PC Lewis' phone.

Allegation 3:

PC F stated there were other colleagues in the vicinity of the yard when PC Lewis approached, however, she only recalled PC A being present, she could not recall who else was present. PC B's name was provided by PC Lewis in his criminal interview as someone who may have seen the images of the victims as she was standing near PC F when she viewed the images. PC Lewis said he did not recall any indication from PC B that she had seen the images. In PC B's account she stated she had no awareness of the images being held by any colleagues and she had no sight of them. PC B stated she had no doubt whatsoever that she did not know about nor view any photographs from the murder crime scene on any colleague's phone.

PC B said she had never spoken to PC Lewis about the murders and only had a brief conversation with PC Jaffer regarding his attendance at the scene on a date following 7 June 2020.

On the balance of probabilities, the evidence suggests PC B did not witness colleagues viewing inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on PC Jamie Lewis' personal mobile phone.

> PC C

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It was alleged that PC C was aware that her colleague PC Deniz Jaffer held inappropriate and sensitive images from a murder scene on his personal mobile phone, without a valid policing purpose, and she failed to report or challenge his improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer in our determinations letter

2. It was alleged that PC C viewed the images of the murder victims on PC Deniz Jaffer's personal mobile device without a legitimate policing purpose and subsequently failed to report or challenge PC Jaffer's improper conduct.

We determined no case to answer

> Summary of rationale

Allegation 1 and 2:

Our provisional opinion was that PC C had no case to answer but that her failure to report PC Jaffer (as well as challenging him directly) fell short of the expectations of the public and the police service and that this amounted to a practice requiring improvement and that she should be referred to the Reflective Practice Review Process. We note the appropriate authority is not in agreement and considers that PC C has already adequately reflected on the circumstances of this matter and, as such, a referral to Reflective Practice Review Process is unnecessary.

> Misconduct meetings

We determined three officers had a case to answer for misconduct who were either aware of, received or viewed the inappropriate photographs taken at scene of the murder and failed to challenge or report them.

Misconduct meetings were held on 22 June 2022 and concluded that misconduct was proven for the three officers, and they would receive written warnings.

Investigation name:	Operation Gascoyne
IOPC reference:	2020/137384, 2020/138858 and 2021/149306

Summary of IOPC conclusions

[Our full report](#) was published in December 2021.

A summary of our conclusions and our rationale is set out below for officers subject to investigation. For each allegation, we applied The College of Policing's (CoP) 'Guidance on outcomes in police misconduct proceedings', which states that when assessing the seriousness of misconduct, culpability and harm must be considered as well as any aggravating or mitigating factors.

> Inspector A

> Allegations of breached standards of professional behaviour

1. It is alleged that Inspector A failed to appropriately progress and update the MERLIN for Ms Smallman.

We determined unsatisfactory performance

2. It is further alleged that Inspector A failed to take any actions in relation to the missing person report of Ms Henry.

We determined unsatisfactory performance

3. The closure of the missing person CADs for Ms Smallman and Ms Henry was inappropriate as they were still defined as missing persons.

We determined unsatisfactory performance

> Summary of rationale

We initially determined Inspector A had a case to answer for misconduct. The AA was not in agreement with our opinion in this regard, however they have accepted there were failings by Inspector A which in their view could be addressed through the Reflective Practice and Review Process (RPRP).

We have given due consideration to the points raised by the AA in their response, and we are satisfied that the issues raised in the report in respect of Inspector A are properly performance rather than conduct matters. Accordingly, we determined there is no case to answer for misconduct or gross misconduct for Inspector A.

As part of the AA response, they have acknowledged that the MPS Missing Person policy, which was in place at the time, was not widely available and therefore previous

versions were still in circulation. The investigation uncovered that there was confusion surrounding who had overall responsibility for a missing persons investigation in between the Duty Officers initial risk assessment being completed and the next review which takes place after 24 hours. This specific issue is being addressed via IOPC learning recommendations to the force and local BCU.

However, there was consistency between versions of the MPS Missing Person policy regarding the description of a person who is to be classed as 'absent' or 'missing' and the requirements of a Duty Officer to input a risk assessment. This is the crux of allegations against Inspector A and regardless of whether another supervisor should have reviewed it and completed an update following the call from Ms A, this did not remove the need for Inspector A to complete an updated risk assessment once he had decided that Ms Henry and Ms Smallman were no longer to be classed as missing. As he had made this decision, no one else would have been able to effectively record a rationale.

Moreover, whilst we have acknowledged the MERLIN for Ms Smallman was still left open and as such allowed a missing person investigation of sorts to continue, it is also of significant relevance, that Inspector A did not record a MERLIN report for Ms Henry even though she had been classified as missing on the CAD. This prevented any action being taken into her whereabouts and this is in direct breach of the MPS Missing Person policy.

The AA suggested the outcome of the women being deceased would not have changed regardless of Inspector A's actions. Whilst from the evidence, this statement is likely correct, we do believe the focus should be on the fact that it could have changed the distress caused to the family of Ms Henry and Ms Smallman in not only having to conduct their own missing person investigation, due to the lack of police response, undertake a physical search for their loved ones, and endure the incredibly distressing outcome of discovering their bodies. It is therefore possible that if Inspector A had acted accordingly this outcome could have been avoided. Our view on this is reinforced by the concerns raised by the early shift the following day who commented on the lack of progress and record keeping on the missing person reports for Ms Henry and Ms Smallman. It is relevant to have regard to the harm resulting from the officer's actions, even if inadvertent, when assessing the severity (see the College of Policing Outcomes guidance at 4.12 and 4.57 to 4.65).

The AA also suggests the IOPC report has not discussed whether the initial medium risk grading given to the missing person report of Ms Smallman was correct. We do not consider this to be entirely relevant to the allegations against Inspector A, but what is of importance is Inspector A's decision to change this grading and make no record of his rationale and actions. In his account to the IOPC, Inspector A stated that he was aware of the medium risk grading assigned to Ms Smallman, but despite stating this there is no evidence that he progressed the report. In fact, there is no evidence by way of contemporaneous notes, either electronic or otherwise, to substantiate Inspector A's account to the IOPC and therefore we can only place limited weight on its evidential value.

We acknowledge the information supplied during the call from Ms A may have provided some basis for Inspector A to believe the women's whereabouts and lack of contact was accounted for. However, this was not sufficient information in line with MPS Missing Person policy to confirm Ms Henry and Ms Smallman were no longer missing. Ms A had neither spoken to, nor had she seen Ms Henry and Ms Smallman and therefore relayed assumptions based on an event from the previous day, some 15

hours prior. In addition, at 11.10pm on 6 June 2020 on CAD 7591, which Inspector A stated he reviewed, information was recorded stating Mr A had been to Ms Henry's address (the location Ms A stated she believed Ms Henry and Ms Smallman were likely to be) and there was no sign or response to knocking. This information strongly conflicted with the information provided by Ms A and therefore should have been considered further by Inspector A. We note that the AA has stated that it is not known if Inspector A was aware of the information on CAD 6898, that Mr A was waiting at Ms Smallman's address for officers to attend. However, if this is the case, and Inspector A had still decided to close all of the CADs, this could be considered as further evidence to support the allegations that he was not diligent enough in his duty as we consider it would have been both reasonable and necessary for Inspector A to appraise himself of all relevant information prior to deciding to close a medium risk missing person CAD.

Also of relevance when trying to decide an appropriate way forward for this matter, is that Inspector A had not accepted any wrongdoing or indicated that he has reflected on this incident with a view to improving his performance. However, we do note he has offered his condolences to the family for their loss. We agree with the AA, there is no evidence to suggest Inspector A wilfully intended for the missing persons reports of Ms Henry and Ms Smallman to be mistreated, that he abused his position or powers, nor that he had any intent for the women to come to any harm. We have previously stated in our initial decision-making document that the under resourcing and incredibly busy environment at the time was a factor in this case. We acknowledge the weight the AA have given to the lack of experience Inspector A had at the time of the incident, having only been an Inspector for two months. We acknowledge the very sad circumstances in which Ms Henry and Ms Smallman went missing are extremely rare and unlikely foreseeable to Inspector A.

Taking these factors into consideration, we still consider the evidence indicates the actions of Inspector A have fallen far short of what the public and police service expect.

However, we have given careful consideration to the evidence of Inspector A's relative inexperience in his role and that his misunderstanding as to who was responsible for missing persons reviews was shared by other inspectors. We accept that the evidence suggests there is a lack of knowledge on Inspector A's part rather than a failure to follow policies that he knew well. Having considered the view of the AA, we believe that the actions and inactions of Inspector A would be more appropriately dealt with under Unsatisfactory Performance Procedures (UPP).

We therefore determine that Inspector A's performance was unsatisfactory. We believe this is consistent with the AAs assessment that one police staff member should be subject to UPP and that this will provide a mechanism of accountability which requires Inspector A to adhere to a monitored performance plan to address and improve his professional capability.

We determined that the performance of the additional police staff member was unsatisfactory. We note the AA was not in agreement with our provisional opinions in this respect and have suggested the process of RPRP as an appropriate method to address the actions of this police staff member. We have given due regard to the points raised by the AA, who have placed significant weight on the lack of service the police staff member held at the time of the incident. Considering this and the fact this was a singular incident, we agree with the AA that a method outside of formal performance procedures is an appropriate outcome, however RPRP is not applicable under the MPS Police Staff Discipline Standard Operating Procedure v3.3.

> Organisational learning

Recommendation 1 – Section 10

The IOPC recommends that the Metropolitan Police Service should review the processes whereby separate computer systems are used by First Contact Officers (call handling) and Dispatch (CHS and CAD), review CAD literacy requirements for FCOs and consider if further training should be provided to FCOs.

Evidence obtained by the investigation has shown that FCOs do not appear to be fully literate within the CAD system, as they primarily work out of the CHS (call handling) system. This led to FCOs potentially providing members of the public with inaccurate information about police response to ongoing incidents, and on other occasions meant that FCOs could not provide concerned callers with updates regarding the current state of police action, as they were not literate in the CAD system where the information was held. In this case, callers should have been made aware that the police were no longer attending to room search at one of the missing persons' (MISPERs') addresses, but they were not informed of this, in part due to a lack of CAD literacy by FCOs.

Recommendation 2

The IOPC recommends the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) informs all police officers and staff involved in missing person investigations of the updated MPS missing person investigation protocol Local Resolution Team, v2.3 May 2020.

As part of an ongoing IOPC investigation into the MPS response to concerns of the whereabouts of two missing females in Wembley, who were subsequently found deceased, the IOPC investigation were informed the most current MPS missing person policy titled 'MPS missing person investigation protocol Local Resolution Team, v2.3, May 2020' had not been updated on the intranet, which still reflected the previous protocol v2.2 June 2019. As such police officers and staff dealing with missing person investigations were unaware of it. Furthermore, the IOPC found officers were also unaware of the MPS missing person policy titled 'MPS missing person investigation protocol Local Resolution Team v2.2 2019' and had not been informed the policy prior to this, from 2018, had been changed.

Recommendation 3

The IOPC recommends the Metropolitan Police Service North Wembley borough command unit (BCU) reviews its current missing person investigation and supervision process to;

- **provide clear guidance on the roles and responsibility for those based within the Operations room, Local Resolution Team and Emergency Response Policing Team**
- **consider aligning their policy with the wider MPS protocol**

As part of an ongoing IOPC investigation into the missing persons investigations of two females by the MPS North Wembley BCU it transpired this borough had a different local policy to that of the MPS general missing person policy. The current MPS missing person protocol, Local Resolution Team, V2.3, suggests the operations manager agrees the initial review and risk assessment, however within the North Wembley borough command unit this is carried out by the duty officer. There was a suggestion some within the North Wembley borough also believed the Local Resolution Team were responsible for all missing person investigations, which is in contrast to the missing person protocol, Local Resolution Team v2.3, which suggest only low risk cases will be the sole responsibility of the Local Resolution Team, whereas medium and high risk will be the responsibility of the Emergency Response Team. In addition, the North Wembley borough is split into East and West and this investigation found an inconsistency in how missing person investigations are run between across East and West. The North Wembley East Unit are based out of Colindale police station, where the Operations room resides. However, the North Wembley West are based at Wembley police station. There was a belief the North Wembley West used their 'own' staff from the local resolution team rather than those based within the Operations room at Colindale and therefore the Operations room sergeant did not complete supervisory reviews of missing person investigation reports carried out in the West. This led to a period of twelve hours during a medium risk missing person investigation where no actions or supervisory review were completed, due to confusion about whose responsibility it was to investigate and who, when and how supervisory reviews were completed. At this time the IOPC do not have any information to explain what led to this variation from policy.

[The MPS responses](#) are available on our website.

Published July 2022

© IOPC 2022

OGL This is licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated.

This does not include material on this site as belonging to third parties.
Authorisation to use such material must be obtained from the copyright holders concerned.

To find out more about our work or to request this report in an alternative format, you can contact us in a number of ways:

Independent Office for Police Conduct (IOPC)
10 South Colonnade Canary Wharf London E14 4PU
Tel: **0300 020 0096**
Email: enquiries@policeconduct.gov.uk
Website: www.policeconduct.gov.uk
Text relay: **18001 020 8104 1220**

We welcome telephone calls in Welsh
Rydym yn croesawu galwadau ffôn yn y Gymraeg

