



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Jonathan Briggs: Professional conduct panel outcome**

**Panel decision and reasons on behalf of the  
Secretary of State for Education**

**March 2022**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

## **Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State**

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Jonathan Briggs
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1056519
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	4 November 1985
<b>TRA reference:</b>	18643
<b>Date of determination:</b>	16 March 2022
<b>Former employer:</b>	North Durham Academy, County Durham

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 16 March 2022 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Jonathan Briggs.

The panel members were Ms Susanne Staab (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist) and Ms Marjorie Harris (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Josie Beal of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Caoimhe Daly of QEB Hollis Whiteman, instructed by Fieldfisher LLP solicitors.

Mr Briggs was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place by way of a virtual hearing in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 17 December 2021.

It was alleged that Mr Briggs was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On or around 10 October 2019, he was convicted of possession of extreme pornographic images of an act of intercourse / oral sex with a dead / alive animal on 1 September 2017 to 18 April 2019, contrary to s. 63 (1) (7)(d) of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008.
2. On or around 10 October 2019 he was convicted of making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child on 22 November 2014 to 22 April 2019 contrary to s.1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.
3. On or around 10 October 2019 he was convicted of making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child on 22 November 2014 to 22 April 2019 contrary to s.1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.
4. On or around 10 October 2019 he was convicted of making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child on 22 November 2014 to 22 April 2019 contrary to s.1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978

Mr Briggs made no admission of facts in respect of allegations 1 to 4.

## Preliminary applications

The panel noted that since the date of the referral to the TRA in this case, new 'Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession' were published in May 2020 (the "May 2020 Procedures"). The panel understands that the earlier provisions contained within the 'Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession' updated in April 2018 (the "April 2018 Procedures") apply to this case, given that those provisions applied when the referral was made. Although the panel has the power to direct that the May 2020 Procedures should apply in the interests of justice or the public interest, the panel had received no representations that this should be the case. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the panel confirms that it has applied the April 2018 Procedures in this case.

The panel heard the following preliminary applications.

## Application to proceed in the absence of the teacher

Mr Briggs was not present at the hearing nor was he represented. The presenting officer made an application to proceed in the absence of Mr Briggs.

The panel accepted the legal advice provided in relation to this application and took account of the various factors referred to it, as derived from the guidance set down in the case of *R v Jones [2003] 1 AC 1* (as considered and applied in subsequent cases, particularly *GMC v Adeogba*).

The panel was provided with a copy of the notice of referral dated 16 October 2020 and a follow up letters from the presenting officer firm, Fieldfisher, dated 12 November 2020, 19 March 2021 and 20 July 2021 seeking a response to the notice of referral and engagement from Mr Briggs. The panel was provided with an email delivery receipt dated 12 November 2020, proof of delivery dated 24 March 2021 (signed for by "Briggs") and proof of delivery dated 21 July 2021 (signed for by "J Briggs"). Mr Briggs did not respond to the notice of referral.

The panel was informed that Mr Briggs' address had changed during the course of the TRA's correspondence with him and, when the TRA became aware of this, it sent (on 20 July 2021) copies of its previous correspondence to Mr Briggs' new address.

The panel was satisfied that the notice of proceedings had been sent to Mr Briggs (to his new address) on 17 December 2021 in accordance with the April 2018 Procedures. The panel was provided with a proof of delivery indicating that the notice of proceedings was signed for by "Briggs" on 22 December 2021.

Mr Briggs did not respond to the notice of proceedings. The panel was not presented with any evidence to indicate that Mr Briggs had engaged with the TRA; he had not responded to communications sent to him and he had not provided any documentation for the panel to consider.

The panel was provided with a further letter from Fieldfisher dated 27 January 2022 enclosing a copy of the hearing bundle, and a proof of delivery indicating that the letter and bundle had been signed for by "J Briggs" on 28 January 2022.

The panel was also provided with copies of the Microsoft Teams invite links that had been sent to Mr Briggs by email and by post on 16 February 2022. The panel was provided with an email delivery receipt dated 16 February 2022 to Mr Briggs' email address and a proof of delivery signed for by "ZP" on 17 February 2022.

The panel noted that the notice of proceedings stated that the hearing would be heard on "16 March 2021 to 16 March 2022". The letter from Fieldfisher dated 27 January 2022 also referred to the hearing date as "16 March 2021". These documents were sent to Mr Briggs after 16 March 2021. The panel also noted that the subsequent Microsoft Teams

links and letter dated 16 February 2022 referred to the correct date of the hearing, being 16 March 2022.

The panel considered that there was a typographical error in the notice of proceedings and letter of 27 January 2022 and that, from the date of the correspondence and the correspondence that followed, it was apparent that the date of the hearing was 16 March 2022.

The panel concluded that Mr Briggs' absence was voluntary and that he was aware of the hearing and that the matter would proceed in his absence.

The panel noted that Mr Briggs had not sought an adjournment to the hearing and the panel did not consider that an adjournment would procure his attendance at a hearing. There was no medical evidence before the panel that Mr Briggs was unfit to attend the hearing. The panel considered that it was in the public interest for the hearing to take place.

Having decided that it was appropriate to proceed, the panel agreed to seek to ensure that the proceedings were as fair as possible in the circumstances, bearing in mind that Mr Briggs was neither present nor represented.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

In advance of the hearing, the panel received a bundle of documents which included:

- Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 1 to 2
- Section 2: Notice of referral, notice of proceedings and response – pages 3 to 20
- Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – 21 to 57
- Section 4: Correspondence and delivery receipts – pages 58 to 79

### **Witnesses**

No witnesses were called to give oral evidence.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

Mr Briggs was employed at North Durham Academy ('the School') from 13 June 2016, latterly as Head of Maths.

On 24 April 2019, an 'executed strike' was carried out by the police at Mr Briggs' home to investigate whether inappropriate or indecent images had been accessed at the address. The police removed a number of personal devices from Mr Briggs' home to establish whether such images had been accessed and whether internet access was locked down or open, with the potential for others to use.

On 14 August 2019, Mr Briggs left his role at the School following his resignation.

On 10 October 2019, Mr Briggs was convicted of 4 offences at County Durham and Darlington Magistrates Court, namely making indecent photographs/pseudo photographs of a child and possessing extreme pornographic images. Mr Briggs pleaded guilty.

On 11 November 2019, Mr Briggs was sentenced at Durham Crown Court to a 12 month prison sentence, suspended for 24 months. Mr Briggs was also required to sign the sex offenders register for a period of 10 years and a sexual harm prevention order was made for a period of 10 years.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. On or around 10 October 2019, you were convicted of possession of extreme pornographic images of an act of intercourse / oral sex with a dead / alive animal on 1 September 2017 to 18 April 2019, contrary to s. 63 (1) (7)(d) of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008.**
- 2. On or around 10 October 2019 you were convicted of making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child on 22 November 2014 to 22 April 2019 contrary to s.1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**
- 3. On or around 10 October 2019 you were convicted of making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child on 22 November 2014 to 22 April 2019 contrary to s.1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**
- 4. On or around 10 October 2019 you were convicted of making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child on 22 November 2014 to 22 April 2019 contrary to s.1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978**

The panel noted that Mr Briggs had not provided any evidence or otherwise engaged with these proceedings.

The panel was provided with a copy of the police report which indicated that [REDACTED].

The panel was provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Durham Crown Court, which confirmed that Mr Briggs had been convicted of one count of possessing extreme pornographic images – act of intercourse/oral sex with a dead/alive animal and three counts of making an indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers February 2022 ('the Advice') which states that where there has been a conviction, at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction that establishes the relevant facts, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not consider that there were any exceptional circumstances present.

On examination of the documents before the panel, including the police report and the certificate of conviction, the panel was satisfied that the facts of allegations 1, 2, 3 and 4 were proven.

### **Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Briggs in relation to the facts it found proved involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Briggs was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.



The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Briggs was wholly contrary to the standards expected of the teaching profession, and it was of the view that Mr Briggs' conduct was at the more serious end of the spectrum.

The panel noted that the offences had taken place outside of the school setting and had not involved pupils from the schools where Mr Briggs worked or other members of staff. However, the panel concluded that Mr Briggs' actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. This was on the basis that Mr Briggs was convicted of making indecent photographs/pseudo photographs of children and possessing extreme pornographic images. The panel was of the view that Mr Briggs' actions contravened the spirit of the safeguarding obligations to which he was subject as a teacher. The behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety or security of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Briggs' behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Briggs' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The Advice states that a conviction for any offence leading to a term of imprisonment, including any suspended sentence, is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

The panel noted page 12 of the Advice, which states that a conviction for any offence which relates to, or involves, certain conduct will be considered a relevant offence. Having reviewed all the documents, including the police report, the panel considered that the proven offences related to or involved:

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one off incidents.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Briggs' ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel found that Mr Briggs had been convicted of a relevant offence.

## Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. The panel acknowledged that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Briggs which involved making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of a child and possessing extreme pornographic images, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils.

The panel considered Mr Briggs' conduct to be serious, noting that a large number of indecent images had been found on devices belonging to Mr Briggs (436 "category A" images, 551 "category B" images, 399 "category C" images and 6 extreme pornographic images), and that his conduct appeared to be consistent over a long period of time. During the police interview, Mr Briggs accepted that he was responsible for the content on the devices recovered by the police.

The panel therefore considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Briggs was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel assessed public confidence by reference to the standard of an ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen, who both appreciates the seriousness of the proposed 'sanction' and recognises the high standards expected of all teachers, as well as other issues involved in the case.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Briggs was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Briggs.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Briggs. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour.

The panel noted that the Advice indicates that panels should attach appropriate weight and seriousness to online behaviours including, but not limited to, online misconduct. The panel duly attached weight to Mr Briggs' serious online misconduct.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Briggs' actions were not deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Briggs was acting under extreme duress.

No evidence was submitted to attest to Mr Briggs' previous history as a teacher. There was no evidence that Mr Briggs had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in either his personal or professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Mr Briggs did not submit any mitigation evidence, any character references or any evidence in respect of insight/remorse, however the panel considered the information before it. This included the School's investigation report, within which it was noted that Mr Briggs had accepted that, at the point he was charged, he would never teach again.

The panel considered the police report which included a summary of the explanation Mr Briggs gave to the police. [REDACTED].

The panel was therefore of the view that Mr Briggs demonstrated little or no insight into his actions and lacked contrition. He had not engaged with the TRA to answer to the allegations or otherwise contribute to these proceedings. Whilst Mr Briggs had accepted responsibility for the images, his comments in the police report indicate a failure to acknowledge the seriousness of his actions or the impact of his actions. The panel noted that Mr Briggs had not apologised for his behavior. The panel concluded that Mr Briggs' conduct was deliberate, calculated and motivated, particularly given that he had [REDACTED].

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Briggs of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Briggs. The seriousness of Mr Briggs' conduct and his convictions, in particular the volume of indecent images overall, the number of images within the most serious category, category A (436), [REDACTED] and his lack of insight and remorse, were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that where a case involves certain conduct, it is likely the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in the favour of not offering a review period. The panel found the following conduct referred to in the Advice present in this case:

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Jonathan Briggs should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Briggs is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Briggs fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding which involved making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of a child and possessing extreme pornographic images.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Briggs, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "Mr Briggs' actions contravened the spirit of the safeguarding obligations to which he was subject as a teacher. The behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety or security of pupils and/or members of the public." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, set out as follows, "The panel was therefore of the view that Mr Briggs demonstrated little or no insight into his actions and lacked contrition. He had not engaged with the TRA to answer to the allegations or otherwise contribute to these proceedings. Whilst Mr Briggs had accepted responsibility for the images, his comments in the police report indicate a failure to acknowledge the seriousness of his actions or the impact of his actions. The panel noted that Mr Briggs had not apologised for his behaviour." In my judgement, the lack of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils'. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Briggs' ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding involving making an indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an "ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen."

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Briggs himself and the panel comment “No evidence was submitted to attest to Mr Briggs’ previous history as a teacher. There was no evidence that Mr Briggs had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in either his personal or professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Briggs from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning mitigation evidence. The panel has said, “Mr Briggs did not submit any mitigation evidence, any character references or any evidence in respect of insight/remorse, however the panel considered the information before it. This included the School’s investigation report, within which it was noted that Mr Briggs had accepted that, at the point he was charged, he would never teach again.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Briggs. The seriousness of Mr Briggs’ conduct and his convictions, in particular the volume of indecent images overall, the number of images within the most serious category, category A (436), [REDACTED] and his lack of insight and remorse, were significant factors in forming that opinion.”

The Advice indicates the seriousness of behaviours, including online misconduct and in this case Mr Briggs’ was responsible for serious online misconduct involving images of children, which resulted in a conviction.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Briggs has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The Advice indicates that where a case involves certain conduct, it is likely the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in the favour of not offering a review period. The panel found the following conduct referred to in the Advice present in this case:

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the offence and the lack of insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

**This means that Mr Jonathan Briggs is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Briggs shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mr Jonathan Briggs has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 17 March 2022**

This decision is taken by the decision maker named above on behalf of the Secretary of State.