



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Dr Tariq Majid Qureshi: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

February 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	8
Decision and reasons	8
Findings of fact	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	18

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

Teacher:	Dr Tariq Majid Qureshi
Teacher ref number:	98/40500
Teacher date of birth:	24 June 1960
TRA reference:	0019287
Date of determination:	3 February 2022
Former employer:	St Anne's R.C. High School, Stockport

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened virtually on 1 February 2022 to consider the case of Dr Tariq Majid Qureshi ("Dr Qureshi").

The panel members were Ms Dawn Hawkins (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Patricia Hunt (former teacher panellist) and Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Carly Hagedorn of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Michael O'Donohoe of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Dr Qureshi was present and was not represented.

The hearing took place virtually, in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 28 October 2021.

It was alleged that Dr Qureshi was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or was convicted of a relevant offence in that, whilst employed at St Anne's R.C. High School ("the School") between 3 September – 20 December 2018 and/or after his employment ceased;

1. On 7 January 2020 he was convicted at Minshull Street Crown Court of three offences of assault by beating (battery) and was sentenced to a 12-month community order, a rehabilitation activity requirement for 15 days and a victim surcharge of £85.00.
2. The conduct leading to his conviction(s) at Allegation 1 was in respect of conduct that occurred between September – October 2018 and was;
 - a. Perpetrated on Pupil A;
 - b. Perpetrated on school premises and/or during school hours;
 - c. Included, on more than one occasion;
 - i. Telling Pupil A [REDACTED] was his favourite and/or [REDACTED] was beautiful and/or gorgeous or words to that effect;
 - ii. Touching Pupil A on the leg and/or hand with his hand;
 - iii. Touching and/or squeezing Pupil A's face;
 - iv. Hugging Pupil A;
 - v. Kissing Pupil A on the head.
3. The conduct leading to his conviction(s) at Allegation 1 was of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.
4. Prior to his appointment and/or during your employment at the School, he failed to disclose to the School his previous Prohibition Order and/or the nature of his previous misconduct for similar acts as alleged at allegation 1.

5. His conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 4 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

The teacher admitted to the facts of allegations 1, 2, 4 and 5 and that they amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence. The teacher denied the fact of allegation 3.

Preliminary applications

Application to admit late evidence

Video evidence

The presenting officer applied to admit a video, Achieving Best Evidence (“ABE”) interview of Pupil A and an audio interview of the teacher. Those documents were not served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 4.20 and 4.23 of the Teacher Misconduct Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession (April 2018) (“the Procedures”), and as such the panel was required to decide whether those documents should be admitted under paragraph 4.25 of the Procedures.

The panel took into account the representations from the presenting officer and the objections raised by the teacher to the admission of the documents. The presenting officer stated that the index to the bundle was sent to a representative for the teacher on 17 January 2022. The index included a section which referred to the video evidence, although the presenting officer could not confirm whether the requirements as set out in paragraph 4.23 had been followed. The teacher objected to the application as he did not believe it was fair to admit the evidence at such a late stage. He confirmed to the panel that he had never viewed the video evidence of Pupil A prior to this hearing.

Under paragraph 4.18 of the Procedures, the panel may admit any evidence, where it is fair to do so, which may reasonably be considered to be relevant to the case.

The panel noted that the video evidence of Pupil A may be considered to be relevant to assess Pupil A’s demeanour and body language during the ABE interview, given that [REDACTED] was not being called as a witness at the hearing to give evidence. However, the panel was not satisfied that the evidence was fair to admit at such a late stage. The panel noted that the evidence was not served in accordance with sections 4.20 and 4.23. The teacher had not been given any opportunity to view the video evidence prior to the hearing.

The central question for the panel was whether it was fair in the circumstances to allow evidence to be put forward by the Presenting Officer without the opportunity for the witness to be cross-examined by the teacher.

The panel had regard to the seriousness of the allegations in this case, and that it is open to the panel to recommend prohibition in this case if the allegations are found proven. The panel also considered the importance of the evidence and whether it constituted a critical part of the evidence against the teacher. The panel noted that it had access to the summary of key evidence from the police, outlining what was said by Pupil A during the interview. The panel also had access to the teacher's prepared statement from the police and the teacher was present at the hearing, so they had the ability to put any questions to him in respect of his interview with the police.

In the circumstances, the panel was not aware of any efforts that had been made to secure the attendance of Pupil A, so the panel concluded that the right to a fair hearing entitled the teacher to have the opportunity to cross-examine this witness.

With regard to the overall question of fairness, the panel noted that it would be unfair to admit the evidence, taking into account the teacher's objection. The video evidence had been made available to the TRA in April 2021 and it was unclear to the panel why this evidence was only now being presented at the start of the hearing. It was clear that the video evidence was not provided to the teacher at the earliest opportunity.

By reason of the above, the panel decided not to admit the video evidence.

Documents in support of the teacher's character and teacher's medical letter

The teacher applied to admit character references and a letter from his doctor. Those documents were not served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 4.20 and 4.23 of the Procedures, and as such the panel was required to decide whether those documents should be admitted under paragraph 4.25 of the Procedures. The panel took into account the representations from the teacher and the objections raised by the presenting officer to the admission of the documents.

When asked by the panel about the dates of the character references, the teacher explained that the character references were provided prior to the date of these allegations. The teacher did not have a copy of the medical letter from his doctor to hand and stated that he would need to find the letter. The presenting officer objected to this application, as he had not seen a copy of the character references prior to the hearing. The presenting officer also noted that the teacher could not make an application to admit the medical letter which was not available.

As noted above, under paragraph 4.18 of the Procedures, the panel may admit any evidence, where it is fair to do so, which may reasonably be considered to be relevant to the case.

The panel noted that whilst character references may be helpful at a later stage, the references were not current or up-to-date. The panel was not satisfied that the documents could reasonably be considered to be relevant to the case. The panel also noted that they were unable to admit the medical letter, if it was not available at the time of the application. Since the documents did not meet the threshold of relevance, it was unnecessary for the panel to consider the question of fairness.

By reason of the above, the panel decided not to admit the character references or medical letter.

Application to amend allegation 1

An application was made by the presenting officer to amend the Notice of Proceedings by amending the date of conviction and date of sentencing in allegation 1. The panel has the power to, in the interests of justice, amend an allegation or the particulars of an allegation, at any stage before making its decision about whether the facts of the case have been proved.

Before making an amendment, the panel was required to consider any representations by the presenting officer and by the teacher, and the parties were afforded that opportunity. The teacher raised no objection to the amendment.

The panel considered that the amendment proposed, being a correction of a factual date error, would not change the nature, scope or seriousness of the allegation. There was no prospect of the teacher's case being presented differently had the amendment been made at an earlier stage, and therefore no unfairness or prejudice was caused to the teacher.

The panel therefore agreed to the amendment of allegation 1, which would now read as follows:

On 2 December 2019 you were convicted at Minshull Street Crown Court of three offences of assault by beating (battery) for which, on 7 January 2020 you were sentenced to a 12 month community order, a rehabilitation activity requirement for 15 days and a victim surcharge of £85.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of Proceedings – pages 2 to 6

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 8 to 111

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 113 to 114

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing.

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witness, who was called on behalf of the TRA:

Witness A – [REDACTED], St Anne’s R.C. High School

The teacher also gave oral evidence at the hearing.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Dr Qureshi was previously recruited via a supply agency to work at St Anne’s RC High School (“the School”) in May 2018. Dr Qureshi was later employed on a temporary contract as a Mathematics teacher at St Anne’s RC High School (“the School”) between September 2018 and December 2018. In October 2018, Pupil A made a disclosure to staff members that Dr Qureshi had made [REDACTED] feel uncomfortable at the School.

Pupil A disclosed that Dr Qureshi would squeeze [REDACTED] face and call [REDACTED] beautiful and gorgeous. Pupil A further disclosed that since September to October 2018, Dr Qureshi had told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was his favourite, kissed [REDACTED] on the head, hugged [REDACTED], put his hand on [REDACTED] hand, touched [REDACTED] leg, called [REDACTED] gorgeous and squished [REDACTED] face with his hands.

Dr Qureshi was escorted off the School premises on the same day. Later, his employment came to an end. A police investigation was carried out where it was discovered that Dr Qureshi had behaved similarly whilst employed at a different school.

On 2 December 2019, Dr Qureshi was convicted at Minshull Street Crown Court of three offences of assault by beating (battery). On 7 January 2020 he was sentenced to a 12 month community order, a rehabilitation activity requirement for 15 days and a victim surcharge of £85.

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 2 December 2019 you were convicted at Minshull Street Crown Court of three offences of assault by beating (battery) for which, on 7 January 2020 you were sentenced to a 12 month community order, a rehabilitation activity requirement for 15 days and a victim surcharge of £85.**

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation. The panel reviewed the certificate of conviction, which stated that he was convicted on 2 December 2019 upon his own confession of three offences of assault by beating. The panel also reviewed the transcript of the proceedings.

Therefore, the panel found allegation 1 proved.

- 2. The conduct leading to your conviction(s) at Allegation 1 was in respect of conduct that occurred between September – October 2018 and was;**

- a. Perpetrated on Pupil A;**

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation. The panel reviewed the certificate of conviction, which stated that he was convicted on 2 December 2019 upon his own confession of three offences of assault by beating. The panel also reviewed the transcript of the proceedings, which named Pupil A.

Therefore, the panel found allegation 2a proved.

- b. Perpetrated on school premises and/or during school hours;**

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation. The panel reviewed the certificate of conviction, which stated that he was convicted on 2 December 2019 upon his own confession of three offences of assault by beating. The panel also reviewed the transcript of the proceedings, which stated that the offences were committed when Dr Qureshi was a Maths teacher of Pupil A.

The panel considered the police summary and Witness A's oral evidence. Pupil A had disclosed that the incidents took place during [REDACTED] lessons with Dr Qureshi.

Therefore, the panel found allegation 2b proved.

- c. Included, on more than one occasion;**

- i. Telling Pupil A [REDACTED] was your favourite and/or [REDACTED] was beautiful and/or gorgeous or words to that effect;**

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation. Dr Qureshi stated that he would tell a number of students that they were his favourite.

The panel considered the police summary document where Pupil A stated that Dr Qureshi had made [REDACTED] feel uncomfortable at the School. Pupil A disclosed that Dr Qureshi would call [REDACTED] beautiful and gorgeous. Pupil A further disclosed that since September to October 2018, Dr Qureshi had told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was his favourite.

Therefore, the panel found allegation 2c(i) proved.

ii. Touching Pupil A on the leg and/or hand with your hand;

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation. Dr Qureshi stated in oral evidence that the touch of Pupil A's leg was accidental and caused by the back of his hand touching Pupil A's leg when pulling up a chair to sit next to [REDACTED].

Dr Qureshi was convicted on his admission of assault for touching Pupil A's leg.

The panel considered the police summary document where Pupil A had informed the police that he crouched down, put his right hand under the desk and touched [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] legs. Dr Qureshi stated in oral evidence that Pupil A was lying about this.

The panel found allegation 2c(ii) proved.

iii. Touching and/or squeezing Pupil A's face;

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation.

The panel considered the police summary document where Pupil A disclosed that Dr Qureshi would squeeze [REDACTED] face.

Dr Qureshi was convicted on his admission of assault for touching and squeezing Pupil A's face.

The panel found allegation 2c(iii) proved.

iv. Hugging Pupil A;

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation.

The panel considered the police summary document where Pupil A disclosed that Dr Qureshi had hugged [REDACTED].

Dr Qureshi was convicted on his admission of assault for hugging Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 2(iv) proved.

v. Kissing Pupil A on the head.

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation.

The panel considered the police summary document where Pupil A disclosed that Dr Qureshi had kissed [REDACTED] on the head.

Dr Qureshi was convicted on his admission of assault for kissing Pupil A on the head.

The panel found allegation 2(v) proved.

3. The conduct leading to your conviction(s) at Allegation 1 was of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

Dr Qureshi denied this allegation. Dr Qureshi stated in oral evidence that the touch of Pupil A's leg was accidental and occurred due to the back of his hand touching Pupil A's leg when pulling up a chair to sit next to [REDACTED]. Dr Qureshi also stated that he would use the terms 'beautiful' and 'gorgeous' to canteen and other staff.

The panel had regard for the legal adviser's advice.

The panel noted that in the case of *Basson v GMC* (2018), it stated "the state of a person's mind is not something that can be proved by direct observation. It can only be proved by inference or deduction from the surrounding evidence".

It was also stated in this case that a sexual motive means the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a future sexual relationship.

The panel considered that the use of the words 'beautiful' and 'gorgeous' related to Pupil A's physical appearance which Dr Qureshi admitted to and he accepted that the use of the words may have been inappropriate. The Panel also considered the kissing on the pupil's head and hugging to be inappropriate and capable of being construed as sexual.

The panel considered the police summary document where Pupil A had informed the police that he crouched down, put his right hand under the desk and touched [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] legs. Dr Qureshi stated in oral evidence that Pupil A was lying about this. The panel did not consider there to be any reason why Pupil A would lie about this. On review of the documents, the panel noted that Dr Qureshi had lied to the police.

Dr Qureshi accepted in oral evidence that there would be no reason for placing his hand under Pupil A's desk. The panel considered that there was no other reason for placing his hand under the desk, other than if it were to be of a sexual nature. The panel was of

the view that his action would suggest that a reasonable person would consider this to be of a sexual nature.

The panel considered the case of GMC v Haris (2020). The panel asked itself whether on the balance of probabilities reasonable persons would think the words and actions found proven could be sexual. The panel considered that there was no other reason for placing his hand under the desk, other than if it were to be of a sexual nature. The panel was of the view that his action would be considered by a reasonable person to be of a sexual nature. The panel considered that in all the circumstances of the conduct in the case, it was more likely than not that the teacher's purpose of such words and actions were sexual.

The panel noted that Dr Qureshi had lied to the police on more than one occasion. The panel considered that the lies were premeditated as Dr Qureshi had prepared his statement before his police interview.

In light of all of the various verbal and physical incidents and on the balance of probabilities, the panel found allegation 3 proved.

4. Prior to your appointment and/or during your employment at the School, you failed to disclose to the School your previous Prohibition Order and/or the nature of your previous misconduct for similar acts as alleged at allegation 1.

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation.

The panel noted that Dr Qureshi had been subject to a previous prohibition order. Dr Qureshi accepted in oral evidence that his previous prohibition order was the subject of child protection concerns. The panel noted that when Dr Qureshi completed his application form for his position as Mathematics teacher at the School, he was asked whether he had ever been the subject of any child protection concerns within his work or personal life or been the subject of, or involved in disciplinary action, including any which is time expired. Dr Qureshi answered "No" to this question.

Dr Qureshi accepted, when questioned by the panel, that he should have answered 'yes' to this question.

Therefore, the panel found allegation 4 proved.

5. Your conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 4 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

The panel considered Dr Qureshi's admission to this allegation.

The panel had regard for the legal adviser's advice when considering the allegation of

dishonesty. The panel needed first to ascertain subjectively the actual state of Dr Qureshi's knowledge or belief as to the facts. Secondly, the panel needed to determine whether Dr Qureshi's state of mind was honest or dishonest by the application of the objective standards of the ordinary honest person.

The panel firstly turned its mind to the actual state of Dr Qureshi's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The panel noted that Dr Qureshi had knowingly misled the School on his application form when asked whether he was or has been subject to any child protection concerns. Dr Qureshi lied by answering 'No' as he had been subject to a teaching prohibition order.

The panel also noted that Dr Qureshi was clearly dishonest when lying to the police during his interview.

Furthermore, the panel found that his actions would be regarded by the standards of ordinary, decent people to be dishonest.

When considering lack of integrity, the panel recognised that this allegation connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own profession that involves more than mere honesty. It is linked to the manner in which the profession professes to serve the public.

The panel recognised that in addition to Dr Qureshi acting dishonestly, Dr Qureshi's actions impacted on the pupils, parents, community, individual colleagues and the School as a whole.

The panel noted Witness A's oral evidence about the negative publicity and the negative impact within the community which was caused as a result of Dr Qureshi's conduct. The panel noted Dr Qureshi's disregard for the teacher's standards to maintain appropriate and professional boundaries with pupils. The panel noted the clear reputational damage to the School.

The panel considered that Dr Qureshi's behaviour did not adhere to the ethical standards of a teacher and was in contrast to the manner in which the profession professes to serve the public. The panel therefore found allegation 5 proved.

Unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Dr Qureshi, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Dr Qureshi 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

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- 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
- 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 Dr Qureshi amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Dr Qureshi's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 10 and 11 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of violence was relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception

The panel therefore found that Dr Qureshi's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 proved, the panel further found that Dr Qureshi's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Relevant Offence

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Dr Qureshi in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Dr Qureshi 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
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - 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.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. The offences for which Dr Qureshi was convicted were committed against a pupil and on the School's premises.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils.

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

This was a case concerning an offence involving violence, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel noted that there was no relevant evidence of any mitigating circumstances.

In the light of the findings, the panel did find the convictions to be relevant to the teacher's ongoing suitability to teach.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and 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. 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 a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the protection of pupils and the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel found that Dr Qureshi's misconduct amounted to a finding of a relevant conviction for three offences of assault by beating (battery), a finding that his conduct was sexually motivated and that he acted dishonestly and with a lack of integrity. Therefore, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of his inappropriate conduct against Pupil A in a school setting.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Dr Qureshi was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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 Dr Qureshi 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 Dr Qureshi.

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 Dr Qureshi. 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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;

- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;
- other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- 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.

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 evidence that Dr Qureshi's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Dr Qureshi was acting under duress, and, in fact, the panel found Dr Qureshi's actions to be calculated and motivated.

The panel saw evidence that showed Dr Qureshi was previously subject to a teaching prohibition order for similar misconduct. Dr Qureshi's previous prohibition order was set aside in 2017. The panel considered Dr Qureshi's misconduct to be a repeated pattern of grooming.

No relevant evidence was offered by Dr Qureshi to demonstrate any good character.

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 Dr Qureshi 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 Dr Qureshi. The fact that Dr Qureshi had previously been subject to a prohibition order for similar misconduct and had not learnt from his previous failings was a significant factor in forming that opinion. The nature of his proven misconduct was very serious. 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 there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include, violence, serious dishonesty, serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used his professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel found that Dr Qureshi misconduct against Pupil A was sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature. The panel considered Dr Qureshi's conduct to be dishonest and lacked integrity and the conviction for the three assault offences link to violent behaviour.

Whilst Dr Qureshi stated that he deeply regretted his actions, the panel did not consider Dr Qureshi showed any insight into his actions.

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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Dr Tariq Majid Qureshi should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Dr Qureshi 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

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - 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.
 - 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 Dr Qureshi fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include an offence involving violence, a finding of dishonesty and a finding that the conduct was of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

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 Dr Qureshi, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. "The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils."

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, which the panel sets out as follows, "Whilst Dr Qureshi stated that he deeply regretted his actions, the panel did not consider Dr Qureshi showed any insight into his actions."

The panel also noted that "that Dr Qureshi was clearly dishonest when lying to the police during his interview."

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future well being 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, “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Dr Qureshi was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the panels comment that “there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of his inappropriate conduct against Pupil A in a school setting.”

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 Dr Qureshi himself, however the panel noted “No relevant evidence was offered by Dr Qureshi to demonstrate any good character.” The panel also observe “There was evidence that Dr Qureshi’s actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Dr Qureshi was acting under duress, and, in fact, the panel found Dr Qureshi’s actions to be calculated and motivated.”

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

“The panel saw evidence that showed Dr Qureshi was previously subject to a teaching prohibition order for similar misconduct. Dr Qureshi’s previous prohibition order was set aside in 2017.” I have placed considerable weight on the panels comment “The panel considered Dr Qureshi’s misconduct to be a repeated pattern of grooming.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Dr Qureshi has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition 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 panel found that Dr Qureshi's misconduct against Pupil A was sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature. The panel considered Dr Qureshi's conduct to be dishonest and lacked integrity and the conviction for the three assault offences link to violent behaviour."

I have considered whether allowing for a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, four 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 three assault offences and the link to violent behaviour, the sexual nature of the findings, the panels consideration that Dr Qureshi's misconduct was a repeated pattern of grooming and the dishonesty.

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 Dr Tariq Majid Qureshi 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 Dr Qureshi 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.

Dr Tariq Majid Qureshi 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: John Knowles

Date: 7 February 2022

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