



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Christopher Glover: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

May 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
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

Teacher:	Mr Christopher Glover
Teacher ref number:	9745103
Teacher date of birth:	12 May 1975
TRA reference:	19985
Date of determination:	9 May 2023
Former employer:	Newbridge Short Stay School, Worcester

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 9 May 2023, to consider the case of Mr Christopher Glover.

The panel members were Mr Ian Hylan (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Nicola Hartley (lay panellist) and Ms Patricia Hunt (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Claire Watson of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Christopher Glover that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Christopher Glover provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Laura Vignoles of Kingsley Napley LLP or Mr Christopher Glover.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 1 March 2023.

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

1. On 5 April 2022, at Dudley Magistrates' Court, he was convicted of the following offences:
 - a. One offence of voyeurism (recording a private act), contrary to section 67 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003;
 - b. Three offences of Making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, contrary to s.1 of the Protection of Children Act 1978 [59 Category A images/videos, 53 Category B images, and 92 Category C images]
 - c. Three counts of Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, contrary to s.1 of the Protection of Children Act 1978 [3 Category A videos, 4 Category B videos, 1 Category B image]

Mr Glover admitted the facts of the case and conviction of a relevant offence.

Preliminary applications

At the outset of the meeting, the legal adviser brought to the panel's attention that the notice of meeting dated 1 March 2023 did not include a stem to the allegation, namely whether Mr Glover was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute or conviction, at any time, of a relevant offence. Although a previous notice of meeting referred to unacceptable professional conduct and conviction of a relevant offence, the signed statement of agreed facts stated that Mr Glover was guilty of a relevant offence.

The legal adviser also raised that allegation 1c referred to one category B image, which was reflected in the allegations as set out in the signed statement of agreed facts. The panel had sight of the transcript from Mr Glover's sentencing hearing which referred to the distribution of one category C image.

The panel considered whether to amend the allegations. 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.

The panel considered the proposed amendments, and given the seriousness of the allegation, was of the view that it was in the interests of justice for the allegation to be consistently formulated.

The panel considered whether it was necessary to adjourn the meeting for the presenting officer and teacher to make representations on the proposed amendments.

The panel considered that the amendment proposed did not change the nature or scope of the allegations. 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 caused to the teacher. The teacher had been notified of the stem of the allegation, namely conviction of a relevant offence, and had signed the statement of agreed facts which referred to the stem of the allegation. The teacher was also aware of the nature of his conviction.

The panel therefore decided to amend the allegations as follows:

You have been convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

1. On 5 April 2022, at Dudley Magistrates' Court, you were convicted of the following offences:
 - a. One offence of voyeurism (recording a private act), contrary to section 67 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003;
 - b. Three offences of Making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, contrary to s.1 of the Protection of Children Act 1978 [59 Category A images/videos, 53 Category B images, and 92 Category C images]
 - c. Three counts of Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, contrary to s.1 of the Protection of Children Act 1978 [3 Category A videos, 4 Category B videos, 1 Category C image]

The panel did not consider it necessary in the interests of justice or the public interest for the case to be considered at a professional conduct panel hearing or for the meeting to be adjourned to take representations from the presenting officer and teacher on amending the allegations.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 5 to 9

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 5 to 9

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 10 to 35

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Christopher Glover on 18 December 2022.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Glover for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Glover had been employed by Newbridge Short Stay School (“the School”) as a teacher from 1 January 2021.

Mr Glover was arrested on 27 April 2021 by West Midlands Police on suspicion of possession of an indecent image of a child. During interview, Mr Glover admitted to the possession of images and was further arrested regarding an allegation of voyeurism whereby he had secretly filmed an adult undressing without her consent.

On 28 April 2021, the School received a letter from West Midlands Police with information as to Mr Glover’s arrest and bail conditions. On 28 April 2021, the School wrote to Mr Glover and terminated his employment.

Mr Glover was convicted at Dudley Magistrates’ Court on 5 April 2022 following entering a guilty plea to the offences as mentioned in the allegations.

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 5 April 2022, at Dudley Magistrates’ Court, you were convicted of the following offences:**

- a. One offence of voyeurism (recording a private act), contrary to section 67 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003;**
- b. Three offences of Making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, contrary to s.1 of the Protection of Children Act 1978 [59 Category A images/videos, 53 Category B images, and 92 Category C images]**
- c. Three counts of Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, contrary to s.1 of the Protection of Children Act 1978 [3 Category A videos, 4 Category B videos, 1 Category C image]**

The allegations were admitted and were supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers ('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, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of a certificate of conviction from the Crown Court at Wolverhampton. This stated that Mr Glover was convicted on 5 April 2022 at Dudley Magistrates' Court of:

1. Voyeurism – recording a private act;
2. Make indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child;
3. Make indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child;
4. Make indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child;
5. Distribute an indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child;
6. Distribute an indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child;
7. Distribute an indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child.

The panel also had sight of a transcript of the sentencing hearing at Wolverhampton Crown Court. In the prosecution's opening at the sentencing hearing, it was stated that the indecent images included 59 Category A images, 53 Category B images and 92 Category C images. The transcript also showed that the prosecution stated that the

distribution of indecent images of children related to three Category A images and a video, four Category B videos and one Category C image.

The allegations were therefore, found proved.

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 Glover, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Glover 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 noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting as the convictions related to indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children. The panel noted the nature and gravity of the offences. Mr Glover's actions had breached several elements of the frameworks relevant to teaching including Keeping Children Safe in Education and Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public. Although there was no evidence that the indecent images were of pupils at the School, the panel noted from the sentencing transcript that the indecent images were of children as young as 8. Mr Glover had been found guilty of an offence of voyeurism. The sentencing transcript stated that a number of devices were found in Mr Glover's locker at the School, including what was referred to as a secret recording device. The panel noted that examination of that device had shown that it was used in Mr Glover's personal life outside of the education setting to record an adult in a state of undress without their consent. The panel considered this behaviour to have likely impacted members of the

public and noted that the sentencing transcript referred to the distress of the individual that had been recorded without consent.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Glover's behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Glover was allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Glover's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed, and which the Advice states is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

This was a case concerning an offence involving voyeurism and 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 Advice indicates that a conviction for any offence that relates to or involves such offences is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

The panel was provided with no evidence as to Mr Glover's teaching proficiency. The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Glover's fitness to be a teacher. 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.

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 is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Mr Glover and whether a prohibition order is necessary and proportionate. 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 a 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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Glover, which involved a conviction of one offence of voyeurism, three offences of making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children and three counts of distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making and distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Glover were 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 Mr Glover was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

Whilst the panel considered the public interest of retaining the teacher in the profession, the panel had no evidence of Mr Glover's abilities as an educator. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Glover in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher's behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, 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 disclosure;

- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;

Although there was no evidence that Mr Glover's actions had affected the education and well-being of pupils at the School, the panel noted, given the age of the children in the indecent photographs, that these children would have been of school age.

- 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 panel considered that while Mr Glover's actions did constitute sexual misconduct, there was no evidence that Mr Glover had used or exploited the trust, knowledge or influence derived from his professional position.

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 such activity, including one-off incidents;

a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;

dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence.

The panel found that Mr Glover had deliberately concealed his actions. He had secretly recorded an adult without their consent and had used an encrypted application. However, the panel acknowledged that Mr Glover had been open at the first opportunity with the police about his actions.

Even though the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, taking account of the public interest and the seriousness of the behaviour and the likely harm to the public interest were the teacher be allowed to continue to teach, the panel went on to consider whether there were mitigating circumstances.

There was evidence that Mr Glover's actions were deliberate. Mr Glover had purchased a video recording device to record an adult without their knowledge and had downloaded a security application in which he kept images for trading, including sexual images of children.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Glover was acting under extreme duress, for example a physical threat or significant intimidation and, in fact, the panel found Mr Glover's actions to be calculated and motivated.

The panel noted that no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to Mr Glover's abilities as a teacher. No references were provided which attested to high standards in Mr Glover's personal and professional conduct.

Mr Glover had cooperated fully with the police investigation and admitted his conduct in his first interview with the police. The panel acknowledged that Mr Glover had said he kept deleting the sharing application as felt "disgusted", but the panel considered that Mr Glover had nevertheless reinstalled the sharing application and viewed indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children.

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 Glover 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 Glover. The nature of the convictions were a significant factor 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 there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include serious sexual misconduct, for example where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons and 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 found that Mr Glover was responsible for looking at indecent images of children, distributing indecent images of children and recording an adult getting changed without their knowledge.

The panel had sight of a transcript of the sentencing hearing, which referred to Mr Glover's previous good character and [REDACTED]. It was noted that there were a limited number of distributed materials and a limited time over which they were distributed, being October 2020 to April 2021. In mitigation at the sentencing hearing, it was stated that Mr Glover had put "building blocks" in place to address his issues and had willingly engaged in a range of courses to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. However, the panel did not consider that the completion of these courses would address the public interest consideration of maintaining public confidence in the profession. The panel noted that the sentencing transcript stated that Mr Glover had admitted to viewing indecent images of children 'for years' but not constantly and that over time, his 'boundaries got lower'.

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 relevant convictions.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Glover, 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 also, "noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting as the convictions related to indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children. The panel noted the nature and gravity of the offences. Mr Glover's actions had breached several elements of the frameworks relevant to teaching including Keeping Children Safe in Education and Working Together to Safeguard Children."

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious because of the nature of the convictions found proven.

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 a relevant conviction, 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 Glover, 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 protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public. Although there was no evidence that the indecent images were of pupils at the School, the panel noted from the sentencing transcript that the indecent images were of children as young as 8.” 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, “Mr Glover had cooperated fully with the police investigation and admitted his conduct in his first interview with the police. The panel acknowledged that Mr Glover had said he kept deleting the sharing application as felt “disgusted”, but the panel considered that Mr Glover had nevertheless reinstalled the sharing application and viewed indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight or 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 also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Glover’s behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Glover was allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Glover’s behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed, and which the Advice states is likely to be considered “a relevant offence”.

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual misconduct 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 a relevant conviction, 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 Glover himself. The panel comment, "The panel noted that no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to Mr Glover's abilities as a teacher. No references were provided which attested to high standards in Mr Glover's personal and professional conduct."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Glover from teaching and 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 "The panel found that Mr Glover was responsible for looking at indecent images of children, distributing indecent images of children and recording an adult getting changed without their knowledge."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Glover 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 evidence of full 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 had sight of a transcript of the sentencing hearing, which referred to Mr Glover's previous good character and [REDACTED]. It was noted that there were a limited number of distributed materials and a limited time over which they were distributed, being October 2020 to April 2021. In mitigation at the sentencing hearing, it was stated that Mr Glover had put "building blocks" in place to address his issues and had willingly engaged in a range of courses to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. However, the panel did not consider that the completion of these courses would address the public interest consideration of maintaining public confidence in the profession. The panel noted that the sentencing transcript stated that Mr Glover had admitted to viewing indecent images of children 'for years' but not constantly and that over time, his 'boundaries got lower'."

I have considered whether not allowing for a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, the factors which mean that allowing for no review is necessary are the nature of the convictions and the lack of evidence of insight or 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 Christopher Glover 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 Christopher Glover 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 Christopher Glover has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alan Meyrick', followed by a vertical line.

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 15 May 2023

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