



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Jonathan Sinfield: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

April 2024

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Statement of agreed facts	6
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	8
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

Teacher:	Mr Jonathan Sinfield
Teacher ref number:	1569919
Teacher date of birth:	11 July 1992
TRA reference:	20562
Date of determination:	30 April 2024
Former employer:	Wellsway School, Bristol

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 30 April 2024 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Jonathan Sinfield.

The panel members were Ms Hannah Fellows (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Cathy Logan (teacher panellist) and Mr Dara Islam (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Rebecca Hughes of Birketts 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 Sinfield that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Sinfield 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 Clare Hastie of Kingsley Napley LLP, Mr Sinfield or any representative for Mr Sinfield.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 21 March 2024. As outlined below, the panel noted differences between the allegations in the notice of meeting and the allegations in the statement of agreed facts and decided to amend the allegations. The amended allegations are as set out below.

It was alleged that Mr Sinfield was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that, he was convicted of the following;

1. Offence 1: Wound / inflict grievous bodily harm without intent on 27/10/20. Offences against the person act 1861 s.20 Court/Date: Bristol Crown Court. 24 June 2022. Disposal: Imprisonment 3 years. Victim surcharge
2. Offence 2: Assault of a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm on 27/10/20. Offences against the person act 1861 s.47 Court/Date: Bristol Crown Court. 24 June 2022. Disposal: No separate penalty

Mr Sinfield admitted the particulars of allegations 1 and 2 and that his behaviour amounted to the conviction of a relevant offence, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Sinfield on the 15 January 2024, and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on the 15 February 2024.

Preliminary applications

The panel heard legal advice on proceeding with a professional conduct panel meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Sinfield or any representative on behalf of Mr Sinfield. The panel noted that the TRA had agreed to a request from Mr Sinfield for the allegations to be considered without a hearing.

The panel therefore concluded that it was appropriate to proceed in the circumstances taking into account Mr Sinfield's admission of the allegations, request for such a meeting and the interests of justice or public interest in proceeding.

Notice of meeting

The notice of meeting had not been sent to Mr Sinfield 10 weeks before the hearing. However, the panel noted an email from Mr Sinfield in which he agreed to waive the 10 week notice period under paragraph 5.23 of the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession May 2020 (the '2020 Procedures'). The panel was therefore content that it could proceed with the professional conduct panel meeting.

Application to amend allegations

The panel noted that the allegations as set out in the notice of meeting did not match those in the statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Sinfield on 15 January 2024, and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 15 February 2024 or the certificate of conviction.

The allegations in the statement of agreed facts read as follows:

You have been convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

- 1. Wound / inflict grievous bodily harm without intent*
- 2. Assault of a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm*

The allegations in the notice of meeting dated 21 March 2024, read as follows:

You have been convicted at any time, of the following relevant offences:

Offence 1: Wounding / inflicting grievous bodily harm on 27/10/20. Offences against the person act 1861 s.20 Court/Date: Bristol Crown Court. 24 June 2022. Disposal. Imprisonment 3 years. Victim surcharge 190.00

Offence 2: Assault occasioning actual bodily harm on 27/10/20. Offences against the person act 1861 s.47 Court/Date: Bristol Crown Court. 24 June 2022. Disposal: No separate penalty

The panel was advised that it had the power to amend allegations in accordance with paragraph 5.83 of the 2020 Procedures and decided to consider whether to amend the allegations in light of the different wording in the statement of agreed facts and notice of meeting.

The panel considered that the differences between the two sets of allegations did not change the nature and scope of the allegations. The allegations were still within the same parameters. As such, the panel considered that amending the allegations would not amount to a material change to the allegations.

The panel decided to proceed to amend the allegations to reflect the first part of the allegations as set out in the notice of meeting.

The panel noted that the teacher and presenting officer had not been informed of the proposed changes to the allegations. However, the changes proposed were in line with the agreed statement of facts which was signed by both the teacher and presenting officer.

The legal adviser drew the panel's attention to the case of *Dr Bashir Ahmedsowida v General Medical Council* [2021] EWHC 3466 (Admin), 2021 WL 06064095 which held that the lateness of amendments did not necessarily mean they were unjust, as acknowledged in the previous case of *Professional Standards Authority v Health and Care Professions Council and Doree* [2017] EWCA Civ 319 at [56].

Accordingly, the panel exercised its ability to amend the allegations and considered the amended allegations, which are set out above.

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 3 to 6
- Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 7 to 20
- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 21 to 23
- Section 4: TRA documents – pages 24 to 158
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 159 to 172

In addition, the panel received the following:

- Determination of case without a hearing – request pro forma – pages 173 to 174
- Notice of meeting – pages 175 to 176
- Email confirming waiver of 10 weeks' notice period – page 177

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Sinfield on 15 January 2024, and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 15 February 2024.

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached the following decision and reasons:

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Sinfield 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.

On the 1 August 2015, Mr Sinfield commenced employment as a teacher at Wellsway School ('the School').

In October 2020, Mr Sinfield was absent from work after [REDACTED] was taken to hospital.

On the 28 October 2020, Mr Sinfield was arrested for grievous bodily harm in respect of [REDACTED]. He was interviewed by the police, denied that he acted with intent and was released under investigation.

On the 30 October 2020, a LADO managing allegation strategy meeting was held.

On the 2 June 2021, a [REDACTED] was held in respect of [REDACTED].

On the 6 September 2021, a LADO managing allegation strategy meeting was held.

On the 29 October 2021, the findings from the [REDACTED] were released to the School.

On the 11 November 2021, Mr Sinfield was charged with grievous bodily harm.

On the 15 November 2021, Mr Sinfield was notified that the School would be commencing a disciplinary investigation.

On the 26 November 2021, Mr Sinfield attended an investigatory interview.

On the 11 January 2022, a disciplinary hearing was held, which Mr Sinfield attended.

On the 12 January 2022, Mr Sinfield was notified of the outcome of the disciplinary hearing and ceased working at the School.

On the 22 March 2022, Mr Sinfield was convicted at Bristol Crown Court of wound/inflict grievous bodily harm without intent, and of assault a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm.

On the 24 June 2022, Mr Sinfield was sentenced at Bristol Crown Court to 3 years imprisonment.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. Offence 1: Wound / inflict grievous bodily harm without intent on 27/10/20. Offences against the person act 1861 s.20 Court/Date: Bristol Crown Court. 24 June 2022. Disposal: Imprisonment 3 years. Victim surcharge**
- 2. Offence 2: Assault of a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm on 27/10/20. Offences against the person act 1861 s.47 Court/Date: Bristol Crown Court. 24 June 2022. Disposal: No separate penalty**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Sinfield on 15 January 2024. In that statement of agreed facts, Mr Sinfield admitted the amended particulars of allegations 1 and 2. Further, it was admitted the facts of the allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel considered the letter from Mr Sinfield where he confirmed that he had entered a guilty plea for grievous bodily harm to take advantage of a discount on his sentencing, which resulted in his imprisonment. Mr Sinfield confirmed he admitted to the allegations and that they amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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 the certificate of conviction from Bristol Crown Court, dated 22 March 2022, which detailed that Mr Sinfield had been convicted of one count of wound/inflict grievous bodily harm without intent and one count of assault a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm. The panel noted that Mr Sinfield pleaded guilty to both offences.

In respect of the allegations, Mr Sinfield was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment and to pay a victim surcharge.

The panel also noted the sentencing remarks which indicated that the offences related to [REDACTED]. The sentencing remarks indicated that Mr Sinfield had [REDACTED], which resulted in significant and continuing injuries.

On examination of the documents before the panel and the admissions in the signed statement of facts, the panel was satisfied that the facts of allegations 1 and 2 were proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found both of 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 document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as 'the Advice'.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Sinfield in relation to the facts it found proved involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Sinfield 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 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 Sinfield fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel noted that the offences had taken place outside of the education setting and had not involved pupils or other members of the School's staff. Nevertheless, having considered all the facts of the case the panel decided that Mr Sinfield's convictions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting, as they [REDACTED] at the time of the offences.

The offences caused the panel particular concern because they were committed [REDACTED].

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence 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 Sinfield's behaviour in committing these offences could undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His

conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care [REDACTED].

The panel noted that Mr Sinfield's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The [REDACTED] and public protection issues engaged by Mr Sinfield's actions were demonstrated by the Court's sentence.

This was a case involving an offence of violence which the Advice states is more likely to be considered a relevant offence. The panel also noted that the Advice refers to [REDACTED] as being more likely to be considered a relevant offence and, whilst Mr Sinfield was not convicted of an offence of [REDACTED], it considered [REDACTED].

The panel further noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Sinfield, he admitted the facts amounted to the conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding his admission the panel, having considered all the evidence before them, was satisfied on the evidence before it that Mr Sinfield had been convicted of a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Sinfield's 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.

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. 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 the following to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public/the maintenance of public confidence in the profession/declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the nature of the offences for which Mr Sinfield was convicted, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and

other members of the public. His actions raised obvious concerns and significant public and [REDACTED] concerns.

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

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

Notwithstanding 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 Sinfield. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

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 the teacher. 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 are relevant in this case are:

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

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.

The panel took into account the sentencing remarks submitted as part of the bundle, which highlighted the mitigation that was taken into account. In particular, it was noted that Mr Sinfield had no previous convictions and was a man of previous good character,

and that the state of mind Mr Sinfield was in at the time of the incident may have been a contributory factor.

There was no evidence that Mr Sinfield actions were not deliberate.

The panel considered the prosecution' opening facts that Mr Sinfield had been unwell at the time of the offences, however, the panel did not find this sufficient to determine that Mr Sinfield had been acting under duress and no evidence had been provided to evidence that this impacted his actions. Therefore, the panel concluded that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Sinfield was acting under extreme duress.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Sinfield demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and has contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that there was a lack of evidence of remorse on the part of Mr Sinfield. The panel considered the letter submitted by Mr Sinfield, where he admitted to pleading guilty to the offences but also denied the narrative put forward by the prosecution and also blamed [REDACTED] for putting forward "*false statements*". The panel considered that Mr Sinfield had not reflected on the impact of his actions on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Further, the panel were concerned that Mr Sinfield had not reflected on the fact [REDACTED], following his actions and that [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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Sinfield 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 Sinfield. The panel found that this was an incredibly serious conviction for which he received a term of imprisonment. The panel was of the view that Mr Sinfield still sees himself as a wrongly convicted man, and that this was apparent from his letter to the TRA dated 1 May 2023. Further, the panel noted that Mr Sinfield had [REDACTED]. This was 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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. 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. One of these behaviours includes [REDACTED]. The panel found that Mr Sinfield was responsible for inflicting grievous bodily harm and assault occasioning bodily harm [REDACTED], which the panel considered could amount to [REDACTED].

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours includes violence. The panel found that Mr Sinfield was responsible for inflicting grievous bodily harm and assault occasioning bodily harm. The panel also considered that this was [REDACTED].

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 Sinfield should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Sinfield 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 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 Sinfield, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for the relevant offences of wounding/inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent and assaulting a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm. Mr Sinfield was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment.

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 Sinfield, 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 offences had taken place outside of the education setting and had not involved pupils or other members of the School’s staff. Nevertheless, having considered all the facts of the case the panel decided that Mr Sinfield’s convictions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting, as they [REDACTED] at the time of the offences.” The panel has also noted that “The [REDACTED] and public protection issues engaged by Mr Sinfield’s actions were demonstrated by the Court’s sentence.” 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 has set out as follows, “The panel noted that there was a lack of evidence of remorse on the part of Mr Sinfield. The panel considered the letter submitted by Mr Sinfield, where he admitted to pleading guilty to the offences but also denied the narrative put forward by the prosecution and also blamed [REDACTED] for putting forward “*false statements*”. The panel considered that Mr Sinfield had not reflected on the impact of his actions on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Further, the panel were concerned that Mr Sinfield had not reflected on the fact [REDACTED], following his

actions and that [REDACTED].” In my judgement, the lack of full 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 has observed, “Mr Sinfield’s behaviour in committing these offences could undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care [REDACTED].” I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for wounding/inflicting grievous bodily harm without intent and assaulting a person thereby occasioning them actual bodily harm 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 Sinfield himself. The panel has commented, “There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Sinfield demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and has contributed significantly to the education sector.” The panel has also noted the mitigation highlighted in the sentencing remarks and that “In particular, it was noted that Mr Sinfield had no previous convictions and was a man of previous good character, and that the state of mind Mr Sinfield was in at the time of the incident may have been a contributory factor.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Sinfield 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 the seriousness of the offence and Mr Sinfield’s lack of full insight and remorse. The panel has said, “The panel found that this was an incredibly serious conviction for which he received a term of imprisonment. The panel was of the view that Mr Sinfield still sees himself as a wrongly convicted man, and that this was apparent from his letter to the TRA dated 1 May 2023.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Sinfield 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 full insight and remorse, 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 that "The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours includes [REDACTED]. The panel found that Mr Sinfield was responsible for inflicting grievous bodily harm and assault occasioning bodily harm [REDACTED], which the panel considered could amount to [REDACTED]."

The panel has also noted that "The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours includes violence. The panel found that Mr Sinfield was responsible for inflicting grievous bodily harm and assault occasioning bodily harm. The panel also considered that this was [REDACTED]."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period 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 serious nature of the offences of which Mr Sinfield was convicted and the lack of full 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 Sinfield 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 Sinfield 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 Sinfield 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 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 1 May 2024

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