



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Darren Wogman: Professional conduct panel hearing

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

November 2024

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	7
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 Darren Wogman
Teacher ref number: 1584320
Teacher date of birth: 02/05/1990
TRA reference: 18315
Date of determination: 4 November 2024
Former employer: University College School, London (“the School”)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 4 November 2024 to consider the case of Mr Wogman.

The panel members were Ms Aisha Miller (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Jeremy Phillips KC (lay panellist) and Mrs Joanne Arscott (teacher panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Louisa Atkin of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Wogman was not present but was represented by Mr James Lloyd of Mountford Chambers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 30 July 2024.

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

1. On 4 October 2019, in the Willesden Magistrates' Court, Mr Wogman was convicted of:
 - a. One count of Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of Children on 11 April 2019, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s1(a).

Mr Wogman admitted the allegation and that the allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. However, given that Mr Wogman did not attend the hearing, the allegations were treated as not admitted.

Preliminary applications

Applicable procedures

The panel noted the allegation against Mr Wogman was referred to the TRA by the police on 12 April 2019, as confirmed by an email dated the same day. As such, the 2018 version of the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession (the "Procedures") applied in this case.

Notwithstanding the above, the panel also acknowledged the Notice of Hearing dated 30 July 2024 referred Mr Wogman to certain provisions in the 2020 version of the Procedures.

The panel considered paragraph 1.6 of the 2020 version of the Procedures, which states the 2018 version of the Procedures will apply to the case unless, in the interests of justice or the public interest, the TRA or the panel directs otherwise.

As the Notice of Hearing dated 30 July 2024 referred Mr Wogman to the provisions of the 2020 versions of the Procedures, the panel considered that it was in the interests of justice for the 2020 version of the Procedures to apply in this case.

The panel noted that no objections to the application of the 2020 version of the Procedures were received by the presenting officer or the representative of Mr Wogman. Additionally, the panel considered that Mr Wogman would not suffer prejudice as a result of the 2020 version of the Procedures applying to his case.

Accordingly, the panel determined that the 2020 version of the Procedures applied to Mr Wogman's case pursuant to paragraph 1.6 of the Procedures.

Proceeding in absence

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer for the hearing to proceed in the absence of Mr Wogman. No objection was made by Mr Wogman's representative to the application.

The panel considered whether the hearing should continue in the absence of Mr Wogman.

The panel was satisfied that the TRA had complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19(1)(a) to (c) of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the "Regulations").

The panel was also satisfied that the Notice of Hearing complied with paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24 of the Procedures.

The panel took as its starting point the principle from R v Jones [2003] that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one. In considering the question of fairness, the panel recognised that fairness to the professional is of prime importance but that it also encompasses the fair, economic, expeditious and efficient disposal of allegations against the professional, as was explained in GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis [2016].

In making its decision, the panel has noted that Mr Wogman may waive his right to participate in the hearing. The panel has firstly taken account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of R v Jones [2003].

Mr Wogman responded to the Notice of Hearing dated 30 July 2024 on 22 August 2024 stating that he intended to be present at the hearing. The panel considered submissions from Mr Wogman's representative, that Mr Wogman no longer wished to attend the hearing and was satisfied with the hearing continuing with his representative making submissions on his behalf.

Whilst the panel had not been provided with evidence in relation to Mr Wogman's reasons for no longer wishing to attend the hearing, the panel determined that Mr Wogman had waived his right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing was taking place and that he would be represented.

Mr Wogman's representative submitted that an adjournment would not result in Mr Wogman attending the hearing as he had unequivocally waived his right to attend. The panel therefore determined it to be unlikely that Mr Wogman would attend an adjourned hearing, as there was no evidence to the contrary and it received direct submissions from Mr Wogman's representative on this point.

The panel had regard to the benefit of Mr Wogman having representation at the hearing, and that it is able to take his representative's submissions into account at the relevant stage, including evidence addressing mitigation. The panel further had regard to the fact that Mr Wogman had admitted the allegation and had not raised any points of dispute.

The panel was also able to exercise vigilance in making its decision, taking into account the degree of risk of the panel reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard Mr Wogman's account.

The panel recognised that the allegation against Mr Wogman is serious and that there is a real risk that if proven, the panel will be required to consider whether to recommend that Mr Wogman ought to be prohibited from being a teacher.

The panel also recognised that the efficient disposal of allegations against teachers is required to ensure the protection of pupils and to maintain confidence in the profession. The conduct alleged was said to have taken place whilst Mr Wogman was employed at the School. The School therefore had an interest in the hearing taking place in order to move forwards. This was especially the case as the allegation against Mr Wogman occurred in 2019, meaning a considerable amount of time has already passed.

The panel considered that in light of Mr Wogman's waiver of his right to appear, by taking such measures referred to above to address any unfairness insofar as is possible, and taking account of his representative's submissions, that on balance, this is a serious allegation and the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time was in favour of the hearing continuing.

The panel therefore determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 5.47 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Wogman.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

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

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Notice of Hearing and responses – pages 4 to 18

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 27

Section 4: Teaching documents – page 28

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

Witnesses

No witnesses provided evidence.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

A referral was made to the TRA by the police on 12 April 2019, in relation to Mr Wogman's alleged conduct.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. On 4 October 2019, in the Willesden Magistrates' Court, you were convicted of:

- a) One count of Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of Children on 11 April 2019, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s1(a).**

Mr Wogman admitted the allegation.

The panel was presented with a certificate of conviction from HM Courts and Tribunals Service, confirming that Mr Wogman was convicted on 4 October 2019, in the Willesden Magistrates' Court, of the offence particularised in this allegation.

Mr Wogman was sentenced on 5 November 2019 in the Crown Court at Harrow to:

- 4 months imprisonment, suspended for 24 months;
- 7 years on the sex offenders register;
- remain at home address between 10:00pm and 5:00am for 28 days;
- pay £500 in costs within 6 months; and
- pay £115 victim surcharge.

The panel was presented with the transcript of the sentencing remarks of her Honour Judge [REDACTED] sat in the Crown Court at Harrow, dated 5 November 2019, summarising the offence and the reason for the sentences imposed.

The panel noted that Mr Wogman had provided no further evidence to persuade the panel that there were exceptional circumstances to call into question the facts implied by

the conviction. The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of this offence by Mr Wogman.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a) proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wogman, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2 of the Teachers' Standards, Mr Wogman 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs.
- 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 Mr Wogman's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting, as his conviction relates to an offence of making an indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public, given the harm caused in supporting an industry that exploits children.

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

The panel noted that Mr Wogman's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed, and which the Teacher Misconduct: the Prohibition of Teachers, referred to as "the Advice", states is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

This was a case concerning making indecent photograph or indecent pseudo photograph of a child. The Advice indicates that a conviction for any offence that relates to or involves such an offence is likely to be considered “a relevant offence”.

The panel considered Mr Wogman’s offence to be grave, in light of the following aggravating factors outlined in the sentencing remarks dated 5 November 2019:

- “whilst it may be argued this is one image, it is a moving image, it is of quite some length and it relates to young people, you are a person who at that stage worked with young people. There is a risk in all of this which I am sure it is apparent to you and easy to see”
- “..you downloaded that image. You saved it and you watched it on more than one occasion”

The panel also took into account the following statements contained in the sentencing remarks, dated 5 November 2019, in respect of Mr Wogman’s mitigating circumstances:

- “since you have been arrested and you have co-operated with the police and entered a guilty plea at the earliest opportunity you have worked extremely hard with professionals to understand and rationalise your behaviour and to minimise the risk that is there for everyone to see for the future”

The panel saw no evidence in relation to Mr Wogman’s previous ability as a teacher. Even had they done so, the panel found the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Wogman’s fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered a finding that this conviction is a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct, so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel therefore found that the facts of those proved against Mr Wogman amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

Panel’s recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour, any mitigation offered by Mr Wogman 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 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 and protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and
- the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Wogman, which involved a conviction of a relevant offence, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public. The serious findings relating to indecent photographs of a child against Mr Wogman raises significant public and child protection concerns.

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

The panel concluded there was not a public interest consideration in retaining Mr Wogman in the profession. The panel considered the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Wogman in the profession, given the nature of the allegation in this case, regardless of whether there had been any evidence that Mr Wogman ought to be regarded as an exceptional teacher.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Wogman.

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;
- 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; 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 such activity, including one-off incidents.

The panel also attached weight and seriousness to the conduct found proven, given the conviction related to online behaviour including online misconduct and facilitating online abuse.

Even though the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, taking account of the public interest, 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 any mitigating circumstances.

The panel considered that Mr Wogman’s actions were deliberate, as he downloaded an indecent image of a child and watched it on more than one occasion, as referred to in the sentencing remarks dated 5 November 2019.

The panel acknowledged there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Wogman was acting under extreme duress, such as due to a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence of Mr Wogman having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. Neither did the panel see evidence that showed Mr Wogman was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

The panel noted that no references were provided evidencing Mr Wogman’s good character or attesting to his abilities as a teacher. The panel noted this to be significant given Mr Wogman was represented at the hearing and was able to submit evidence in relation to mitigation, yet none was provided.

The panel acknowledged that Mr Wogman was cooperative with the police following his arrest, and pleaded guilty to the offence at the first opportunity, as referred to in the sentencing remarks dated 5 November 2019, showing that he had taken accountability for his conduct

The panel further noted from the sentencing remarks dated 5 November 2019 that Mr Wogman had “worked extremely hard with professionals to understand and rationalise” his behaviour to “minimise the risk that is there for everyone to see for the future”.

However, the panel acknowledged that no evidence was provided to confirm the work that Mr Wogman had undertaken to reduce the risk of him repeating his behaviour. Neither did Mr Wogman's representative make any submissions on any developments that Mr Wogman has made to rehabilitate himself.

The panel was not provided with any evidence, nor were any submissions made by Mr Wogman's representative, in relation to Mr Wogman's remorse for his conduct. The panel considered that Mr Wogman had not shown any insight into the nature and gravity of his offence, nor any degree of empathetic identification with victims of such an offence.

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 noted that Mr Wogman's representative did not object to the provision of a prohibition order, and neither did he propose a review period of the order if applicable. Notwithstanding this, Mr Wogman's representative submitted that Mr Wogman had completed his suspended sentence during the period within which Mr Wogman awaited conclusion of his case, and that this should be taken into consideration.

The panel considered the guidance set out in *Dr Bright Selvadurai Selveajan v GMC* [2008] in relation to the relevance of time that has passed whilst Mr Wogman has awaited the conclusion of the case. Whilst the panel noted that it had taken over 5 years for the case to come to a hearing, following the referral to the TRA in 2019, the panel acknowledged that Mr Wogman remained subject to the requirements of the sex offenders register until 2026, meaning prohibition was appropriate notwithstanding the time that has passed.

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 Wogman 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 Wogman. The seriousness of the offence and the harm caused to children who have been exploited in this manner 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 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 panel considered the list of behaviours at paragraph 50 of the Advice, which 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. One of these behaviours, making indecent photograph or indecent pseudo photograph of a child, was relevant in Mr Wogman's case as the panel found that he was convicted of this offence.

The panel also considered the list of behaviours at paragraph 51 of the Advice, which 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 a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. The panel found that none of these behaviours were relevant to Mr Wogman's conduct.

Whilst the sentencing remarks, dated 5 November 2019, indicated that Mr Wogman had taken steps to improve his behaviour, the panel had not seen any evidence to support this and no submissions were made by Mr Wogman's representative to assure the panel that Mr Wogman's conduct would not be repeated. Given the seriousness of the offence, the risk of repetition meant the panel considered the public interest in safeguarding children to be significant and weighed in favour of not offering a review period.

In the absence of any submissions by Mr Wogman's representative that a review period would be appropriate, 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 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 Darren Wogman should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Wogman 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a relevant conviction related to indecent photographs of a child.

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 Wogman, 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Wogman, which involved a conviction of a relevant offence, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public. The serious findings relating to indecent photographs of a child against Mr Wogman raises significant public and child protection concerns.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, set out as follows, “The panel also took into account the following statements contained in the sentencing remarks, dated 5 November 2019, in respect of Mr Wogman’s mitigating circumstances:

- “since you have been arrested and you have co-operated with the police and entered a guilty plea at the earliest opportunity you have worked extremely hard with professionals to understand and rationalise your behaviour and to minimise the risk that is there for everyone to see for the future”

The panel went on to say “The panel was not provided with any evidence, nor were any submissions made by Mr Wogman’s representative, in relation to Mr Wogman’s remorse for his conduct. The panel considered that Mr Wogman had not shown any insight into the nature and gravity of his offence, nor any degree of empathetic identification with victims of such an offence.” In my judgement, the lack of full 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 Wogman’s behaviour in committing the offence would affect public confidence in the teaching profession if Mr Wogman was allowed to continue teaching.” I am particularly mindful of the finding related to indecent photographs of a child in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of 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 Wogman himself and the panel comment “There was no evidence of Mr Wogman having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. Neither did the panel see evidence that showed Mr Wogman was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Wogman 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 insight or remorse. The panel has said, “The panel further noted from the sentencing remarks dated 5 November 2019 that Mr Wogman had “worked extremely hard with professionals to understand and rationalise” his behaviour to “minimise the risk that is

there for everyone to see for the future". The panel went on to say "However, the panel acknowledged that no evidence was provided to confirm the work that Mr Wogman had undertaken to reduce the risk of him repeating his behaviour. Neither did Mr Wogman's representative make any submissions on any developments that Mr Wogman has made to rehabilitate himself."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that "The panel concluded there was not a public interest consideration in retaining Mr Wogman in the profession. The panel considered the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Wogman in the profession, given the nature of the allegation in this case, regardless of whether there had been any evidence that Mr Wogman ought to be regarded as an exceptional teacher."

This is a serious case, where Mr Wogman downloaded an indecent image of a child and watched it on more than one occasion.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Wogman 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 evidence of 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 "Whilst the sentencing remarks, dated 5 November 2019, indicated that Mr Wogman had taken steps to improve his behaviour, the panel had not seen any evidence to support this and no submissions were made by Mr Wogman's representative to assure the panel that Mr Wogman's conduct would not be repeated. Given the seriousness of the offence, the risk of repetition meant the panel considered the public interest in safeguarding children to be significant and weighed in favour of not offering a review period."

In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the finding involving a conviction for indecent photographs of a child and the risk of repetition.

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 Darren Wogman 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 Wogman 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 Wogman 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 'S Buxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 7 November 2024

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