



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr David Aves: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

March 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Mr David Aves
Teacher ref number: 0302319
Teacher date of birth: 21 June 1970
TRA reference: 21948
Date of determination: 6 March 2025
Former employer: SET Beccles School, Suffolk

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened between 5 and 6 March 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr David Aves.

The panel members were Mrs Christine McLintock, (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Aruna Sharma (teacher panellist) and Mr Paul Millett (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Sarah Price of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Felix Keating of 3PB instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Aves was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public, save for parts of the hearing that were heard in private, and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 2 December 2024.

It was alleged that Mr Aves was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working at SET Beccles School (“the School”):

1. Between around 7 January 2023 and 28 February 2023, he informed the School that he was not well enough to attend work and provided sick notes, when he was in fact able to work;
2. He worked as a Teacher at Pakefield High School while he was on sick leave from the School, on:
 - a. 10 January 2023;
 - b. 12 January 2023;
 - c. 13 January 2023.
3. On or around 17 March 2023, he provided a letter to Teach Recruitment Agency purporting this to be from a senior member of staff at the School.
4. His actions at paragraph 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 were:
 - a. Dishonest;
 - b. Lacking integrity.

Mr Aves has not responded to the notice of proceedings, therefore the allegations were considered as denied.

Preliminary applications

Application to proceed in absence

The panel considered an application from the TRA to proceed in the absence of Mr Aves.

The panel carefully considered all relevant documentation and the submissions by the presenting officer. It accepted the legal advice provided.

First, the panel was satisfied that the notice of proceedings had been served in accordance with the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020. The panel concluded that the TRA had made all reasonable efforts to

bring the hearing to the attention of Mr Aves by delivering the notice of proceedings and bundle to his only and last-known postal and email addresses.

The panel went on to consider whether the hearing should proceed in Mr Aves' absence.

Mr Aves had not responded to the Notice and had not engaged with the TRA at all during the investigation process. Accordingly, the panel concluded that Mr Aves had voluntarily waived his right to attend. He had given no reason for his non-attendance and there was no medical evidence indicating he was unfit to attend.

The panel considered that there was no indication that Mr Aves might attend at a future date and that no purpose would be served by an adjournment. There is public interest in hearings taking place within a reasonable time and the panel had in mind that two witnesses were in attendance to give evidence in these proceedings.

The panel decided to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Aves. The panel would proceed with great care and caution and with close regard to the overall fairness of the proceedings bearing in mind that Mr Aves was neither present nor represented.

Privacy

The panel decided that any matters pertaining to Mr Aves' health were private matters that should not be heard in public. The panel directed that any details regarding Mr Aves' health would be heard in private during the hearing and would be redacted from the written decision.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings– pages 6 to 10

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 12 to 20

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 21 to 156

The panel was also provided with two bundles, consisting of 31 and 19 pages, in relation to the proceeding in absence application.

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the TRA:

- Witness A – [REDACTED]
- Witness B – [REDACTED]

Mr Aves did not attend the hearing.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Aves had been employed at Seckford Education Trust (“SET”) from August 2022 as a full time music teacher across two schools in the Trust which included Beccles School (“the School”). From January 2023, he was employed on a full time basis at the School.

On 10 January 2023, Mr Aves contacted the School to say that he was too unwell to attend work. On 10 January 2023, Mr Aves commenced a short-term contract at a different school, Pakefield High School, via an agency.

It is alleged that Mr Aves attended Pakefield High School as an agency music teacher on three occasions (10, 12 and 13 January 2023) whilst still employed by the School.

It is also alleged that Mr Aves provided a letter to the agency purporting to be from Witness A, stating that he was not employed by the School as of 1 January 2023. However, it is alleged that Witness A did not write this letter and the content of the letter was untrue.

After a period of absence, Mr Aves ceased employment at the School on 22 March 2023.

Mr Aves was referred to the TRA on 10 May 2023.

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. Between around 7 January 2023 and 28 February 2023, you informed the School that you were not well enough to attend work and provided sick notes, when you were in fact able to work

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness A, who told the panel that she was aware that Mr Aves had called in sick on 10 January 2023. She knew this because she had been copied into an email sent from Mr Aves to [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. Witness A was also copied into a further email from Mr Aves to [REDACTED] on 18 January 2023, which indicated that Mr Aves was still too unwell to attend work. Witness A's evidence was that there was no reason for Mr Aves to include her in the emails as she was not his line manager nor had responsibility for teacher absence cover.

The panel was provided with copies of the emails sent by Mr Aves to the School, dated 10 January 2023 and 18 January 2023. The panel noted that the content of those emails stated that Mr Aves was not well enough to attend work.

The email dated 10 January 2023 was sent at 06:05am and stated *"I tested positive for Covid last night and this morning. I'm hoping it's only a mild case but nevertheless will need to isolate for 5 days as a precaution."*

The email sent on 18 January 2023 was sent at 05:55am and stated *"I'm still testing positive and still feeling rough, mainly coughing and chest complications." The email went on to state "I will collect a medical certificate from GP today as it is ready for collection and will forward on to you."*

The panel was also provided with a copy of a sick note dated 31 January 2023 which covered the period 31 January to 28 February 2023. The panel did not have sight of a sick note prior to this date.

The panel was also provided with evidence that Mr Aves worked at a different school, Pakefield High School on three occasions in January 2023. This evidence is set out in more detail below. Therefore, the panel was satisfied that it could infer that Mr Aves was able to work on those three dates, namely 10, 12 and 13 January 2023.

Based on the evidence provided, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1 had been found proved in that they had been provided with the emails from the School advising he was not well enough to work, and the sick note referred to above. Further, there were three dates in January 2023 in respect of which Mr Aves had informed the School that he was not well enough to attend work when he was able to work.

Allegation 1 is found proved.

2. You worked as a Teacher at Pakefield High School while you were on sick leave from the School, on:

- a. 10 January 2023;
- b. 12 January 2023;
- c. 13 January 2023

The panel heard evidence from Witness B, who confirmed that Mr Aves was brought into Pakefield High School, via a recruitment agency, for a short-term contract as a music teacher. The contract was due to run between 10 January to 31 March 2023. Witness B confirmed that Mr Aves attended Pakefield High School to teach on only three occasions, namely 10, 12 and 13 January 2023.

The panel was also provided with a copy of the attendance record that confirmed Mr Aves signed into the School on the three dates in question. The panel also saw a copy of the agency booking sheet that was provided to Pakefield High School.

As set out above, in relation to allegation 1, the panel was satisfied that on 10, 12 and 13 January 2023, Mr Aves had informed the School that he was too unwell to work. The panel was further satisfied that the evidence demonstrated that Mr Aves had worked at Pakefield High School on three dates in January 2023 whilst he was absent from the School due to reported illness.

Allegation 2 is found proved.

3. On or around 17 March 2023, you provided a letter to Teach Recruitment Agency purporting this to be from a senior member of staff at the School.

The panel was provided with a copy of a letter dated 17 March 2023. This letter was addressed to Mr Aves and purported to be from Witness A on SET headed paper. The letter stated “*This statement acknowledges that your employment at SET Beccles did not commence as from 1st January 2023. Please use this statement for auditing purposes if required*”.

In her oral evidence Witness A told the panel that she had not seen the letter until it was provided to her by the agency on or around 20 March 2023. Witness A stated she was asked by the agency to verify the letter which the agency said had been sent to them by Mr Aves. Witness A was clear that she had not written the letter. Witness A told the panel that she does not use SET headed paper when corresponding, and that she uses the School’s headed paper. Further, Witness A told the panel that the letter did not have a signature, and that she always added her signature to her School letters.

The panel carefully considered the material it had been provided with. The panel did not have the benefit of hearing from Mr Aves but inferred that he was the only person who could have benefitted from the letter being sent. The panel was therefore satisfied, on the

balance of probabilities, that Mr Aves provided a letter to Teach Recruitment Agency purporting to be from Witness A, who was a senior member of staff at the School.

Allegation 3 is proved.

4. Your actions at paragraph 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 were:

a. Dishonest;

b. Lacking integrity.

Having found allegations 1, 2 and 3 proved, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Aves' actions were dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

In determining whether Mr Aves' conduct was dishonest, the panel had regard to the decision in *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67. The panel considered Mr Aves' state of knowledge or belief as to the facts before determining whether his conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

In regard to lack of integrity, the panel had regard to the decision in *Wingate v SRA; SRA v Malins* [2018] EWCA Civ 366. The panel recognised that integrity denotes adherence to the standards of the profession and the panel therefore considered whether by his actions, Mr Aves failed to adhere to those standards.

The panel was satisfied that at the time, Mr Aves knew that he was employed by the School, when he accepted the short-term contract via the agency, Teach, to work at Pakefield High School. The panel was also satisfied that Mr Aves had told the School that he was too unwell to work at the School but then went to work at another school for three days in January 2023.

The panel noted that Mr Aves did not return to work at the School after he called in sick on 10 January 2023, until he left employment. The reason provided for his absence was illness. After working three days at Pakefield High School in January 2023, Mr Aves did not return to Pakefield High School after 13 January 2023. The panel was provided with an email from Mr Aves to Pakefield High School dated 17 January 2023. In this email Mr Aves explained that he would not be able to attend Pakefield High School that day because [REDACTED]. The panel was advised that Pakefield High School cancelled the contract due to Mr Aves' continued absence. The panel was concerned that Mr Aves had provided different explanations for his absence from each school.

In relation to the letter purporting to be from Witness A, the panel concluded that it was Mr Aves who provided the letter to Teach recruitment agency as he was the only person who could benefit from it. The panel concluded that Mr Aves would have known that what he was telling the agency was not true.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Aves' actions as described in allegations 1-3 were deliberate and inferred that Mr Aves' actions were for financial gain. Mr Aves took his full salary from the School whilst he was absent from work when on three days the panel found he was able to work, and at the same time he took a fee from the agency for working at Pakefield High School.

In the panel's view, this was dishonest behaviour by the standards of ordinary decent people. For the same reasons, the panel concluded that Mr Aves' actions lacked integrity. The panel found that children at the School did not have the benefit of their class teacher on those three days when he was clearly able to work. Mr Aves had lied to his employer, the recruitment agency and Pakefield High School.

Allegation 4 is proved.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 first considered whether the conduct of Mr Aves, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Aves was in breach of the following standards:

- 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.

The panel noted that Mr Aves had not had proper regard to his contract of employment with the School, by accepting outside employment.

The panel also noted that in the preamble of the Teachers' Standards it states that "teachers act with honesty and integrity". The panel found that Mr Aves had not acted with honesty and integrity.

The panel also considered whether Mr Aves' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct. The panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Aves amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Aves was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

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

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Aves' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Aves was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

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

For these reasons, the panel also found that Mr Aves' actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, 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 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Aves in the profession.

Whilst there was some, albeit very limited, evidence that Mr Aves had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Aves 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.

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

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions...

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 found that Mr Aves' actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Aves was acting under extreme duress.

There was no evidence that Mr Aves had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel was not provided with any evidence of good character. Although the panel was told by Witness B that he had no concerns regarding Mr Aves' teaching, the panel noted that Mr Aves had only attended Pakefield High School on three occasions.

Mr Aves had not engaged with the TRA or these proceedings. The panel had no evidence of insight or remorse.

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 Aves 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 Aves. The finding that Mr Aves had acted dishonestly and without integrity 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 Advice indicates that there are certain types of cases where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases 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. One of these includes:

- fraud or serious dishonesty;

Whilst the panel had found that Mr Aves acted dishonestly, the panel considered that Mr Aves' actions occurred over a short period of time and there was no evidence that his conduct was repeated.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel was satisfied that a review period of 3 years would be appropriate and proportionate response on the specific facts of this case.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr David Aves should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of three years.

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

- 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.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of dishonesty and lack of integrity.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into

disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Aves, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "Mr Aves had not engaged with the TRA or these proceedings. The panel had no evidence of insight or remorse." In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight or remorse could mean that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. 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 considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Aves were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Aves himself and the panel comment "There was no evidence that Mr Aves had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel was not provided with any evidence of good character. Although the panel was told by Witness B that he had no concerns regarding Mr Aves' teaching."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Aves 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, "The panel was satisfied that Mr Aves' actions as described in allegations 1-3 were deliberate and inferred that Mr Aves' actions were for financial gain. Mr Aves took his full salary from the

School whilst he was absent from work when on three days the panel found he was able to work, and at the same time he took a fee from the agency for working at Pakefield High School.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “the panel concluded that Mr Aves’ actions lacked integrity. The panel found that children at the School did not have the benefit of their class teacher on those three days when he was clearly able to work. Mr Aves had lied to his employer, the recruitment agency and Pakefield High School.”

In reaching my decision I have placed weight on the following “Whilst there was some, albeit very limited, evidence that Mr Aves had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Aves in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Aves 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 evidenced by remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 3 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases 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. One of these includes:

- fraud or serious dishonesty;

Whilst the panel had found that Mr Aves acted dishonestly, the panel considered that Mr Aves’ actions occurred over a short period of time and there was no evidence that his conduct was repeated.” The panel also said “that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel was satisfied that a review period of 3 years would be appropriate and proportionate response on the specific facts of this case.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found and the lack of evidence of either insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that a three year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr David Aves is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 18 March 2028, 3 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Aves remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr David Aves has a right of appeal to the Kings 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 horizontal line underneath.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 12 March 2025

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