



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Nicholas James Heuvel: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**July 2025**

## Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Allegations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of evidence</b>	<b>5</b>
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
<b>Decision and reasons</b>	<b>5</b>
Findings of fact	9
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

**Teacher:** Mr Nicholas James Heuvel

**Teacher ref number:** 9706190

**Teacher date of birth:** 1 April 1957

**TRA reference:** 20446

**Date of determination:** 15 July 2025

**Former employer:** Box Hill School, Surrey

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 15 July 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Nicholas James Heuvel.

The panel members were Mrs Joanne Arscott (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Natalie Moore (teacher panellist) and Ms Emma Billings (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Samantha Cass of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Michael Bellis of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Heuvel was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 1 May 2025 (save for as amended at the start of the hearing, at allegation 3).

It was alleged that Mr Heuvel was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while working as a teacher at Box Hill School Trust Limited:

1. Between 7 January 2016 and 23 January 2018, he downloaded and/or were in possession of up to 224 indecent images of children on his electronic device(s);
2. Between 22 October 2017 and 23 October 2017, to locate indecent images of children, he used an internal search engine with the following phrases;
  - a) 'Little boy nudists';
  - b) 'young naturists';
  - c) 'naked young ugo';
  - d) 'young boy naturist';
  - e) 'young boy boner';
  - f) 'young erection';
  - g) 'young boy naked';
  - h) 'young boy speedos';
3. On or around 30 September 2021, in respect of his conduct at allegation 1 above, he accepted a simple police caution for:
  - a) Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made indecent photographs namely, 222 Category C images of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;
  - b) Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made an indecent photograph namely one Category B image of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;
  - c) Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made an indecent photograph namely a Category A

image of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;

4. His conduct at allegations 1 and 2 was sexually motivated.

Mr Heuvel admitted allegations 1, 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e), 2(f), 2(g), 2(h), 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c), and denied allegation 4, as set out in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Heuvel on 16 December 2024.

## **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 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 14

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 15 to 80

Section 4: Teacher documents – page 81

Section 5: Statement of agreed facts – pages 82 to 86

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the 2020 Procedures.

### **Witnesses**

The TRA and Mr Heuvel did not call any witnesses to give evidence at the hearing.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Heuvel worked at Box Hill School Trust (the “School”) from 1 September 1997 and resigned in 2017.

Images of children in picture format were found on a Samsung Galaxy Fame mobile phone.

On 30 September 2021, Mr Heuvel accepted a simple police caution for:

- Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made indecent photographs namely, 222 Category C images of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;
- Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made an indecent photograph namely one Category B image of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;
- Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made an indecent photograph namely a Category A image of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;

On 7 December 2021, Mr Heuvel was referred to the TRA.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. Between 7 January 2016 and 23 January 2018, you downloaded and/or were in possession of up to 224 indecent images of children on your electronic device(s);**
- 2. Between 22 October 2017 and 23 October 2017, to locate indecent images of children, you used an internal search engine with the following phrases;**
  - a) 'Little boy nudists';**
  - b) 'young naturists';**
  - c) 'naked young ugo';**
  - d) 'young boy naturist';**
  - e) 'young boy boner';**
  - f) 'young erection';**
  - g) 'young boy naked';**
  - h) 'young boy speedos';**

The panel noted that Mr Heuvel admitted allegations 1, 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e), 2(f), 2(g) and 2(h) as set out in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Heuvel on 16 December 2024.

The panel considered the forensic digital report, which set out that suspected indecent images of children in picture format were found on a Samsung Galaxy Fame mobile phone.

The report set out that reports had been compiled to show the images found of suspected indecent images of children, and that time and date stamps indicated between 22/10/2017 and 23/10/2017 a user accessed Microsoft's 'Bing' internet search engine and searched for the following phrases:

- Little Boy Nudists
- Young naturists
- Naked young ugo
- Young boy naturist
- Young boy boner
- Young erection
- Young boy naked
- Young boy speedos

The panel considered the police occurrence log dated 8 December 2021, which attested to the same searches as above.

The panel found allegations 1 and 2 proven.

**3. On or around 30 September 2021, in respect of your conduct at allegation 1 above, you accepted a simple police caution for:**

- a) Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made indecent photographs namely, 222 Category C images of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;**
- b) Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made an indecent photograph namely one Category B image of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;**

**c) Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made an indecent photograph namely a Category A image of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;**

The panel noted that Mr Heuvel admitted allegations 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c) as set out in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Heuvel on 16 December 2024.

The panel considered the certificate of caution, dated 30 September 2021. The caution was accepted by Mr Heuvel and was for:

- Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made indecent photographs namely, 222 Category C images of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;
- Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made an indecent photograph namely one Category B image of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978;
- Make indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child on 23/01/2021 at Dorking, Surrey UK made an indecent photograph namely a Category A image of a child. Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978.

The panel noted the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as 'the Advice, which states that a caution establishes a clear admission of guilt in relation to the offence.

The panel found allegation 3 proven.

**4. Your conduct at allegations 1 and 2 was sexually motivated.**

The panel noted that Mr Heuvel denied allegation 4, as set out in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Heuvel on 16 December 2024.

The panel's attention was drawn to section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018]*, *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* and *The General Medical Council v Haris [2020]*.

The panel noted guidance from *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* that: "A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship".



The panel further noted that in *General Medical Council v Haris* [2021], it was stated that, “*In the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves. A sexual motive was plainly more likely than not; I would go so far as to say that that inference was overwhelming.*”

The panel therefore considered whether there was a plausible innocent explanation for the conduct as found proven at allegations 1 and 2. The panel found no plausible innocent explanation and found that Mr Heuvel was more likely than not, on the balance of probabilities, to be seeking sexual gratification.

The panel concluded that on the balance of probabilities, and viewing the allegations found proven as a whole, and in the absence of a plausible innocent explanation, Mr Heuvel’s conduct as found proven at allegations 1 and 2 was sexually motivated. The panel considered that the period of time within which Mr Heuvel was found to have accessed these images was particularly relevant along with the lack of evidence surrounding any attempts by Mr Heuvel to report the images that he accessed during this period of time.

The panel found allegation 4 proven.

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

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved 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 Heuvel, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Heuvel 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
  - 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...

- 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 Heuvel, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Mr Heuvel was in breach of Para 145 which states as follows:

- possibly committed a criminal offence against or related to a child.

This part of the guidance is about managing cases of allegations that might indicate a person would pose a risk of harm if they continue to work in regular or close contact with children in their present position, or in any capacity. It should be used in respect of all cases in which it is alleged that a teacher or member of staff (including volunteers) in a school or college that provides education for children under 18 years of age.

The panel considered that Mr Heuvel was in breach of Part one: 2. Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone’s responsibility. Everyone who comes into contact with children and their families and carers has a role to play in safeguarding children. In order to fulfil this responsibility effectively, all professionals should make sure their approach is child-centred. This means that they should consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Heuvel, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Mr Heuvel’s 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 any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents was relevant. The panel also considered the potential dishonesty shown by Mr Heuvel in terms of the lack of evidence surrounding any attempts by Mr Heuvel to report the images that he accessed during the relevant time period. However, the panel noted that there were no allegations of dishonesty.

The panel noted that allegations 1 and 2 could have taken place outside the education setting. Despite this, the panel considered that Mr Heuvel’s actions were relevant to his position as a teacher, in that he was viewing a significant number of indecent images of children on his devices and searching for these images over a significant period of time.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Heuvel 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 Heuvel was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Heuvel's 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 Heuvel's 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 Heuvel was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents was relevant.

The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be "*conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute*". The panel considered the lack of any evidence of any attempts by Mr Heuvel to report the images that he accessed and the fact that he would have known that he needed to do this by virtue of his role in the teaching profession and associated safeguarding training that he would have received as part of his teaching role.

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

The panel considered that Mr Heuvel's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Heuvel's 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 punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Heuvel which involved the offence of any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity and that this was sexually motivated, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Heuvel 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 Heuvel 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 Heuvel in the profession. The panel found that there was no evidence of any public interest in retaining Mr Heuvel in the teaching profession.

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 Heuvel.

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;
- 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;
- 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;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- actions or behaviours that...undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law...;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Heuvel's actions were not deliberate. On the contrary, the panel found that Mr Heuvel's actions had been deliberate, in particular with regards to Mr Heuvel viewing numerous indecent images of children across categories A to C over a sustained period of time during which he had used numerous specific search terms in order to access the indecent material.

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

Mr Heuvel did not provide any evidence that he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character and did not have any evidence that this was the case.

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 Heuvel 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 Heuvel. The period of time with which Mr Heuvel used specific search terms in order to access indecent images of children was a significant factor in forming that opinion along with the risk of repetition which the panel considered was high due to Mr Heuvel's lack of insight and/or remorse into his actions and the impact that his actions had on children. 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 case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

One of these includes:

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

The 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.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel however noted that these lists are not intended to be exhaustive and panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved.

The panel noted that Mr Heuvel had not provided any evidence for mitigation and/or insight into the impact that his conduct had had on children. Accordingly, the panel considered that there was a significant risk of repetition by Mr Heuvel of his conduct found proven.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Heuvel 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
  - 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...
- 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 Heuvel 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 Heuvel fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of downloading and/or possessing indecent images of children.

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

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Heuvel which involved the offence of any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity and that this was sexually motivated, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.”

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 the lack of insight and remorse shown by Mr Heuvel. The panel has said that “Mr Heuvel had not provided any evidence for mitigation and/or insight into the impact that his conduct had had on children.” In my judgement, the lack of 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:

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of accepting a police caution for making indecent images of children 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 and 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 Heuvel himself. The panel has found no public interest in retaining Mr Heuvel in the profession and has commented:

“Mr Heuvel did not provide any evidence that he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Heuvel 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 serious nature of the misconduct found proven and the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has commented:

“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 Heuvel. The period of time with which Mr Heuvel used specific search terms in order to access indecent images of children was a significant factor in forming that opinion along with the risk of repetition which the panel considered was high due to Mr Heuvel’s lack of insight and/or remorse into his actions and the impact that his actions had on children.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Heuvel 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 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.

The panel has noted that the Advice indicates that the public interest will weigh in favour of not offering a review period where the misconduct includes any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel noted that Mr Heuvel had not provided any evidence for mitigation and/or insight into the impact that his conduct had had on children. Accordingly, the panel considered that there was a significant risk of repetition by Mr Heuvel of his conduct found proven."

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 misconduct found proven, the lack of either insight or remorse 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 Nicholas James Heuvel 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 Heuvel 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 Heuvel has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 16 July 2025**

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

