



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Anguel Tchourkin: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**July 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	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	17
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	20

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

**Teacher:** Mr Anguel Tchourkin

**Teacher ref number:** 3759335

**Teacher date of birth:** 7 November 1971

**TRA reference:** 19304

**Date of determination:** 31 July 2025

**Former employer:** Engage Education, Watford

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (the “panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (the “TRA”) convened on 29 July 2025 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, and then subsequently on 30 and 31 July 2025 by way of a virtual hearing to consider the case of Mr Anguel Tchourkin (“Mr Tchourkin”).

The panel members were Ms Joanna Hurren (teacher panellist), Dr Martin Coles (former teacher panellist) and Mrs Anila Rai (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Sherelle Appleby of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Tchourkin 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 10 March 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Tchourkin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a Supply Teacher;

1. When applying to work with Engage Education as a Supply Teacher he provided false and/or misleading information, by:
  - a) Stating that he worked for a Tradewind Recruitment ("Tradewind") between February 2018 and May 2019, when in reality he registered with Tradewind in June 2018 but only worked with them between January 2019 and April 2019.
  - b) Stating that he worked at FreshSteps Independent School between September 2017 and January 2018 when in reality he worked there for a period of two weeks.
  - c) Stating that he worked for Prospero Teaching between March 2016 and September 2016 when in reality he worked there between the 23 May 2016 and the 27 May 2016.
2. He engaged in such conduct as may be found to be proven at Allegation 1 above in order to:
  - a) Improve his prospects of securing and/or retaining a teaching post;
  - b) Conceal his involvement in one or more safeguarding incidents, specifically including an incident on or about 29 April 2019 at Copthall School.
3. When applying to work at Omnia People as a Supply Teacher he provided false and/or misleading information, in order to improve his prospects of securing and/or retaining work as a Supply Teacher, by:
  - a) Failing to mention that he worked for Engage Education on or about 14 February 2020.
  - b) Failing to mention that he registered with Tradewind in June 2018 but only worked with them between January 2019 and April 2019.
  - c) Stating that he worked for Remedy Recruitment from May 2019-February 2020 when in reality he worked there from 10 June 2019-30 June 2019.
  - d) Stating that he worked for Remedy Recruitment because of the Covid-19 Pandemic when in reality that was not the case.

- e) Stating that he ceased working for Athona Recruitment because of the Covid-19 Pandemic when in reality that not the case.
4. He engaged in such conduct as may be found to be proven at;
- a) 3a above in order to conceal his involvement in a safeguarding incident at Bentley Wood High School on or about 14 February 2020
  - b) 3b above in order to conceal his involvement in a safeguarding incident at Copthall School on or about 29 April 2019.
  - c) 3e above in order to conceal the fact that, beginning in August 2020 he was made subject to an Interim Prohibition Order (IPO) by the Teaching Regulation Agency.
5. His behaviour as may be found proven at allegations 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 above was dishonest and/or lacking in integrity.

Mr Tchourkin denied the allegations in their entirety.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of hearing – pages 4 to 14

Section 2: TRA documents – pages 15 to 62

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following documents:

3 July 2020	E-mail between Mr Tchourkin and others re IPO,
5 August 2020	TRA notice of IPO,
24 February 2022	E-mail correspondence between the TRA and Omnia People and others,
14 February 2024	TRA Notice of Referral
20 February 2025	E-mail between Mr Tchourkin and others re Hearing Dates,
Various	E-mail chains between TRA and Mr Tchourkin regarding his requested postponement of PCPH including, without limitation, a postponement request made 22 May 2025 and the TRA's response to that request of 30 June 2025

25 July 2025            E-mail from Mr Tchourkin to TRA regarding NEU representation

28 July 2025            2 E-mails from the Presenting Officer to Mr Tchourkin

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

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

## **Witnesses**

The TRA did not call any witnesses to provide oral evidence. Mr Tchourkin had provided no evidence or witness statements.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

The panel noted that a complaint had been raised to the TRA on the 12 May 2020 concerning Mr Tchourkin.

Subsequent investigations had established that on at least two occasions Mr Tchourkin had provided, to potential employers, CVs which, it was alleged, contained false and or misleading information.

It was alleged that by his actions Mr Tchourkin was seeking to misrepresent his period of service at various employers and, in certain instances, to conceal one or more safeguarding incidents which had been reported concerning him.

The TRA proceeded to investigate the matter and assembled various documentary evidence to be considered.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

In respect of all the allegations the panel scrutinised the entire bundle and the additional documents which they had been provided with including e-mail correspondence from the staffing agencies who had retained Mr Tchourkin.

The panel noted that the evidence within a lot of these documents was hearsay but considered that the evidence was relevant to the allegations and that it was necessary and in the interests of justice that it be admitted. The panel therefore admitted the

hearsay evidence within the bundle after careful consideration in each case but noted that the evidence should be considered carefully and cautiously, including in relation to appropriate amount of weight to place on it. The panel noted that the TRA's case was based on documentary evidence and was especially careful in their considerations of the weight to be placed on each document.

The panel was very conscious that they had limited evidence from Mr Tchourkin beyond his denial of the allegations generally and proceeded to follow a robust process to test the evidence in relation to each allegation on the basis that all allegations were denied by him.

The panel was also conscious that Mr Tchourkin had chosen to absent himself from proceedings and from the opportunity to put his evidence forward in response to the allegations and had not asserted a legitimate reason for doing so.

**You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/ or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Supply Teacher;**

- 1. When applying to work with Engage Education as a Supply Teacher you provided false and/or misleading information, by:**
  - a) Stating that you worked for a Tradewind Recruitment ("Tradewind") between February 2018 and May 2019, when in reality you registered with Tradewind in June 2018 but only worked with them between January 2019 and April 2019**
  - b) Stating that you worked at FreshSteps Independent School between September 2017 and January 2018 when in reality you worked there for a period of two weeks.**
  - c) Stating that you worked for Prospero Teaching between March 2016 and September 2016 when in reality you worked there between the 23 May 2016 and the 27 May 2016.**

The panel carefully considered a copy of Mr Tchourkin's CV (the "First CV") which had been attached to e-mails of 12 March 2020 and 23 April 2020 from Individual A – [REDACTED] Compliance of Engage Partners, a supply teacher provider.

The panel also carefully considered a later copy of Mr Tchourkin's CV (the "Second CV") which had been attached to an e-mail of 2 September 2021 sent by Mr Tchourkin to Individual B, of Omnia People, a supply teacher provider.

In the First CV supplied to Engage Mr Tchourkin had stated that that he: a) worked for Tradewind Recruitment ("Tradewind") between February 2018 and May 2019; b) worked for FreshSteps Education Centre ("FreshSteps") from September 2017 to January 2018;

and c) worked for Prospero Teaching London (“Prospero”) from March 2016 to September 2016.

The panel noted that Individual A e-mail of 12 March 2020 confirmed that (a) having spoken to Individual C at Tradewind, also a supply teacher provider, Mr Tchourkin had registered with them in June 2018 but only worked for them from January 2019 to April 2019, (b) having spoken to Individual D at FreshSteps Mr Tchourkin had only worked for them for 3 weeks, and (c) having spoken to Individual E, [REDACTED] at Prospero, Mr Tchourkin only worked for them on one occasion from 23 May 2016 to 27 May 2016.

The panel noted correspondence from Individual C a representative from Tradewind stating that Mr Tchourkin had registered with Tradewind in June 2018 but only worked for them between January 2019 to April 2019.

The panel considered a letter from FreshSteps dated 25 May 2021, confirming that Mr Tchourkin worked at FreshSteps as a Maths Tutor for two weeks only in October 2017 and that his last day was 20 October 2017.

The panel noted an email from Prospero dated 17 June 2020, confirming that Mr Tchourkin originally registered with them in April 2015. The letter stated that Mr Tchourkin worked via Prospero at The Crest Academy for a total of 5 days between 23 May 2016 to 27 May 2016. Mr Tchourkin registered again with Prospero in May 2019, and May 2020 but, on both occasions, Mr Tchourkin was not provided with any work.

The panel carefully considered all these documents noting Mr Tchourkin’s denial of these allegations. The panel carefully checked the provenance of the First and Second CVs with the Presenting Officer noting that the First CV was the relevant document in respect of these allegations. The panel again noted that the TRA relied solely on documentary evidence and that the evidence of Individual A in particular was hearsay but they also noted that there was separate documentary evidence which supported her assertions.

The panel found that when applying to work with Engage Education as a Supply Teacher Mr Tchourkin provided false and/or misleading information, by:

a) stating that he worked for a Tradewind between February 2018 and May 2019, when in reality he registered with Tradewind in June 2018 but only worked with them between January 2019 and April 2019

b) stating that he worked at FreshSteps between September 2017 and January 2018 when in reality he worked there for a period of two weeks.

c) stating that he worked for Prospero between March 2016 and September 2016 when in reality he worked there between the 23 May 2016 and the 27 May 2016.

The panel found allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) proven.



**2. You engaged in such conduct as may be found to be proven at Allegation 1 above in order to:**

- a) Improve your prospects of securing and/or retaining a teaching post;**
- b) Conceal your involvement in one or more safeguarding incidents, specifically including an incident on or about 29 April 2019 at Copthall School.**

The panel noted the findings of fact they had made in relation to allegation 1 which demonstrated that Mr Tchourkin had repeatedly stated false and misleading information on his CV.

The panel noted that they had no evidence before them from Mr Tchourkin as to any reason for the false and misleading information provided and that Mr Tchourkin's position was that he simply denied the allegations.

The panel noted that Mr Tchourkin had deliberately chosen to absent himself from the proceedings without proper explanation and that he had not submitted any evidence in his defence or any witness statement as to the basis upon which he denied the allegations.

The panel carefully considered whether there might be any alternative explanation for the facts as found proven other than a desire to seek to procure future teaching work on a false basis but could conceive of no plausible alternative. The panel was satisfied based on its experience and knowledge that evidence of longer periods of teaching was more likely to procure future teaching work.

The panel was also satisfied that Mr Tchourkin would have had an understanding of the safer recruitment procedures for schools and it noted that the likely effect of reducing the gaps in his CV and exaggerating his periods of service would have been to reduce the prospect of safeguarding concerns being raised.

The panel noted the evidence of a safeguarding incident on or around the 29 April 2019 in the bundle including an incident form dated 29 April 2019 which was concerned with Mr Tchourkin [REDACTED]. The panel also noted an e-mail from Copthall School of 7 May 2019 confirming this complaint.

The panel did not seek to interrogate the details of the allegation conscious that they had been informed by the presenting officer that this incident itself was not part of the allegations which they were considering save simply for the fact that it evidenced a complaint had been made. The panel was satisfied that a complaint had been made in relation to an incident on or about 29 April 2019 at Copthall School.

The panel noted that Copthall School was not mentioned on the First CV and that there was evidence that Mr Tchourkin was aware of this allegation.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Tchourkin's actions as found proven in allegation 1 were engaged in by Mr Tchourkin in order to improve his prospects of securing and or retaining a teaching post.

The panel noted that allegation 2 (b) appeared to relate only to their findings in relation to allegation 1 (a) and proceeded to consider it on that basis. The panel noted though that the TRA's case under allegation 1 (a) was that Mr Tchourkin had provided false and/or misleading information about his dates with Tradewind, as the panel had found he had, but that, notwithstanding this, the dates which Mr Tchourkin had falsely detailed included April 2019 which had been the date of the Copthall School allegation.

Given this the panel did not see that an inference could reasonably be drawn that Mr Tchourkin's decision to misrepresent his service with Tradewind was engaged in by Mr Tchourkin in order to conceal his involvement in one or more safeguarding incidents, specifically including an incident on or about 29 April 2019 at Copthall School.

The panel therefore found allegation 2(a) proven and allegation 2 (b) not proven.

**3. When applying to work at Omnia People as a Supply Teacher you provided false and/or misleading information, in order to improve your prospects of securing and/or retaining work as a Supply Teacher, by:**

- a) Failing to mention that you worked for Engage Education on or about 14 February 2020.**
- b) Failing to mention that you registered with Tradewind in June 2018 but only worked with them between January 2019 and April 2019.**
- c) Stating that you worked for Remedy Recruitment from May 2019-February 2020 when in reality you worked there from 10 June 2019-30 June 2019.**
- d) Stating that you worked for Remedy Recruitment because of the Covid-19 Pandemic when in reality that was not the case.**
- e) Stating that you ceased working for Athona Recruitment because of the Covid-19 Pandemic when in reality that not the case.**

The panel again carefully considered the Second CV which was sent to Individual B of Omnia People by Mr Tchourkin on 2 September 2021. In the Second CV Mr Tchourkin stated that:

1) worked for Remedy Recruitment from May 2019 to February 2020 and that "*Work is on hold due to the COVID-19*"; and

2) worked for Athona Recruitment from March 2020 but that “*Work is on hold due to the COVID-19*”.

The panel noted that in the Second CV:

- 1) there was no reference to Mr Tchourkin working for Engage Education on or about 14 February 2020, and
- 2) there was no reference whatsoever to his having worked for Tradewind in 2018 or 2019 or otherwise.

The panel noted that in the First CV Mr Tchourkin had been specific in stating that he worked for Tradewind between February 2018 and May 2019, and that they had already found this to be a misrepresentation, but that there had clearly been a decision by Mr Tchourkin not to include Tradewind on the Second CV.

The panel noted that the impact of removing any reference to Tradewind from the CV was to also move even further away from any link to Copthall School who had raised a safeguarding concern regarding Mr Tchourkin to Tradewind.

The panel noted that the First CV correctly set out that Mr Tchourkin worked for Remedy Recruitment in June 2019 and that the Second CV had seemingly been written to indicate that he worked for them from May 2019 to February 2020.

The panel noted the letter from Remedy Recruitment of 18 November 2019 which stated that he worked for them from 10 June 2019 until 30 June 2019.

The panel also noted again Individual A’s e-mail of 12 March 2020 where she confirmed that she had spoken to the [REDACTED] at Remedy Recruitment who confirmed that Mr Tchourkin had only had one position with them for three weeks at the school in June 2019.

The panel noted that Mr Tchourkin had been issued with an Interim Prohibition Order on 5 August 2020 and that the impact of this would be that he would not be able to work providing teaching services after this point.

The panel again considered their previous findings in relation to why false and misleading information could have been made on Mr Tchourkin’s CV and was satisfied that especially given the absence of any plausible alternative explanation these steps were taken (in each instance found proven below) to improve Mr Tchourkin’s prospects of retaining and/or securing work as a supply teacher.

When applying to work at Omnia People as a supply teacher then the panel considered it proven that Mr Tchourkin provided false and/or misleading information in that the evidence demonstrated that Mr Tchoukin:

1. Had failed to mention on the Second CV that he had worked for Engage Education on or about 14 February 2020.
2. Had failed to mention that he registered with Tradewind in June 2018 but only worked with them between January 2019 and April 2019.
3. Had stated that he had worked for Remedy Recruitment from May 2019-February 2020 when, in reality, he had worked there from 10 June 2019-30 June 2019.

In relation to the allegation that Mr Tchourkin had stated that he worked for Remedy Recruitment because of the Covid-19 Pandemic when in reality that was not the case, the panel considered that this allegation may have been wrongly drafted and found allegation 3 (d) not proven.

In relation to the allegation that Mr Tchourkin had stated that he ceased working for Athona Recruitment because of the Covid-19 Pandemic when in reality that was not the case the panel considered this issue extremely carefully. The panel noted that the pattern of behaviour which they had found proven illustrated provision by Mr Tchourkin of information which was false and/or misleading. The panel also noted that Mr Tchourkin had applied to Omnia when the subject of an IPO. The panel also considered that it was likely that the IPO, issued on 5 August 2020, was the reason for Mr Tchourkin ceasing to work for Athona Recruitment given that he would not have been able to legally work for them as a teacher after this point. The panel also noted that the Second CV in fact used wording slightly different from the allegation in that it said "*Work is on hold due to the COVID-19*".

This all having been said the panel had no evidence in front of it that the reason why Mr Tchourkin ceased working for Athena was not the Covid-19 Pandemic. Given this the panel found Allegation 3 (e) unproven.

The panel therefore found allegations 3 (a) (b) and (c) proven and allegations 3 (d) and (e) not proven.

**4. You engaged in such conduct as may be found to be proven at;**

- a) 3a above in order to conceal your involvement in a safeguarding incident at Bentley Wood High School on or about 14 February 2020**
- b) 3b above in order to conceal your involvement in a safeguarding incident at Copthall School on or about 29 April 2019.**
- c) 3e above in order to conceal the fact that, beginning in August 2020 you were made subject to an Interim Prohibition Order (IPO) by the Teaching Regulation Agency.**

The panel noted that they had found allegations 3 (a) and 3 (b) proven but 3 (e) unproven and therefore had no choice but to find allegation 4 (c) unproven.

The panel noted that they had already found in relation to allegations 3 (a) and 3 (b) that false and/or misleading information had been provided by Mr Tchourkin on the Second CV to improve Mr Tchourkin's prospects of retaining and/or securing work as a supply teacher.

The panel scrutinised an incident report form of Engage Education dated 14 February 2020 in which a safeguarding incident was described.

The panel did not seek to interrogate the details of the allegation, conscious that they had been informed by the presenting officer that the allegation itself was not part of the allegations which they were considering. The panel simply noted the fact that a complaint had been made. The panel was satisfied that a complaint had been made in relation to an incident on or about 14 February 2020 at Bentley Wood High School.

The panel noted that they had previously found that a complaint had been made in relation to an incident on or about 29 April 2019 at Copthall School.

The panel again noted, regarding all allegations under allegation 4, their general findings as to the basis upon which Mr Tchourkin had provided false and/or misleading information in his CVs.

The panel noted the absence of any plausible alternative as to why any period of employment would have been omitted by Mr Tchourkin from the Second CV, and again noted the absence of any alternative explanation by Mr Tchourkin to the allegations made by the TRA.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Tchourkin's intention in omitting Engage Education from his CV would, on the balance of probabilities, be reasonably inferred as being to conceal the safeguarding incident at Bentley Wood High School on or about 29 April 2019.

The panel noted that Tradewind had been expressly referenced by Mr Tchourkin in the First CV but not included in the Second CV, and, again, noted the absence of any plausible alternative to that stated in the Allegations, as to why such a reference should not be included in the Second CV. The panel again noted the absence of any alternative explanation from Mr Tchourkin. The panel was satisfied that Mr Tchourkin's intentions in failing to mention that he registered with Tradewind in June 2018, but only worked with them between January 2019 and April 2019, and further in failing to mention Tradewind at all, would, on the balance of probabilities, be reasonably inferred as being to conceal the safeguarding incident at Copthall School on or about 29 April 2019.

The panel found allegations 4 (a) and 4 (b) proven and 4 (c) unproven

## **5. Your behaviour as may be found proven at allegations 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 above was dishonest and/or lacking in integrity.**

The panel carefully considered the legal advice with which they had been provided.

The panel noted that the findings they had made demonstrated that Mr Tchourkin had provided false and/or misleading information regarding his employment history to the various employment agencies.

The panel noted that they had found that this was a deliberate attempt to improve his prospects of securing and/or retaining work and that he had done this for reasons including concealing the raising of safeguarding concerns.

The panel was satisfied that he would have been aware of his safeguarding and other obligations under KCSIE and the Teachers' Standards and that he knowingly acted in breach of the same.

The panel further noted that their findings included matters that had been deliberately excluded from Mr Tchourkin's CV in addition to his periods of service being misrepresented.

The panel noted that they could find no legitimate explanation for the allegations as found proven and that none had been provided by Mr Tchourkin who had voluntarily chosen not to attend without legitimate explanation.

Noting that they had not heard from Mr Tchourkin the panel was nevertheless satisfied that he would have been fully aware that this was, and that he was being, deliberately dishonest both by his own standards and by the standards of ordinary, decent people.

The panel noted that professionals, whilst not expected to be paragons of virtue, were held to a higher standard and believed this included in a teachers' case an expectation of honesty and integrity. The panel was satisfied that Mr Tchourkin's actions as proven demonstrated a deliberate attempt to circumvent recruitment and safeguarding processes dishonestly, and in a manner which lacked integrity, including that he lied about his work experience and made a deliberate effort to conceal his involvement in at least one safeguarding incident to prospective employers.

The panel found allegation 5 proven.

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

Having found a number 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 Tchourkin, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

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

- A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct.
- 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 Tchourkin, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”) specifically part one, point 12.

The panel also considered whether Mr Tchourkin’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 “fraud or serious dishonesty” was relevant.

The panel carefully considered again the allegations as had been found proven. The panel noted their findings demonstrated that Mr Tchourkin had intentionally and repeatedly set out to mislead potential employers with regard to his periods of service and with regard to his employment history generally. The panel noted that recruitment processes were in place at schools so as to safeguard children and that deliberately providing false and/or misleading information to employers fundamentally undermined that process. The panel further noted their findings that Mr Tchourkin’s conduct was dishonest and lacked integrity and the panel considered that honesty and integrity were fundamental requirements for anybody involved in the highly sensitive and important area of providing teaching services to children.

The panel noted that Mr Tchourkin would have been fully aware of the statutory framework within which he operated and that he was deliberately breaching the teaching standards by his actions. The panel also noted that they had concluded that he had committed serious dishonesty and that the Advice indicated that such an action was likely to amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

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

The panel were also satisfied that this conduct would affect the way a teacher performed their teaching role and may lead to pupils being influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way including in that honesty and integrity, and setting an example as a role model, were at the heart of a teachers' duties.

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

In relation to whether Mr Tchourkin'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 Tchourkin'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 Tchourkin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel considered afresh their findings. The panel noted that they had found that Mr Tchourkin's actions in providing misleading and/or false statements was seriously dishonest and lacked integrity and that the public would certainly expect teachers to be honest and demonstrate consistently high levels of integrity in their personal and professional life.

The panel noted that they had found that Mr Tchourkin had on more than one occasion misrepresented how long he had worked at schools.

The panel considered that Mr Tchourkin's conduct, as proven, could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel also considered that Mr Tchourkin's conduct as proven was conduct of a serious nature which would likely have a negative impact on the public's perception of the individual as a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Tchourkin'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/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. The panel was aware that prohibition orders should not be issued 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 protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Tchourkin which involved deliberately misleading staffing agencies, and therefore schools, as to his career history including the duration of and nature of his periods of service, which actions the panel had found were dishonest and lacked integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The panel considered that it was essential that a teacher provided accurate information before and on their hiring as, without this, employers were unable to make an informed decision about them and the safeguarding of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Tchourkin 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 Tchourkin 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 Tchourkin in the profession.

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Tchourkin 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 Tchourkin.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Tchourkin's actions were not deliberate, indeed he had clearly chosen what detail, including false detail, to include and what to omit in the 2 CVs he had provided.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Tchourkin demonstrates exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he has contributed significantly to the education sector. Though the panel had no evidence as to whether the incidents found proven were out of character it noted that Mr Tchourkin's actions had been repeated on at least one occasion. The panel noted that on the occasion of the second CV when he was applying for work he appeared to have been the subject of an IPO.

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 which they had identified as present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Tchourkin of prohibition.

The panel then was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr

Tchourkin. The dishonesty and lack of integrity which the panel had found proven and Mr Tchourkin's apparent willingness to mislead potential employers about the extent of his experience and the nature of his previous employments, as well as the relevant behaviours the panel had found itemised in the Advice which indicated that prohibition was appropriate, were significant factors 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 case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of those 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. The panel found that one of these applied being fraud or serious dishonesty.

The panel had no evidence of any previous disciplinary warning being issued to Mr Tchourkin.

The panel had no evidence in front of it of any mitigation or mitigating circumstances and the panel had seen no evidence that Mr Tchourkin had demonstrated any insight into his actions nor any remorse for his actions. The panel noted that the allegations as found proven appeared to demonstrate a pattern of behaviour.

The panel was seriously concerned that Mr Tchourkin would repeat the behaviours which he had already demonstrated on more than one occasion and that they had no evidence before them to suggest he would not. The panel noted that they had found that one of the circumstances under which a longer review period may be appropriate, specifically serious dishonesty, applied to the circumstances here.

After a detailed consideration of factors including but not limited to the nature of the offences as well as the public interest and Mr Tchourkin's interests, and taking into account the level of seriousness they had found, the panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period of a reasonable duration 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 of 4 years.

## 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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven, including 2(b), 3(d), 3(e), 4(c). I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

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

- A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct.
- 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 Tchourkin, 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 Tchourkin fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of repeatedly setting out to mislead potential employers in relation to employment history and periods of service, conduct found to be dishonest and lacked 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 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 Tchourkin, 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 Tchourkin which involved deliberately misleading staffing agencies, and therefore schools, as to his career history including the duration of and nature of his periods of service, which actions the panel had found were dishonest and lacked integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The panel considered that it was essential that a teacher provided accurate information before and on their hiring as, without this, employers were unable to make an informed decision about them and the safeguarding of pupils." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel had no evidence in front of it of any mitigation or mitigating circumstances and the panel had seen no evidence that Mr Tchourkin had demonstrated any insight into his actions nor any remorse for his actions. The panel noted that the allegations as found proven appeared to demonstrate a pattern of behaviour." In my judgement, the lack 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 considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Tchourkin were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of serious 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 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 Tchourkin himself and the panel comment "There was no evidence that Mr Tchourkin demonstrates exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he has contributed

significantly to the education sector. Though the panel had no evidence as to whether the incidents found proven were out of character it noted that Mr Tchourkin's actions had been repeated on at least one occasion."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Tchourkin 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 considered afresh their findings. The panel noted that they had found that Mr Tchourkin's actions in providing misleading and/or false statements was seriously dishonest and lacked integrity and that the public would certainly expect teachers to be honest and demonstrate consistently high levels of integrity in their personal and professional life."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that "The panel had no evidence in front of it of any mitigation or mitigating circumstances and the panel had seen no evidence that Mr Tchourkin had demonstrated any insight into his actions nor any remorse for his actions. The panel noted that the allegations as found proven appeared to demonstrate a pattern of behaviour."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Tchourkin 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 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 4 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The panel was seriously concerned that Mr Tchourkin would repeat the behaviours which he had already demonstrated on more than one occasion and that they had no evidence before them to suggest he would not. The panel noted that they had found that one of the circumstances under which a longer review period may be appropriate, specifically serious dishonesty, applied to the circumstances here."

The panel also said "After a detailed consideration of factors including but not limited to the nature of the offences as well as the public interest and Mr Tchourkin's interests, and taking into account the level of seriousness they had found, the panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period of a reasonable duration 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 of 4 years.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a lesser review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the findings, including dishonesty, and the lack of either insight or remorse.

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

**This means that Mr Anguel Tchourkin 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 7 August 2029, 4 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 Tchourkin remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Tchourkin has a right of appeal to 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 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 4 August 2025**

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