



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Cornelius Jansen Van Vuuren: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

Teacher: Mr Cornelius Jansen Van Vuuren
Teacher ref number: 1881523
Teacher date of birth: 19 July 1989
TRA reference: 21803
Date of determination: 7 August 2025
Former employer: Barclay Academy, Stevenage

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 7 August 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Van Vuuren.

The panel members were Ms Susan Humble (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Anila Rai (lay panellist) and Mr Chris Major (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Eleanor Bullen-Bell of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Van Vuuren that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Van Vuuren provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Mr David Drew of Browne Jacobson LLP Solicitors, Mr Van Vuuren or his representative Ms Emma Thomas of NASUWT.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 22 May 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Van Vuuren had been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence in that:

1. On 17 June 2024, he was convicted at Cambridge Crown Court for the offence of "Cause / Incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over Abuse of position of trust on 07/04/23 - 09/04/23", contrary to Section 17(1)(e)(i) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

The panel noted that Mr Van Vuuren admitted the allegation as set out in the notice of meeting dated 22 May 2025 and in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Van Vuuren on 28 January 2025. The panel noted that the statement of agreed facts included a wider period of 7 to 10 April 2023. However, the panel did not consider it necessary to amend the allegation as the panel was satisfied that Mr Van Vuuren had admitted to a date range which included the full range of dates within the allegation against him.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology – page 4

Section 2: Notice of Meeting and response – pages 6 to 28a

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 29 to 33

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 35 to 83

Section 5: Teacher Documents – pages 85 to 87

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 document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020 ("the Procedures").

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of Agreed Facts which was signed by Mr Van Vuuren on 28 January 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Van Vuuren for the allegation to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Van Vuuren had been employed as a teacher at Barclay Academy ("the School") as an agency teacher from 2 September 2019 and became a permanent member of staff on 1 September 2020. He was dismissed on 30 June 2023.

The School was notified via email that Mr Van Vuuren had exchanged inappropriate messages and pictures with a [REDACTED] pupil. The School notified the LADO and the police.

Following a police investigation, Mr Van Vuuren was charged and subsequently convicted on 17 June 2024 at Cambridge Crown Court for the criminal offence of "Cause / Incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over Abuse of position of trust on 07/04/23 - 09/04/23, contrary to Section 17(1)(e)(i) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003".

The case was referred to the TRA by Hertfordshire Police on 12 April 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On 17 June 2024, you were convicted at Cambridge Crown Court for the offence of "Cause / Incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over Abuse of position of trust on 07/04/23 - 09/04/23", contrary to Section 17(1)(e)(i) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.**

The panel considered the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by Mr Van Vuuren on 28 January 2025. In that Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Van Vuuren admitted the particulars of allegation 1 and further admitted the facts of the allegation amounted to conviction, at any time, of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the documents available to it.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers ("the Advice") which states that where there has been a conviction, at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Cambridge Crown Court which detailed that Mr Van Vuuren had been convicted on 17 June 2024 of the criminal offence of "Cause / Incite sexual activity with female 13-17 offender 18 or over Abuse of position of trust on 07/04/23 - 09/04/23, contrary to Section 17(1)(e)(i) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003".

The panel noted that Mr Van Vuuren had pleaded guilty to the offence.

In respect of the conviction, which is the subject of the allegation, Mr Van Vuuren was sentenced on 17 June 2024 to a 6-month custodial sentence (suspended for 24 months), 150 hours of unpaid work, up to 30 rehabilitation days, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order of 7 years and a Sex Offenders Notification requirement of 7 years.

The panel found the allegation proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Van Vuuren 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:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;

- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
- ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Van Vuuren's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting, given that his behaviour involved a serious abuse of his position of trust and influential role as a teacher and sexually inappropriate communications with a pupil. His sending of unsolicited indecent images and incitement to the pupil to reciprocate such behaviour demonstrated a clear risk to the safety and wellbeing of children and his conduct was fundamentally incompatible with his professional responsibilities in the education setting.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Van Vuuren's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel considered paragraph 33 of the Advice and noted that Mr Van Vuuren's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment (albeit suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning a conviction for an offence involving sexual activity and sexual communication with a child, each of which, the Advice states, is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

In addition, the panel noted that the offence for which Mr Van Vuuren was convicted related to controlling or coercive behaviour and harassment and/or stalking, each of which the Advice indicates are likely to mean the offence will be considered a relevant offence. The panel found that Mr Van Vuuren's messages reflected a manipulative and coercive disposition, indicating his clear intent to abuse his position of trust.

The panel observed concerning suggestions that he had formed an inappropriate interest in the pupil for some time, as evidenced by her police interview in which she described him frequently staring and winking at her. The panel was concerned by the unknown

means by which Mr Van Vuuren had obtained this pupil's mobile phone number, contrary to the standards of personal and professional conduct, for which he had provided no explanation that it had seen.

The panel noted the apparent severity of Mr Van Vuuren's exploitation of this child, the seriousness of his conduct and the potential for his conduct to escalate into physical sexual behaviour within the school building. In particular, the panel noted the message put to him in his police interview, "So grab your arse then Monday?", as a clear indication of a threat of sexual behaviour. In the pupil's police interview, she stated that "he said he would come and collect me and take me back to his and get me all kinds of naked."

The panel noted that the lists on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice are non-exhaustive and noted Mr Van Vuuren's incitement to the pupil to send him an indecent image of herself. The panel noted that Mr Van Vuuren sent two unsolicited indecent photographs of himself to the pupil. This conduct indicated to the panel his coercive attitude in direct contravention of the personal and professional standards expected of him.

The panel noted that Mr Van Vuuren did not provide any evidence of mitigating circumstances.

The panel was not presented with any evidence of Mr Van Vuuren's teaching proficiency.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Van Vuuren's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel also considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel found that Mr Van Vuuren had been convicted of a relevant offence.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order 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 noted that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the

safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and the upholding of proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Van Vuuren, which involved a criminal conviction following his inappropriate sexual communications with a pupil, representing a serious finding of inappropriate sexual activity and abuse of a position of trust, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Van Vuuren were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel considered that the ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen would undoubtedly recognise the seriousness of his conduct, its detrimental effects and the need to protect vulnerable young people.

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 Van Vuuren 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 Van Vuuren in the profession. The panel noted that no evidence has been presented which could attest to his ability as an educator. The panel therefore considered that the adverse public interest considerations (as set out above) outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Van Vuuren in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he actively sought to exploit his position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Van Vuuren.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- a lack of integrity; and
- collusion or concealment including encouraging [the pupil] to break rules.

The panel noted that this is a non-exhaustive list and, additionally, were concerned that Mr Van Vuuren had incited the pupil to send him indecent photographs of herself.

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 whether there were any mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

Considering the panel's findings, there was evidence that Mr Van Vuuren's actions were deliberate.

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

Mr Van Vuuren did not provide evidence to demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or his having contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that Mr Van Vuuren did not provide evidence in mitigation to the TRA, despite being given the opportunity to do so.

The panel was not referred to any evidence of good character or references which could attest to Mr Van Vuuren's contribution to the education sector. The panel was not referred to any evidence of mitigation or evidence demonstrating insight or remorse from Mr Van Vuuren.

The panel observed that Mr Van Vuuren pleaded guilty at court and admitted the allegation before this panel. However, at no point, so far as the panel were aware, did he demonstrate any meaningful understanding of the gravity of his actions or express remorse. This absence of reflection and accountability further heightened the panel's concerns regarding his suitability to work with children or within an educational environment. The panel noted the effects on the pupil and, in particular, her statement that she was "shocked and scared" when she discovered it was Mr Van Vuuren messaging her.

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 Van Vuuren 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 Van Vuuren. The finding of a relevant conviction and his clear intent to abuse and exploit his position of trust was a significant factor in the panel 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. These include:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where

the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and

- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

The panel found these to be relevant in this case.

The panel noted that this list is not intended to be exhaustive and that it should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved.

The panel specifically noted Mr Van Vuuren's sexually inappropriate communications with a pupil, his sending of unsolicited indecent sexual images and his incitement for the pupil to reciprocate such behaviour.

The panel noted that Mr Van Vuuren has not shown any insight or remorse into his actions which the panel considered increased the risk of repetition of future behaviour and weighed in favour of a longer, or no, review period.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Cornelius Jansen Van Vuuren should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Van Vuuren 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:

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
 - 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 Van Vuuren involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of children as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Van Vuuren “demonstrated a clear risk to the safety and wellbeing of children and his conduct was fundamentally incompatible with his professional responsibilities in the education setting.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexually inappropriate communications with a pupil.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Van Vuuren, 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 the light of the panel's findings against Mr Van Vuuren, which involved a criminal conviction following his inappropriate sexual communications with a pupil, representing a serious finding of inappropriate sexual activity and abuse of a

position of trust, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing 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 has set out as follows:

“The panel was not referred to any evidence of mitigation or evidence demonstrating insight or remorse from Mr Van Vuuren.”

“The panel observed that Mr Van Vuuren pleaded guilty at court and admitted the allegation before this panel. However, at no point, so far as the panel were aware, did he demonstrate any meaningful understanding of the gravity of his actions or express remorse. This absence of reflection and accountability further heightened the panel’s concerns regarding his suitability to work with children or within an educational environment.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence 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 Van Vuuren were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel considered that the ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen would undoubtedly recognise the seriousness of his conduct, its detrimental effects and the need to protect vulnerable young people.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding that the teacher sent two indecent photographs of himself to a pupil and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Van Vuuren himself. The panel has commented:

“Mr Van Vuuren did not provide evidence to demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or his having contributed significantly to the education sector.”

“The panel was not referred to any evidence of good character or references which could attest to Mr Van Vuuren’s contribution to the education sector.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Van Vuuren from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the seriousness of Mr Van Vuuren’s conduct which resulted in a suspended custodial sentence. The panel has said:

“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 Van Vuuren. The finding of a relevant conviction and his clear intent to abuse and exploit his position of trust was a significant factor in the panel.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s finding that there was no evidence of insight or remorse on the part of Mr Van Vuuren, and the panel’s concerns regarding his suitability to work with children or within an educational environment.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Van Vuuren 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 evidence of insight and remorse, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments:

“The panel specifically noted Mr Van Vuuren’s sexually inappropriate communications with a pupil, his sending of unsolicited indecent sexual images and his incitement for the pupil to reciprocate such behaviour.”

“The panel noted that Mr Van Vuuren has not shown any insight or remorse into his actions which the panel considered increased the risk of repetition of future behaviour and weighed in favour of a longer, or no, review period.”

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 offence of which Mr Van Vuuren was convicted, the lack of evidence 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 Cornelius Jansen Van Vuuren 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 allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Van Vuuren 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 Van Vuuren 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 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 8 August 2025

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