



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Waleed Nasir: 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
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	7
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

Teacher: Mr Waleed Nasir

Teacher ref number: 2153703

Teacher date of birth: 25 February 1998

TRA reference: 22167

Date of determination: 21 August 2025

Former employer: Orchard Park High School, Surrey

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 21 August 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Waleed Nasir.

The panel members were Mr Paul Millett (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Jo Palmer-Tweed (teacher panellist) and Ms Susan Ridge (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Graham Miles of Blake Morgan 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 Waleed Nasir that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Nasir 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 Nasir or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 13 August 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Waleed Nasir has been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

On or around 28 May 2024 he was convicted at Guildford Crown Court for the offences of:

1. Three counts of Adult Abuse of Position of Trust – Sexual Activity with a Girl 13 – 17 cared for in s21 Premises contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003.
2. Adult Abuse of Position of Trust – Cause/ Incite Sexual Activity with Girl 13 – 17 s21 Premises contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Mr Nasir admitted that he was convicted of the offence concerned.

Mr Nasir also admitted that the conviction was for a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of Hearing, Response and Notice of Meeting – pages 5 to 17b

Section 2: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer representations – pages 19 to 23

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 26 to 183

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 185 to 187

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 Nasir on 6 July 2025.

Decision and reasons

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 Waleed Nasir for the allegations 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 Waleed Nasir was employed as a [REDACTED] Teacher at Orchard Park High School, Croydon, Surrey ('the School') from 4 July 2022 until his dismissal on 12 June 2023.

On 28 April 2023, Mr Nasir attended a hotel with a female [REDACTED] pupil who was [REDACTED] at the time. The management of the hotel raised concerns as Mr Nasir had booked a double room and the female with him appeared to be a child. Mr Nasir was arrested on 28 April 2023 for the offence of causing or inciting a child to engage in sexual activity whilst he was in a position of trust.

On 28 May 2024, Mr Nasir pleaded guilty to four offences under the Sexual Offences Act 2003. He was given a suspended sentence of imprisonment together with a rehabilitation activity requirement, an unpaid work requirement, a restraining order, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order and a requirement to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 10 years.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

On or around 28 May 2024 you were convicted at Guildford Crown Court for the offences of:

- 1. Three counts of Adult Abuse of Position of Trust – Sexual Activity with a Girl 13 – 17 cared for in s21 Premises contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003.**
- 2. Adult Abuse of Position of Trust – Cause/ Incite Sexual Activity with Girl 13 – 17 s21 Premises contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003.**

Mr Nasir admitted that he was convicted of the specified offences and he signed a statement of agreed facts to that effect. In addition, the panel was provided with a

certificate of conviction from the Guildford Crown Court which confirmed Mr Nasir's convictions. The panel was also provided with a transcript of the judge's sentencing remarks.

The certificate of conviction confirmed that Mr Nasir pleaded guilty to three counts of sexual activity with a girl contrary to s16(1)(a) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and one count of causing or inciting sexual activity contrary to s17(1)(a) of the same Act.

The transcript of the judge's sentencing remarks described the offences contrary to s16(1)(a) as involving Mr Nasir touching the pupil's breasts on two occasions and giving her a love bite on the third occasion. The sentencing remarks described the offence contrary to s17(1)(a) as Mr Nasir causing or inciting the pupil to touch his penis.

The transcript referred to Mr Nasir being the pupil's [REDACTED] teacher and the fact that he began to give her extra help before they became friends and met outside of school. The judge said, '*You began meeting out of school, she would go and sit in your car and there you would give her what she described as hickeys or love bites on her chest neck and breast. Things escalated from there...you were touching her breasts and she was touching your penis*'.

The panel found the allegations 1 and 2 proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

The panel was satisfied that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Nasir 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including... the rule of 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 Mr Nasir's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. An essential ingredient of the four offences for which Mr Nasir was convicted was that he was in a position of trust in relation to the pupil because he was her teacher. In his sentencing remarks, the judge described Mr Nasir's conduct as *'a gross breach of trust which demonstrates predatory behaviour and exploitative behaviour by you of a pupil of yours'*.

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

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Nasir's behaviour in committing the offences 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 noted that Mr Nasir's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The sentence also included a rehabilitation activity requirement, an unpaid work requirement, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for seven years and a requirement to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 10 years. The Sexual Harm Prevention Order places significant restrictions on Mr Nasir's ability to communicate with or be in the presence of persons under the age of 18. Mr Nasir is expressly prohibited from:

'Undertaking any work, whether paid or voluntary, which by its nature is likely to bring him into lone or unsupervised contact with young persons under the age of 18 years, for example (but not exclusively) any work connected with parks or schools'

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity with a child, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the convictions was relevant to Mr Nasir's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel 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.

Therefore, the panel found that the convictions were for relevant offences.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of conviction of relevant offences, 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.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of an inappropriate relationship with a child.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Nasir 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 Nasir 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 Nasir in the profession. The panel was not presented with evidence of Ms Nasir's proficiency as a teacher which might have enabled the panel to conclude that such a public interest existed. In any event, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any potential public interest in retaining Ms Nasir in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he had exploited 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 Nasir.

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 or former 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;
- collusion or concealment including:
 - encouraging others to break rules;
 - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing;

In this specific context, the panel noted that the transcript of the sentencing remarks referred to Mr Nasir giving differing accounts of what had taken place and had implicated [REDACTED] in an attempted cover up.

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

The teacher's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Nasir was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation

Mr Nasir did have a previously good history in that he had not been the subject of any previous disciplinary finding.

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 Nasir 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 Nasir. The serious nature of the offences and the gross breach of trust 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.

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;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child;

These elements were present in this case in the context of behaviour described by the judge as '*predatory*', '*exploitative*' and '*a gross breach of trust*' towards a pupil.

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 a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Nasir 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including... the rule of 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 Nasir involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for offences involving sexual activity with a girl aged 13 to 17.

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 Nasir, 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, “There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of an inappropriate relationship with a child.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

The panel has not commented on whether Mr Nasir has shown insight or remorse. The panel has noted that Mr Nasir pleaded guilty to the offence but also that he had given “differing accounts of what had taken place and had implicated [REDACTED] in an attempted cover up.” The panel has also noted the judge’s sentencing remarks that “described Mr Nasir’s conduct as *‘a gross breach of trust which demonstrates predatory behaviour and exploitative behaviour by you of a pupil of yours’*.” Mr Nasir’s sentence included a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for 7 years which places significant restrictions on his ability to communicate with or be in the presence of people under the age of 18. In my judgement, the imposition of restrictions on Mr Nasir’s contact with people under 18, alongside the absence of evidence of insight or remorse, indicate that there is some risk of Mr Nasir repeating this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element some 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 that “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Nasir were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for offences involving sexual activity with a child in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Nasir himself. The panel has commented, “Mr Nasir did have a previously good history in that he had not been the

subject of any previous disciplinary finding.” The panel has also noted that it “was not presented with evidence of Ms Nasir’s proficiency as a teacher”.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Nasir 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 offences involving sexual activity with a child, for which Mr Nasir received a suspended custodial sentence, and his gross breach of trust. I agree with the panel that “the conduct found against Mr Nasir was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated” and that “his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he had exploited his position of trust.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Nasir 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, 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 in cases involving any sexual misconduct with a child, the public interest will weigh in favour of not offering a review period. The panel has commented that “These elements were present in this case in the context of behaviour described by the judge as ‘*predatory*’, ‘*exploitative*’ and ‘*a gross breach of trust*’ towards a pupil.”

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 offences for which Mr Nasir was convicted and received a suspended custodial sentence and the gross breach of trust.

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 Waleed Nasir 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 Nasir 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 Nasir 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 'David Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 27 August 2025

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