



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Amrinder Singh Pannu: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

September 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	14
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	18

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

Teacher:	Mr Amrinder Singh Pannu
Teacher ref number:	1249630
Teacher date of birth:	22 January 1987
TRA reference:	18777
Date of determination:	23 September 2025
Former employer:	St Marks Church of England Academy, Mitcham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 22 to 23 September 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Amrinder Singh Pannu.

The panel members were Ms Rachel Curry (lay panellist – in the chair) and Mrs Kate Hurley (teacher panellist) and Mr Neil Green (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Holly Quirk of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Amrinder Pannu was not present and was not represented.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 29 May 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Pannu was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a teacher of science /head of science at St Mark's Church of England Academy he;

1. Engaged in inappropriate behaviour during a conversation with Pupil A specially stating:
 - a. "it's a nice arse" or words of a similar nature;
 - b. "you're not teasing me I know you want it" or words of a similar nature.
 - c. "just have it, just have it init, just the way you have your tits" or words of a similar nature in reference to your penis;
 - d. "if you were in a different school then it would have been a different story" or words of a similar nature'
 - e. "you're one horny girl man; fuck..." or words of a similar nature;
 - f. "so you could do me round the corner?" or words of a similar nature;
 - g. He agreed to have sexual intercourse with Pupil A "a few month in" after she turned 18 or words of a similar nature;
2. His conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

Mr Pannu made no admissions of fact in respect of allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), 1(d), 1(e), 1(f), 1(g) or 2 prior to the hearing.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list – page 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 29

Section 3: Correspondence with teacher – pages 31 to 34

Section 4: TRA witness statements – pages 36 to 57

Section 5: TRA documents – pages 59 to 131

Section 6: Teacher documents – pages 134 to 148

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

In consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2018, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Witness B – [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Pannu commenced employment at St Marks Church of England School (‘the School’) on 1 September 2015.

On 10 September 2018 Pupil A recorded a conversation between her and Mr Pannu, in his classroom during a free period. The conversation was allegedly sexual in nature.

Mr Pannu allegedly made comments to Pupil A such as *“it’s a nice arse”*, calling Pupil A *“horny”*, and agreeing to have sexual intercourse with her a few months after she turned 18, amongst other inappropriate comments.

On 11 September 2018, three members of staff at the School received an anonymous whistleblowing email attaching the voice recordings of Mr Pannu’s interaction with Pupil A. The email set out that the conversation between Mr Pannu and Pupil A was sexually explicit. Mr Pannu was suspended, and these matters were investigated by the School.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 10 October 2019.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. Engaged in inappropriate behaviour during a conversation with Pupil A specially stating:**
 - a. “it’s a nice arse” or words of a similar nature;**
 - b. “you’re not teasing me I know you want it” or words of a similar nature.**
 - c. “just have it, just have it init, just the way you have your tits” or words of a similar nature in reference to your penis;**
 - d. “if you were in a different school then it would have been a different story” or words of a similar nature’**
 - e. “you’re one horny girl man; fuck...” or words of a similar nature;**
 - f. “so you could do me round the corner?” or words of a similar nature;**
 - g. You agree to have sexual intercourse with Pupil A “a few month in” after she turned 18 or words of a similar nature;**

The panel carefully considered three audio recordings, containing discussions between Pupil A and Mr Pannu and the transcripts of those meetings which were contained within the bundle. The panel noted that the evidence was that it was not in dispute that the individuals who had been recorded were Pupil A and Mr Pannu.

The panel noted the following comments made in the three recordings:

- Pupil A said to Mr Pannu *“I don’t have a big arse”*, to which Mr Pannu is heard responding *“no but it’s a nice arse”* or words of a similar nature.
- Pupil A said to Mr Pannu *“I’m just teasing you”*, to which Mr Pannu responded *“you’re not teasing me, I know you want it”* or words of a similar nature.
- Pupil A said to Mr Pannu words to the effect of *“yeah but the dick is good, how would you see a dick like that”*, to which Mr Pannu responded with *“just have it, just have it init, just the way you have your tits”* or words of a similar nature.

- Mr Pannu said to Pupil A *"I just... if you were in a different school"* and *"if you were in a different school then it would have been a different story"* or words of a similar nature.
- Mr Pannu said to Pupil A words to the effect of *"you're one horny girl man, fuck"* or words of a similar nature.
- Mr Pannu said to Pupil A that he loved a girl, to which Pupil A asked to be invited to his [REDACTED]. Mr Pannu is heard saying to Pupil A *"so you could do me around the corner?"* or words of a similar nature.
- Pupil A said words to the effect of *"so when I turn 18 you'll have sex with me right?"* to which Mr Pannu responded with words to the effect of *"a few months then later yeah"*.
- Mr Pannu said words to the effect *"no yet, no, no chance, not yet, no, not til..."* and *"I do want you"*

The panel considered the oral and written evidence of Witness A, who stated that she and the headteacher met with Mr Pannu and informed him that they had received some recordings. She stated that Mr Pannu denied that it was him speaking in the recordings, despite it being obvious that it was him. [REDACTED]

Witness A informed the panel that Pupil A had told her that Pupil A considered that she was in a relationship with Mr Pannu.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B, who confirmed that he was the investigating officer on behalf of the School in relation to the incident. Witness B confirmed that he had interviewed Pupil A and her family in the presence of the SENCO/DSL and interviewed Mr Pannu. He stated that Pupil A came across extremely upset during their meeting, and that Mr Pannu came across as reflective and upset during the investigation. Witness B confirmed in oral evidence that Mr Pannu had acknowledged that it was him on the recordings and that Mr Pannu acknowledged that Pupil A had been flirtatious and that he, Mr Pannu, had been flirtatious in response.

The panel considered the meeting notes taken by Witness B regarding the meeting with Pupil A on 16 July 2019. The panel was aware that these were hearsay but considered it to be in the interests of justice and the parties that they were admitted. They applied significant weight to them noting that they had the opportunity to question Witness B.

The notes set out that, within the meeting, Pupil A had confirmed that she had recorded the three audio recordings and described her relationship with Mr Pannu as flirtatious from both sides. The notes further set out that Pupil A had recorded the conversations she had had with Mr Pannu as her friend did not believe what she had been telling them about the situation and had asked her to prove it.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil A. The panel applied moderate weight to this statement. Pupil A set out that she was [REDACTED] when her relationship with Mr Pannu changed and the incidents happened. She stated that she would only meet up with Mr Pannu and go and see him one to one in School.

Pupil A stated that at first, she and Mr Pannu would talk about regular things, for example travelling and university. She stated that Mr Pannu knew how they were interacting was wrong and would tell her that she could not tell anyone because his life would be ruined.

Pupil A stated that the audio recordings of the conversations she had with Mr Pannu were recorded during her free period at School. She stated that she chose to record the conversation because she had spoken to one of her friends about the situation and they didn't believe her.

The panel considered the written response of Mr Pannu's then legal advisor, dated 23 April 2021, and the attached 'reflection piece' apparently authored by Mr Pannu.

The panel admitted and placed a significant amount of weight on this evidence noting that, in the absence of Mr Pannu, it represented its best opportunity to consider his response to the allegations before it.

Mr Pannu denied that any inappropriate relationship existed with Pupil A or that there were any sexual acts between them. He accepted that the conversation that was recorded by Pupil A on 10 September 2018 was handled badly by him when responding to comments made by Pupil A and that he did not follow the correct protocols.

Mr Pannu stated that, during his time as pastoral lead in early 2016, he was asked to become involved in the issues surrounding Pupil A at the time. [REDACTED]

Mr Pannu stated that Pupil A came into his classroom on 10 September 2018 during a free period where he was lesson planning alone. He stated that he usually spoke to [REDACTED] students in a more casual manner but accepted that he engaged with this conversation when he should not have done so.

Mr Pannu accepted that the conversation contained sexual references but stated that he neither instigated nor encouraged the sexual nature of the conversation. He stated that

he did not take the comments seriously at the time and had not been particularly concerned about Pupil A's behaviour judging it as being akin to a crush or pushing boundaries. He stated there was no physical contact of any form and throughout the conversation they were on either side of a desk. He stated he did inform another staff member about the incident but did not mention the details of what was said, and he accepted he did not report the conversation to the safeguarding lead and that it was a safeguarding issue. Mr Pannu denied he flirted with Pupil A and stated that he tried to steer her onto other topics.

The panel noted that during the recording Mr Pannu can be heard saying 'no', 'no chance' and 'stop that' though it was not clear what this was in reference to. Mr Pannu accepted that he was not assertive enough, and the panel noted that Mr Pannu still continued to engage in the conversation, including by making the comments as set out above.

The panel was satisfied that the recording was a recording of a conversation between Mr Pannu and Pupil A.

Having considered all of the evidence before it, the panel found it proven that Mr Pannu had engaged in inappropriate behaviour during a conversation with Pupil A in that he had behaved as set out within allegation 1 and made all the statements described there or words of a similar nature.

The panel therefore found allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), 1(d), 1(e), 1(f) and 1(g) proven.

2. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

The panel again considered the written response of Mr Pannu's then legal advisors dated 23 April 2021 and the attached statement from Mr Pannu.

Mr Pannu accepted that his conversation with Pupil A on 10 September 2018 contained elements of a sexual nature but did not accept that his conduct was sexually motivated.

Mr Pannu further accepted that he was a party to the conversation but stated that he neither instigated nor encouraged the sexual nature of the conversation.

The panel's attention was drawn to section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018]*, *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* and *The General Medical Council v Haris [2021]* by the legal adviser.

The panel considered whether the conduct was sexually motivated. It noted that in *Basson* it was stated that, “[a] sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship”.

The panel was also mindful of the Court of Appeal’s conclusion in *Haris*. The Court found in that case that, “[i]n the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves. A sexual motive was plainly more likely than not; I would go so far as to say that that inference was overwhelming.”

As the panel had found proven, Mr Pannu had behaved inappropriately by the statements he had made in his conversation with Pupil A.

The panel particularly noted some of the comments it had found proven Mr Pannu had made to Pupil A, including stating that she had a “nice arse”, the suggestion that she would wish to “do him round the corner” at his [REDACTED], the implication that if she had been at a different school they would have had a relationship, their discussion of his penis and his direct agreement that he would have sexual intercourse with her a few months after she turned 18.

The panel considered that the conversation in itself and the statements made, language used and actions taken by Mr Pannu in his conversation with Pupil A were inherently sexual in nature and that there was an absence of any other plausible alternative understanding of the words used and actions taken.

Though the panel focused themselves on the wording they had found proven in allegation 1 in making their findings, the panel noted that the context in which these statements had been made was a significant conversation in which the majority of the discussions between Mr Pannu and Pupil A were focused on matters of a sexual nature.

The panel noted that Mr Pannu’s position remained that he neither instigated nor encouraged this behaviour and sought to steer her onto other subjects. Though there was limited information that Mr Pannu raised other subjects on occasion, the panel did not accept that he did not encourage the behaviour.

Specifically, the panel formed the view on a detailed consideration of the evidence and recordings that the discussions between them, as found proven, had been overtly sexual and that Mr Pannu by his language did not seek to close down their discussions but, at times, actively encouraged the progression of them. The panel found Mr Pannu’s behaviour and tone towards Pupil A to be flirtatious and wholly inappropriate for any teacher in conversation with a pupil.

The panel noted that Mr Pannu’s position was that the transcript of the recording did not reflect the tone of the conversation. The panel in fact formed the view that Mr Pannu’s tone, in relation to the statements which they had found proven, often appeared to be a consensual, flirtatious and encouraging one.

The panel considered Mr Pannu's evidence that he had not instigated the conversation with Pupil A or encouraged it.

As stated, the panel felt that Mr Pannu had on multiple occasions encouraged the conversation, noting in particular the comments regarding engaging in sexual intercourse with Pupil A, calling Pupil A "*horny*", complimenting her bottom and, in the context of the conversation, telling Pupil A that if she would have been at a different school "*it would have been a different story*".

The panel felt there was a continuous sexual element to Mr Pannu's replies to Pupil A and that, although he was mostly responding to Pupil A's comments, he had made an active decision to do so and had not meaningfully shut the conversation down despite its nature.

The panel noted that it had found that Mr Pannu had agreed to have sex with Pupil A a few months after she turned 18. The panel carefully considered, but did not accept as evidenced, Mr Pannu's apparent assertions that his responses were statements made in order as to bring the conversation to an end and that he had no intention to have any sexual relationship with Pupil A.

The panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Pannu's intention in taking the actions which it had found proven he had, as set out within Allegation 1, was the pursuance of sexual gratification and/or a sexual relationship with Pupil A. The panel found there was no plausible innocent explanation for his actions as found proven under Allegation 1.

The panel found that Mr Pannu's conduct as found proven at allegation 1 was conduct of a sexual nature and was sexually motivated.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 proven.

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

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Pannu 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; and
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Pannu, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the relevant version of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel considered that Mr Pannu was in breach of paragraphs 7 and 11.

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

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child was relevant.

The panel again carefully considered the matters which it had found proven. It noted that it had found that Mr Pannu had engaged in conduct which was sexually motivated with a [REDACTED]-year-old child who was under his care.

The panel reminded itself that it had found that the detail of the conversation between Mr Pannu and Pupil A was obviously sexual and flirtatious and that Mr Pannu had agreed with the child to have sex with her after she had turned 18. The panel could see no way in which this behaviour could ever be viewed as anything other than extremely serious and harmful behaviour by a teacher towards a child.

The panel noted the substantial power imbalance in play in their relationship and that the male role model which the child had encountered was clearly contrary to that which she and her parents would have been entitled to expect.

The panel considered the School should have been a safe environment for the pupil and that the actions of Mr Pannu made it significantly less so by his breaches of professional standards and boundaries. [REDACTED]. On this basis his behaviour towards her should have been, if anything, exceptionally careful. The panel had found though that instead he had crossed professional boundaries in engaging in behaviour which had no place in a School. Whilst the panel noted the teacher's occasional calls for restraint in Pupil A's behaviour in the recordings which they had considered, these appeared to the panel to be more about his concerns that he would be discovered and his career prejudiced rather than any genuine attempt to close down the situation or consider the safeguarding needs of the child involved.

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

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

In relation to whether Mr Pannu'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 Pannu'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 Pannu was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child was relevant.

The panel considered that parents and the general public would consider that their first expectation of a School and its teachers would be that they would keep their children safe and act in their best interests. The allegations which the panel had found proven demonstrated behaviour by the teacher which, by his sexually motivated conduct of a sexual nature, wholly breached that expectation. As stated, the panel considered that Mr Pannu's actions were potentially seriously damaging both to the child and to her understanding of how role models should behave. The panel again noted the pastoral role which Mr Pannu had previously had in Pupil A's life so his influence over her was potentially even greater. The panel was satisfied that an ordinary member of the public, with a full understanding of the situation, would find Mr Pannu's actions completely unacceptable.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Pannu'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. 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 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 light of the panel's findings against Mr Pannu, which involved him having engaged in an inappropriate conversation of a sexual nature with a pupil and him stating, *"it's a nice arse", "you're teasing me I know you want it", "if you were in a different school then it would have been a different story", "you're one horny girl man; fuck...", "so you could do me round the corner?"* or words to a similar effect and his agreement to have sex with the pupil after she turned 18, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as Mr Pannu's behaviour, including his engaging in sexually motivated conduct with a child, 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 Pannu in the profession. Mr Pannu provided no meaningful evidence as to his ability as an educator.

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Pannu in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he 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 Pannu.

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;
- 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);

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. The

panel was aware that mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel concluded that Mr Pannu's actions were clearly deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Pannu was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence that Mr Pannu had demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct, in fact to the contrary, and there was no evidence of him having contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that Mr Pannu's decision not to engage with the TRA process meant they were confined to consider his written submissions for his position.

The panel again considered Mr Pannu's document entitled "*reflection piece*" where he set out that at the time of speaking to Pupil A that he made a huge mistake focusing on letting her talk and being friendly. He stated that he was horrified he allowed himself to engage with Pupil A's comments.

Mr Pannu stated that he was treating Pupil A like an adult and trying to give her space which he accepted was wrong.

Mr Pannu apologised for the language he used and recognised how badly he handled the situation. He stated that he has spent many hours and days since the incident replaying the moments again in his head.

Mr Pannu listed multiple individuals to whom he wanted to make an apology, including Pupil A and her family, the School, his colleagues, the students, the profession and the public.

The panel noted that they had not accepted that Mr Pannu's actions were limited to him simply mishandling the situation but, rather, had found that his sexually motivated actions within the conversation were wholly inappropriate and amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

Carefully considering Mr Pannu's statements in response to the allegations, including those listed above and otherwise, the panel found that Mr Pannu's position demonstrated the beginnings of remorse but not meaningful remorse. The panel, in particular, noted that there appeared to be no material level of remorse and insight for the impact his actions had/could have had upon the child herself.

In fact Mr Pannu's stated position, through his lawyer, was a confused one and significantly short of insightful including in that he stated on one side that Mr Pannu "*does not want to blame*" Pupil A whilst saying at the same time "*he can only imagine that [Pupil A] has chose to target him for these allegations*" and "*he is justified in believing that [Pupil*

A] had initiated all of the contact and the sexual references in order to create a fictitious relationship”.

In particular, this appears to the panel to be a failure on Mr Pannu’s part to reflect at all on his actions and statements including those found proven under Allegation 1.

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 Pannu 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 Pannu.

The panel’s findings that there had been serious departures from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers’ Standards and the serious safeguarding ramifications of Mr Pannu’s actions were relevant factors in their decision as was Mr Pannu’s clearly wholly unacceptable behaviour in exploiting his position of trust to engage in a sexually motivated conversation with a pupil.

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.

The panel found that the cases of “*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*” were relevant in this situation.

The panel considered these types of case were clearly disclosed from the allegations which they had found proven, including in that Mr Pannu engaged in sexually motivated conduct agreeing to have sex with the child after she had turned 18, his implying that, had she been to another school, they would have had some manner of sexual relations, his discussing his penis with her and his otherwise using flirtatious and sexual language towards her including directly suggesting to her that she would seek to have sex with him at his [REDACTED].

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

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

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

The panel found little, or no evidence of mitigation or insight and the limited level of remorse shown seemed principally directed at Mr Pannu's sorrow for his own position rather than any reflection, on his part, on the implications for the child. The panel found no evidence that Mr Pannu had identified the triggers or motivations which led to his behaviour or sought to remedy them or put in place measures concerning them.

Whilst noting that they had not been made aware of any previous disciplinary action the panel was extremely concerned that, were a similar circumstance to arise in the future, there was a serious risk that Mr Pannu's conduct would be repeated with another pupil, and they had seen no evidence which countered these concerns to any material degree. The panel noted that he accepted that he had not disclosed the contents of this conversation via any manner of appropriate safeguarding protocol, or otherwise, and that this situation had only come to light through the whistleblowing process.

The panel noted that they had found that the advice guided them that the public interest would have greater relevance and would weigh in favour of not offering a review. The panel considered that the very serious findings they had reached indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Pannu 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; and
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Pannu 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 Pannu fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of inappropriate behaviour with a pupil that was of a sexual nature and sexually motivated.

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 Pannu, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Pannu, which involved him having engaged in an inappropriate conversation of a sexual nature with a pupil and him stating, *“it’s a nice arse”, “you’re teasing me I know you want it”, “if you were in a different school then it would have been a different story”, “you’re one horny girl man; fuck...”, “so you could do me round the corner?”* or words to a similar effect and his agreement to have sex with the pupil after she turned 18, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

“Carefully considering Mr Pannu’s statements in response to the allegations, including those listed above and otherwise, the panel found that Mr Pannu’s position demonstrated the beginnings of remorse but not meaningful remorse. The panel, in particular, noted that there appeared to be no material level of remorse and insight for the impact his actions had/could have had upon the child herself.”

In my judgement, the lack of full 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 Pannu was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated conduct 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 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 Pannu himself. The panel has commented:

“There was no evidence that Mr Pannu had demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct, in fact to the contrary, and there was no evidence of him having contributed significantly to the education sector.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the serious nature of the misconduct that it had found proven. The panel has said:

“The panel’s findings that there had been serious departures from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers’ Standards and the serious safeguarding ramifications of Mr Pannu’s actions were relevant factors in their decision as was Mr Pannu’s clearly wholly unacceptable behaviour in exploiting his position of trust to engage in a sexually motivated conversation with a pupil.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Pannu had not demonstrated full insight and remorse into his actions. The panel has said:

“The panel found little, or no evidence of mitigation or insight and the limited level of remorse shown seemed principally directed at Mr Pannu’s sorrow for his own position rather than any reflection, on his part, on the implications for the child. The panel found no evidence that Mr Pannu had identified the triggers or motivations which led to his behaviour or sought to remedy them or put in place measures concerning them.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Pannu 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 full 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 no provision should be made for a review period.

The panel has noted the Advice on review periods in cases of serious sexual misconduct or any sexual misconduct involving a child. I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel considered these types of case were clearly disclosed from the allegations which they had found proven, including in that Mr Pannu engaged in sexually motivated conduct agreeing to have sex with the child after she had turned 18, his implying that, had she been to another school, they would have had some manner of sexual relations, his discussing his penis with her and his otherwise using flirtatious and sexual language towards her including directly suggesting to her that she would seek to have sex with him at his [REDACTED]."

I have also given considerable weight to the panel's comments:

"Whilst noting that they had not been made aware of any previous disciplinary action the panel was extremely concerned that, were a similar circumstance to arise in the future, there was a serious risk that Mr Pannu's conduct would be repeated with another pupil, and they had seen no evidence which countered these concerns to any material degree. The panel noted that he accepted that he had not disclosed the contents of this conversation via any manner of appropriate safeguarding protocol, or otherwise, and that this situation had only come to light through the whistleblowing process."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found proven, the lack of full insight and remorse, and the serious 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 Amrinder Singh Pannu 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 Pannu 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 Amrinder Singh Pannu 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: 26 September 2025

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