



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Louis Kisitu Ssekabira: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**December 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	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Kisitu Ssekabira
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1789980
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	04 May 1995
<b>TRA reference:</b>	20126
<b>Date of determination:</b>	5 December 2025
<b>Former employer:</b>	Bishop Challenor Catholic Federation of Schools, London

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 5 December 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Louis Kisitu Ssekabira.

The panel members were Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Bev Williams (teacher panellist) and Ms Janette McCormick (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) 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 Ssekabira that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Ssekabira provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Katherine Knowles of Capsticks LLP or Mr Ssekabira.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 18 September 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Ssekabira was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

1. While employed as a teacher at Droitwich Spa High School:
  - a. On or around 5 May 2020, he was in possession of around 262 sets of card details and/or around 69 logins for online banking in other people's names;
  - b. He intended to use those details fraudulently;
2. While employed as a teacher at Bishop Challenor Catholic Federation of Schools ("School B"):
  - a. On or around Friday 25 June 2021, he accepted a police caution for an offence of possession of articles used to commit fraud, namely 262 sets of card details and 69 logins for online banking in other people's names, contrary to Section 6 of the Fraud Act 2006;
3. His conduct as set out in paragraphs 1 a. and/or b. was dishonest.

Mr Ssekabira admitted the alleged facts and that he was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 6 to 13

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – page 14 to 17

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 18 to 27

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 28 to 123

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 Ssekabira on 29 May 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 Ssekabira 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 Ssekabira was employed as a teacher of mathematics at Droitwich Spa High School and sixth form centre (“School A”) from 1 September 2019 to 31 December 2020.

He was employed as a teacher of mathematics at Bishop Challenor Catholic Federation of Schools (“School B”) from January 2021 until August 2022.

On 5 May 2020, the police attended Ms Ssekabira’s home and seized his electronic devices. Mr Ssekabira attended a voluntary police interview on 29 October 2020.

On 1 July 2021, Mr Ssekabira was reported to the TRA by the [REDACTED].

In August 2022, Mr Ssekabira left his employment at School B.

## **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. While employed as a teacher at Droitwich Spa High School:**

- a. On or around 5 May 2020, he was in possession of around 262 sets of card details and/or around 69 logins for online banking in other people's names;**
- b. He intended to use those details fraudulently;**

On 21 April 2025, Mr Ssekabira completed a notice of referral form to confirm he admitted this allegation.

In the statement of agreed facts Mr Ssekabira admitted this allegation. He agreed that on 5 May 2020, the police seized a MacBook laptop computer from his home. He also agreed that the police searched this device and found 235 sets of card details and 62 sets of login credentials in other people's names.

He admitted that, on the same day, the police seized from his home an iPhone XR, that the police searched this device and found 11 sets of card details and 2 sets of login credentials.

He also admitted that, on the same day, the police seized from Mr Ssekabira's home an iPhone 5S, that the police searched this device and found 16 sets of card details and 5 sets of login credentials.

Mr Ssekabira admitted that the devices belonged to him, that he was aware of the card details and login credentials and intended to use them to commit fraud.

The panel has seen a Case Summary from [REDACTED]. This confirmed that on 5 May 2020, a search warrant had been executed on Mr Ssekabira's property. The information contained within the Case Summary with regard to the items and what was found on them correlated with the information referred to above contained within the statement of agreed facts. The panel has also seen a witness statement from the detective constable who examined the devices seized and confirmed the details referred to above were found on Mr Ssekabira's devices.

In a police interview with Mr Ssekabira on 25 June 2021, the Case Summary reports that Mr Ssekabira knew he had the details found on his devices and was going to use them to commit fraud. He accepted that he knew it was wrong and expressed remorse.

The panel has seen a transcript of the police interview stating that he "was planning to commit some sort of fraud" and confirmed that "no one had forced him to hold those details, and that it was a decision of his own. He confirmed that he regretted having the details.

The panel found this allegation proven.

## **2. While employed as a teacher at Bishop Challenor Catholic Federation of Schools ("School B"):**

- a. On or around Friday 25 June 2021, he accepted a police caution for an offence of possession of articles used to commit fraud, namely 262 sets of card details and 69 logins for online banking in other people's names, contrary to Section 6 of the Fraud Act 2006;**

On 21 April 2025, Mr Ssekabira completed a notice of referral form to confirm he admitted this allegation.

In the statement of agreed facts Mr Ssekabira admitted this allegation. Mr Ssekabira accepted that, on 25 June 2020, he accepted a police caution for an offence of possession of articles used to commit fraud, namely 262 sets of card details and 69 logins for online banking in other people's names, contrary to Section 6 of the Fraud Act 2006. He admitted that this caution related to the conduct set out in allegation 1 and that in order to accept the caution, Mr Ssekabira admitted the offence. The panel noted the discrepancy between the date on which Mr Ssekabira states that he admitted the caution and that set out in the allegation. Based on other evidence of whether the caution was acceptable, the panel considered the reference to 2020 to have been a typographical error.

The panel has seen the referral by [REDACTED] to the TRA dated 1 July 2021 which stated that "on Friday 25<sup>th</sup> June, Mr Louis Ssekabira...was given a police caution for an offence of possession of articles used to commit fraud, namely 262 sets of card details and 69 logins for online banking in other people's names. This is contrary to Sec 6 of the Fraud Act 2006."

The [REDACTED] at School B provided a witness statement that he first became aware of Mr Ssekabira's caution when the [REDACTED] brought it to his attention that a police officer wanted to speak with him about Mr Ssekabira. He stated that he had a conversation with the police officer concerned who told him that Mr Ssekabira had been found to have a laptop in his possession with the card and/or bank details of several people on it and had been given a caution.

The panel noted from the [REDACTED] Case Summary that it stated Mr Ssekabira had been given a caution on 25 June 2021.

The panel has also seen a print out of the PNC record which confirmed that Mr Ssekabira had been cautioned on 25 June 2021 for "Make/ Supply Article(s) for use in fraud (s)" and s7 of the Fraud Act 2006 was cited. The panel noted that this particular offence described in the PNC record was different to that referred to in the notice informing the TRA of the caution and also to that referred to in the Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel considered that there was clear consistent evidence that the caution had been administered for possession of articles used to commit fraud, namely 262 sets of card details and 69 logins for online banking in other people's names. The specific paragraph number of the Fraud Act that had been contravened was not intrinsic to the panel's

deliberations in this case. Rather it was the underlying conduct that the panel was to exercise its judgement upon. The panel therefore found this allegation proven, accepting that the caution itself may have referred to either s6 or s7 of the Fraud Act 2006.

The panel found this allegation proven.

### **3. His conduct as set out in paragraphs 1 a. and/or b. was dishonest.**

On 21 April 2025, Mr Ssekabira completed a notice of referral form to confirm he admitted this allegation.

In the statement of agreed facts Mr Ssekabira admitted this allegation. He admitted that intending to carry out a fraudulent act is inherently dishonest.

The panel noted from the [REDACTED] Case Summary that when the search warrant was executed and Mr Ssekabira's devices were seized he confirmed the devices belonged to him but refused to provide password and pin numbers. This was confirmed in a witness statement provided by the detective constable who executed the search warrant.

In a police interview with Mr Ssekabira on 25 June 2021, the Case Summary reports that Mr Ssekabira said that he knew he had the details found on his devices and was going to use them to commit fraud. He accepted that he knew it was wrong and expressed remorse. The panel has seen a transcript of the police interview stating that he "was planning to commit some sort of fraud" and confirmed that "no one had forced him to hold those details", and that it was a decision of his own. He confirmed that he regretted having the details.

[REDACTED] at School B stated in his witness statement that Mr Ssekabira had explained in a meeting that he bought the laptop off Gumtree and found the details on the laptop when he started using it. The panel noted that this provided no explanation as to why some of the card details and login details were also found on Mr Ssekabira's other devices.

The panel considered that it was more likely than not that Mr Ssekabira had intended to use the details fraudulently. Had there been an innocent explanation, he would have provided this to the police, and it seems unlikely when such details were found on multiple devices. The panel also noted that he refused to hand over pin/ password details to the police when the devices were seized. He ultimately accepted that he had been planning "some sort of fraud" to the police. The panel considered that Mr Ssekabira's intention had been to commit fraud, and that the ordinary person would consider this to be dishonest.

The panel found this allegation 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 Ssekabira in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Ssekabira 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
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ssekabira in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

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

The panel also considered whether Mr Ssekabira’s caution involved behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where there is acceptance of a caution for an offence involving behaviours associated with such an offence, a panel is likely to consider it as being an admission of behaviours that would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel noted that the proven allegations took place outside the education setting. The panel considered that such conduct affected the way Mr Ssekabira fulfilled his teaching

role as it fundamentally undermines the trust that could be placed in him. Dishonesty of this severity is not compatible with acting as a role model to pupils.

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

In relation to whether Mr Ssekabira'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 Ssekabira's caution involved 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 Ssekabira was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant. The Advice indicates that where there is an acceptance of a caution for an offence involving behaviours associated with such an offence, a panel is likely to consider it as being an admission of conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Ssekabira's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have a 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 protection of other members of the public; 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 protection of the public given Mr Ssekabira's intention to perpetrate fraud using the 262 sets of card details and 69 login details for online banking in other people's names in his possession.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ssekabira 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 Ssekabira 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 Ssekabira in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mr Ssekabira had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Ssekabira in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. 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. The panel considered that it was an abuse of trust for a teacher to intend to use others' card details and login details to the detriment of members of the public.

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 Ssekabira.

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;
- abuse of position or trust...;
- actions or behaviours that ... undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect...
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences...; and
- collusion or concealment including:
  - ...;
  - ... concealing inappropriate actions....

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

There was evidence to indicate that Mr Ssekabira's actions were deliberate.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Ssekabira had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. There was no evidence of any previous disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

The panel noted that Mr Ssekabira provided one character statement dated 25 October 2022 for the panel's consideration. This was from a referee who had [REDACTED] Mr Ssekabira and referred to Mr Ssekabira always being an upright character in School B's community of schools. It was stated that he had been instrumental in the transformation of the department from being dysfunctional to Good with Outstanding features. The latest Ofsted inspection in September 2021 praised the mathematics department for its strong behaviour management and very good teaching and learning. It referred to Mr Ssekabira

having shown great leadership and pastoral skills, where as deputy head of year 10 girls he single-handedly improved attendance and punctuality across a cohort. It referred to Mr Ssekabira having been promoted to Head of Year 10 at an Outstanding School in Ilford and was on course to become Assistant Principal. The reference referred to Mr Ssekabira having expressed deep remorse in making such a serious mistake.

Mr Ssekabira also provided a second undated character statement from a former colleague at School B. This referred to Mr Ssekabira working tirelessly for the students in his care on a pastoral level, and also his dedication as a math's teacher supporting students to achieve progress both academically and holistically. It was stated by this referee that Mr Ssekabira had always shown integrity and honesty.

The panel noted that Mr Ssekabira had expressed remorse to the police and admitted that he intended to commit fraud. Mr Ssekabira expressed in representations to the TRA that he had shown complete remorse for his actions.

The [REDACTED] at School B stated in his witness statement that Mr Ssekabira had explained in a meeting that he bought the laptop off Gumtree and found the details on the laptop when he started using it. He stated that he became quite "sort of excited by this and showed it to people but didn't do anything with it, explaining that he knows he should have deleted it but didn't." He also stated that he "grew up in bad company and was trying to get away from it all." This witness also stated that Mr Ssekabira's reasoning for not having informed his employer of his caution was that "he was hoping it would all go away and nobody would find out."

The panel was concerned that Mr Ssekabira's insight and remorse was undermined by the position he had adopted when discussing his caution with the School. The caution appeared to have come to the attention of the School as a result of information provided by the police, rather than Mr Ssekabira having informed them himself. The explanation he gave was at odds with him having admitted to the police that he intended to commit "some sort of fraud". It also failed to acknowledge that more than one device had been found to have on them card details and login details for online banking of third parties.

The panel also noted that Mr Ssekabira stated in representations to the TRA that he had been transparent with all of his employers. The extent to which he was transparent with School B was undermined by the evidence of the former [REDACTED] referred to above.

Mr Ssekabira has not shown any insight for the impact of those whose card details and login details he had on his devices, and of the worry that would have been caused to those individuals had they have known that he had them and his intentions.

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 Ssekabira 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 Ssekabira. The seriousness of Mr Ssekabira's actions was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

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

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

One of these includes fraud or serious dishonesty.

Whilst there was evidence that Mr Ssekabira has the ability to make a valuable contribution to the teaching profession in the future, the panel remained concerned regarding the extent to which Mr Ssekabira had demonstrated insight into his actions, as indicated by his failure to be fully transparent with his employer.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review after 5 years.

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

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Ssekabira 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
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Ssekabira fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a teacher accepting a police caution for an offence of possession of articles used to commit fraud.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In assessing 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 that may 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 Ssekabira, 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 does not record having considered any evidence indicating that Mr Ssekabira's behaviour had a direct impact on pupil wellbeing.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which it sets out as follows:

"The panel noted that Mr Ssekabira had expressed remorse to the police and admitted that he intended to commit fraud. Mr Ssekabira expressed in representations to the TRA that he had shown complete remorse for his actions."

However, elsewhere it provides these observations:

"The panel was concerned that Mr Ssekabira's insight and remorse was undermined by the position he had adopted when discussing his caution with the School. The caution appeared to have come to the attention of the School as a result of information provided by the police, rather than Mr Ssekabira having informed them himself. The explanation he gave was at odds with him having admitted to the police that he intended to commit "some sort of fraud". It also failed to acknowledge that more than one device had been found to have on them card details and login details for online banking of third parties.

The panel also noted that Mr Ssekabira stated in representations to the TRA that he had been transparent with all of his employers. The extent to which he was transparent with School B was undermined by the evidence of the [REDACTED] referred to above.

Mr Ssekabira has not shown any insight for the impact of those whose card details and login details he had on his devices, and of the worry that would have been caused to those individuals had they have known that he had them and his intentions."

In my judgement, the lack of evidence that Mr Ssekabira has developed full insight into his conduct means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. 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 provides this observation:

"As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Sseskabira was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant. The Advice indicates that where there is an acceptance of a caution for an offence involving behaviours associated with such an offence, a panel is likely to consider it as being an admission of conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.



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

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Ssekabira's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the negative impact that such a finding is likely to have 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 Ssekabira himself. The panel records these observations:

"There was no evidence that Mr Ssekabira had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. There was no evidence of any previous disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

The panel noted that Mr Ssekabira provided one character statement dated 25 October 2022 for the panel's consideration. This was from a referee who had [REDACTED] Mr Ssekabira and referred to Mr Ssekabira always being an upright character in School B's community of schools. It was stated that he had been instrumental in the transformation of the department from being dysfunctional to Good with Outstanding features. The latest Ofsted inspection in September 2021 praised the mathematics department for its strong behaviour management and very good teaching and learning. It referred to Mr Ssekabira having shown great leadership and pastoral skills, where as deputy head of year 10 girls he single-handedly improved attendance and punctuality across a cohort. It referred to Mr Ssekabira having been promoted to Head of Year 10 at an Outstanding School in Ilford and was on course to become Assistant Principal. The reference referred to Mr Ssekabira having expressed deep remorse in making such a serious mistake."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Ssekabira 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 serious nature of the misconduct found, which resulted in Mr Ssekabira accepting a police caution, the lack of evidence that he has developed full insight into his behaviour and the likely damage to the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a five-year review period.

In doing so it has referenced the Advice as follows:

“The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

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

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

One of these includes fraud or serious dishonesty.”

I have considered the panel’s concluding remarks:

“Whilst there was evidence that Mr Ssekabira has the ability to make a valuable contribution to the teaching profession in the future, the panel remained concerned regarding the extent to which Mr Ssekabira had demonstrated insight into his actions, as indicated by his failure to be fully transparent with his employer.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review after 5 years.”

I have considered whether a five-year 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 I agree with the panel that allowing such a review period is sufficient and necessary to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are serious nature of the misconduct and serious dishonesty found, the lack of evidence of full insight, and injury done to the reputation and standing of the profession.

I consider therefore that a five-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and for Mr Ssekabira to demonstrate full insight into his actions.

**This means that Mr Louis Ssekabira is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 15 December 2030, five years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Ssekabira remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Ssekabira 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 'M Cavey', enclosed within a large, loopy oval stroke.

**Decision maker: Marc Cavey**

**Date: 10 December 2025**

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