



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Richard Halladay: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

November 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

Teacher: Mr Richard Halladay

TRA reference: 21030

Date of determination: 6 November 2025

Former employer: Alleyn's School, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 November 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Richard Halladay.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Richard Young (lay panellist) and Mr Ben Greene (teacher 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 Halladay that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Halladay 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 Helen Bates of Capsticks Solicitors LLP or Mr Halladay.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 30 October 2025.

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

1. Whilst employed as a teacher at Alleyn's School, Townley Road, London, SE22, in or around 1990, he engaged in and/or encouraged an intimate relationship with Pupil A.
2. His conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 was sexually motivated.

Mr Halladay admitted the allegations and that he was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised person list and list of key people – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 25

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 26 to 31

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 27 to 265

The panel also received a supplementary bundle for the professional conduct panel meeting consisting of:

Section 1: Notice of proceedings – pages 1 to 2

Section 2: Presenting officer representations – pages 3 to 4

Section 3: Miscellaneous additional documents – pages 5 to 25

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 Halladay on 17 September 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 Halladay 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 Halladay was employed by Alleyn’s School (the “School”) from September 1991. Throughout his employment at the School, Mr Halladay’s duties included the planning and delivery of English lessons.

On 29 November 2021, an anonymous report was received by the School that Mr Halladay had engaged in a sexual relationship with a 17-year-old pupil of the School (“Pupil A”) in approximately 1990.

On 20 April 2022, Mr Halladay was interviewed and admitted that he had engaged in a sexual relationship with Pupil A whilst she was attending [REDACTED] at the School.

Mr Halladay was dismissed from the School on 23 June 2022. He was referred to the TRA on 9 September 2022.

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. Whilst employed as a teacher at Alleyn's School, Townley Road, London, SE22, in or around 1990, you engaged in and/or encouraged an intimate relationship with Pupil A.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Halladay admitted that he engaged in and/or encouraged an intimate relationship with Pupil A in that he engaged in a sexual relationship with Pupil A.

He accepted that Pupil A was a pupil in [REDACTED] at the School at the time of the sexual relationship and was aged 17 years old when the sexual relationship began.

He accepted that he was in a position of trust in relation to Pupil A at the time of the sexual relationship and that, as such Pupil A was vulnerable to exploitation and/or harm within the sexual relationship.

He accepted that his conduct as admitted had the potential to cause harm to Pupil A and did not promote her well-being and safety.

[REDACTED] There was no suggestion within the email that Mr Halladay, himself, had had multiple sexual relationships or that he had had any relationship with anyone under the age of 16.

The School arranged for a suitability assessment to be carried out in respect of Mr Halladay. This was carried out by Individual A, an independent safeguarding consultant. She was tasked with concluding whether, in her professional opinion, Mr Halladay presented a risk to children with whom he may have contact working in a position of trust at the School, and if so: how any risks identified should be best managed, and whether Mr Halladay was safe to continue teaching.

Individual A had a telephone call with Pupil A and made a note of that conversation. Pupil A stated that she would not have reported the matter herself but had told her friend. The note recorded that Pupil A stated that she does not "*feel a victim*", that she is "*not angry*" and "*does not want to attach to [Mr Halladay] forever by ruining his life.*" She went on to state "*that there was no excuse for it*", and if someone did that to her daughter she could not put into words how angry she would be. She stated that if she had thought "*he was a serial offender*, she would have said something sooner" and that she thought he was "*a naïve person, not an offender*", that he was being "*self indulgent, good looking, lots of girls throwing themselves at him. He was innocent.*" She stated that she wanted to stress that he was not predatory, that she had been 16, and "*it was rather exciting.*" She stated that she feels "*so terrible for him*" but that she could "*intellectualise she is not responsible.*"

In terms of the relationship itself, Pupil A stated that it had continued for a few months. She could not remember if she had met up with him in the school holidays but had not gone to hotels with him or did not "*go away with him.*" She stated that she had been in

[REDACTED], and Mr Halladay had picked her up in his car as he lived close to her. She stated that “*things took place in his flat.*” She could not remember the first time she had visited his flat specifically but could remember the flat where he had lived on his own. She stated that they would drink alcohol, but “*not masses*”. She stated that she felt the relationship progressed and she spent more time with him and would go to his flat a couple of times a week, although it varied. She stated that there was no physical contact at school and did not think that he treated her any differently at school. She stated that it had “*fizzled out*”, and that she was the one who felt in control. She stated that he had never referred to it as being their secret and it was her belief that he did not see it as abuse, or that what he was doing was wrong.

Pupil A has since passed a message to the School via the anonymous source. She made clear that maintaining her anonymity was her priority and that she did not want or expect any further action. She explained that she had only told her friend having wanted to “*put down the burden of secrecy*”, and that this was enough for her. She explained that she would not have said anything herself but understood why her friend felt she had to pass on the information. [REDACTED] She stated that it was a “*heavy weight*” to realise that what had been said will inevitably impact on Mr Halladay and that she had no interest in ruining his reputation. She stated that “*he was not a predator. This was a self-indulgent man in his twenties. The culture was very different.*”

Individual A also met with Mr Halladay. He was asked if he had taken pupils back to his flat for any reason. Mr Halladay responded that he had thirty years ago, before his representative intervened. Mr Halladay was told the allegation and he admitted having engaged in a physical and sexual relationship with Pupil A. He stated that it had not gone on for long and that he could not really remember much about it. He stated that both had decided it was wrong. He was asked about the culture at the time and Mr Halladay stated that [REDACTED] When asked what he had meant by saying that he knew it was wrong, Mr Halladay stated that he “didn’t want it to happen and knew it was wrong” but that it had happened as there was a “mutual understanding and attraction.” He stated that he had found Pupil A very mature and different from the other students. He found her intelligent and there was a mutual attraction.

Mr Halladay then went on to explain that he would only see Pupil A in the flat, and that he did not think they ever went out but then said that they had gone to the pub, but “*not a lot*”. He stated that he did not think there were any explicit rules at the time, but if he was being asked about the immorality of it, “*of course he knew it was wrong*”, and that he was concerned about “*compromising her.*”

The panel exercised caution given that Pupil A provided no witness statement verified by a statement of truth and there were no witnesses to the conduct alleged. However, given the information provided by Pupil A, it is clear that Pupil A was not motivated to bring any allegation against Mr Halladay. Her account was corroborated by the responses of Mr Halladay. The panel considered that her account was credible. Having regard to her

account and Mr Halladay's admissions, it was more likely than not that Mr Halladay had engaged in and/or encouraged an intimate relationship with Pupil A.

2. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 was sexually motivated.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Halladay admitted that his conduct as admitted at allegation 1 was undertaken for the purpose of sexual gratification and was therefore sexually motivated.

Given that Mr Halladay had engaged in a sexual relationship with Pupil A, it was impossible for the panel to infer any other motivation, other than his purpose was sexual being in pursuit of sexual gratification.

The panel found it proven that Mr Halladay's conduct was sexually motivated.

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".

Mr Halladay's conduct took place prior to the coming into force of Teachers Standards. Accordingly, the panel had regard to its knowledge and experience of teaching standards at the time of the conduct. Having done so, it considered that there were no explicit standards in place that would have indicated such conduct was unacceptable. There was no safeguarding policy in place at the time of the conduct within the School, and no evidence that staff received any training around personal relationships with pupils at that time. His terms of employment made no reference to safeguarding or personal relationships with pupils. The panel considered that Mr Halladay's conduct would have been widely regarded as wrong at the time, but that there was no standardised position across the teaching profession. The panel had regard to Pupil A's evidence that the culture at the school was very different at the time, and that [REDACTED]

The panel also noted that the current head teacher of the School provided a witness statement in which she stated that Mr Halladay's conduct at the time would not have been viewed with the same level of severity as it is now, and that to a degree, interactions like these between younger members of staff and older pupils was less shocking. She explained that there was not the same understanding of the risk conduct of this nature poses to young people.

The panel considered whether Mr Halladay'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. His conduct did not constitute a criminal offence at the time, although such conduct later became criminalised.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. The panel did not consider that his conduct affects the way he fulfils his teaching role today or may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way. At the time, it may have led to Pupil A being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way given the power imbalance in the relationship, which is now recognised, albeit may not have been appreciated in the same way then. However, the expectations around safeguarding of children have developed significantly since this time, and there is no evidence that Mr Halladay would act in the same way today.

Mr Halladay accepted that his actions were wrong and the panel regarded it to be misconduct of a serious nature, but the panel was not satisfied that his conduct fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession of the time. The panel did not find that Mr Halladay was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Halladay'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 Halladay'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 Halladay was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that his conduct did not constitute a criminal offence at the time, although such conduct later became criminalised.

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 Halladay's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Halladay'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 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 one of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Halladay were not treated seriously when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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 Halladay in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession, particularly given his many years of experience.

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 Halladay.

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:

- 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; and
- 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;

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 panel found that Mr Halladay's actions were sexually motivated, and they were therefore deliberate. However, the panel noted that Pupil A stated that Mr Halladay had never asked her to keep their relationship secret. The panel noted that Mr Halladay had not, over the years that had passed, disclosed the relationship of his own volition, but thought that it was unlikely he had ever been asked or required to do so, until the anonymous complaint was received.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Halladay demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he has contributed significantly to the education sector, other than having been a teacher for a significant period of time, since 1986. The panel noted that he had been promoted to deputy Head of Middle School.

Mr Halladay had not previously been subject to any disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

No references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to Mr Halladay's abilities as a teacher or to his character.

The panel noted that Mr Halladay accepted that his conduct had been wrong at the earliest opportunity when he was told of the allegations and he promptly admitted that the relationship had occurred. He signed a statement of facts enabling these proceedings to be dealt with efficiently, minimising the cost to the public purse.

The panel had regard to the culture of the School at the time. Pupil A referred to the culture at the school having been very different at the time, given the example of a [REDACTED] The panel recognised that safeguarding of children has developed significantly since that time and Mr Halladay has received the relevant training in his role since around 2013. This was a one-off relationship at a time when there were no explicit standards in place that would have indicated such conduct was unacceptable. There are no suggestions of any further incidents of a similar nature. Mr Halladay has clearly

acknowledged that what he did was wrong, and there is no indication that he would repeat such conduct in the context of today's society when the safeguarding of children is paramount.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. The panel did not consider that his conduct affects the way he fulfils his teaching role today or may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way. At the time, it may have led to Pupil A being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way given the power imbalance in the relationship, which is now recognised, albeit may not have been appreciated in the same way then. However, the expectations around safeguarding of children have developed significantly since this time, and there is no evidence that Mr Halladay would act in the same way today.

The conclusions of the suitability assessment support this position. This concluded that it "would be entirely unreasonable to suggest [Mr Halladay] was not suitable to work with children, based on one grave error of judgement nearly 30 years ago."

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to maintain public confidence in the profession.

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 sanction.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel did not find that Mr Halladay was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, I have therefore put that matter entirely from my mind.

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.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Richard Halladay should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended

that the finding of conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

I have considered the panel's comments regarding the Teacher Standards, "Mr Halladay's conduct took place prior to the coming into force of Teachers Standards. Accordingly, the panel had regard to its knowledge and experience of teaching standards at the time of the conduct. Having done so, it considered that there were no explicit standards in place that would have indicated such conduct was unacceptable."

The panel did not find that the conduct of Mr Halladay fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession of the time.

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

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. The panel did not consider that his conduct affects the way he fulfils his teaching role today or may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way. At the time, it may have led to Pupil A being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way given the power imbalance in the relationship, which is now recognised, albeit may not have been appreciated in the same way then. However, the expectations around safeguarding of children have developed significantly since this time, and there is no evidence that Mr Halladay would act in the same way today."

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight or remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel noted that Mr Halladay accepted that his conduct had been wrong at the earliest opportunity when he was told of the allegations and he promptly admitted that the relationship had occurred. He signed a statement of facts enabling these proceedings to be dealt with efficiently, minimising the cost to the public purse." 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 observe, "The panel considered that public

confidence in the profession could be weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Halladay were not treated seriously when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated conduct with a pupil 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 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 Halladay and the panel comment "There was no evidence that Mr Halladay demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he has contributed significantly to the education sector, other than having been a teacher for a significant period of time, since 1986. The panel noted that he had been promoted to deputy Head of Middle School."

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments, "The panel recognised that safeguarding of children has developed significantly since that time and Mr Halladay has received the relevant training in his role since around 2013. This was a one-off relationship at a time when there were no explicit standards in place that would have indicated such conduct was unacceptable. There are no suggestions of any further incidents of a similar nature. Mr Halladay has clearly acknowledged that what he did was wrong, and there is no indication that he would repeat such conduct in the context of today's society when the safeguarding of children is paramount."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the that "The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession, particularly given his many years of experience."

The panel also said "The panel found that Mr Halladay's actions were sexually motivated, and they were therefore deliberate. However, the panel noted that Pupil A stated that Mr Halladay had never asked her to keep their relationship secret. The panel noted that

Mr Halladay had not, over the years that had passed, disclosed the relationship of his own volition, but thought that it was unlikely he had ever been asked or required to do so, until the anonymous complaint was received."

I have given weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Halladay has and could continue to make to the profession, along with the mitigating factors that were present in this case.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah Buxcey".

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 13 November 2025

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