



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Joseph Luttmann: 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	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

Teacher: Mr Joseph Luttman

Teacher ref number: 1168296

Teacher date of birth: 6 September 1985

TRA reference: 22909

Date of determination: 12 December 2025

Former employer: Marland School, Torrington

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 12 December 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Joseph Luttman.

The panel members were Mr Tom Snowdon (teacher panellist – in the chair), Dr Sian Rees-Evans (lay panellist) and Mrs Victoria Kelly (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 Luttman that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Luttman 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 Sophie Allen of Kingsley Napley LLP or Mr Luttman.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 29 September 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Luttman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a class teacher at Marland School (“the School”):

1. On or around 7 September 2023, he behaved in a threatening and/or intimidating and/or inappropriate manner, in that he:
 - a. Pushed Pupil A causing him to fall on the floor; and/or
 - b. Pushed Pupil A away for a second time; and /or
 - c. Picked up Pupil A and/or physically threw him out of an open doorway onto the playground area outside causing him to land on his back; and/or
 - d. Tickled and/or poked Pupil A.
2. On or around 7 September 2023, he incorrectly and/or inadequately reported the incident involving Pupil A on the School’s reporting database “Behaviourwatch”.
3. On or around 7 September 2023, he did not follow the School’s safeguarding procedures, in that he did not report the incident involving Pupil A to the School’s safeguarding lead and/ or the headteacher immediately and/or in a timely manner.
4. His conduct at paragraph 2 was misleading and/or dishonest.

Mr Luttman admitted the alleged facts and admitted that he was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or 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 and response to notice of referral – pages 6 to 11

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and representations – pages 12 to 16

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 17 to 227

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 228 to 232

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 Luttman on 4 June 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 Luttman 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 Luttman was employed at the School as a class teacher from 5 September 2018. Whilst employed at the School, [REDACTED].

On 7 September 2023, the parent of a pupil emailed the school asking for a summary of what had taken place that day and asked why she had not been asked to sign an accident form. The following day she sent an email alleging that there had been an incident the previous day which involved Pupil A being hurt by a member of staff. On 12 September 2023, a multi-agency Strategy meeting was convened involving officers of the School, the Local Authority Designated Officer (“LADO”) and the police.

On 1 November 2023, Mr Luttman attended an investigation meeting. On 8 December 2023, he attended a disciplinary hearing and he ceased to be employed by the School.

Findings of fact

Whilst working as a class teacher at Marland School (“the School”):

- 1. On or around 7 September 2023, you behaved in a threatening and/or intimidating and/or inappropriate manner, in that you:**

- a. Pushed Pupil A causing him to fall on the floor; and/or**
- b. Pushed Pupil A away for a second time; and /or**
- c. Picked up Pupil A and/or physically threw him out of an open doorway onto the playground area outside causing him to land on his back; and/or**
- d. Tickled and/or poked Pupil A.**

Mr Luttman admitted the above allegations in his response to a notice of referral dated 29 April 2025. He further admitted the allegations in the statement of agreed facts.

In the statement of agreed facts, he admitted that on 7 September 2023, Pupil A and Pupil B were chasing each other around a classroom during a lesson that he was teaching. He admitted that he pushed Pupil A causing Pupil A to fall to the floor. He admitted that when Pupil A got up, he then pushed Pupil A again towards Pupil B. He admitted that he picked Pupil A up by the right arm and shoulder, and using both arms lifted Pupil A up and physically threw him out of an open doorway onto the garden area outside. He also admitted that when Pupil A tried to let Mother A know about the incident, he poked and tickled Pupil A whilst he was in his car seat.

Mr Luttman also admitted that on or around 10 January 2024 he had accepted a police caution in relation to this conduct. The panel was provided with a copy of the caution and noted that it related to an assault by beating contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 that had taken place on 7 September 2023 at the School. In accepting the caution, Mr Luttman admitted to committing the offence.

The panel viewed two relevant portions of CCTV footage and noted that the admitted facts represent the events that were recorded in the classroom. The panel noted that the other member of staff present displayed signs of shock at what she had witnessed.

The panel noted that the assistant headteacher responded to Pupil A's mother on 8 September with a summary of the previous day, having spoken with Mr Luttman. No information was contained within the email of the incidents referred to in allegation 1. The email stated that "No accidents were reported, the closest thing Joe could think of to this was when he and Pupil A bumped into each other in the garden, as reported to you, but there was no injury and they had a giggle about it."

The panel noted an email from Pupil A's mother in response at 8:42 stating that her son had told her there had been an incident the previous day which involved Pupil A being hurt by a member of staff resulting in bruises, scrapes and marks on his body, including his head. She sent a further email at 09:04 which stated that Mr Luttman had not reported bumping into Pupil A. Her email also stated that Pupil A had tried to let her know what happened and that Mr Luttman had distracted Pupil A by tickling him.

On 8 September 2023 at 16:30, Pupil A's mother provided a statement of what happened when she collected Pupil A. This stated that Mr Luttman had told her that Pupil A had no screen time and that Pupil A had been quite distressed and upset by this. She stated that Pupil A then said "yes and you threw me into the garden didn't you." The mother stated that Mr Luttman tried to continue talking about Pupil A not lying to his mother regarding screen time. She stated that she had said "pardon" to Pupil A who repeated the same sentence. She stated that Mr Luttman then started poking and tickling Pupil A and said something about him being a tickle monster, and that he had never met a child so ticklish. She stated that Pupil A's father had showered Pupil A and called his mother upstairs to show her the bruises, marks and scrapes on Pupil A. She stated that Pupil A had said that his teacher had "done this" to him and explained that he had a disagreement with a boy in his class and that he was thrown outside by the teacher. She stated that one of the marks was on Pupil A's forehead and that Pupil A had been complaining of a headache after the incident and asked staff for help and an "icepole" but was ignored. Pupil A's mother stated that she was told when she collected Pupil A that he was given an "icepole" for good behaviour.

Pupil A's mother attached to her email a statement from Pupil A's father which stated that when he was showering Pupil A he found marks on Pupil A's side, head, lower back and both arms. He stated that Pupil A had said that his teacher had "done it" when he "chucked him outside in the garden". He confirmed that Pupil A had said that he had told the teachers that he had a sore head and that Pupil A had said that he let the teachers know "but they didn't do anything". Photographs were also attached to the email sent by Pupil A's mother of the marks on Pupil A.

The panel considered that Mr Luttman's physical actions towards Pupil A were threatening and intimidating, given that these were actions by an adult against a young child as well as being inappropriate. Throwing a child from a classroom in the manner the panel observed on the CCTV footage could not be considered to be the use of reasonable force. It was inappropriate for him to have sought to distract Pupil A from reporting the incident to his mother.

The panel found this allegation proven.

2. On or around 7 September 2023, you incorrectly and/or inadequately reported the incident involving Pupil A on the School's reporting database "behaviourwatch".

Mr Luttman admitted this allegation in his response to a notice of referral dated 29 April 2025. He further admitted the allegation in the statement of agreed facts.

In the statement of agreed facts, he admitted that he reported the incident involving Pupil A on "Behaviourwatch" as "Child A smacked Child B on the head and JL guided to the garden with a hand on the shoulder."

The panel was provided with a note of an interview that took place with the deputy principal of the School on 30 October as part of the School's investigation. The deputy principal stated that neither Mr Luttman nor the other member of staff present had raised any concerns about the incident. The deputy principal stated that the incident appeared to be logged on "Behaviourwatch" as Child A smacked Child B on the head and Mr Luttman guided to the garden with a hand on the shoulder. He stated that his level of recording did not raise any concerns or require follow up from the safeguarding team or leadership team.

The panel considered that the report on "Behaviourwatch" did not correctly or adequately report the incident.

The panel found this allegation proven.

3. On or around 7 September 2023, you did not follow the School's safeguarding procedures, in that you did not report the incident involving Pupil A to the School's safeguarding lead and/ or the headteacher immediately and/or in a timely manner.

Mr Luttman admitted this allegation in his response to a notice of referral dated 29 April 2025. He further admitted the allegation in the statement of agreed facts.

As referred to above, the panel noted that the assistant headteacher responded to Pupil A's mother on 8 September at 8:15am with a summary of the previous day, having spoken with Mr Luttman. No information was contained within the email of the incidents referred to in allegation 1. The email stated that "No accidents were reported, the closest thing Joe could think of to this was when he and Pupil A bumped into each other in the garden, as reported to you, but there was no injury and they had a giggle about it."

The deputy principal stated in his interview as part of the School's investigation that he first became aware of this incident on 8 September at 8:55am having received a call from the headteacher of the primary school as to the allegations. He stated that the call followed an email sent to the safeguarding lead at the School at 5:15pm the previous evening, as the mother had emailed asking for a summary of the day. He stated that she later emailed reporting injuries. He stated that the incident had not come to his attention sooner because neither Mr Luttman nor the other member of staff present had raised any concerns about the incident.

Mr Luttman did not report the incident in the debrief at the end of the School day.

The panel noted that the School's Code of Conduct provided to it was adopted on 25 September 2023 by the Governing Body of the School, but the version history shows no changes from the July 2022 version. The panel noted that Mr Luttman failed to report his concerns about the pupil to the School's Designated Safeguarding Lead for child protection, as was required by paragraph 5.1 of the Code of Conduct. The other policies

provided to the panel post-dated this incident. The panel considered that Mr Luttman's failure to report the incident breached the School's safeguarding procedures in that he breached the School's Code of Conduct and his actions were contrary to Keeping Children in Safe in Education ("KCSIE") to which all staff are required to adhere.

The panel found this allegation proven.

4. Your conduct at paragraph 2 was misleading and/or dishonest.

Mr Luttman admitted this allegation in his response to a notice of referral dated 29 April 2025. He further admitted the allegation in the statement of agreed facts.

The panel considered that Mr Luttman's intention in seeking to conceal this incident was apparent from the tickling of Pupil A to distract him from reporting the incident to his mother when she collected Pupil A from School. Similarly, he made no report at the debrief at the end of the School day. His intention to conceal his actions was apparent from the manner in which he reported the incident on Behaviourwatch. It could not have been the case that he had insufficient time to report, as he had made a Behaviourwatch entry. That entry failed to report the extent of Mr Luttman's involvement in the incident or the seriousness of it. The panel considered that this was misleading.

The panel considered that Mr Luttman had sought to conceal his actions and that the ordinary honest 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 Luttman in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Luttman was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- not undermining fundamental British values, including ... the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the majority of the policy documents provided to it post-dated the incident. However, the School's disciplinary policy referred to the inappropriate physical intervention of a child as being an example of behaviour that could be regarded as gross misconduct. Having viewed the CCTV footage, the panel did not consider the throwing of a child to constitute an appropriate physical intervention.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Luttman, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of KCSIE.

The panel considered that Mr Luttman was in breach of the obligation to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and to act in the best interests of the child. The panel noted that that safeguarding is defined as protecting children from maltreatment, yet Mr Luttman engaged in conduct that constituted maltreatment against Pupil A. He also had a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn and failed to do so. He was required to act on concerns about Pupil A's welfare immediately, and yet failed to report the incident. He behaved in a way that harmed a child, committed a criminal offence against a child, behaved in a way that indicated he may pose a risk of harm to children, and in a way that indicates he may not be safe to work with children.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Luttman, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the principles of Working Together to Safeguard Children in that he failed to appreciate that children's welfare is paramount. He failed to have regard to the effective sharing of information between practitioners being essential for early identification of need, assessment and service provision to keep children safe.

The panel also considered whether Mr Luttman'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 offences of violence and child cruelty were relevant. The panel noted that Mr Luttman had accepted a caution involving an offence of violence, which the Advice states would likely amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

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

In relation to whether Mr Luttman's conduct 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 Luttman'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 Luttman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offences of violence and child cruelty were relevant. The panel noted that Mr Luttman had accepted a caution involving an offence of violence, which the Advice states would likely amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Luttman'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 punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of using unreasonable force against a child in his care.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Luttman 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 Luttman 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 Luttman in the profession. The panel had no evidence of Mr Luttman's ability as a teacher. In any event, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Luttman in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he breached the trust placed in him to safeguard a child in his care.

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.

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 Luttman.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;

- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead...when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- ... other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- actions or behaviours that...undermine fundamental British values of...the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect...
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions...especially where these behaviours ... had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests; and
- collusion or concealment including:
 - ... concealing inappropriate actions;
 - ...lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing.

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 that Mr Luttman's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Luttman was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. The panel noted that during the School's investigation, Mr Luttman stated that "[REDACTED]." He stated that Pupil A was "[REDACTED]." He also referred to Pupil A not having been allowed [REDACTED] on that day at the request of Pupil A's mother. Whilst the panel appreciated that there can be challenges associated with [REDACTED], this incident occurred on only the second

day of term following the Summer holidays. It was evident that there was another member of staff present and there were only a small number of children present in the classroom at the time. The panel considered it unlikely that the daily demands of dealing with challenging behaviour would have constituted extreme duress at this point in the academic year. Had Mr Luttman felt that he was unable to cope with behaviour in his class, the panel would have expected him to have reached out for additional support, rather than seeking to conceal his actions. The panel noted that Pupil A was a [REDACTED], and as such Mr Luttman's actions would have undermined Pupil A from settling into a new class and his parents' confidence that he was to be properly cared for.

There was no evidence provided that Mr Luttman had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

There was no evidence provided that Mr Luttman was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

Mr Luttman produced no testimonial statements attesting to his ability as a teacher or to his character.

The panel noted that during the School's disciplinary investigation, Mr Luttman stated that he "feel[s] really bad about the situation. It was about moving him to keep him safe and the other boys". He also acknowledged that he should have written up what had happened on "Behaviourwatch". Mr Luttman has accepted the allegations in these professional conduct proceedings and accepted a caution for his actions. However, the panel was concerned that there was no evidence that Mr Luttman had demonstrated any insight as to the impact on Pupil A of his actions. Similarly, Mr Luttman has not demonstrated any appreciation for the adverse impact his actions had on the trust the parents of Pupil A could place in the School, or the potential reputational consequences of his actions on the School.

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 Luttman 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 Luttman given the force used in this incident without regard for the safety of Pupil A.

Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

These include child cruelty and/or neglect.

The panel was sufficiently shocked by the CCTV footage of the incident to consider that Mr Luttman's actions towards the child were cruel and demonstrated a complete lack of control and disregard for the safety of the child.

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.

These include:

- fraud or serious dishonesty; and
- violence.

The panel had found Mr Luttman to have acted dishonestly by not referring to the role he played in the incident when making a report on "Behaviourwatch", and that this was serious given the damage it caused to the trust placed in the School by the child's parents. This was an act of violence, and Mr Luttman accepted a caution for the offence of assault by beating.

There was insufficient evidence that Mr Luttman had demonstrated sufficient insight for the panel to be satisfied that the risk of repetition was low.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision 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/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Luttman is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including ... the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Luttman involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of using unreasonable force against a pupil.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct or 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 Luttman, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

“There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of using unreasonable force

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:

“Mr Luttman has accepted the allegations in these professional conduct proceedings and accepted a caution for his actions. However, the panel was concerned that there was no evidence that Mr Luttman had demonstrated any insight as to the impact on Pupil A of his actions.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight 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 Luttman were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding that Mr Luttman had accepted a caution involving an offence of violence 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 or 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 Luttman himself. The panel has commented:

“There was no evidence provided that Mr Luttman had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the seriousness of Mr Luttman’s actions that resulted in harm to a child. The panel has said:

“The panel considered that Mr Luttman was in breach of the obligation to safeguard and promote the welfare of children and to act in the best interests of the child. The panel noted that that safeguarding is defined as protecting children from maltreatment, yet Mr Luttman engaged in conduct that constituted maltreatment against Pupil A. He also had a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn and failed to do so. He was required to act on concerns about Pupil A’s welfare immediately, and yet failed to report the incident. He behaved in a way that harmed a child, committed a criminal offence against a child, behaved in a way that indicated he may pose a risk of harm to children, and in a way that indicates he may not be safe to work with children.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s finding that there was “insufficient evidence that Mr Luttman had demonstrated sufficient insight for the panel to be satisfied that the risk of repetition was low.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Luttman has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by evidence of

insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments:

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

These include child cruelty and/or neglect.

The panel was sufficiently shocked by the CCTV footage of the incident to consider that Mr Luttman's actions towards the child were cruel and demonstrated a complete lack of control and disregard for the safety of the child.

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.

These include:

- fraud or serious dishonesty; and
- violence.

The panel had found Mr Luttman to have acted dishonestly by not referring to the role he played in the incident when making a report on “Behaviourwatch”, and that this was serious given the damage it caused to the trust placed in the School by the child's parents. This was an act of violence, and Mr Luttman accepted a caution for the offence of assault by beating.”

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 and violent nature of the behaviour towards a pupil, the dishonesty found, the lack of evidence of insight and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Joseph Luttman 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 Luttman 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 Joseph Luttman has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Oatley".

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 15 December 2025

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