



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Ikechukwu Ogben: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**January 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	19

## Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations

**Teacher:** Mr Ikechukwu Ogben

**Teacher ref number:** 2072274

**Date of Birth:** 23 August 1974

**TRA reference:** 22021

**Date of determination:** 15 January 2026

**Former employer:** Weavers Academy, Creative Education Trust, Wellingborough (“the School”)

## Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 12 – 15 January 2026 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Ikechukwu Ogben.

The panel members were Mrs Jane Gotschel (teacher panellist – in the Chair), Ms Amy Barron (lay panellist) and Mr Philip Trendall (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Charlotte Belcher of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Alexander Barnfield of Capsticks Solicitors LLP.

Mr Ogben was present at the hearing and he was not represented, save that the cross examination of Pupil A was undertaken by Special Counsel, Mr Justin Davies, on behalf of Mr Ogben.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

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

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

While employed as a teacher at Weavers Academy (“the School”):

1. On or around 26 January 2023, he used inappropriate and/or excessive force in that he:
  - a. Grabbed Pupil A;
  - b. Pushed Pupil A against the wall.
2. As a result of his conduct at (a) and/or (b) above, caused Pupil A difficulty in breathing.

Mr Ogben denied the facts set out in the allegations. Mr Ogben denied 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, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 39

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 40 to 44

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 45 to 205

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 206 to 237

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”).

## **Witnesses**

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer on behalf of the TRA:

1. Witness A - [REDACTED]
2. Pupil A – Pupil involved in the alleged incident.

Mr Ogben also gave oral evidence to the panel. He did not call any witnesses.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Ogben was employed at the School as a teacher from 1 September 2016 until his suspension from the School on 26 January 2023 following the alleged incident between him and Pupil A. The School conducted an investigation and a disciplinary hearing was held on 26 May 2023. A referral was made to the Teaching Regulation Agency (“TRA”) on 24 May 2023.

## **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:

**While employed as a teacher at the School:**

1. **On or around 26 January 2023, you used inappropriate and/or excessive force in that you:**
  - a. **Grabbed Pupil A.**

Mr Ogben denied the allegation.

In respect of this allegation, the panel heard oral evidence from Mr Ogben and received his written evidence. Mr Ogben admitted that he held on to Pupil A, although this was for a minimum amount of time. Mr Ogben denied that this was an excessive or inappropriate use of force and disputed use of the word ‘grabbed’. He considered that his actions were taken in line with what was permitted. The panel considered that, at times, Mr Ogben’s accounts of the incident, both written and oral, were inconsistent for example in respect of how he was holding Pupil A.

The panel heard oral evidence from Pupil A that Mr Ogben took hold of him and that force was used, which the panel considered to be consistent with his written statements. The panel noted that there were differences in Pupil A's and Mr Ogben's account in relation to the use of force. However, the panel also noted that it had the benefit of CCTV footage of the altercation in the hallway outside Mr Ogben's classroom.

The panel watched the brief CCTV footage of 26 January 2023 a number of times and carefully considered its contents. The CCTV footage was of a high quality, however the panel was alive to the fact that the CCTV footage could not show all angles and that, at the beginning of the CCTV, Mr Ogben was already holding Pupil A. The panel saw that Mr Ogben used both hands to hold on to Pupil A and pivoted Pupil A back around towards his classroom. Mr Ogben had one hand on the back of Pupil A's coat and the other hand around his front. The panel considered the footage showed that energy and force were used to bring Pupil A back to the classroom. At one point, Pupil A held on to a window ledge.

The panel had regard to the School's Restraint Policy, which outlined circumstances which would warrant the use of more forceful restraint, for example in attempting to break up a fight between two pupils. It was clear from the policy that such a level of restraint should only be used as a last resort.

The panel considered whether the actions taken by Mr Ogben to return Pupil A to the classroom were proportionate to the circumstances. The panel heard in evidence that Pupil A was attempting to leave the classroom. Mr Ogben submitted in oral evidence that he did not know where Pupil A was going, whereas Pupil A submitted in his oral evidence that he was going to the RESET room and that Mr Ogben had asked him to leave. The panel considered the difference in stature between Mr Ogben and Pupil A, who was a [REDACTED] student, which could be seen on the CCTV footage, and the potential imbalance of strength. The panel had regard to the fact that it had heard and read evidence from both Mr Ogben and Pupil A that Mr Ogben had had liquid sprayed in his eyes in the classroom and that this was not acceptable behaviour from a pupil.

The panel considered that the level of force used in trying to return Pupil A to the classroom and the nature of the hold used by Mr Ogben, as shown on the CCTV footage, was excessive and disproportionate. Furthermore, the panel was provided with no evidence to indicate that alternative steps to deescalate the situation had been considered or attempted. The panel concluded therefore that Mr Ogben's actions amounted to "grabbing" Pupil A.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence and considered that, on the balance of probabilities, Mr Ogben grabbed Pupil A on 26 January 2023. The panel also considered that this action constituted inappropriate and/or excessive force.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a) proven.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

**While employed as a teacher at the School:**

- 1. On or around 26 January 2023, you used inappropriate and/or excessive force in that you:**

- b. Pushed Pupil A against the wall.**

Mr Ogben denied the allegation.

The panel heard oral evidence from Pupil A who confirmed he could not recall being pushed against the wall. Pupil A was then shown the CCTV footage, and having seen the footage, confirmed that this did happen. The panel considered that being pushed against the wall was a significant action and therefore something that Pupil A would be likely to have remembered and have recorded in his written evidence or have mentioned in his oral evidence prior to being shown the CCTV footage.

The panel also heard oral evidence from Mr Ogben who denied pushing Pupil A into the wall. He stated that when Pupil A approached the glass, and there was a risk to Pupil A's safety, he released Pupil A.

As set out above, the panel had the benefit of CCTV footage of the incident on 26 January 2023. The panel considered that, as Mr Ogben pivoted Pupil A back towards his classroom, they turned to face the wall, which contained a large window, and Pupil A placed his hand on the window ledge. Whilst Mr Ogben did not appear to push Pupil A into the wall, the panel considered force was used to turn Pupil A back.

The panel carefully considered the wording of the allegation. The allegation, as phrased, suggests a deliberate act of pushing Pupil A into the wall. The panel did not consider that such a deliberate act was undertaken, but as a result of the pivot action back to the classroom, Pupil A and Mr Ogben were facing the window. The panel did not consider that this action could be described as Mr Ogben having pushed Pupil A against the wall.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence and, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that Mr Ogben used inappropriate and excessive force to pivot Pupil A back to the classroom resulting in them facing the window but that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that Pupil A had been actively pushed into the wall by Mr Ogben.

Consequently, the panel found allegation 1(b) not proven.

- 2. As a result of your conduct at (a) and/or (b) above, caused Pupil A difficulty in breathing.**

Mr Ogben denied the allegation.

The panel noted that the allegation made a causal link between the difficulty in breathing and the activities in allegations (1)(a) and (b), namely grabbing Pupil A and pushing him into the wall.

The panel heard oral evidence from Pupil A, which remained consistent in both his oral and his written evidence in that he told Mr Ogben during the incident that he could not breathe, on two or three occasions.

Further, the panel heard oral evidence from Mr Ogben in relation to this aspect of the allegation. The panel considered that Mr Ogben's oral evidence was inconsistent in his response to whether he heard Pupil A say he could not breathe, or not. In oral evidence, Mr Ogben said he could not hear what Pupil A said, but at another point, he said he heard Pupil A say this once but not three times. He also submitted that when he heard Pupil A say he could not breathe, he released him.

The panel noted that the CCTV footage did not provide evidence of whether or not the actions referred to at allegation 1(a) or (b) caused Pupil A to have difficulty in breathing. Furthermore, it noted the CCTV footage of the incident lasted less than five seconds. The panel further noted that there was no wider evidence, such as a first aid report, which could be used to assist in reaching a conclusion on this allegation. In reaching a conclusion, the panel therefore had to weigh up the evidence from Mr Ogben and Pupil A.

Notwithstanding the fact that the panel considered the incident was both distressing and frightening for Pupil A and that for a range of reasons Pupil A was convinced he could not breathe, on the balance of probabilities the panel did not consider there was sufficient evidence that Mr Ogben's conduct at allegation 1(a) or 1(b), caused Pupil A difficulty in breathing.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 not proven.

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

Having found allegation 1(a) proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegation 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 had regard to the definition of unacceptable professional conduct set out in paragraph 21 of the Advice that it “is misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher.”

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Ogben 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

In respect of the standards referred to above, the panel did not consider that the inappropriate and excessive level of force shown, in particular from the CCTV footage, was consistent with treating Pupil A with dignity and building a relationship based on mutual respect.

Mr Ogben stated in his oral evidence that he did not intend to harm Pupil A but sought to safeguard him in circumstances where he did not know where Pupil A was going. Pupil A’s evidence was that he intended to go to the RESET room, which is where he said Mr Ogben had asked him to go. However, the panel considered the force to have been used, from its review of all of the evidence, could have caused Pupil A injury, and this was inconsistent with having regard to the need to safeguard Pupil A’s well-being. Mr Ogben, in his evidence, admitted that there was no other adult in the classroom at the time. The panel was also mindful of the fact that whilst Mr Ogben was out of the classroom trying to restrain Pupil A, the other children in the class were not being supervised and therefore safeguarding of those children was not prioritised.

In respect of Mr Ogben having regard to the ethos, policies and practices of the School, the panel found, on the evidence presented by Mr Ogben and the presenting officer, Mr Ogben did not have regard to the School’s Behaviour Policy and Restraint Policy in assessing how to deal with the incident. In his evidence, Mr Ogben consistently referred

to the classroom policy which was on the wall in his room and which he submitted was an abridged version of the School's policies. The School's Restraint Policy referred to circumstances which were exceptional and which would warrant the use of more forceful restraint. The Restraint Policy referenced incidents between pupils, such as attempting to break up a fight between two pupils, however it was clear to the panel on the evidence before it that restraint should only be used as a last resort.

Mr Ogben stated in his oral evidence that he used deescalation techniques, as suggested in the School's policy, in the classroom immediately prior to Pupil A leaving; however the panel noted that Mr Ogben was not able to articulate clearly what those steps were, both in his oral evidence and in the contemporaneous email following the incident. The panel considered there was little evidence to suggest that deescalation was used following the incident of spraying liquid from a bottle in Mr Ogben's face in the classroom. The panel further had regard to the fact that the incident happened over a short period of time and it was not clear, from the evidence provided to the panel, what was said between Pupil A and Mr Ogben during the period of restraint. The panel had carefully balanced the evidence and did not consider, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Ogben used deescalation techniques, and had found that it was more likely that the restraint used by Mr Ogben was a direct reaction to being sprayed in the face with a liquid by Pupil A.

The panel found that the circumstances of this incident between Mr Ogben and Pupil A did not warrant the level of restraint used, which was not proportionate to the situation, and therefore Mr Ogben did not comply with the School's policies. The panel had found there was no evidence that Pupil A was a risk to other pupils and that Mr Ogben had other options available to respond to the incident.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ogben, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE"), the version of which in force at the time was the 2022 version.

The panel considered that Mr Ogben was in breach of the following provisions:

- All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn.
- Teachers should safeguard children's wellbeing and maintain public trust in the teaching profession as part of their professional duties (as set out in the Teachers Standards).

The panel considered that these provisions had been breached due to the evidence of inappropriate and excessive use of force against Pupil A, creating an unsafe environment and not safeguarding Pupil A's wellbeing, in circumstances where restraint should be used as a last resort. The panel considered that Mr Ogben was not mindful of the statutory guidance to safeguard children and in particular, the reference to local School policies.

The panel considered whether the behaviours set out on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice applied, and, in particular, behaviour amounting to violence. In considering the ordinary meaning of the word ‘violence’, the panel was of the view that this suggested a more deliberate act. The panel found that the force used by Mr Ogben was inappropriate and excessive but that it did not amount to violence such as that referred to on page 12 of the Advice.

For the above reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ogben 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 Ogben was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct in respect of allegation 1(a).

In relation to whether Mr Ogben’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 Ogben’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

For the reasons set out above in the panel’s findings as to whether Mr Ogben was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be “conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute”.

The panel considered the following points when considering whether this amounted to conduct bringing the profession into disrepute:

- Mr Ogben used inappropriate and excessive force to restrain Pupil A where there were other options available to him and where Mr Ogben was in a position of authority.
- The level of force used was disproportionate in the situation in which Mr Ogben found himself.
- There was a difference in stature between Pupil A, a year 8 pupil, and Mr Ogben, resulting in an imbalance of strength.

- The response of an ordinary member of the public on viewing the CCTV footage would likely be one of shock and concern, given the excessive use of force and the age of the child.
- There is an expectation that a teacher would follow procedures and work to safeguard children.

The panel carefully considered the circumstances in which Mr Ogben found himself. The panel considered it was absolutely clear that the behaviour of Pupil A in spraying liquid in Mr Ogben's eyes was not acceptable, and Pupil A admitted this in his oral evidence. It was clear from the character references presented that Mr Ogben was an effective classroom teacher and Pupil A's evidence confirmed that Mr Ogben was one of his favourite teachers. It was unclear from the evidence of Witness A whether Mr Ogben received training in respect of the School's Restraint Policy and there was no other evidence that he had received the training. Witness A was unable to provide the panel with examples of training that might have been delivered and could only offer opinion rather than factual evidence.

However, the panel considered that in light of all of the evidence it had heard, a member of the public would find that Mr Ogben's response during the incident was disproportionate and concerning due to the use of inappropriate and excessive force.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Ogben's actions at allegation (1)(a) 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.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Ogben, which involved the use of inappropriate and excessive force in grabbing Pupil A, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The panel considered the fact that Mr Ogben did not safeguard the wellbeing of Pupil A and use both hands to restrain him, which could have caused injury. This was a serious finding. Mr Ogben had other choices available which could have safeguarded Pupil A and the panel was mindful that they did not see any evidence that deescalation techniques had been used. The panel did not have any other contemporaneous evidence from inside the classroom at the beginning of the incident to confirm whether such techniques were used.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ogben, which would shock and concern a member of the public, 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. The panel was mindful that Mr Ogben had to respond in a stressful situation where liquid had been sprayed into his eyes, but Mr Ogben's conduct on this occasion was outside that which could be reasonably expected or 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 Ogben 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

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 considered that Mr Ogben's misconduct was serious, given the use of inappropriate and excessive force.

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 Ogben.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher's behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; and
- failure in their duty towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE).

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors.

Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

Mr Ogben's actions were deliberate in that he intended to restrain Pupil A.

The panel acknowledged that the circumstances were such that Mr Ogben had been sprayed in the eyes with a liquid, the incident developed rapidly and Mr Ogben found himself responding to the incident without the benefit of restraint training. However, there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Ogben was acting under extreme duress. For example, Mr Ogben was not acting in response to an ongoing physical threat at the time of the conduct found proven, as it was agreed by both Mr Ogben and Pupil A that Pupil A was trying to remove himself from the classroom after spraying liquid into Mr Ogben's eyes.

Whilst there was evidence that Mr Ogben was a competent teacher, there was no evidence that he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and

professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel was mindful that Mr Ogben had only held qualified teacher status for a short period of approximately two years prior to his suspension, meaning this may have been more difficult to demonstrate, although in his written and oral evidence Mr Ogben referred to his longer experience as a teacher in the UK and abroad.

There was no evidence that Mr Ogben was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings. The panel accepted that this incident was out of character.

It was clear from his oral evidence that Mr Ogben was passionate about teaching which he saw as a vocation and one which he relished. Mr Ogben also stated that the proceedings had caused him psychological strain and that it had taken over his life for three years.

The panel received four testimonials from former colleagues. It was not clear to the panel whether these colleagues were aware of the specific allegations against Mr Ogben.

One former colleague of Mr Ogben at the School, who confirmed that they were aware of these proceedings, stated:

*“Throughout our time working together, Ike consistently demonstrated dedication to their students and a genuine passion for education. They were known for their patience, professionalism, and commitment to fostering a positive learning environment. I observed their ability to engage pupils of varying abilities, encouraging them to achieve their potential while maintaining ambitious standards of discipline and respect. Ike was highly respected by his students and was often called upon to support with the hardest to reach students...”*

*“Beyond the classroom, Ike contributed positively to the wider school community. They were supportive of colleagues, collaborative in team settings, and often went above and beyond, to assist with extracurricular activities. Their integrity and reliability earned the respect of both staff and students alike...In my view, they remain a person of good character who has made valuable contributions to the teaching profession.”*

Another former colleague at the School stated:

*“He consistently demonstrated care for their students, ensuring that the young people in his form group felt supported both academically and personally...I valued his professionalism and the way he fostered a supportive environment for both students and staff. Ike’s commitment to the wellbeing of pupils was evident in the time and effort he invested in pastoral duties, often going beyond what was required to ensure students felt encouraged and cared for.”*

*“A clear testimony to the positive effect Ikechukwu Ogben had on his students is that, even now - nearly three years since he left Weavers Academy - pupils still ask after him.”*

*This enduring regard speaks volumes about the impact he made and confirms what I have always believed: he is a born teacher, whose influence extends far beyond the classroom... In my view, he is a person of integrity who has made meaningful contributions to the school community and to the lives of the students he taught and mentored.”*

Further, a colleague from a former school, stated “*throughout our association, I have witnessed Ikechukwu's unwavering commitment to the well-being of children.*” The panel noted that this colleague worked with Mr Ogben from 2010-2012 and therefore Mr Ogben's good character appeared to extend over a long period of time.

During Mr Ogben's Qualified Teacher final assessment in 2021, the assessor stated “*Ike is truly an impressive candidate. I would like to bottle his professional attitude and enthusiasm for teaching and share it with my trainees who could learn so much from him!*” These comments from the assessor were drawn to the panel's attention by Mr Ogben.

The panel was mindful that Pupil A had also confirmed that Mr Ogben was one of his favourite teachers.

The panel considered whether there were any other mitigating factors in this case. The panel received no evidence that Mr Ogben had received any form of restraint training from the School. In his oral evidence Mr Ogben confirmed he did not recall any safeguarding or restraint training, but that his actions were based on his own interpretation of what was permitted in the circumstances in which he found himself. Mr Ogben also confirmed that behaviour in the School was generally good. In evidence submitted by Mr Ogben's former legal representative, it was stated “*his employer was eager to point out that he was aware of the Restraint Policy when this incident took place. This is accepted. However, we submit that his assessment of his actions at the time of the disciplinary process was heavily influenced by the fact that he had (1) never had to restrain a student before, and (2) had never received any specific training on restraint methods and what constituted reasonable force. Mr Ogben did not know what constituted reasonable force.*”

Witness A was also unable to confirm what training Mr Ogben had received, but offered an opinion on what should have been covered. The panel did not have any documentary evidence from the School in relation to Mr Ogben's training, or confirmation that he had received, read or understood the policies, or evidence of the practice within the School, for example with regard to the restraint book, which should be completed following every episode of restraint in a school. The panel was only provided with a copy of the School's local policies, for example, in respect of behaviour and restraint. The panel was mindful that restraint training needed to have contextual relevance and go further than reading the policy. The panel noted that the assessor in Mr Ogben's Qualified Teacher final

assessment stated “*Ike takes his safeguarding responsibilities seriously ensuring his training is up to date*”, although there was no documentary evidence of this.

The panel considered this as a mitigating factor although Mr Ogben had his own obligation under the Teaching Standards to “*have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach*” and to adhere to the obligation in KCSIE that “*all staff should be aware of systems within their school or college which support safeguarding, and these should be explained to them as part of staff induction*” which includes the behaviour policy.

The panel noted that Mr Ogben had engaged fully with the TRA process.

The panel went on to consider the level of insight and remorse shown by Mr Ogben. In the evidence submitted by his former legal representative, it was stated “*Mr Ogben is deeply regretful of his actions and has acknowledged how his actions, however innocent in intent, have been perceived. He is extremely mindful of the emotional stress and anxiety which his actions have caused to others, with particular concern to Pupil A*” and that “*there was never any intention to harm the child*”. Mr Ogben submitted in oral evidence that he did not intend to harm Pupil A and that he had apologised for his actions. He stated that he would do things differently now.

Mr Ogben submitted evidence suggesting insight into his need for further training in respect of safeguarding and restraint. This included a certificate of achievement dated 21 August 2023 following completion of the course “Zest Education – Safeguarding Children” and an undated screenshot of a training dashboard indicating Mr Ogben had completed 17% of the programme “training on restraint awareness”. There was no further evidence before the panel of further engagement with this course or initiation of further training.

Despite this apology and apparent remorse, the panel was concerned as to the depth of Mr Ogben’s insight. At times, during Mr Ogben’s oral evidence, the panel considered that he attempted to downplay and deflect the seriousness of his conduct and the impact of his actions, which undermined the level of insight and remorse shown. This also led to inconsistencies in his evidence, as set out above, and indicated he had a limited insight into the fact he had used inappropriate and excessive force when grabbing Pupil A. This led the panel to conclude there was a risk of repetition.

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 mindful that a prohibition order was not designed to have a punitive effect.

The panel noted that these proceedings have taken three years to conclude, and the panel took this into account when considering whether prohibition would be a proportionate measure.

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 Ogben 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 Ogben. The use of inappropriate and excessive force in this case was inappropriate given his position as a teacher and the requirements to safeguard the wellbeing of pupils. 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 two years.

Paragraph 50 of 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.

Paragraph 51 of the Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

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

The panel had regard to the extent to which Mr Ogben had shown insight into his actions and remorse shown. The panel was also mindful that, whilst the incident was serious, it was at the lower end of the spectrum in terms of harm and the length of the restraint, it being less than five seconds. The panel acknowledged that Mr Ogben had partially addressed his need for further training, had demonstrated remorse but his insight into his actions was not yet fully developed.

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 provisions for a review period of two 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 one of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found allegations 1.b and 2 not proven, and I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Ikechukwu Ogben should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Ogben 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ogben involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of a teacher using inappropriate and excessive 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 and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Ogben, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Ogben, which involved the use of inappropriate and excessive force in grabbing Pupil A, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The panel considered the fact that Mr Ogben did not safeguard the wellbeing of Pupil A and use both hands to restrain him, which could have caused injury. This was a serious finding. Mr Ogben had other choices available which could have safeguarded Pupil A and the panel was mindful that they did not see any evidence that deescalation techniques had been used. The panel did not have any other contemporaneous evidence from inside the classroom at the beginning of the incident to confirm whether such techniques were used.”

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 concluded as follows:

“Despite this apology and apparent remorse, the panel was concerned as to the depth of Mr Ogben’s insight. At times, during Mr Ogben’s oral evidence, the panel considered that he attempted to downplay and deflect the seriousness of his conduct and the impact of his actions, which undermined the level of insight and remorse shown. This also led to inconsistencies in his evidence, as set out above, and indicated he had a limited insight into the fact he had used inappropriate and excessive force when grabbing Pupil A. This led the panel to conclude there was a risk of repetition.”

In my judgement, the lack of full 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 Ogben, which would shock and concern a member of the public, were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a teacher using inappropriate and excessive force against 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 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 Ogben himself. The panel has said:

“Whilst there was evidence that Mr Ogben was a competent teacher, there was no evidence that he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel was mindful that Mr Ogben had only held qualified teacher status for a short period of approximately two years prior to his suspension, meaning this may have been more difficult to demonstrate, although in his written and oral evidence Mr Ogben referred to his longer experience as a teacher in the UK and abroad.

There was no evidence that Mr Ogben was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings. The panel accepted that this incident was out of character.”

The panel has noted that it received 4 testimonials from former colleagues which attested to Mr Ogben’s ability as a teacher.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Ogben 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 findings that Mr Ogben's actions were deliberate and that the "use of inappropriate and excessive force in this case was inappropriate given his position as a teacher and the requirements to safeguard the wellbeing of pupils." The panel has noted that "a member of the public would find that Mr Ogben's response during the incident was disproportionate".

I have also placed considerable weight on the findings of the panel that Mr Ogben's insight into his actions was limited and that there was therefore a risk of repetition.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Ogben 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 2-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel had regard to the extent to which Mr Ogben had shown insight into his actions and remorse shown. The panel was also mindful that, whilst the incident was serious, it was at the lower end of the spectrum in terms of harm and the length of the restraint, it being less than five seconds. The panel acknowledged that Mr Ogben had partially addressed his need for further training, had demonstrated remorse but his insight into his actions was not yet fully developed.

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 provisions for a review period of two years."

I have considered whether a 2-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 a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the

profession. These elements are serious nature of the misconduct as well as the lack of evidence of full insight and the risk this creates of repetition.

I have decided, therefore, that a 2-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.

**This means that Mr Ikechukwu Ogben 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 27 January 2028, 2 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 Ogben remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

Mr Ogben 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: 19 January 2026**

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