



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Owen Puttock: Professional conduct panel meeting 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
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher:	Mr Owen Puttock
Teacher ref number:	854202
Teacher date of birth:	6 August 1984
TRA reference:	23840
Date of determination:	19 January 2026
Former employer:	Elizabeth Garrett Anderson School, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 19 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Puttock.

The panel members were Mrs Joanne Arscott (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Olayinka Oshoko (teacher panellist) and Mrs Alexandra Burton (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Lucy Churchill of Birketts LLP.

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 Puttock that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Puttock 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 Jessica Etherington or Mr Puttock.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

Allegations

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

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

1. On or around 9 May 2023, he submitted an application form to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson School, that was not accurate, in that he:
 - a. Did not include details of his former employer La Retraite School;
 - b. Did not include reasons for leaving his former employer;
 - c. Stated that the gap in employment was due to his taking an academic year to look after his child, when that was not the case.
2. His conduct at paragraph 1 above was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Mr Puttock admitted allegations 1 and 2 and that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the statement of agreed facts dated 26 November 2025.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, Key Person List and Anonymised Individual List – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of proceedings, response and notice of meeting – pages 5 to 35

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 36 to 39

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 40 to 134

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 135 to 139

Section 6: Notice of meeting - pages 140 to 141

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 Puttock on 18 November 2025 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 26 November 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 Puttock 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.

On 1 January 2023, Mr Puttock commenced his employment at La Retraite School (“La Retraite”) as an assistant headteacher.

On 27 March 2023, La Retraite gave Mr Puttock notice to terminate his employment, and he was placed on garden leave for the duration of his notice period.

On 9 May 2023, Mr Puttock completed an application form for the role of assistant headteacher at Elizabeth Garrett Anderson School (the “School”).

On 31 August 2023, Mr Puttock’s employment at La Retraite terminated.

On 1 September 2023, Mr Puttock commenced employment as assistant headteacher at the School.

On 29 May 2024 Mr Puttock resigned as assistant headteacher at the School.

On 6 June 2024, the matter was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. On or around 9 May 2023, you submitted an application form to Elizabeth Garrett Anderson School, that was not accurate, in that you:

- a. Did not include details of your former employer La Retraite School;**
- b. Did not include reasons for leaving your former employer;**
- c. Stated that the gap in employment was due to you taking an academic year to look after your child, when that was not the case.**

Mr Puttock admitted allegations 1(a), (b) and (c) in his statement of agreed facts. Notwithstanding Mr Puttock's admissions, the panel made its own determination as to the facts.

The panel had sight of a contract of employment for the role of assistant headteacher at La Retraite which was dated 28 September 2022 and signed by Mr Puttock and the clerk on behalf of La Retraite. The contract stated that Mr Puttock started working for La Retraite as assistant headteacher on 1 January 2023.

The panel noted the letter dated 27 March 2023 from La Retraite's headteacher to Mr Puttock which confirmed the decision to place Mr Puttock on garden leave "with immediate effect" and that the decision had been taken due to "concerns about your professional conduct over the last few weeks, but which has now culminated in me receiving a formal complaint about you ...".

The panel also had sight of a letter dated 30 March 2023 from La Retraite's chair of governors to Mr Puttock which confirmed his employment would terminate on 31 August 2023.

The panel had sight of Mr Puttock's application form for assistant headteacher at the School dated 9 May 2023 and noted the following information provided by Mr Puttock:

- under the heading "Current Employment", his response was "None provided".
- under the heading "Previous Employment", he recorded his most recent employment was with Mossbourne Victoria Park Academy ("Victoria Park") which ended in October 2022.
- under the heading "Gaps in employment/education history: Has gap(s) in employment", his response was "No".
- Mr Puttock cited his reason for leaving his employment at Victoria Park was "to look after second born child".
- within his supporting statement Mr Puttock stated: "Following the birth of my second child at the end of June last year, I took the difficult decision to leave

[Victoria Park] after 13 year to enable me to look after my child for an academic year during her early development.”

The panel noted the written statement of Mr Puttock admitting to the allegations in their entirety.

The panel then considered Mr Puttock’s written statement. Mr Puttock stated that he did not put details of his employment with La Retraite in the application form because he received advice from a previous HR professional that it was not necessary to include that role due to its short duration. Mr Puttock further stated that another reason for his omission was because he left that position following a professional disagreement with Person A [REDACTED].

The panel considered the witness statement of Person B who was Director of Learning, Business & Operations at La Retraite. Person B evidence was that on 27 March 2023, he had a meeting with Mr Puttock and Person A about Mr Puttock’s conduct and about the decision to terminate his employment.

The panel concluded, on the evidence, that Mr Puttock had deliberately omitted any detail of his employment with La Retraite from his application form and claimed to be taking care of his second child for the entire academic year 2022/23 in order to avoid scrutiny of the reason(s) for his dismissal from La Retraite.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found allegations 1 (a), (b) and 1(c) proven on the balance of probabilities.

2. Your conduct at paragraph 1 above was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Mr Puttock admitted allegation 2 in his statement of agreed facts. Notwithstanding Mr Puttock’s admissions, the panel made its own determination as to the facts.

Having found allegations 1 (a), (b) and (c) proven, the panel firstly considered whether Mr Puttock’s conduct was dishonest. In reaching its decision on this, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel firstly sought to ascertain the actual state of Mr Puttock’s knowledge or belief as to the facts. By his own admission, Mr Puttock deliberately and knowingly provided false information and/or omitted information on his application form. Mr Puttock admitted that, in doing so, he was dishonest.

Next, the panel considered whether Mr Puttock’s conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel found that Mr Puttock was objectively dishonest by:

- i. failing to disclose his employment at La Retraite on his application form to the School;
- ii. falsely stating that he was not working at any school during the period of October 2022 to May 2023;
- iii. failing to disclose the reasons for leaving La Retraite; and
- iv. falsely stating that his reason for leaving Victoria Park was due to Mr Puttock looking after his second child.

The panel also considered that Mr Puttock had ticked the box in his application form to the School with the intention of confirming that the information he provided was true and accurate.

The panel found that Mr Puttock was dishonest by deliberately failing to provide accurate information about his employment history. In reaching this decision, the panel considered Mr Puttock's explanation for having done this which was that he had received advice from a previous HR professional that it was not necessary to include details of his employment at La Retraite because the duration of his employment there was short.

The panel therefore found that Mr Puttock was intentionally dishonest about his past employment during the recruitment process and made a conscious decision to omit information from his employment history.

The panel then went on to consider whether Mr Puttock's conduct lacked integrity and considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*.

The panel considered that Mr Puttock had failed to act within the higher standards expected of a teacher by:

- i. failing to disclose his employment at La Retraite on his application form to the School;
- ii. falsely stating that he was not working at any school during the period of October 2022 to May 2023;
- iii. failing to disclose the reasons for leaving La Retraite; and
- iv. falsely stating that his reason for leaving Victoria Park was due to Mr Puttock looking after his second child.

The panel felt that Mr Puttock's failure to disclose information and decision to provide false information relating to his employment history, was relevant. The panel further noted that the application form asked for current employment and previous employment.

The panel found that by deliberately failing to disclose this information and falsely stating information relating to his employment history, he had failed to act with integrity.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found allegation 2 proven.

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

Having found 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 Puttock, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Puttock 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
 - 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...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

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

The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was not relevant.

The panel considered that Mr Puttock’s conduct seriously undermined the safer recruitment requirements set out in Keeping children safe in education 2023 which are in place to safeguard pupils’ wellbeing.

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

In relation to whether Mr Puttock'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 Puttock'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 Puttock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that no offence was relevant.

The panel considered that Mr Puttock's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, reasonably expecting them to act with integrity and honestly.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Puttock'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/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

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

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Puttock, which involved:

- i. deliberately failing to disclose his employment at La Retraite on his application form to the School;

- ii. falsely stating that he was not working at any school during the period of October 2022 to May 2023;
- iii. failing to disclose the reasons for leaving La Retraite to the School; and
- iv. falsely stating that his reason for leaving Victoria Park was due to Mr Puttock looking after his second child,

there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct as the conduct found against Mr Puttock was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Puttock in the profession.

The panel noted that there was no meaningful evidence regarding his performance as a teacher. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations set out above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Puttock in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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 Puttock.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; and
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity.

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 Puttock's actions were deliberate.

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

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

The panel did not find any evidence that Mr Puttock had shown insight into his actions or remorse beyond the impact that his actions had on him, his reputation and his family. The panel did not consider that Mr Puttock had shown any insight into the seriousness of the potential safeguarding consequences of interfering with schools' safer recruitment processes by omitting information and providing knowingly false information.

Mr Puttock stated that, at the time of completing the application form, he took advice from a previous HR professional who informed him that due to his short length of employment with La Retraite, it was not necessary to include that role in future applications.

Mr Puttock stated that in the past several years he has struggled and received a formal diagnosis of [REDACTED] and has undergone an assessment for [REDACTED] which he suggests affected his judgement and decision making. Mr Puttock did not provide any medical evidence for the panel to consider.

Mr Puttock stated that he feels profoundly regretful for his actions and the consequences they have caused, although he did not elaborate as to how or why he felt remorseful for his actions and the impact or potential impact on anyone other than himself and his family.

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 Puttock 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 Puttock. The current lack of insight and the perceived associated risk of repetition was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

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

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

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

The panel found that Mr Puttock was responsible for acts of dishonesty which warranted a prohibition order although considered that these were at the lower end of dishonesty especially as they were not aware of any direct harm having actually been caused as a result of his actions.

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 the prohibition to be reviewed in two years. The panel considered that this would allow Mr Puttock the opportunity to reflect on the seriousness and potential implications of his behaviour and explore how to avoid repetition.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Puttock 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
 - 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...
- 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 Puttock involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of dishonesty in providing inaccurate information about the teacher's employment history.

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 Puttock, 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:

"The panel considered that Mr Puttock's conduct seriously undermined the safer recruitment requirements set out in Keeping children safe in education 2023 which are in place to safeguard pupils' wellbeing."

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:

“The panel did not find any evidence that Mr Puttock had shown insight into his actions or remorse beyond the impact that his actions had on him, his reputation and his family. The panel did not consider that Mr Puttock had shown any insight into the seriousness of the potential safeguarding consequences of interfering with schools’ safer recruitment processes by omitting information and providing knowingly false information.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

“The panel considered that Mr Puttock’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher, reasonably expecting them to act with integrity and honestly.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty 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 Puttock himself. The panel has commented:

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

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Puttock 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 Puttock's actions were deliberate and that his behaviour was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel concerning the lack of insight shown by Mr Puttock and the associated risk of repetition.

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel found that Mr Puttock was responsible for acts of dishonesty which warranted a prohibition order although considered that these were at the lower end of dishonesty especially as they were not aware of any direct harm having actually been caused as a result of his actions.

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 the prohibition to be reviewed in two years. The panel considered that this would allow Mr Puttock the opportunity to reflect on the seriousness and potential implications of his behaviour and explore how to avoid repetition."

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 the serious nature of the misconduct found as well as the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse and the risk this creates of repetition.

I have, therefore, decided 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 Owen Puttock 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 7 February 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 Puttock remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Puttock 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', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 20 January 2026

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