



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Lee Butler: Professional Conduct Panel Hearing 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	6
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 Lee Butler
Teacher ref number:	9846565
Teacher date of birth:	15 April 1976
TRA reference:	0019558
Date of determination:	28 January 2026
Former employer:	Bridgnorth Endowed School, Bridgnorth, West Midlands

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually between 26 and 28 January 2026 to consider the case of Mr Lee Butler.

The panel members were Ms Janette McCormick (lay panellist and Chair), Mrs Remi Alabi (lay panellist), and Mr Patrick Berry (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr John Lucarotti of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Brittany Buckell of Capsticks LLP.

Mr Butler was present and unrepresented (although Ms Louise Price was appointed for Mr Butler by the TRA for the sole purpose of putting questions to Pupil A).

On 19 December 2025, a panel chair ordered the following arrangements for the hearing:

- Mr Butler to turn off his camera when Pupil A is giving evidence
- Independent Counsel shall be appointed by the TRA to ask questions of Pupil A on behalf of Mr Butler.

The hearing was heard in public and recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 29 October 2025.

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

1. In or around 2003, while employed as a teacher at St Augustine's Catholic High School and Sixth Form ("St Augustine's") you: a. Engaged in a sexual relationship with Pupil A, who was then a student at St Augustine's
2. In (or around) September 2020 you stated to your employer that the relationship with Pupil A commenced after she had left St Augustine's when this was incorrect and/or misleading
3. Your conduct at 2 above was dishonest.

At the outset of the hearing, Mr Butler admitted all of the allegations.

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 3-5
Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response	pages 6-50
Section 3: TRA witness statements	pages 51-57
Section 4: TRA documents	pages 58-105
Section 5: Teacher's documents and correspondence	pages 106-115
Section 6: TRA correspondence	page 116

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 TRA:

- Individual A, [REDACTED]
- Individual B, [REDACTED]
- Pupil A

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

Upon careful consideration of all the evidence presented, and after reviewing the submissions from the TRA as well as Mr Butler's admissions, and having accepted the legal advisor's advice, the panel observed that there was no dispute regarding the facts between the parties. The following points were agreed:

Pupil A was enrolled at St Augustine's Catholic High School and Sixth Form. She first encountered Mr Butler in September 2001, when he became her Media Studies teacher at AS Level. In April or May of 2003, when Pupil A was [REDACTED], she and Mr Butler entered into a sexual relationship.

This relationship started outside the school setting, as they began spending personal time together. The relationship occurred away from the school premises, primarily at Mr Butler's home, and ended in April / May 2004 at the direction of Pupil A.

In 2020, a third party brought the relationship to the attention of the police, prompting an enquiry into Mr Butler. Mr Butler subsequently informed his current employer about these enquiries and held several discussions with Individual B in September 2020, where he contended that the relationship had begun after Pupil A left the school.

Prior to reaching its factual conclusions, the panel specifically had regard to the following points regarding the witness evidence and submissions before it:

Pupil A

Pupil A indicated that the relationship began in April or May 2003, when she was still a pupil at the school, after an occasion whereby she gave Mr Butler a lift home following social drinks with others. She stated that he had initiated the relationship.

Pupil A stated that, whilst now in hindsight she considered the relationship to have been inappropriate, she did not believe it had had a negative impact on her wellbeing since.

Mr Butler

Mr Butler was referred to the Teaching Regulation Agency (TRA) on 29 September 2020 by his then employer, Bridgnorth Endowed School. This referral concerned an allegation that, while teaching at a different school in 2003, Mr Butler had engaged in a relationship with one of his students. Additionally, it was reported that in 2020, Mr Butler provided inaccurate information to his employer about when this relationship began; he claimed it started after the student (Pupil A) had left the school, which was said to be not the case.

Mr Butler did not give sworn evidence but instead made oral submissions highlighting:

- his previous statement in response to the TRA investigation
- that he admitted the allegations and accepted that, in hindsight, he had displayed poor judgment
- the prevailing culture of the school in 2003 in that staff and pupils did socialise with each other
- that he was in fear and panicked in September 2020 when he was asked about the previous relationship, and that this caused him to lie about when it started

The panel took account of Mr Butler's submissions but noted that his evidence was not sworn and that it had not had the opportunity to ask him any questions.

Findings of fact

The panel made the following findings of fact:

1. In or around 2003, while employed as a teacher at St Augustine's Catholic High School and Sixth Form ("St Augustine's") you engaged in a sexual relationship with Pupil A, who was then a student at St Augustine's

The panel noted that Mr Butler fully admitted the allegation.

It also noted that Pupil A confirmed the nature of the relationship (including that it was sexual) and its duration from April / May 2003 until April / May 2004. Pupil A confirmed that she had not left school until June / July 2003 and therefore that the relationship had started whilst she was a pupil at the school.

The panel found this allegation proved.

2. In (or around) September 2020 you stated to your employer that the relationship with Pupil A commenced after she had left St Augustine's when this was incorrect and/or misleading

The panel noted that Mr Butler fully admitted the allegation.

It also noted that Individual B gave evidence to the effect that there were two conversations with Mr Butler in September 2020 where he contended that the relationship had not started until Pupil A left school. The evidence of Pupil A confirmed that that was incorrect.

The panel found this allegation proved.

3. Your conduct at 2 above was dishonest.

The panel noted that Mr Butler fully admitted the allegation.

The panel received legal advice on the test for dishonesty arising out of the Supreme Court decision of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (2017) UKSC 67*. Its attention was drawn to the following section of the judgement.

'When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of the belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest.'

Taking this test into account, the panel determined, based on the evidence presented, that Mr Butler knew the information he gave to Individual B regarding the commencement of the relationship with Pupil A was inaccurate, and that he intentionally gave this incorrect information in order to mislead his employer about the circumstances. In Mr Butler's own words from his submissions to the panel, he 'panicked' and then started lying to cover up the fact that the relationship had started when Pupil A was still a current pupil.

The panel found this allegation proved.

In summary, the panel found the following factual allegations proved:

1,2 and 3.

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

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*, (“the Advice”).

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

It took into account the following factors:

- there were efforts made by both Mr Butler and Pupil A to conceal the relationship whilst Pupil A was a current pupil at the school
- the relationship was pursued outside of the school setting
- the submissions made by Mr Butler to the effect that the prevailing culture of the school accepted social relationships between teaching staff and pupils

The panel noted that allegation 1 occurred in 2003 before the current Teachers’ Standards came into force, and that the TRA was not able to identify a specific standard from the time that had been breached by Mr Butler in respect of his relationship with Pupil A.

The panel considered whether the lack of an express standard during the period of Mr Butler’s relationship with Pupil A precluded it from making a finding of unacceptable professional conduct by Mr Butler in connection with that relationship.

The panel concluded that it was able to make a finding of unacceptable professional conduct in relation to allegation 1. The panel reminded itself that ‘unacceptable professional conduct’ is misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard expected of a teacher. The panel considered the fact that in 2003 there did not appear to be an express prohibition against a teacher having a sexual relationship with a current pupil does not mean that it was acceptable in any shape or form, more that it had not been identified as a priority issue for guidance at that time.

The panel noted that the need for proper boundaries between teachers and pupils was not a recent development and that this would have been apparent to Mr Butler in 2003. The panel considered that this breach of professional boundaries displayed moral culpability on the part of Mr Butler such that it amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

In respect of allegations 2 and 3, the panel had regard to Part 2 of the Teachers’ Standards, and concluded that Mr Butler 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 ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel considered that Mr Butler's dishonest actions in misleading his employer had the potential to harm pupils' wellbeing as it meant that his employer was unable to conduct an informed risk assessment in light of the police enquiries into Mr Butler.

The panel also considered whether Mr Butler'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 noted that allegation 1 relates to sexual activity with a pupil and that allegations 2 and 3 relate to dishonesty of a somewhat serious nature, and that both of these factors appear in the Advice.

For the above reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Butler amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the teaching profession. Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Butler was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Butler'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 Butler'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 Butler was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the following points were relevant:

- Mr Butler entered into a sexual relationship with a current pupil and significantly exceeded professional boundaries in doing so.
- Mr Butler knowingly provided incorrect information to his employer regarding the start date of his relationship with Pupil A, which was crucial for the employer to perform an accurate risk assessment.

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

The panel considered that Mr Butler's conduct had the potential to damage confidence in the education system as a member of the public (either now or in 2003) would be concerned to hear of his actions in respect of having a sexual relationship with a pupil and then lying to his employer as to when the relationship started.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Butler'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 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 Butler, which involved him engaging in a sexual relationship with a pupil and then later intentionally misleading his employer about when the relationship had begun, the panel considered that these matters had the potential to affect public confidence in the profession.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Butler was not treated with 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 Butler 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 Butler in the profession. Whilst the panel noted Mr Butler's submissions to the effect that he had worked well as a teacher since the

relationship, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Butler 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 Butler.

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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:
 - 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.

The panel observed that in 2003, regarding allegation 1, Mr Butler was at an early stage of his teaching career, and the guidance concerning personal relationships with pupils was likely less defined. In contrast, allegations 2 and 3 took place in 2020, by which time Mr Butler had accrued significant experience, making it clear that any misrepresentation to his employer regarding his relationship with Pupil A constituted a serious issue.

The panel also acknowledged Mr Butler's previously unblemished character, his clear commitment to working as a teacher and supporting children, and the fact that he continued teaching between 2003 and 2020 without any concerns being raised. Additionally, it noted that Mr Butler had engaged with the proceedings and showed some awareness of his actions, having admitted to the allegations and consistently characterised his conduct as 'wrong' and 'unacceptable'. However, the panel recognised that it had not been able to question Mr Butler directly and, consequently, was unable to further question the extent of his insight.

In the panel's view, none of these factors were sufficient to amount to significant mitigation in the circumstances.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, and assessed 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 Butler 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 Butler. The breaching of professional boundaries in the form of a sexual relationship with a current pupil in 2003 and the deliberate misleading of his employer in 2020 were significant factors 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. The panel noted that allegation 1 related to a sexual relationship between a teacher and a current pupil and that there is an inherent power imbalance within this dynamic, and that this could amount to serious sexual misconduct. It also noted the circumstances in which the relationship took place, namely:

- Pupil A's evidence that the relationship was consensual and that she stated that she had suffered no harm from it,

- The comparatively small age gap between Mr Butler and Pupil A when the relationship took place,
- What was said by Mr Butler to be the prevailing culture at the time in the school around socialising between staff and pupils,
- The lack of express guidance in force at the time around the unacceptability of relationships between staff and pupils

Taking these factors into account, the panel considered that, notwithstanding what is recorded at para 50 of the Advice, a review period would be appropriate in this case.

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. The panel noted that allegations 2 and 3 related to serious dishonesty on the part of Mr Butler. In light of this, the panel considered that a review period of more than two years would be appropriate in relation to Mr Butler's case.

Given the circumstances of this case, and considering what was both proportionate and required in the public interest, the panel considered that the review period should be set at five years from the date at which any order takes effect. The panel considered that any period less than that would not adequately mark the seriousness of Mr Butler's conduct.

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 Butler should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

The panel has found that Mr Butler is in breach of the following standards (in relation to allegations 2 and 3):

- 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 ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The Panel notes that the behaviour found proved at Allegation 1 occurred in 2003, before the introduction of the Teachers' Standards. However, it also finds that that behaviour would not have been deemed acceptable at that time.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of engaging in a sexual relationship with a pupil, and then dishonesty on the part of the teacher when questioned about that sexual relationship.

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 Butler, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, *"The panel considered that Mr Butler's dishonest actions in misleading his employer had the potential to harm pupils' wellbeing as it meant that his employer was unable to conduct an informed risk assessment in light of the police enquiries into Mr Butler."* 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 sets out as follows, *"Mr Butler had engaged with the proceedings and showed some awareness of his actions, having admitted to the allegations and consistently characterised his conduct as 'wrong' and 'unacceptable'. However, the panel recognised that it had not been able to question Mr Butler directly and, consequently, was unable to further question the extent of his insight"*.

The panel has also commented that *"...none of these factors were sufficient to amount to significant mitigation in the circumstances"*.

In my judgement the lack of full insight, particularly in circumstances where the panel was unable to question Mr Butler, 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 observe, *“The panel considered that Mr Butler’s conduct had the potential to damage confidence in the education system as a member of the public (either now or in 2003) would be concerned to hear of his actions in respect of having a sexual relationship with a pupil and then lying to his employer as to when the relationship started”*.

I am particularly mindful of the findings that Mr Butler engaged in a sexual relationship with a pupil and was subsequently dishonest about the circumstances, 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 Mr Butler himself. The panel comment *“The panel also acknowledged Mr Butler’s previously unblemished character, his clear commitment to working as a teacher and supporting children, and the fact that he continued teaching between 2003 and 2020 without any concerns being raised”*.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Butler 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 seriousness of the proven conduct as well as the panel’s comments concerning the lack of full insight or remorse.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Butler 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.

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments *"The panel noted that allegation 1 related to a sexual relationship between a teacher and a current pupil and that there is an inherent power imbalance within this dynamic, and that this could amount to serious sexual misconduct."*

However, the panel has gone on to identify relevant circumstances which impact on its decision regarding a review period,

"It also noted the circumstances in which the relationship took place, namely:

- *Pupil A's evidence that the relationship was consensual and that she stated that she had suffered no harm from it,*
- *The comparatively small age gap between Mr Butler and Pupil A when the relationship took place,*
- *What was said by Mr Butler to be the prevailing culture at the time in the school around socialising between staff and pupils,*
- *The lack of express guidance in force at the time around the unacceptability of relationships between staff and pupils"*

I have considered whether a five year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

I have gone on to consider the Advice, which states,

"Where a case involved any of the following, it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period:

- *serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons"*

In my view, factors in this case mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the sexual nature of the conduct towards a pupil, in circumstances where Mr Butler had been their teacher, the serious dishonest conduct when subsequently asked about the relationship, and that Mr Butler has not shown full insight into his proven conduct which the panel has identified which, in my view, means there is some risk of repetition. I am

also conscious of the likely damage done to the profession by Mr Butler's actions in entering into a sexual relationship with a pupil.

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 Lee Butler 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 Butler 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 Mr Butler.

Mr Butler has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 2 February 2026

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