



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Ramesh Mal: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**February 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	22

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

**Teacher:** Mr Ramesh Mal

**Teacher ref number:** 0509234

**Teacher date of birth:** 14 December 1977

**TRA reference:** 19312

**Date of determination:** 2 February 2026

**Former employer:** Heath Park School, Wolverhampton

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 11 to 14 November 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Ramesh Mal. The panel reconvened again on 2 February 2026.

The panel members were Mr Richard Young (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Julie Wells (teacher panellist) and Mr Ben Wilkinson (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Kimberley Clayton of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Felix Keating of Three Raymond Building Barristers instructed on behalf of Kingsley Napley LLP.

Mr Ramesh Mal was present and was represented by Mr Mark Rose of NASUWT trade union.

The hearing took place in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 26 September 2024.

It was alleged that Mr Mal was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

Mr Mal was convicted of a relevant offence namely:

1. On or around 23 November 2015, he was convicted of one count of common assault or battery contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1988 s39.
2. On or around 20 February 2023, he was convicted of breach a non-molestation order contrary to Family Law Act 1996 s42.A.

It was also alleged that Mr Mal was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a science instructor at Heath Park School:

3. On 9 May 2020, he was arrested for the offence of common assault as a result of:
  - a. Placing his hand on Person A's head causing her to hit her head on the corner of the sofa and/or;
  - b. Grabbing Person A's hair and/or;
  - c. Placing his knee on the chest of Person A.
4. He did not notify his employer that he was the subject of a police investigation from May 2020 for the offence of common assault.
5. On 22 April 2021, during a year 11 science lesson he:
  - a. Prevented Student A from entering his classroom without good reason and in a manner that had the potential to cause embarrassment to the student;
  - b. Engaged in unnecessary physical contact with Pupil A by grabbing her by the arms and moving her into the classroom.
6. By reason of his conduct at paragraphs 5(a) and 5(b) he did not follow the reasonable management instruction given to him on 26 March 2021 to conduct himself in a professional manner at all times.
7. By reason of his conduct at paragraph 4 he:

- a. Acted dishonestly, and/or;
  - b. Demonstrated a lack of integrity.
8. On or around 5 November 2022, he used excessive and/or inappropriate physical force in relation to Person B in that he:
- a. Grabbed Person B by the waist and/or stomach;
  - b. Grabbed and/or put his hand(s) on and/or around Person B's neck.

Mr Mal admitted allegations 1 and 2 and that those admitted facts amounted to a conviction for a relevant offence. Mr Mal denied allegations 3 to 8.

## 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 5 to 9

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 10 to 18

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 19 to 36

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 37 to 384

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Letter from the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) dated 13 January 2016 – to be numbered pages 385 to 386.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, and viewed the CCTV footage, in advance of the hearing and the additional document that the panel decided to admit.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2018, (the “Procedures”).

### Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Person A

Witness B – [REDACTED]

Witness C – [REDACTED]

## Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

The TRA's case is as follows:

Mr Mal commenced employment at Heath Park School ('the School') in 2002, and was employed as an instructor of science in 2010.

On 13 November 2015 Mr Mal assaulted Person A and was later convicted at Wolverhampton Magistrates' Court.

On 9 May 2020 Mr Mal was arrested for assault on Person A.

Mr Mal allegedly failed to inform his employer that he was under police investigation in respect of this incident.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 18 May 2020.

On 26 March 2021 Witness B had a professional management conversation with Mr Mal.

On 22 April 2021, during a year 11 science lesson Mr Mal allegedly prevented Pupil A from entering the room without good reason and grabbed her arms to move her into the classroom.

On 5 November 2022 Mr Mal was arrested for allegedly grabbing Person B's waist/stomach and for grabbing her neck.

On 20 February 2023, Mr Mal was convicted of a breach of a non-molestation order.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. On or around 23 November 2015, he was convicted of one count of common assault or battery contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1988 s39.**

The panel noted paragraph 15 of the Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers ('the Advice'), which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of

both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel was provided with a copy of the memorandum of conviction from Wolverhampton Magistrates' Court which set out that on 23 November 2015 Mr Mal pleaded guilty to assault of Person A by beating them.

In respect of the conviction, Mr Mal was sentenced to a community order, a restraining order, a fine of £130, a collection order and was ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £60 and costs of £105.

The panel noted that Mr Mal had been convicted of this offence and the conviction was supported by the magistrates' court record and the documentary evidence. The panel also noted that Mr Mal had admitted this allegation.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

## **2. On or around 20 February 2023, he was convicted of breach a non-molestation order contrary to Family Law Act 1996 s42.A.**

The panel considered the conviction report and court extract which set out that on 20 February 2023 Mr Mal was convicted of breach of a non-molestation order on 28 August 2022. The panel noted that Mr Mal pleaded guilty to the offence.

The panel noted paragraph 15 of the Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers ('the Advice'), which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

In respect of the conviction, Mr Mal was sentenced to a restraining order and fine of £600.

In their oral evidence, Person A confirmed that Mr Mal breached the non-molestation order on 28 August 2022 when he attended their property in breach of a non-molestation order, which they discovered through security camera footage. The breach arose as it was unarranged. [REDACTED]. Person A stated that they reported the August 2022 incident because they believed Mr Mal appeared intoxicated and felt they needed protection.

The panel accepted that there was a conviction for breach of a non-molestation order which was supported by the court extract provided. The panel also noted that Mr Mal had admitted this allegation.

The panel found allegation 2 proven.

**3. On 9 May 2020, he was arrested for the offence of common assault as a result of:**

- a. Placing his hand on Person A's head causing her to hit her head on the corner of the sofa and/or;**
- b. Grabbing Person A's hair and/or;**
- c. Placing his knee on the chest of Person A.**

The panel considered the police report which set out that on 9 May 2020 Mr Mal was arrested for common assault. [REDACTED]. The report stated that Mr Mal leant onto Person A as they were sitting on the sofa and knocked them to the end of the sofa, grabbed their hair and placed his knee into their chest. The report confirmed that both parties called the police and Mr Mal was arrested.

[REDACTED]

Person A stated [REDACTED]. They stated that he grabbed their hair and pushed their head into the sofa and then stood in front of them and put his knee into their chest.

Person A stated that Mr Mal was arrested on 9 May 2020 following the incident.

In their oral evidence, Person A stated that the 2020 incident occurred when Mr Mal was intoxicated and angry. [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]. Person A stated that the police did not provide any detailed reasons for why the 2020 incident was not prosecuted.

The panel considered the police report and statement from Person A. The panel noted that the allegation involved serious misconduct, and the police report had recorded that Mr Mal appeared intoxicated and was resistant during arrest. The panel also noted that [REDACTED] indicated that they had witnessed Mr Mal [REDACTED] placing his knee on Person A's chest.

Person A was not challenged about the details of the assault in cross-examination and furthermore, their evidence was not in any way diminished by the teacher's representative's questions. While the panel acknowledged that the police did not pursue a prosecution, it concluded that this was not determinative, as the standard of proof differs from criminal proceedings. The panel concluded that there was sufficient evidence to find that the incident occurred.

The panel found allegations 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c) proven.

**4. He did not notify his employer that he was the subject of a police investigation from May 2020 for the offence of common assault.**

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B, who stated that Mr Mal did not inform the School immediately that he had been arrested in May 2020 and was being investigated by the police. She stated that Mr Mal did not inform the School at the time of the arrest but did notify her of the arrest and subsequent police investigation at a later stage.

Witness B confirmed that she had no record and could not recall the dates and details of when Mr Mal informed her of his arrest however stated in her oral evidence that Mr Mal informed her of his arrest “within days”.

Witness B explained that if it had been alleged that a teacher had been violent in front of a child, the expectation would be that they reported the matter at the earliest opportunity, including over a weekend if they had the headteacher’s details. Witness B stated that this would enable the School and the Central Learning Partnership Trust to review the case, liaise with the police, attend any strategy meetings, and consider whether a risk assessment or suspension would be necessary.

In her oral evidence, Witness B stated that Mr Mal did not comply with the safeguarding policy which required immediate reporting of his arrest. Witness B also confirmed that all teachers receive safeguarding training, with catch-up sessions for any staff who miss the sessions, and these practices had been in place for a number of years. Witness B stated that Mr Mal would have been aware of the requirement to report his arrest in May 2020 at the earliest opportunity.

The panel noted that the allegation concerned failure to report the arrest to the employer. The panel concluded that the evidence demonstrated that Mr Mal did report the matter to Witness B, albeit not immediately. The panel concluded that the allegation did not specify timeliness or promptness, and therefore the delay was not relevant to the wording of the allegation.

The panel found allegation 4 not proven.

**5. On 22 April 2021, during a year 11 science lesson he:**

- a. Prevented Student A from entering his classroom without good reason and in a manner that had the potential to cause embarrassment to the student;**
- b. Engaged in unnecessary physical contact with Pupil A by grabbing her by the arms and moving her into the classroom.**

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B, who stated that on 22 April 2021 Pupil A reported that Mr Mal had put his hands on her to 'push' her into the classroom.

The panel considered the written statement of Witness C who stated that on 22 April 2021 she was informed that [REDACTED] had made a complaint because of Mr Mal's conduct towards Pupil A. She stated that two other staff members raised concerns because of Mr Mal's conduct on this date.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. She stated that, following the incident, [REDACTED] attended the School on 23 April 2021 to raise concerns and that Pupil A had reported feeling uncomfortable.

The panel considered this allegation, which involved keeping a pupil outside the classroom and allegedly grabbing her to move her. The panel noted that managing late arrivals is a standard aspect of teaching in a classroom, as immediate entry into the lesson can cause disruption. Therefore, the panel concluded that it was acceptable for a pupil to be asked to wait outside until an appropriate time. The panel stated that asking a pupil a question upon entering or leaving the classroom is not unusual.

The panel noted that the evidence was based on hearsay. The panel agreed that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the teacher's actions were unreasonable or to establish that Mr Mal had grabbed the pupil.

The panel found allegations 5(a) and 5(b) not proven.

**6. By reason of his conduct at paragraphs 5(a) and 5(b) he did not follow the reasonable management instruction given to him on 26 March 2021 to conduct yourself in a professional manner at all times.**

The panel considered the record of the professional management conversation with Mr Mal on 26 March 2021. The record set out that a number of concerns and complaints had been raised regarding Mr Mal's conduct and behaviour from parents, students and staff.

The record set out that Witness B reminded Mr Mal of his duty to conduct himself as a teacher professionally and that if she were to receive further complaints in the future she would have no option but to take the matter up formally.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B, who stated that on 26 March 2021 she had a professional management conversation with Mr Mal as a result of several concerns and complaints being raised regarding his conduct.

In her oral evidence, Witness B explained that the investigation into the complaint concluded without referral to governors because she felt that formal disciplinary action

was inappropriate. She confirmed that this decision did not breach KCSIE, as Mr Mal was not considered a risk to children.

The panel considered the written statement of Witness C who stated that Witness B had a professional management conversation with Mr Mal on 26 March 2021 and she was provided with a copy of the record of their conversation. She stated that there had been a number of complaints and concerns raised about Mr Mal's conduct and behaviour from parents, students and staff members which prompted the discussion.

In her oral evidence, Witness C explained that some interview statements within the bundle were unsigned and undated. Witness C stated that she could not recall receiving any objections to the contents of their written statements, however confirmed that if any amendments had been made, the amended statement would have been included in the appendices provided for the hearing.

The panel concluded that this allegation was dependent on allegations 5 (a) and (b). As allegations 5 (a) and (b) were not proven, the panel found allegation 6 not proven.

**7. By reason of your conduct at paragraph 4 he:**

**a. Acted dishonestly, and/or;**

**b. Demonstrated a lack of integrity.**

The panel considered whether Mr Mal had failed to act with integrity. The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*. The panel then went on to consider whether Mr Mal had acted dishonestly and, in doing so, had regard to the legal advice which it had received including the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel noted that Witness B stated that there is an implicit expectation that teachers disclose when they are the subject of a police investigation and although Mr Mal had not done so immediately, Witness B had confirmed in her oral evidence that Mr Mal informed her within days of his arrest.

The panel concluded that this allegation was dependent on allegation 4. As allegation 4 was not proven, the panel found allegations 7(a) and 7(b) not proven.

**8. On or around 5 November 2022, he used excessive and/or inappropriate physical force in relation to Person B in that he:**

**a. Grabbed Person B by the waist and/or stomach;**

**b. Grabbed and/or put his hand(s) on and/or around Person B's neck.**

The panel considered the investigation report produced by the police regarding the incident on 5 November 2022.

The report set out that Mr Mal and Person B had been drinking at a pub. Person B decided to leave but Mr Mal followed her and tried to get her to stay. The report stated that Person B refused, and Mr Mal grabbed her around the waist. The report further stated that Person B managed to get away but Mr Mal then grabbed her around the throat strangling her, causing Person B to lose consciousness briefly.

The panel acknowledged that this allegation was based on hearsay but noted corroborating evidence from police records, including reports of physical injuries and resistance to arrest. The allegation involved serious conduct, including strangulation which resulted in Person B briefly losing consciousness.

The panel concluded that Person B's statement was supported by contemporaneous police notes and the police officer who made a witness statement described Mr Mal smelling of alcohol and resisting arrest. The panel also noted similarities with previous incidents, indicating a pattern of violent behaviour, although they did not treat this as determinative. The panel concluded that there was sufficient evidence to find the allegation proven.

The panel found allegations 8(a) and 8(b) proven.

### **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to:

- In respect of allegations 1 and 2, a conviction of a relevant offence.
- In respect of allegations 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 8(a) and 8(b), 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 Mal, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Mal 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...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

### **Conviction of a relevant offence**

The panel was satisfied that the convictions referred to in allegations 1 and 2 were both relevant convictions.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Mal in respect of both convictions, when considered separately, fell very significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Mal's behaviour in committing the offences could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Mal's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

In relation to allegation 1, the panel agreed that this was a case concerning an offence involving violence, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence. The panel considered the seriousness of the conduct and its incompatibility with the standards expected of a teacher. The panel discussed whether the offence was likely to impact public confidence and concluded that violent behaviour, [REDACTED], is contrary to the professional standards of teachers.

The panel noted that allegation 2 involved a conviction for breach of a non-molestation order, which is a court order designed to protect individuals from harm. The panel agreed that disregarding such an order is a serious matter and concluded that this conduct is likely to undermine public confidence in the teaching profession and is incompatible with the standards expected of teachers.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Mal's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel considered whether there were any mitigating circumstances, and noted that they had been made aware of Mr Mal's personal and [REDACTED] issues at the time of

allegations 2, 3 (a), (b), (c) and 8 (a) and (b), and the evidence presented in the teacher's representative's submissions during the hearing. The panel concluded that Mr Mal provided no supporting medical evidence in relation to past or present [REDACTED] concerns such that the panel could be satisfied that there was any defence to the allegations and any significant mitigating circumstances. The panel also considered the teacher's representative's submissions regarding the case of **Bar Standards Board v Howd [2017] EWHC 210** and concluded that there was insufficient evidence provided for the hearing that Mr Mal's behaviour was a consequence of a medical condition that was beyond his control.

### **Unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute**

The panel made the following determination in respect of allegations 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 8(a) and 8(b).

The panel also considered whether Mr Mal'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 violence was relevant.

The panel noted that the conduct in allegations 3 (a), (b) and (c) occurred [REDACTED], which demonstrated a disregard for the wellbeing of [REDACTED]. The panel agreed that teachers have a duty to safeguard all children, not only pupils at their own school. The panel agreed that violent behaviour [REDACTED] was viewed as incompatible with the standards expected of a teacher. The panel noted that safeguarding responsibilities are fundamental to the teaching role and Witness B had confirmed in her oral evidence that Mr Mal had undertaken safeguarding training.

The panel concluded that the behaviour in allegations 3 (a), (b) and (c) amounted to unprofessional conduct of a serious nature. The panel agreed that the conduct in allegation 3 was capable of seriously damaging public confidence in the teaching profession. The panel concluded that violent behaviour outside the school setting, particularly [REDACTED], undermined the trust in teachers as role models and was inconsistent with the expectations of the profession.

The panel noted that allegations 8 (a) and (b) involved violent behaviour and was therefore a serious breach of professional standards. The panel agreed that such conduct demonstrated an inability to manage personal behaviour at all appropriately and was inconsistent with the professional expectations of a teacher. The panel considered that the behaviour was aggravated by its nature and seriousness, and the panel noted

that although allegations 8(a) and 8(b) took place outside the education setting, they were relevant to Mr Mal's position as a teacher in that he had used excessive and inappropriate physical force towards another person.

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

In relation to whether Mr Mal'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 Mal'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 Mal was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of violence was relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the public's perception of the teaching profession.

The panel concluded that the behaviour in allegations 3 (a), (b) and (c) and 8 (a) and (b) amounted to unprofessional conduct of a serious nature. The panel agreed that violent behaviour of this kind undermined public confidence in the teaching profession and was incompatible with the role of a teacher as a role model.

The panel agreed that Mr Mal's conduct could damage the reputation of the profession and the public's perception of a teacher. The panel concluded that the conduct was likely to damage the reputation of the profession and therefore amounted to conduct that brings the profession into disrepute.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Mal'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, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and conviction of a relevant offence, 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 and the protection of other members of the public (in relation to protecting members of the public), the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Mal, namely, a conviction for assault, a conviction for breaching a non-molestation order, being arrested for the assault of Person A, and using inappropriate force towards Person B by grabbing their waist or stomach and neck, the panel considered that there was a strong public interest in protecting members of the public.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as Mr Mal's conduct 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 Mal in the profession. Mr Mal provided insufficient evidence for the panel to assess whether he had an outstanding ability as an educator. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Mal 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 Mal.

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, namely: teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others, and teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures; and
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE).

In relation to the last of these points, the panel noted the evidence that [REDACTED] was present in the course of the May 2020 assault.

There was no evidence that Mr Mal's actions were not deliberate and the panel did not accept Mr Mal's mitigation that alcohol misuse excused his behaviour. There was also no evidence that Mr Mal was acting under extreme duress.

The panel held that Mr Mal had not demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal or professional conduct, nor that he had made a significant contribution to the education sector. While the panel noted evidence that he was regarded as an effective teacher, there was nothing to indicate that his conduct or contribution went beyond what would ordinarily be expected of someone with his experience. Although there were no recent concerns arising from his work as a supply teacher, this was not sufficient to amount to the type of exceptional contribution required to outweigh the public interest in maintaining high standards of conduct.

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. In the panel's view, publication alone would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations and not adequately address the seriousness of the concerns in

this case, despite recognising the significant personal consequences that a prohibition order would have for Mr Mal.

The panel went on to consider whether prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate and if the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Mal.

In reaching this decision, the panel considered that breaching a court order represents a serious departure from the standards of conduct expected of a teacher and has the clear potential to undermine public confidence in the profession. Although the panel accepted that the video evidence relating to the breach of the non-molestation order did not indicate that Mr Mal was intoxicated or present for a prolonged period, it nevertheless concluded that any violent behaviour is wholly inappropriate for a teacher and is incompatible with the standards of personal and professional conduct expected by the public.

The panel also noted that the School's Staff Code of Conduct updated in March 2021 outlined that *"Staff must not engage in conduct outside work which could seriously damage the reputation and standing of the school or the employee's own reputation or the reputation of other members of the school community. In particular, criminal offences that involve violence or possession or use of illegal drugs or sexual misconduct, are regarded as unacceptable and could result in dismissal."*

The panel recognised that this behaviour occurred outside the classroom but considered that breaching the conditions imposed by a court is a serious matter. It reflects a willingness to prioritise personal wants or needs over the expectations set by the court and demonstrated an attitude inconsistent with the integrity required of a teacher. The panel was of the view that such conduct indicates a belief that the individual is above the rules and obligations that apply to others. A teacher is expected to model high standards of personal behaviour and to put the welfare of others before themselves, and the panel concluded that the attitude exhibited by Mr Mal is not compatible with the responsibility and trust inherent in the teaching profession.

The panel accepted the presenting officer's submission that the conduct found proven constituted a pattern of behaviour, in that the conduct involved violence against females whilst under the influence of alcohol. The panel also noted that the letter to Mr Mal from the National College for Teaching and Leadership ("NCTL") in 2016 stated:

*"Therefore, this case will not be progressed further by the NCTL. However, you are asked to note that if any further matters are brought to the NCTL's attention, reference to this case may form part of that further consideration."*

The panel also noted the nature of the assaults found proven included grabbing Person A's hair, Mr Mal placing his knee on the chest of Person A, and in relation to Person B,

grabbing their neck. The panel agreed with the presenting officer's categorisation of these as "nasty".

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.

In her oral evidence, Witness C confirmed that, throughout the investigation, all witnesses expressed concern for Mr Mal and considered his behaviour to be out of character.

The panel noted that no character references had been provided. However, it also noted that Mr Mal had stated he had been going through a difficult period in his personal life, and this was supported by the evidence of several female colleagues, referred to in Witness C's evidence, who described him as a good colleague who had been struggling. One colleague, Individual B, said she was aware he was experiencing [REDACTED] and that staff had been concerned about him. Individual C stated that she understood he was going through a difficult time and that this might explain aspects of his behaviour, noting that personal circumstances can affect professional conduct. Individual D explained that she knew Mr Mal personally and believed he had been struggling but regarded him as a decent man whose circumstances had "got hold of him." Individual E said he was generally excellent in lessons, and Individual F stated that he had been "going through a lot" and was experiencing a difficult patch. Individual A similarly commented that he had been struggling for some time and described him as a really good teacher. The panel noted that all of these colleagues were women, which it considered relevant given that the allegations related to conduct towards women. However, these statements were made without knowledge of the allegations considered by the panel, as they related to the School's investigation process.

In her oral evidence, Witness B described Mr Mal as an incredibly caring teacher who began as a former student and later worked as a science technician before being employed as an unqualified teacher (a science instructor). She stated that he was well respected by colleagues and students and was central to school life. She confirmed that there were no conduct issues prior to 2020.

Witness B also stated that Mr Mal's [REDACTED], which led to a noticeable change in his conduct and ability to contribute in the way he had before. Mr Mal also gave oral evidence to the panel about the impact the [REDACTED] had on him.

The panel noted that Mr Mal's document named "rehabilitation" had referred to working with his probation officer as part of his Rehabilitation Activity Requirement and attending [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], and to ensure his alcohol consumption is kept to a minimum. Mr Mal also outlines that he was suffering from [REDACTED] and drinking irresponsibly during the lead up to the crime committed in November 2015. The panel

noted that no evidence was provided as to the content and impact of the meetings attended.

The panel noted Mr Mal's account that he had been living with [REDACTED], as set out in his statement of mitigation. He described the difficulties he had been experiencing and the important role [REDACTED] had played in supporting him during this period. The panel considered that the fact he had [REDACTED], and was willing to rely on their support, reflected positively on his willingness to seek help when needed. It also noted that having this support network in place lessened the risk of further instability should his personal circumstances change. Mr Mal had also [REDACTED] and continues to [REDACTED].

The panel noted that, despite the personal difficulties described, Mr Mal had not demonstrated an understanding of how his behaviour outside school related to his professional responsibilities. He appeared to regard the matter as separate from his role as a teacher and had not made the connection between personal conduct and the expectations placed on teachers as role models. The panel also observed that Mr Mal asserted when giving evidence at the mitigation stage that the account given by Person A and Person B was fabricated, and he did not accept that he had done anything violent. The panel considered his lack of insight and failure to accept responsibility to be a matter of concern.

The panel considered that there remained a risk of repetition. Mr Mal had been given the opportunity during the hearing to address this point, but he had a limited acceptance of what had gone wrong or to show any meaningful insight into the seriousness of his behaviour. In the absence of such insight, the panel could not be reassured that similar conduct would not occur in the future.

The panel considered the principles in ***GMC v Khetyar [2018] EWHC 813 (Admin)***. Whilst the panel did not attach weight in assessing insight and remorse to Mr Mal's denials, having heard oral evidence from him at the mitigation stage, it was not satisfied that he had developed any meaningful insight into why such behaviour would be considered inappropriate for a teacher.

The panel noted that paragraph 51 of the Advice refers to violence and does not require the behaviour to amount to serious violence for prohibition to be considered. The panel also took into account that Mr Mal had previously received a warning from the regulator's predecessor body, which demonstrated that he had been made aware of regulatory concerns about his conduct in the past. The panel considered that his more recent behaviour formed part of a pattern and that, agreeing with the presenting officer, if this did not constitute a pattern of concerning conduct, it was difficult to see what would.

The panel accepted that some aspects of his conduct occurred in his private life, and that there were mitigating circumstances. However, it was concerned by the later assaults

that occurred two years after [REDACTED], which were not consistent with the standards expected of a teacher. The panel observed that if Mr Mal valued his role and the teaching profession to the extent he claimed, it was difficult to understand why he would continue to engage in behaviour that placed his career at risk.

The panel concluded that Mr Mal had exhibited violent behaviour at times when he had been out of control and, given the earlier warning he had received, he should have been fully aware of the seriousness of further misconduct. 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 Mal.

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. The panel noted that this case includes violence, and also noted that Mr Mal had been convicted of common assault and they had found the allegations relating to common assault of Person A and excessive and/or inappropriate force on Person B proven.

The panel considered the appropriate length of the review period. It noted that the violence in this case, while unacceptable and "nasty", did not reach the threshold of serious violence and that there were mitigating factors, including the personal difficulties Mr Mal had been experiencing in his [REDACTED] at the time. The panel also took into account Mr Mal's statement that he had an unblemished recent record as a supply teacher and his evidence that he had reduced his alcohol consumption and undertaken [REDACTED], demonstrating an ability and willingness to address his behaviour. In light of these factors, the panel concluded that a review period longer than two years would not be appropriate.

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 after 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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction.

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven (including allegations 4, 5, 6 and 7), and I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Mal 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...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Mal 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 Mal fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of relevant convictions for common assault or battery and breaching a non-molestation order, a finding of being arrested for the offence of common assault, and a finding of using excessive and/or inappropriate force.

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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, 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 Mal, 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. I have taken account of the panel's observations including the following comments:

"The panel noted that the conduct in allegations 3 (a), (b) and (c) occurred [REDACTED], which demonstrated a disregard for the wellbeing of [REDACTED]. The panel agreed that teachers have a duty to safeguard all children, not only pupils at their own school. The panel agreed that violent behaviour [REDACTED] was viewed as incompatible with the standards expected of a teacher. The panel noted that safeguarding responsibilities are fundamental to the teaching role and Witness B had confirmed in her oral evidence that Mr Mal had undertaken safeguarding training."

"The panel noted that allegations 8 (a) and (b) involved violent behaviour and was therefore a serious breach of professional standards. The panel agreed that such conduct demonstrated an inability to manage personal behaviour at all appropriately and was inconsistent with the professional expectations of a teacher. The panel considered that the behaviour was aggravated by its nature and seriousness, and the panel noted that although allegations 8(a) and 8(b) took place outside the education setting, they were relevant to Mr Mal's position as a teacher in that he had used excessive and inappropriate physical force towards another person."

A prohibition order would 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 noted that, despite the personal difficulties described, Mr Mal had not demonstrated an understanding of how his behaviour outside school related to his professional responsibilities. He appeared to regard the matter as separate from his role as a teacher and had not made the connection between personal conduct and the expectations placed on teachers as role models. The panel also observed that Mr Mal asserted when giving evidence at the mitigation stage that the account given by Person A and Person B was fabricated, and he did not accept that he

had done anything violent. The panel considered his lack of insight and failure to accept responsibility to be a matter of concern.

The panel considered that there remained a risk of repetition. Mr Mal had been given the opportunity during the hearing to address this point, but he had a limited acceptance of what had gone wrong or to show any meaningful insight into the seriousness of his behaviour. In the absence of such insight, the panel could not be reassured that similar conduct would not occur in the future.

The panel considered the principles in ***GMC v Khetyar [2018] EWHC 813 (Admin)***. Whilst the panel did not attach weight in assessing insight and remorse to Mr Mal's denials, having heard oral evidence from him at the mitigation stage, it was not satisfied that he had developed any meaningful insight into why such behaviour would be considered inappropriate for a teacher."

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. 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 Mal was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of repeated violent behaviour 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, 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 Mal himself. The panel has commented:

"The panel held that Mr Mal had not demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal or professional conduct, nor that he had made a significant

contribution to the education sector. While the panel noted evidence that he was regarded as an effective teacher, there was nothing to indicate that his conduct or contribution went beyond what would ordinarily be expected of someone with his experience. Although there were no recent concerns arising from his work as a supply teacher, this was not sufficient to amount to the type of exceptional contribution required to outweigh the public interest in maintaining high standards of conduct.”

I have also taken account of evidence from witnesses at the hearing as to Mr Mal’s ability and behaviour as a teacher including:

“The panel noted that no character references had been provided. However, it also noted that Mr Mal had stated he had been going through a difficult period in his personal life, and this was supported by the evidence of several female colleagues, referred to in Witness C’s evidence, who described him as a good colleague who had been struggling. One colleague, Individual B, said she was aware he was experiencing [REDACTED] and that staff had been concerned about him. Individual C stated that she understood he was going through a difficult time and that this might explain aspects of his behaviour, noting that personal circumstances can affect professional conduct. Individual D explained that she knew Mr Mal personally and believed he had been struggling but regarded him as a decent man whose circumstances had “got hold of him.” Individual E said he was generally excellent in lessons, and Individual F stated that he had been “going through a lot” and was experiencing a difficult patch. Individual A similarly commented that he had been struggling for some time and described him as a really good teacher. The panel noted that all of these colleagues were women, which it considered relevant given that the allegations related to conduct towards women. However, these statements were made without knowledge of the allegations considered by the panel, as they related to the School’s investigation process.

In her oral evidence, Witness B described Mr Mal as an incredibly caring teacher who began as a former student and later worked as a science technician before being employed as an unqualified teacher (a science instructor). She stated that he was well respected by colleagues and students and was central to school life. She confirmed that there were no conduct issues prior to 2020.

Witness B also stated that Mr Mal’s [REDACTED], which led to a noticeable change in his conduct and ability to contribute in the way he had before. Mr Mal also gave oral evidence to the panel about the impact the [REDACTED] had on him.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the pattern of violent behaviour that had been exhibited by Mr Mal. The panel has said:

"The panel noted that paragraph 51 of the Advice refers to violence and does not require the behaviour to amount to serious violence for prohibition to be considered. The panel also took into account that Mr Mal had previously received a warning from the regulator's predecessor body, which demonstrated that he had been made aware of regulatory concerns about his conduct in the past. The panel considered that his more recent behaviour formed part of a pattern and that, agreeing with the presenting officer, if this did not constitute a pattern of concerning conduct, it was difficult to see what would.

The panel accepted that some aspects of his conduct occurred in his private life, and that there were mitigating circumstances. However, it was concerned by the later assaults that occurred two years after [REDACTED], which were not consistent with the standards expected of a teacher. The panel observed that if Mr Mal valued his role and the teaching profession to the extent he claimed, it was difficult to understand why he would continue to engage in behaviour that placed his career at risk.

The panel concluded that Mr Mal had exhibited violent behaviour at times when he had been out of control and, given the earlier warning he had received, he should have been fully aware of the seriousness of further misconduct. 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 Mal."

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's finding that there was an absence of insight on the part of Mr Mal and a risk of repetition.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Mal 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 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 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 this case includes violence, and also noted that Mr Mal had been convicted of common assault and they had found the allegations relating to common assault of Person A and excessive and/or inappropriate force on Person B proven.

The panel considered the appropriate length of the review period. It noted that the violence in this case, while unacceptable and "nasty", did not reach the threshold of serious violence and that there were mitigating factors, including the personal difficulties Mr Mal had been experiencing in his [REDACTED] at the time. The panel also took into account Mr Mal's statement that he had an unblemished recent record as a supply teacher and his evidence that he had reduced his alcohol consumption and undertaken [REDACTED], demonstrating an ability and willingness to address his behaviour. In light of these factors, the panel concluded that a review period longer than two years would not be appropriate."

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, I have disagreed with the panel's interpretation of the Advice. The Advice states that where a case involves "violence" then "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 Advice does not provide for a "threshold of serious violence" when the length of a review period is considered. The panel has found that the conduct involved violence, which is relevant to the length of the review period as set out in the Advice. In my view, this is exacerbated by the recurring incidents over time.

I have considered carefully the mitigating factors cited by the panel. The panel has taken the view that the steps taken by Mr Mal demonstrate "an ability and willingness to address his behaviour". However, I have placed greater weight on the panel's findings that there had been repeated incidents of violent behaviour and that there remained a risk of repetition, as well its findings on Mr Mal's lack of insight and failure to accept responsibility. I am mindful that the allegations found proven in this case relate to incidents that occurred over a period of 8 years from 2015 to 2023. I have taken the view that a longer review period is needed for Mr Mal to demonstrate clear and unequivocal insight into why his behaviour is inappropriate for a teacher, that there has been no repetition of the behaviour, and that he has taken further concrete steps to minimise the risk of any recurrence.

Therefore, in my judgement, factors mean that allowing 2-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and that a longer review period of 5 years is appropriate. These elements are the serious nature of the offences of which Mr Mal was convicted and his repeated violent behaviour, the lack of insight and the consequent risk of repetition, and the potential damage to the public's perception of the teaching profession.

I consider therefore that a 5-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Ramesh Mal 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 19 February 2031, 5 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 Mal remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Ramesh Mal 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 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 12 February 2026**

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