



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Declan Sealy: Professional conduct panel meeting and hearing outcome

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

February 2026

Contents

Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	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	14

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

Teacher:	Mr Declan Sealy
Teacher ref number:	0253260
Teacher date of birth:	30 April 1980
TRA reference:	24943
Date of determination:	19 February 2026
Former employer:	Dixons Brooklands Academy, Manchester

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 28 November 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Declan Sealy. The panel adjourned after making its findings of fact (“Stage 1”) and that Mr Sealy was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence (“Stage 2”). The professional conduct panel reconvened on 19 February 2026 by way of a virtual hearing in order to hear evidence, representations and make its recommendation whether a prohibition order should be imposed (“Stage 3”).

The panel members were Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Richard Young (lay panellist) and Mrs Natalie Moore (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting held on 28 November 2025, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Sealy that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Sealy provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Kate Baggs of Kingsley Napley LLP, Mr Sealy or his representative, Mr Neil Dewhurst of NASUWT.

At the hearing on 19 February 2026, the presenting officer was Mr John Morrison of QEB Hollis Whiteman instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP. Mr Morrison, Mr Sealy and his representative were in attendance.

The meeting held on 28 November 2025 took place in private. The hearing held on 19 February 2026 took place in public with some portions of the hearing held in private. The hearing was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 17 November 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Sealy was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 31/01/24, he was convicted at Cheshire Magistrates Court for
 - a. 1 count of Being Drunk and Disorderly on 01/07/2023 Contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1967 s91(1)
 - b. 1 count of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm on 01/07/2023 Contrary to the Offences Against the Person Act 1861 s47
 - c. 2 counts of Assault by Beating of an Emergency Worker on 01/07/2023 Contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1988 s39.

Mr Sealy admitted the alleged facts and admitted that he was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral and response – pages 6 to 26

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 27 to 29

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 30 to 236

Section 5: Notice of Meeting – pages 237

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting.

In advance of the meeting convened on 19 February 2026, the panel was provided with two references and a letter from a [REDACTED].

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Sealy on 16 October 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Sealy for the allegation to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. At the outset of the professional conduct panel meeting, the panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Following the panel's decision at Stage 2 as to conviction of a relevant offence, the panel reached the view that it was in the interests of justice and the public interest to convene a professional conduct panel hearing for Stage 3 to consider the issue of whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made in this case. The panel considered that it would be fair for the teacher to have the opportunity to attend a professional conduct panel hearing, in order to assist the panel in balancing whether it would be proportionate to recommend a prohibition order taking into account public interest considerations in favour of and against prohibition, in addition to the interests of the teacher.

The panel therefore directed that a professional conduct panel hearing be convened at the earliest available date, noting that Mr Sealy has waived the 10 week notice period required under the Procedures.

On 1 December 2020, Mr Sealy commenced his role as a mathematics teacher at Dixons Brooklands Academy ("the Academy"). On 1 July 2023, Mr Sealy attended a Chester horse racing event with a number of members of the Academy staff. Mr Sealy was arrested following that event for a number of offences.

On 3 July 2023, the Academy commenced an investigation in Mr Sealy's conduct.

The criminal proceedings against Mr Sealy concluded on 29 February 2024.

On 5 September 2024, a disciplinary hearing was held by the Academy and Mr Sealy ceased to be employed by the Academy on 6 September 2024.

On 20 December 2024, Mr Sealy was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On 31/01/24, you were convicted at Cheshire Magistrates Court for**
 - a. 1 count of Being Drunk and Disorderly on 01/07/2023 Contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1967 s91(1)**
 - b. 1 count of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm on 01/07/2023 Contrary to the Offences Against the Person Act 1861 s47**
 - c. 2 counts of Assault by Beating of an Emergency Worker on 01/07/2023 Contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1988 s39.**

In Mr Sealy's response dated 21 July 2025 to the notice of referral, he admitted the allegations.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Sealy admitted the allegations. He also admitted that on or around 29 February 2024, he was sentenced to 26 weeks suspended imprisonment for 12 months, with a further 4 weeks concurrent; ordered to pay compensation; participate in unpaid work; and to undergo a rehabilitation activity requirement.

The panel was provided with an extract of the court record of Chester Magistrates' Court. The panel accepted the record as conclusive proof of Mr Sealy's conviction as well as the facts necessarily implied by the convictions. The panel noted that Mr Sealy had been convicted of each of the counts referred to in the allegations on 31 January 2024. The panel also noted that Mr Sealy had pleaded not guilty to each of the counts. The panel noted that in respect of allegation 1c, the first count related to the assault of a police officer who was acting in the exercise of his functions as such a worker, by beating him. The second count related to the assault by beating of another police officer.

The record showed that Mr Sealy had been sentenced on 29 February 2024. The sentence was recorded as follows for each of the counts identified by reference to the allegations above:

1. Allegation a - No separate penalty
2. Allegation b:
 - Suspended sentence order of imprisonment for 26 weeks, suspended for 12 months by reason of the offence being so serious that only a custodial

sentence could be justified with the ABH having been committed “in drink and whilst in a public place”;

- Rehabilitation activity requirement up to a maximum of 25 days;
- Unpaid work requirement of 200 hours to be completed within 12 months;
- To pay compensation of £500.

3. Allegation c

Count 1

- Suspended sentence order of imprisonment for 4 weeks to run concurrently, suspended for 12 months;
- Rehabilitation activity requirement up to a maximum of 25 days;
- Unpaid work requirement of 200 hours to be completed within 12 months;
- To pay compensation of £50.

Count 2

- Suspended sentence order of imprisonment for 4 weeks to run concurrently, suspended for 12 months;
- Rehabilitation activity requirement up to a maximum of 25 days;
- Unpaid work requirement of 200 hours to be completed within 12 months;
- To pay compensation of £50.

The panel found it proven that Mr Sealy had been convicted of the offences alleged.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Sealy 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the individual's actions were not relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. The offences were committed outside of the school environment, albeit the panel noted that teachers are expected to be role models in the way they behave. To the extent any transferable risk to the school environment was, in fact, present, the panel noted that there was no evidence of Mr Sealy having engaged in violent behaviour in School, nor that he had attended work under the influence of alcohol. Mr Sealy continued to work in the School following his arrest until after his convictions.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public. During the School's investigation, Mr Sealy explained that one police officer had a cut to the knuckle, and the other had a cut on his hand. He also stated that he had bitten a bouncer on his thumb for a period of 20 seconds until Mr Sealy was sprayed with CS gas.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Sealy's behaviour in committing the offence 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 considered that given the level of violence involved, the panel would have a legitimate concern regarding the risk of violence being transferred into the classroom. The panel noted that Mr Sealy was aware of the possibility of adverse publicity of his actions, and that Mr Sealy had chosen not to appeal the convictions out of concern for the attention and publicity it may attract. He also discussed with his probation officer the wearing of an electronic tag, and Mr Sealy stated that he suggested that this would not help his role as a teacher.

The panel noted that Mr Sealy's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

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

This was a case concerning an offence involving violence and serious offences involving alcohol which the Advice states are likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel considered that the offences were serious, particularly since they involved assault of two police officers. In Mr Sealy's role as a teacher, he would be expected to work with the police and have a mutual respect for those who are serving the public.

The panel noted that Mr Sealy referenced his [REDACTED]. Mr Sealy had also previously received two cautions from 2003 and 2007. He explained in his interview with the School that the cautions were for "similar things involving alcohol and getting into an argument". The panel noted that the police report referred to Mr Sealy having said that he had drunk around 10 pints. In circumstances where Mr Sealy was aware that [REDACTED], and having already received two cautions for similar behaviour, the panel regarded Mr Sealy's actions in deciding to attend the event and consume alcohol to that extent to have been reckless, and that he bore responsibility for the consequences of that decision.

The panel also noted that Mr Sealy accepted in the School's investigation that he had bitten the bouncer for around 20 seconds. Whilst scratches could potentially be explained by the circumstances of the arrest, a bite for that duration of time, stopping only because of the application of CS gas was a significant violent act.

The panel took into account Mr Sealy's experience as a teacher with an unblemished career of over 20 years. The panel noted that Mr Sealy provided a number of positive references attesting to his teaching and his character.

The panel also took account of the circumstances at the time, including the difficulties Mr Sealy was having sleeping particularly having [REDACTED] at the time.

[REDACTED]. Similarly, the panel noted that the letter from the GP contained no reference to what impact the consumption of 10 pints of alcohol, voluntarily consumed by Mr Sealy would have had on his actions.

The panel also took account that Mr Sealy has stated that he has since decided to abstain from alcohol and has sought the assistance of the Pioneer service in the church, albeit no evidence has been adduced of the progress Mr Sealy has made in that regard.

Although the panel found that the evidence of Mr Sealy's teaching proficiency and character references was of note, as was the recognition by Mr Sealy of the steps he needs to take going forwards to address the risk of repetition, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Sealy'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.

Directions

At this point, and prior to making a decision on Stage 3, the panel directed that a professional conduct panel hearing be convened at the earliest available date, noting that Mr Sealy has waived the 10 week notice period required under the Procedures.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

At the hearing on 19 February 2026, Mr Sealy gave oral evidence. The panel took this into account, as well as the representations it received.

Given the panel's findings in respect of a 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 protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession/declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of other 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 Sealy were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Sealy 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 Sealy in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator. He is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession, particularly in the subject of mathematics,

and especially given his experience in teaching those who are less able and less confident, as well as teaching in areas of social deprivation.

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 Sealy.

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; and
- 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.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

Mr Sealy's actions were deliberate in that he was aware that [REDACTED], and he nevertheless decided to attend the event and consume alcohol. The panel took account of the duration of time in which Mr Sealy had bitten the bouncer and considered this to have been a deliberate act.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Sealy was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. Although he may have felt physically threatened at the time, it was his own actions and excessive consumption of alcohol that placed him in that position. The panel noted that Mr Sealy's [REDACTED] provided a reference explaining that Mr Sealy was "chronically exhausted" at the time, [REDACTED], with the result that Mr Sealy had had little to no sleep the night before the event, [REDACTED], and which she believed contributed to his significant lack of judgement.

There was no evidence that Mr Sealy had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. Nevertheless, the panel accepted that he had an unblemished record of 20 years in the teaching profession with no previous disciplinary proceedings against him or warnings having been given, The panel also accepted that Mr Sealy had worked

in areas of high deprivation and took pride in having taught pupils with a lower ability to gain confidence and progress in his subject. The panel also noted Mr Sealy's continued commitment to the teaching profession and the contribution he can make going forwards.

The panel noted that in the Academy's referral to the TRA, it recorded that Mr Sealy had declared in his application form that he had previously received two cautions for drunk and disorderly behaviour.

The panel had regard to references adduced by Mr Sealy. One was received from his [REDACTED], who confirmed that Mr Sealy has taken full responsibility for his actions and demonstrated remorse, completing the community service hours without complaint, abstaining from alcohol entirely and "doing everything in his power to make amends". She referred to Mr Sealy posing no safeguarding risk, that he continues to be a "wonderful father" and an upstanding member of the community and that he volunteers to coach rugby every weekend. She explained that it was the difference to children's lives that Mr Sealy made in his role as a teacher that inspired her to retrain as a teacher herself.

The panel also received a reference from a former colleague and parent of a pupil that Mr Sealy has tutored who was aware of Mr Sealy's conviction. She referred to having worked with Mr Sealy for many years, and his dedication to his pupils and their academic achievements. She stated that he had never been seen as a safeguarding risk and had been "dedicated to pupils' achievements in the sporting world, taking them to events, near and far." She referred to the progress her son had made since being tutored by Mr Sealy, and the confidence he has gained.

The panel was provided with several references which were produced for the purpose of Mr Sealy's criminal trial. This included a reference from the vice chairman of a rugby club who referred to Mr Sealy's role as coach and stated he was "one of the most senior and respected members of the club" and "a figurehead to younger members of the senior team providing leadership both on and off the field".

The vice principal of the School in which Mr Sealy previously taught stated she had worked with Mr Sealy since 2003 in two different schools. She described Mr Sealy as a dedicated teacher, going above and beyond for the children that he taught. She stated that Mr Sealy gave up his own time, after school, to run a club for students that, due to poverty, did not have access to online maths resources at home. She stated that she deployed Mr Sealy to classes with the greatest need, as he was very good at "bringing the best out in children that have low self-esteem or special educational needs". She referred to Mr Sealy being, calm and patient and that his "unwavering positivity" made him an "exceptional teacher".

A further reference was provided by a reverend who referred to Mr Sealy as being "sincere", "consistently friendly", "approachable", "calm" and caring for his family. He

stated that he was concerned to make others feel at ease in any situation and that he “gets on well with people”.

The panel considered carefully Mr Sealy’s oral evidence when assessing his level of insight and remorse. The panel noted that he feels embarrassed and ashamed about his conviction, and that he was concerned about the impact of any publicity on the school in which he worked as well as on the profession.

Mr Sealy gave evidence that, on the day he committed the offence, he had been trying to monitor the level of alcohol he consumed, interspersing alcoholic drinks with soft drinks and ensuring he had something to eat. He since recognised that was not effective and a few weeks after his arrest took the decision to abstain from alcohol entirely. He confirmed that he has not consumed alcohol since. He referred to the [REDACTED] as being something outside of his control, but that it is within his control not to consume alcohol at all, given his awareness of the effect it has on him. Mr Sealy explained that he had made a deliberate decision not to attend Alcoholics Anonymous as he did not consider that he had any dependency on alcohol, but instead, after speaking with his mother, chose to make a declaration with Pioneer, a branch of the Catholic church. He explained that this was a declaration he made in accordance with his religious upbringing which he considers morally binds him to honouring that pledge. The panel considered this to be compelling evidence that Mr Sealy has recognised the importance of abstinence and reduces the risk of repetition.

[REDACTED]. There was no evidence that this [REDACTED] was responsible for Mr Sealy’s actions on the day. Since Mr Sealy appeared to have been under stress at the time of the offence and that he had exercised poor judgment, the panel asked Mr Sealy about his coping mechanisms. The panel was satisfied that Mr Sealy has put in place appropriate strategies to minimise the impact of stress, including exercise, visualising stress as a snowball, and taking steps to stop it building including seeking support, in situations where he previously might not. He summarised the key learnings that he has taken from this situation.

Mr Sealy was also asked about his reflections about the police officers and bouncer. His response was credible as he reflected that, at the time, he saw himself as having suffered an injustice. However, reflecting on this now, he sees parallels with occasions that he had broken up fights, and sees the bigger picture, that they were trying to do their jobs in the same way that he sought to do his job as a teacher. He explained they deserved respect to be able to perform their roles.

The panel considered that Mr Sealy had demonstrated a high level of insight and remorse.

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. The level of insight demonstrated by Mr Sealy gave sufficient assurance that the risk of repetition had been mitigated such that the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

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 sanction.

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 convictions of relevant offences.

The panel has recommended that the findings of convictions of relevant offences should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Sealy was “... *not relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting*”, however “...*the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Sealy’s ongoing suitability to teach*”

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that “...*the behaviour involved in committing the offence had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public*”.

Additionally, “*The panel noted that Mr Sealy’s behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed*”.

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 convictions of relevant offences, 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 Sealy, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “*The panel considered that given the level of violence involved, the panel would have a legitimate concern regarding the risk of violence being transferred into the classroom*”. 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, “*The panel noted that he feels embarrassed and ashamed about his conviction, and that he was concerned about the impact of any publicity on the school in which he worked as well as on the profession.*”

The panel has also commented that,

“Mr Sealy gave evidence that, on the day he committed the offence, he had been trying to monitor the level of alcohol he consumed, interspersing alcoholic drinks with soft drinks and ensuring he had something to eat. He since recognised that was not effective and a few weeks after his arrest took the decision to abstain from alcohol entirely. He confirmed that he has not consumed alcohol since. He referred to the [REDACTED] as being something outside of his control, but that it is within his control not to consume alcohol at all, given his awareness of the effect it has on him. Mr Sealy explained that he had made a deliberate decision not to

attend Alcoholics Anonymous as he did not consider that he had any dependency on alcohol, but instead, after speaking with his mother, chose to make a declaration with Pioneer, a branch of the Catholic church. He explained that this was a declaration he made in accordance with his religious upbringing which he considers morally binds him to honouring that pledge. The panel considered this to be compelling evidence that Mr Sealy has recognised the importance of abstinence and reduces the risk of repetition”.

I have therefore given this element some 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 public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Sealy were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding that “The panel considered that the offences were serious, particularly since they involved assault of two police officers. In Mr Sealy’s role as a teacher, he would be expected to work with the police and have a mutual respect for those who are serving the public”.

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 convictions of relevant offences, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the serious misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Sealy himself. The panel heard several character references. The panel record,

“The panel had regard to references adduced by Mr Sealy. One was received from his [REDACTED], who confirmed that Mr Sealy has taken full responsibility for his actions and demonstrated remorse, completing the community service hours without complaint, abstaining from alcohol entirely and “doing everything in his power to make amends”. She referred to Mr Sealy posing no safeguarding risk, that he continues to be a “wonderful father” and an upstanding member of the community and that he volunteers to coach rugby every weekend. She explained that it was the difference to children’s lives that Mr Sealy made in his role as a teacher that inspired her to retrain as a teacher herself.

The panel also received a reference from a former colleague and parent of a pupil that Mr Sealy has tutored who was aware of Mr Sealy's conviction. She referred to having worked with Mr Sealy for many years, and his dedication to his pupils and their academic achievements. She stated that he had never been seen as a safeguarding risk and had been "dedicated to pupils' achievements in the sporting world, taking them to events, near and far." She referred to the progress her son had made since being tutored by Mr Sealy, and the confidence he has gained".

Further, *"The panel was provided with several references which were produced for the purpose of Mr Sealy's criminal trial".* I have fully considered the panel's findings.

However, the panel also notes that *"There was no evidence that Mr Sealy had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. Nevertheless, the panel accepted that he had an unblemished record of 20 years in the teaching profession with no previous disciplinary proceedings against him or warnings having been given..."*

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's findings on mitigation. The panel has said, *"Mr Sealy's actions were deliberate in that he was aware that [REDACTED], and he nevertheless decided to attend the event and consume alcohol. The panel took account of the duration of time in which Mr Sealy had bitten the bouncer and considered this to have been a deliberate act.*

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Sealy was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. Although he may have felt physically threatened at the time, it was his own actions and excessive consumption of alcohol that placed him in that position".

I also note the finding of the panel that *"...[REDACTED]. There was no evidence that this [REDACTED] was responsible for Mr Sealy's actions on the day".*

In this case I have considered the seriousness of the proven conduct. The panel note *"...that Mr Sealy accepted in the School's investigation that he had bitten the bouncer for around 20 seconds. Whilst scratches could potentially be explained by the circumstances of the arrest, a bite for that duration of time, stopping only because of the application of CS gas was a significant violent act".* I have therefore given the finding that this was a 'significant violent act' for which Mr Sealy received a (suspended) custodial sentence, considerable weight in my decision.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Sealy 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 and to protect children. In considering the seriousness of the conduct, a published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession. In my view, the panel has not placed sufficient weight on the seriousness of the proven conduct.

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.

The Advice sets out (at page 20),

“Where a case involved any of the following, 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:

...

- *violence”.*

However, I have also considered the panel’s comments on Mr Sealy’s insight and remorse, as well as the character references provided to the panel in Mr Sealy’s mitigation. I have also placed weight on the panel’s finding that “...*Mr Sealy had demonstrated a high level of insight and remorse”.*

In my view, a two year review period (the statutory minimum) reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession which also adequately reflects the seriousness of the panel’s findings whilst balancing the insight and remorse of Mr Sealy.

This means that Mr Declan Sealy 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 26 February 2028, two 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 Sealy remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

S. Blomfield

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 20 February 2026

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