



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Arfan Munir Rai: 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	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	14
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	18

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Arfan Munir Rai
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	0343157
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	15 July 1978
<b>TRA reference:</b>	24118
<b>Date of determination:</b>	20 February 2026
<b>Former employer:</b>	Kensington Park School, London

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 16 February 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Rai.

The panel members were Mrs Patricia Hunt (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Wendy Baxter (teacher panellist) and Mr Tim Foy (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Nicoletta Czajkowska of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Leah Redden of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Rai was present for most of the hearing. The hearing proceeded in Mr Rai’s absence on day five. Mr Rai was not represented for the duration of the hearing, he was represented only for the cross-examination of Witness A, during which Mr Martin Jones of Hugh James LLP acted on his behalf.

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

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 1 December 2025.

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

1. He failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils in that he:

a. Offered one or more private tuition sessions to one or more pupils outside of the School premises and/or without the School's knowledge and/or parental consent on one or more occasions;

b. Made one or more comments to the effect of:

i. "I am very lucky to have met you" or words to that effect to Pupil A

ii. "I hope you stay in London" or words to that effect to Pupil A;

iii. Asking Pupil A to work at a music show that you attend;

iv. "See you there" or words to that effect to Pupil A in reference to attending a concert

v. "we should go on a ping pong trip but we will have to just 'bump into each other' outside of school and not let the school know about it" or words to that effect to Pupil A

vi. "How many meters from [REDACTED] do you live" or words to that effects to Pupil A

2. He told one or more pupils not to tell the school and/or their parents of him offering private tuition sessions outside school

3. He told one or more pupils to email him under a different name in order to conceal his behaviour on one or more occasions

4. His conduct as may be proven at 1 above demonstrated a failure to follow professional advice and/or instructions, namely those provided to him on or around 14 November 2023 and/or 21 December 2023

5. His conduct as may be proven at 2 and/or 3 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest

Mr Rai denied all of the allegations.

Allegation 1.b.(iv) was amended as referred to below.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Notice of hearing and response – pages 7 to 14

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 16 to 20

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 22 to 430

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 433 to 628

The panel also received the Case Management Hearing Directions from December 2025, comprising 10 pages, and a Preliminary Application Bundle containing 39 pages.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents in advance of the hearing.

Following the panel's findings and before considering sanction, Mr Rai submitted three additional documents in mitigation. The panel members confirmed that they had read the additional documents before considering sanction and making their recommendation.

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

### **Witnesses**

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

Witness A – a pupil from Kensington Park School ([REDACTED]); and

Witness B – [REDACTED], Member of the Advisory Board at Kensington Park School

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Rai was employed as a teacher of Philosophy and Sociology and held the role of an EPQ Coordinator at Kensington Park School ("the School") from 1 February 2023.

Mr Rai was suspended from the School on 7 March 2024 pending an internal investigation into the allegations.

Following a disciplinary hearing, Mr Rai's employment at the School was terminated on 17 June 2024. The matter was subsequently referred to the TRA on 17 July 2024.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

### **1. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils in that you:**

- a. Offered one or more private tuition sessions to one or more pupils outside of the School premises and/or without the School's knowledge and/or parental consent on one or more occasions;**

This allegation was denied by Mr Rai.

The panel considered the evidence presented by the TRA, namely the evidence of Witness A, including their oral evidence, their witness statement and the interview notes taken as part of the School's internal investigation. The panel also considered the interview notes of Students A, C, D and E obtained during the School's internal investigation. The panel did not place significant weight on these accounts because they could not be tested as live evidence and because the accounts of Students C and D were taken over five weeks after the accounts of Witness A and Student A, with Student E's account taken approximately ten weeks later. The interviews with Witness A and Student A were conducted one day apart.

The panel also considered the suggestion made by Mr Rai that Student A may have had a motive to make false allegations because Mr Rai had previously reported behavioural issues concerning that pupil. The panel noted the interview notes of two teachers with whom Mr Rai had discussed this pupil's progress and behaviour, and an email from November 2023 in which Mr Rai reported behavioural concerns about Student A. The panel took this into account, but Student A's account nevertheless corroborated key aspects of Witness A's evidence.

Mr Rai raised concerns with the School's investigative process, referring to an earlier investigation in 2023 which, following a grievance, the School accepted was flawed and the investigation was re-conducted. That investigation ultimately resulted in a written warning which was upheld on appeal, although the duration of the warning was reduced. Mr Rai continued to dispute the fairness and reliability of that process. He argued that

because the earlier investigation was flawed, the School's wider investigative systems could not be relied upon. The panel placed no weight on the School's internal findings and considered the hearsay evidence of the students with caution and limited weight, placing greater weight on the evidence of Witness A. The panel was also careful not to take into account matters that were not part of the allegations.

The panel noted Witness A's evidence that their earliest account, given during the School's investigation, was the most accurate because their recollection was clearest at that time. They explained that [REDACTED] undertaken since then had affected some aspects of their memory. The panel took this into account and carefully considered Witness A's initial account. Overall, the panel found Witness A's evidence to be consistent across the School's investigation, their TRA witness statement and their oral testimony.

During cross-examination, Witness A was asked whether they had attempted to contact Mr Rai on SoundCloud after his suspension. Witness A initially denied having a SoundCloud account, then accepted that they had an old account they had not used for several years and suggested that a friend may have accessed it. There was no evidence before the panel that any contact was made. Mr Rai provided only a screenshot of Witness A's SoundCloud profile and it showed that he had blocked it. Overall, the panel considered Witness A to be a credible and reliable witness.

The panel considered Mr Rai's account, which was consistent throughout the School's investigation, the disciplinary process and the TRA process. He maintained that he did not offer private tuition to pupils at the School and said that pupils must have been referring to the School's Easter Revision programme, which he had mentioned to pupils before it was formally announced. He said that he told pupils to hold off confirming dates with the School until he had finalised his schedule. Mr Rai relied on email correspondence with the programme co-ordinator, [REDACTED], in support of this explanation. Those emails showed Mr Rai registering his availability and, during the School's internal investigation, [REDACTED] accepted that Mr Rai may have been organising his schedule by emailing him in advance. The correspondence also confirmed that Mr Rai had participated in the programme in the previous academic year. Mr Rai added that the pupils referred to in these allegations would not have been aware of the programme from the previous years.

The panel accepted that Mr Rai was intending to participate in the Easter Revision programme. However, the panel found Witness A's evidence compelling that the tuition referred to was not the Easter Revision programme. Both Witness A and Student A said that Mr Rai referred to meeting in a café outside school. The panel considered this strongly indicative that the tuition was not part of the School's official programme.

Mr Rai suggested that pupils may have misunderstood him because they [REDACTED]. However, the panel found Witness A's oral evidence to be clear and consistent, and Student C was also clear that the tuition discussed was not the Easter Revision programme.

Mr Rai accepted that he provided external tuition in Philosophy to individuals who were not pupils at the School and that he advertised this service on a website. Students A, C and D stated that he had shown them the website, although they described him as a Sociology tutor. Mr Rai denied showing the website to any pupils and said the pupils must have been mistaken. In oral evidence, Witness A said that, although they had not viewed the website, they were aware of it and that Mr Rai had mentioned in class that he did external tutoring.

Mr Rai also said that pupils had attempted to contact him on social media in the past and that he had reported one such incident in December 2023. This was supported by the TRA's evidence, and Witness A accepted that Mr Rai's social media presence was well known amongst students.

The panel further found that concealment was a significant feature of the tuition being discussed. The pupils' evidence, including that of Witness A and Students A and C, was that Mr Rai asked them to use alternative names when contacting him about tuition. Witness A also said in their oral evidence that he asked them to use a fake email address. Witness A, Students A and C said that Mr Rai told them not to tell the School about the tuition. The panel considered this a strong indication that the tuition was not part of the Easter Revision programme and that it was intended to be hidden from the School.

The panel considered that there would be no reason to hide the Easter Revision programme from the School. The panel also noted that, during the School's internal investigation, Mr Rai accepted that he knew he was not permitted to tutor pupils of the School externally.

The panel noted Student E's evidence that Mr Rai had not offered them private tuition, only help with work in school. This was taken into account. However, on the balance of probabilities, and considering the tested evidence of Witness A alongside the supporting evidence of Students A, C and D, the panel found that it was more likely than not that Mr Rai had offered private tuition outside school without the School's knowledge. The panel found that this conduct breached the appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils.

The panel also noted the evidence of Witness B regarding the School's policy on external tuition, which required prior approval of the headteacher. The Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy explicitly states that staff must "*have approved the arrangements for one-to-one tuition or coaching. Last minute or informal arrangements should be avoided wherever possible.*" Mr Rai did not assert that he had any such approval and maintained that the tuition offered was in relation to the Easter Revision programme.

Mr Rai maintained that he intended to seek parental consent. The panel accepted the evidence of Witness A and Students A and C that he had referred to parental consent, and therefore the panel did not find that the tuition was intended to be provided without parental consent.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

## **2. You told one or more pupils not to tell the school and/or their parents of you offering private tuition sessions outside school**

Mr Rai denied this allegation.

The panel considered the same evidence and factors as set out in relation to allegation 1(a).

The panel found that the evidence showed that pupils were asked to use alternative names when engaging with the private tuition arrangements, and that this was done to avoid the School finding out. The panel relied on the evidence of Witness A, who stated in their initial account, TRA witness statement and oral evidence that they were told not to tell the School or "*he would be fired*". Student A, in their account to the School, stated that Mr Rai told them not to tell anyone at the School. Student C stated that Mr Rai told them to use a different name because he was not sure the School would allow him to offer such tuition.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness A and Students A and C to be mutually supportive that pupils were told not to tell the School.

However, the panel did not find that Mr Rai told pupils not to tell their parents. The evidence was to the contrary, namely that Mr Rai told pupils to inform their parents and sought parental consent.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven only insofar as Mr Rai told pupils not to tell the School.

## **3. You told one or more pupils to email you under a different name in order to conceal your behaviour on one or more occasions**

Mr Rai denied this allegation.

The panel considered the same factors as for allegations 1(a) and 2. In particular, the panel considered the evidence of Witness A and Students A and C, all of whom stated that Mr Rai asked them to use alternative names when contacting him regarding the tuition. In addition, Witness A in their oral evidence stated that Mr Rai asked them to use a fake email address.

The panel found that this was done in order to conceal Mr Rai's behaviour in offering external tutoring to pupils of the School.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

**4. Your conduct as may be proven at 1 above demonstrated a failure to follow professional advice and/or instructions, namely those provided to you on or around 14 November 2023 and/or 21 December 2023**

Mr Rai denied this allegation.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness B, who presided over the disciplinary process and authored the disciplinary outcome letter dated 14 November 2023, in which Mr Rai was issued with a formal written warning. He confirmed the recommendations he made to Mr Rai at that time and explained the basis on which they were given.

Mr Rai maintained that he did not agree with the 2023 investigation or the School's findings, stating that the process was flawed and that therefore the advice and instructions issued to him were not correct. The panel did not revisit matters arising from the 2023 investigation, as these did not form part of the allegations before it.

The panel had before it both the disciplinary outcome letter of 14 November 2023 and the appeal outcome issued on 21 December 2023. The panel accepted that Mr Rai's grievance had been upheld and that the appeal outcome acknowledged certain failings in the School's first investigation and reduced the length of the formal written warning received. However, the appeal letter expressly confirmed that the recommendations made by Witness B in his 14 November 2023 letter remained in place.

The panel found that regardless of whether the findings of the 2023 investigation were correct, the advice and instructions given to Mr Rai were clear. The relevant recommendations in the 14 November 2023 letter by Witness B were:

*“Going forward you should ensure that:*

- 1. You have a full knowledge of the guidelines and stipulations set out in the School's Staff Code of Conduct and the School's Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy.*
- 2. All of your actions are conducted in a completely transparent and open manner, following guidance set out in the School's Staff Code of Conduct and the School's Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy, especially when providing support to students and when working on a one-to-one basis with students.”*

Mr Rai relied on email chains with pupils not involved in these allegations, which he said demonstrated that from June 2023 onwards he copied the Designated Safeguarding Lead (“DSL”) and/or senior leadership into email correspondence and held meetings with an open door. The panel noted this evidence.

However, in light of its findings at allegation 1(a), namely that Mr Rai offered external tutoring to pupils, asked pupils not to tell the School, and asked them to conceal their identities, the panel found that Mr Rai did not conduct himself in a transparent and open

manner and therefore did not follow the professional advice and instructions he had been given on 14 November 2023 and 21 December 2023.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

### **5. Your conduct as may be proven at 2 and/or 3 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest**

The panel considered the findings it had made in respect of allegations 2 and 3 and found that the ethical standards required of teachers had not been upheld. By asking pupils to conceal their identities through the use of fake names and/or fake email addresses, and by instructing them not to tell the School, Mr Rai acted in a way that lacked the integrity expected of a teaching professional. This conduct also breached School policy, of which Mr Rai would have been aware.

The panel then considered whether the conduct found proven at allegations 2 and 3 was dishonest. The panel applied the test for dishonesty as set out in *Ivey v Genting Casinos*, which requires the decision-maker to consider:

- a) the teacher's knowledge or belief as to the facts, and
- b) whether the conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

In relation to both allegations, the panel found that Mr Rai's conduct was dishonest and that he knew it was dishonest. Telling pupils not to tell the School, combined with asking them to use false identities, demonstrated that Mr Rai must have known that what he was doing was wrong.

The panel also determined that ordinary decent people would consider Mr Rai's actions to be dishonest.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven, namely that the conduct found proven at allegations 2 and 3 was dishonest and lacked integrity.

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

### **1. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils in that you:**

#### **b. Made one or more comments to the effect of:**

- i. "I am very lucky to have met you" or words to that effect to Pupil A**
- ii. "I hope you stay in London" or words to that effect to Pupil A;**
- iii. Asking Pupil A to work at a music show that you attend;**

**iv. “See you there” or words to that effect to Pupil A in reference to attending a concert**

**v. “we should go on a ping pong trip but we will have to just ‘bump into each other’ outside of school and not let the school know about it” or words to that effect to Pupil A**

**vi. “How many meters from [REDACTED] do you live” or words to that effects to Pupil A**

Mr Rai denied this allegation.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness A, including their initial account to the School, their written statement to the TRA and their oral evidence. As with allegation 1(a), the panel examined Witness A’s initial account carefully and noted that the comments referred to at sub-paragraphs (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi) were contained within that account.

The panel found on the balance of probabilities that it was more likely than not that Mr Rai made the comments set out at (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi). However, the panel did not find that those comments amounted to a failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries. The panel considered that they could have been made within the ordinary context of a teacher and pupil relationship and, on the evidence, some were more likely than not made to the class generally rather than directed specifically at Witness A.

In relation to the comment at sub-paragraph (v) concerning the proposed ping pong trip, the panel noted that Witness A’s account was contradicted by the interview with Pupil E conducted as part of the School’s investigation. Pupil E stated that it was the class who suggested a ping pong trip and that Mr Rai said he could not attend because he “*would be sacked if we went out without the School’s permission.*” The panel therefore found that on the balance of probabilities, Mr Rai did not say the comment as specified at sub-paragraph (v).

The panel therefore found allegation 1(b) not proven in its entirety.

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

Having found allegations 1a, 2, 3, 4 and 5 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Rai was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Rai, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE") and that Mr Rai was in breach of the provision that teachers should safeguard children's wellbeing and maintain public trust in the teaching profession as part of their professional duties.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Rai, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

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

The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant. The panel found that Mr Rai's conduct was not only dishonest but that he encouraged pupils to act dishonestly by asking them to use alternative names and/or email addresses when contacting him for the purpose of external tuition.

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

In relation to whether Mr Rai'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 Rai'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 Rai was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel considered that Mr Rai's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Rai's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

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

In light of the panel's findings, there was a strong public interest consideration relating to the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the findings that Mr Rai failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils and encouraged pupils to conceal his behaviour and act dishonestly.

The panel also considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Rai were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was further of the view that there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Rai 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 Rai in the profession.

Whilst there is evidence that Mr Rai has ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Rai in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Rai.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:

- any activity that involves knowingly substantiating another person's statements where they are known to be false;
- failure to challenge inappropriate actions, defending inappropriate actions or concealing inappropriate actions;
- encouraging others to break rules.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Rai's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Rai was acting under extreme duress, such as a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel noted that Mr Rai had denied the allegations from the outset and continued to do so. In light of the panel's findings, this demonstrated a lack of remorse, insufficient insight into his conduct and a failure to take accountability for his actions.

In his written submissions, Mr Rai stated that he posed no ongoing safeguarding or continuing risk to pupils. He accepted that the findings were serious and should be scrutinised, and characterised the matter as one of professional boundary clarity and perception. The panel noted that Mr Rai demonstrated some developing insight, acknowledging that he should have used clearer and more unambiguous language and taking responsibility for not ensuring complete clarity in his communications. Mr Rai continued to deny instructing pupils to conceal their names or offering tuition in a café.

Mr Rai also submitted that, at the time, he was managing a complex academic environment and experiencing heightened strain. He recognised that this was not an excuse and accepted that he should have exercised greater caution and would learn from the experience.

The panel considered the impact of sanction on Mr Rai. His submissions described the personal effect of the proceedings and the fact that he had been out of classroom teaching since the allegations arose, which had affected him both professionally and personally. The panel further acknowledged his 18-year teaching career, his dedication to the profession and the absence of any previous TRA findings against him.

In mitigation, the panel considered two references. Person 1 – [REDACTED], parent of a student Mr Rai tutored, provided a reference dated June 2025. He described Mr Rai as "*an extremely pro active and professional educator*" who delivered "*a focused, tailored and thorough tutoring programme*". The reference stated that Mr Rai's support improved the student's confidence and exam technique and that his approach was "*result driven and personalised*". It also noted that Mr Rai was "*a good and transparent communicator*" and

that his *“personal engagement and interest in my son’s success made it feel like more than just another tutoring assignment”*.

Person 2 – [REDACTED], parent of a student tutored by Mr Rai, provided a reference dated May 2024. He explained that Mr Rai quickly built trust and rapport with the student, who had previously struggled with confidence. The student described Mr Rai as *“personable and has a fine mind”*, with *“an ability to explain and discuss with great clarity”*, and someone who *“gives excellent, bespoke feedback”*. The reference concluded that, as a result of Mr Rai’s support, the student entered her A-Level Philosophy exam with a level of confidence and knowledge that *“would have been unimaginable two months earlier”*.

Mr Rai did not provide any testimonial statements from individuals who were aware of the allegations and could speak to his character.

The panel further considered a lesson observation feedback form from the School dated 29 February 2024. This was very positive and demonstrated Mr Rai’s ability as a classroom teacher, including his enthusiasm for the subject and his engagement with pupils. Comments included: *“Very good classroom presence and classroom control, this is also reinforced through his enthusiasm which keeps students on track and engaged with the subject”*.

Therefore, based on the evidence before it, the panel found that Mr Rai had not demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal or professional conduct, nor had he contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not consider the incidents to be out of character. However, it accepted that Mr Rai was an experienced teacher.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Rai of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Rai. The findings of dishonesty and lack of integrity were a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that

a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 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 categories of cases in which the public interest is likely to carry greater weight and may justify a longer review period. This includes cases involving "fraud or serious dishonesty".

The panel recognised that the finding of serious dishonesty was relevant. However, it did not consider that this finding justified a longer review period in this case. The panel considered the dishonesty to fall at the lower end of the spectrum of "serious dishonesty" in the context of its findings. It accepted that, although the conduct represented a serious departure from the standards expected, it did not warrant extending the review period.

Although Mr Rai continues to deny the allegations, he acknowledged in his submissions that he had learned lessons and demonstrated some developing insight into his actions. The panel considered that a two-year review period would provide sufficient time for him to further reflect, remediate and demonstrate fuller insight. It noted that his written submissions suggested the risk of repetition was already reduced and that a review period would minimise that risk further. The panel also noted that Mr Rai expressed his commitment and enthusiasm to teaching and that he was a good teacher.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of two years.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

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

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

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found allegation 1(b) not proven. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Arfan Munir Rai should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of dishonesty on the part of a teacher, and also *"The panel found that Mr Rai's conduct was not only dishonest but that he encouraged pupils to act dishonestly by asking them to use alternative names and/or email addresses when contacting him for the purpose of external tuition"*.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Rai, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, *"there was a strong public interest consideration relating to the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the findings that Mr Rai failed to*

*maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils and encouraged pupils to conceal his behaviour and act dishonestly.*” 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, *“He accepted that the findings were serious and should be scrutinised, and characterised the matter as one of professional boundary clarity and perception”*.

The panel has also commented that *“The panel noted that Mr Rai demonstrated some developing insight, acknowledging that he should have used clearer and more unambiguous language and taking responsibility for not ensuring complete clarity in his communications”*. In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *“...that Mr Rai’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher.”* I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Rai himself. The panel comment *“His submissions described the personal effect of the proceedings and the fact that he had been out of classroom teaching since the allegations arose, which had affected him both professionally and personally. The panel further acknowledged his 18-year teaching career, his dedication to the profession and the absence of any previous TRA findings against him”*.

I have also considered the accounts of two references provided to the panel, which are provided by parents of former pupils of Mr Rai.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Rai 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. However, I am also mindful of the panels comment *“Therefore, based on the evidence before it, the panel found that Mr Rai had not demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal or professional conduct, nor had he contributed significantly to the education sector”*.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, *“In light of the panel’s findings, this demonstrated a lack of remorse, insufficient insight into his conduct and a failure to take accountability for his actions”*.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Rai encouraged pupils to act dishonestly by asking them to use alternative names and/or email addresses.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Rai has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or 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 two year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments *“The panel recognised that the finding of serious dishonesty was relevant. However, it did not consider that this finding justified a longer review period in this case. The panel considered the dishonesty to fall at the lower end of the spectrum of “serious dishonesty” in the context of its findings. It accepted that, although the conduct represented a serious departure from the standards expected, it did not warrant extending the review period”*.

The panel has also said that a two year review period would *“...provide sufficient time for him to further reflect, remediate and demonstrate fuller insight”*.

In considering the circumstances of this case, I agree with the panel’s recommendation and I consider therefore that a two year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Arfan Munir Rai 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 2 March 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 Rai remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Rai 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 'S. Blomfield', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 2 March 2026**

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