



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Mohamed Dahir Mohamed: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

February 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

Teacher:	Mr Mohamed Dahir Mohamed
Teacher ref number:	1736994
Teacher date of birth:	18 May 1991
TRA reference:	24860
Date of determination:	24 February 2026
Former employer:	The Kingston Academy, Kingston upon Thames

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 23 to 24 February 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Mohamed.

The panel members were Mrs Jane Gotschel (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Steven Boocock (lay panellist) and Ms Katie Dent (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Davina Kahlon of Eversheds Sutherland International LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Tom Lambert of QEB Hollis Whiteman Chambers, instructed by Capsticks Solicitors LLP.

Mr Mohamed was present and was not represented.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 8 December 2025.

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

1. On or around 24 January 2025, he was convicted of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003, section 15A(1).

Mr Mohamed admitted the allegation and that he had been convicted of the relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 57

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 58 to 70

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 71 to 111

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

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [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.

Mr Mohamed was employed at the School as a science teacher and subject lead for chemistry from 1 September 2021 to 8 May 2024.

Mr Mohamed was arrested at the School on 8 November 2023 by the Metropolitan Police as part of an investigation into an allegation that he had made inappropriate contact with a child under the age of 16. The police confirmed that this was not a pupil at the School.

On the 21 October 2024, Mr Mohamed pleaded guilty to sexual communication with a child.

Mr Mohamed was referred to the TRA by the School on 9 December 2024.

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:

You have been convicted of a relevant offence at any time in that:

1. On or around 21 October 2024, you were convicted of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003, section 15A(1).

In Mr Mohamed's response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 8 December 2025, he admitted the allegation. He also admitted the allegation at the start of the hearing.

The panel was provided with a certificate of conviction which confirmed that Mr Mohamed was convicted on 21 October 2024 at Kingston upon Thames Crown Court of the offence set out above and sentenced on 24 January 2025 to imprisonment for 6 months suspended for 18 months. He was required to engage in rehabilitation activity for 12 months, register with the police for 7 years and a sexual harm prevention order was also made for 7 years. He was ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £154. The panel noted that Mr Mohamed had pleaded guilty to the offence.

The panel noted that a PNC record dated 20 December 2024 was included in the bundle. The record indicated no convictions and referred to an impending prosecution for "*attempt/engage in sexual communication with a child*". The panel observed that the PNC record was dated after the conviction on 21 October 2024 and was therefore inconsistent with the certificate of conviction, suggesting it may not have been updated. The panel nevertheless accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction. The panel noted that Mr Mohamed's admission was consistent with him having been convicted of the offence as alleged.

The panel received the police summary report. This stated that between 12 April 2023 and 26 May 2023 Mr Mohamed used social media sites Omegle and Snapchat and engaged with a 13-year-old female child's profile. The report summarised that on 12 April 2023, Mr Mohamed paired with a female profile and stated he was aged 19 and from North London and asked the female child for their Snapchat username so he could add her. Mr Mohamed then proceeded to send messages to the female child requesting details of her sexual experiences and asked the child if she wanted to meet up to have sex, clarifying that they could kiss and she could perform sexual acts on him. Mr Mohamed also engaged in conversations about the female child wearing a skirt and asked her for images of herself. This continued over a number of weeks. The panel also noted that the female child made reference to meeting up with Mr Mohamed in the school holidays.

The panel also reviewed the sentencing remarks which stated: *"You engaged in sexual communications over the Internet with what you believed to be a 13-year-old-girl...The police had created a decoy profile.. and an avatar of a young female profile age 13."* The sentencing remarks further stated: *"When the police investigated the matter, the Snapchat account was associated with.... Gmail address linked to your birth date and that Snapchat account was tracked to an address in [REDACTED]. The telephone number used was linked to you at that address, which was your family home."*

The panel noted the sentencing remarks referred to Mr Mohamed praising the young child for their sexual experience and asking to meet for sex. Mr Mohamed also asked for details of the child's underwear and suggested meeting in a park where he would kiss and digitally penetrate the female child.

The panel found this allegation proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2 of the Teachers' Standards, Mr Mohamed was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including ...the rule of law...

- 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 Mr Mohamed's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting since he had engaged in sexual communication with a young child outside the school environment, who he understood to be 13 years old.

The panel also noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of a child with whom he thought he was engaging in sexual communication, had they not, in fact, been a decoy.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Mohamed'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 noted that Mr Mohamed's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed.

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

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual communication with a child which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel considered the offences committed by Mr Mohamed to be extremely serious.

The panel did note the evidence provided of Mr Mohamed's teaching proficiency and that there had been no previous safeguarding concerns during his employment as a teacher. This was also confirmed by the headteacher at the School. However, the panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Mohamed's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of engaging in sexual communication with a child. The panel noted that, although the child was a police decoy, Mr Mohamed believed the online profile to be that of a real child. The panel considered that the use of a decoy did not lessen the weight placed on the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the considerable potential of risk of serious harm to a child.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Mohamed 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 Mohamed 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 Mohamed in the profession. The only evidence before the panel of Mr Mohamed's teaching ability was that he had been a subject lead for chemistry at the School. Whilst this indicated some capability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Mohamed 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 Mohamed.

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;

- 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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature...;
- 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).

The panel also considered paragraph 41 of the Advice, which states that appropriate weight and seriousness should be placed on online behaviours, including those that facilitate inappropriate relationships. The panel noted that Mr Mohamed created a false profile, posing as a 19 year old male and used the social media platforms Omegle and Snapchat to engage with a child profile. The interaction escalated over a period of several months from an initial conversation to sexual communications and advances, requests for sexual images, and attempts to arrange a meeting during the school holidays in a park or Airbnb for sexual activity. This demonstrated a clear attempt by Mr Mohamed to move the online interaction into a contact relationship, which was only prevented by police intervention because the profile was a decoy.

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

There was evidence that Mr Mohamed's actions were deliberate.

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

The headteacher at the School confirmed that no safeguarding or disciplinary concerns had previously been raised in relation to Mr Mohamed's employment at the School. However, the panel noted that there was no evidence that he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards of personal or professional conduct or had made a significant contribution to the education sector.

The panel heard evidence from Mr Mohamed that he acknowledged the conviction, had complied with all legal, professional and safeguarding restrictions placed upon him, and remained committed to rehabilitation and to living responsibly moving forward. While the panel noted some evidence of good character, Mr Mohamed did not produce any testimonial statements attesting to his character or ability as a teacher.

The panel noted that, as part of his sentence, Mr Mohamed was required to undertake 12 months of rehabilitation activity. Mr Mohamed confirmed during his submissions that he had engaged with this activity; however, the panel received no further or documentary evidence regarding completion of the rehabilitation activity or its efficacy.

The panel noted that Mr Mohamed's insight and remorse appeared limited to accepting the conviction and acknowledging the seriousness of the offence. It also noted from the police summary, when initially arrested, Mr Mohamed denied the conduct. The panel also reviewed the sentencing remarks, which stated: "*You have expressed remorse. You have written a letter to the court in which you have addressed the consequences to yourself. In my view, you still have to address the harm and potential harm that could be done to others by your behaviour.*" There was no other evidence of any expression of remorse or insight before the panel.

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 Mohamed 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 Mohamed, given the seriousness of the offence in this case. 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.

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

The panel noted that, although the sexual misconduct involved a decoy child set up by the Metropolitan Police, Mr Mohamed believed he was communicating with a real child at the time and his conduct had considerable potential to result in serious harm to a child.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

There was insufficient evidence before the panel of insight or remorse that would indicate Mr Mohamed had been sufficiently rehabilitated such that he would not pose a risk of repeating the conduct.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period.

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 the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Mohamed Dahir Mohamed should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including ...the rule of law...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for the relevant offence of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child.

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 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 Mohamed, 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:

“There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of engaging in sexual communication with a child. The panel noted that, although the child was a police decoy, Mr Mohamed believed the online profile to be that of a real child. The panel considered that the use of a decoy did not lessen the weight placed on the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the considerable potential of risk of serious harm to a child.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

“The panel noted that Mr Mohamed’s insight and remorse appeared limited to accepting the conviction and acknowledging the seriousness of the offence. It also noted from the police summary, when initially arrested, Mr Mohamed denied the conduct. The panel also reviewed the sentencing remarks, which stated: *“You have expressed remorse. You have written a letter to the court in which you have addressed the consequences to yourself. In my view, you still have to address the harm and potential harm that could be done to others by your behaviour.”* There was no other evidence of any expression of remorse or insight before the panel.”

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

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

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for the relevant offence of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child 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 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 Mohamed himself. The panel has commented:

“The headteacher at the School confirmed that no safeguarding or disciplinary concerns had previously been raised in relation to Mr Mohamed’s employment at the School. However, the panel noted that there was no evidence that he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards of personal or professional conduct or had made a significant contribution to the education sector.

The panel heard evidence from Mr Mohamed that he acknowledged the conviction, had complied with all legal, professional and safeguarding restrictions placed upon him, and remained committed to rehabilitation and to living responsibly moving forward. While the panel noted some evidence of good character, Mr Mohamed did not produce any testimonial statements attesting to his character or ability as a teacher.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Mohamed 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 seriousness of the offence for which Mr Mohamed was convicted and received a suspended custodial sentence. The panel has said:

“The panel noted that Mr Mohamed’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting since he had engaged in sexual communication with a young child outside the school environment, who he understood to be 13 years old.

The panel also noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of a child with whom he thought he was engaging in sexual communication, had they not, in fact, been a decoy.”

I have also taken into account the finding of the panel that Mr Mohamed’s behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the profession.

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s comment:

“There was insufficient evidence before the panel of insight or remorse that would indicate Mr Mohamed had been sufficiently rehabilitated such that he would not pose a risk of repeating the conduct.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Mohamed 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, 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments:

“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.

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

The panel noted that, although the sexual misconduct involved a decoy child set up by the Metropolitan Police, Mr Mohamed believed he was communicating with

a real child at the time and his conduct had considerable potential to result in serious harm to a child.”

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offences for which Mr Mohamed was convicted, the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Mohamed Dahir Mohamed is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Mohamed shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Mohamed 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: 25 February 2026

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