



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Amani Choudhury: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

March 2026

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Allegations | 4 |
| Summary of evidence | 5 |
| Documents | 5 |
| Witnesses | 5 |
| Decision and reasons | 6 |
| Findings of fact | 6 |
| Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State | 25 |
| Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State | 31 |

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

Teacher: Miss Amani Choudhury

TRA reference: 23932

Date of determination: 13 March 2026

Former employer: Alec Reed Academy, Bengarth Road, Middlesex

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 10 to 13 March 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Miss Amani Choudhury.

The panel members were Mr Carl Lygo (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Aruna Sharma MBE (teacher panellist) and Mr Philip Jolowicz (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Rebecca Hughes of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Alex Mullen, Counsel instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Miss Choudhury was present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public, save those parts which were heard in private, and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 11 December 2025.

It was alleged that Miss Choudhury was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a religious studies teacher at The Alec Reed Academy ('the School'):

1. Between around November 2023 and February 2024, she:
 - a) shared her personal mobile number with at least one pupil;
 - b) shared her social media contact details with at least one pupil;
 - c) followed at least one pupil on Instagram; and
 - d) exchanged messages over text and/or WhatsApp and/or social media with at least one pupil.
2. In relation to her conduct at allegation 1(d) she told at least one pupil to delete the messages(s).
3. On or around 8 February 2024:
 - a) she did not stop and/or intervene when Colleague A drove Pupil A and/or Pupil T to their place of work and/or home whilst she was a passenger in the car; and
 - b) whilst in the car, as referred to above, she put and/or attempted to put her head on and/or near Pupil A's shoulders.
4. In relation to the incident at allegation 3, she:
 - a) did not report and/or inform a member of the School safeguarding team of this;
 - b) contacted Pupil A and/or Pupil T in an attempt to interfere with their version of events.
5. Her conduct at allegation 2 and/or 4(a) and/or 4(b) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Miss Choudhury orally admitted the facts of allegations 1(a), 1(d), 2, 3(a), 4(a) and 5 at the hearing.

Miss Choudhury also admitted, in respect of those admitted facts, that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, list of key people and anonymised pupil list – pages 5 to 7

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 8 to 14

Section 3: Witness statements – pages 15 to 34

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 35 to 346

Section 5: Teacher's representations – pages 347 to 381

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- A chain of emails between Witness A and others at the School in February 2024 – 382 to 387

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A

Pupil N

Miss Choudhury was present and therefore gave oral evidence.

Decision and reasons

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

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

On 1 September 2023, Miss Choudhury commenced employment as a religious studies teacher at the School. Miss Choudhury was an Early Career Teacher (“ECT”) in her second year.

It was alleged that Miss Choudhury gave her personal mobile number to Pupil N.

On 2 February 2024, Miss Choudhury allegedly travelled in a car with Colleague A and two sixth-form pupils, Pupil A and Pupil T, who were driven off-site without authorisation. She allegedly did not report this to the School.

In early February 2024, further allegations were made that Miss Choudhury had contacted pupils via multiple social media platforms, including Instagram and TikTok.

On 9 February 2024, the School suspended Miss Choudhury.

On 28 March 2024, an investigation meeting took place.

On 23 May 2024, the School held a disciplinary hearing into the allegations.

On 29 May 2024, the School informed Miss Choudhury that her employment was terminated.

On 13 June 2024, the School formally referred the matter to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

In respect of all the allegations, the panel carefully considered the oral and written witness evidence and exhibits.

The panel scrutinised the entire bundle, including the TRA’s documents concerning the investigations and the meetings at the School.

The panel noted that the evidence within many of these documents was hearsay from pupils. The panel had admitted the hearsay evidence after careful consideration in each case but noted that the evidence should be considered carefully and cautiously, including in relation to the appropriate amount of weight to be placed on it.

The panel noted that Miss Choudhury had admitted to large parts of the allegations facing her, but as some elements of those allegations were denied or not fully admitted, it proceeded on the basis that this was a fully disputed hearing and determined that it would carefully consider all the evidence before it.

The panel found Miss Choudhury to be a credible witness. The panel noted she openly acknowledged shortcomings in her evidence, which the panel considered enhanced her overall credibility. The panel noted that her presentation was natural and unforced and did not appear rehearsed or over-crafted.

The panel also considered the definition of “*social media*” for the purposes of these proceedings. In doing so, the Panel noted the Cambridge English Dictionary definition of social media as:

- “*Websites and computer programs that allow people to communicate and share information, opinions, pictures, videos, etc. on the internet, especially social networking websites.*”

The panel considered whether any social media messages had been exchanged and, in that context, whether WhatsApp constituted social media. The panel noted that, within the TRA’s own categorisation of communications set out in the allegations, WhatsApp messages were treated separately from social media.

The panel concluded that, for the purposes of these proceedings, WhatsApp should not be treated as social media. The panel noted that WhatsApp messages are exchanged privately and are not public facing. In addition, the panel considered it relevant that WhatsApp communications are identifiable by reference to a phone number rather than an accessible profile. Accordingly, and in the context of the issues before it, the panel treated WhatsApp messages as distinct from social media.

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

1. Between around November 2023 and February 2024, you:

- a) shared your personal mobile number with at least one pupil;**
- d) exchanged messages over text and/or WhatsApp and/or social media with at least one pupil.**

The panel noted that Miss Choudhary was employed by the School from 1 September 2023 and was suspended in February 2024.

The panel noted that, in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 14 January 2026, and in her oral evidence, Miss Choudhury admitted these allegations.

Notwithstanding this, the panel proceeded to consider the evidence in front of it before making a finding.

The panel noted screenshots of messages contained in the bundle before it between Miss Choudhury and Pupil N, in which Miss Choudhury wrote *“I know you guys have issues with him but idk how the comments came to light”, “He’s really annoyed and upset cuz he feels like people are spreading rumours about him when it wasn’t true” and “Could you tell me who told you what he said.”*

The panel noted that both Pupil N and Miss Choudhury accepted that the screenshots of messages contained in the bundle were messaged between themselves.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Pupil N dated 15 March 2025, who stated that Miss Choudhury asked for her phone number in October 2023 because she had been absent and that she gave it to her. She stated that Miss Choudhury messaged her about schoolwork such as links to homework and asking if she [REDACTED] and that she did not have screenshots of these messages because Miss Choudhury made her delete them. She stated that on 7 February 2024, while she was on her way home, Miss Choudhury messaged her on WhatsApp accusing her of gossiping and spreading rumours about her and Pupil A. She stated that later that afternoon, Miss Choudhury sent a further message asking her to delete her phone number and the record of their conversations, stating *“head is onto me”*, and that she deleted the messages because she was told to and then blocked Miss Choudhury.

The panel considered the allegation was *“between around November 2023 and February 2024”* and that Pupil N by her own admission had obtained Miss Choudhury’s number in October 2023. The panel considered whether October 2023 was around November 2023 and concluded it was.

The panel considered the witness statement of Child H dated 8 February 2024, who stated that she had already heard of all the rumours regarding Miss Choudhury, which were *“she has students numbers and is very casual with them instead of professional.”* She said she was *“pretty sure Child N along with Child D have [had] Miss on their phones,”* and that Child N also told her that she (Child N) told Miss Choudhury, *“it’s best not to keep some of the boys on her phone”*. She described Miss Choudhury messaging Child N on WhatsApp during lunch, saying *“something like Child A is upset that he isn’t allowed to come and also I know you don’t like Child A.”* She stated that she read these messages alongside Child N, and recalled Child N telling Miss Choudhury *“to not trust Child A.”* She further recalled that Miss Choudhury replied, *“he’s my friend.”* She said that before being investigated, Miss Choudhury *“told/messaged Child N ‘I’m getting investigated, block and clear our chats’.”*

The panel noted that it had not been provided with copies of any messages involving Miss Choudhury. The panel further noted that Child H’s evidence was multiple hearsay,

as she had not herself seen any messages directly involving Miss Choudhury, nor had she seen any messages confirming that Child D had Miss Choudhury's phone number or that messages had been exchanged between them. The panel also noted that Child H was not certain that Miss Choudhury had sent the messages she described.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil A dated 26 March 2025, who stated that he *"did not have Amani Choudhury's phone number"* nor did she try and give him her number. He stated he was not aware if other pupils had exchanged numbers with Miss Choudhury. Pupil A's evidence was hearsay evidence and was therefore given appropriate weight.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A, dated 8 May 2025, who stated that on 8 February 2024, Individual B reported a concern to him in respect of Pupil N, and that on the same date Pupil N showed Individual B WhatsApp messages she had received from Miss Choudhury which asked the pupil to *"clear chats meaning delete the thread of messages between them."* Witness A explained that on 8 and 9 February 2024 he took statements from pupils concerning *"the messages on social media"* and that these included the witness statements of Pupil H, Pupil N, Pupil E, and the minutes of meetings with Pupil T and Pupil A.

The panel considered the oral evidence of Miss Choudhury, who accepted that she had shared her telephone number with Pupil N. She also admitted to sending a photograph to Pupil N via WhatsApp.

The panel further considered the oral evidence of Miss Choudhury in relation to her communications with Pupil N.

Miss Choudhury explained that the initial contact related to Pupil N missing a mock examination towards the end of October. She stated that Pupil N asked whether she was okay following the missed examination. Miss Choudhury also explained that Pupil N asked whether she could receive tailored topics for the examination. Miss Choudhury stated that she did not provide tailored topics. She explained that revision packs had been prepared and that pupils were required to attend in person to collect them. Miss Choudhury stated that while she tailored the revision packs, pupils were required to physically attend school to obtain them.

Miss Choudhury explained that there was no communication after the Christmas break and that she did not speak to Pupil N after that point, as the school had broken up. Miss Choudhury stated that there was no further conversation until February, at which point Pupil N had been absent frequently.

Miss Choudhury told the panel that she does not have a full record of all messages sent to Pupil N. When asked about the timing of the messages, she stated that they were sent

infrequently. She explained that the first messages were around the time of the mock examination and that there was further contact in December relating to another query.

The panel had a copy of the image of the pupils Miss Choudhury sent to Pupil N, and a screen shot of the messages sent to Pupil N within the bundle and, having considered the evidence, found the allegation proved in respect of text messages and WhatsApp.

The panel further considered the oral evidence of Miss Choudhury, who accepted that she had responded to a message from Pupil A on TikTok. The panel noted that Pupil A had sent an update regarding a meeting via TikTok, and that Miss Choudhury responded to that message. Miss Choudhury explained that, due to the nature of the message, she considered it appropriate to respond, but that she then ceased any further engagement in the conversation. Miss Choudhury accepted that she probably should have blocked the account. The panel noted that Miss Choudhury was suspended before this exchange took place and that her suspension commenced in February 2024. Accordingly, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that the exchange occurred in February 2024.

The panel further noted that there was no other evidence within the bundle of additional exchanges between Miss Choudhury and Pupil A on social media.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that Miss Choudhury did send the message to Pupil A via TikTok, as described in her oral evidence.

The panel found allegations 1(a) and (d) proved.

2) In relation to your conduct at allegation 1(d) you told at least one pupil to delete the messages(s)

The panel noted that, in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 14 January 2026, and in her oral evidence, Miss Choudhury admitted this allegation. Notwithstanding this, the panel proceeded to consider the evidence in front of it before making a finding.

The panel noted the photo of WhatsApp messages on a phone dated 8 February 2024, which included the message: “[Pupil N] block and delete my number please head is onto me” and “clear chats”.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A, who stated that on 8 February 2024 Pupil N showed Individual B WhatsApp messages she had received from Miss Choudhury which asked the pupil to “clear chats” meaning delete the thread of messages between them.

The panel considered the witness statement of Child H, who stated that during lesson discussions Miss Choudhury said that “[Child N] was spreading lies and rumours about Miss,” and that Child N denied this. She also reported that tension in the class developed “because she saw Miss Choudhury give her side eyes.” She described a later argument

between pupils during which issues about Miss Choudhury's behaviour were raised, after which she "*went to Child N and informed Individual B on everything.*" She also stated that before being investigated, Miss Choudhury "*told/messaged Child N I'm getting investigated, block and clear our chats.*" She further added that she can understand why Child N "*did it*" since it risked their A Levels.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Pupil N. She stated that on 7 February 2024, while she was on her way home, Miss Choudhury messaged her on WhatsApp, accusing her of gossiping and spreading rumours about her and Pupil A. She stated that later that afternoon, Miss Choudhury sent a further message asking her to delete her phone number and the record of their conversations, stating "*head is onto me*", and that she deleted the messages because she was told to and then blocked Miss Choudhury.

The panel considered the evidence concerning Miss Choudhury's decision to message Pupil N to ask her to block and delete her number. Miss Choudhury stated that her actions were not motivated by a desire to delete evidence.

Miss Choudhury explained that she felt the contact between herself and Pupil N was for an appropriate purpose. She stated that she had reflected that her behaviour had the potential to "*get out of hand*" and that she had been advised that, as a teacher, she needed to assert appropriate professional boundaries and "*be a better teacher*". She accepted that this principle applied to her own conduct. Miss Choudhury stated that, at that point, she concluded that she should not be conversing with Pupil N at all. She explained that she therefore sought to ensure that Pupil N no longer had her contact details. She stated that she asked Pupil N to remove her number.

Miss Choudhury maintained that her intention was to bring the communication to an end and to prevent any further communication, rather than to conceal or destroy evidence.

The panel noted that it had before it consistent oral evidence from both Pupil N and Miss Choudhury that Miss Choudhury had asked Pupil N to delete the messages and a copy of her message doing so.

The panel further noted that it had no other messages or contemporaneous evidence to suggest that Miss Choudhury had asked any other pupil, on any other occasion, to delete messages. The panel therefore found this allegation proven in respect of Pupil N only.

The panel found allegation 2 proved.

3) On or around 8 February 2024:

- a. you did not stop and/or intervene when Colleague A drove Pupil A and/or Pupil T to their place of work and/or home whilst you were a passenger in the car;**

The panel noted that, in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 14 January 2026, and her oral evidence, Miss Choudhury admitted this allegation. Notwithstanding this, the panel proceeded to consider the evidence in front of it before making a finding.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A, who stated that on 2 February 2024 Miss Choudhury was seen getting into a car with Colleague A, Pupil A and Pupil T, and that this was not reported at the time but was later flagged during pupils' accounts given on 8 February 2024. He explained that the incident was not covered by CCTV as it occurred beyond the school grounds, however, it was witnessed by a sixth-form pupil and Miss Choudhury did confirm that it had happened.

The panel considered the witness statement of Child E dated 9 February 2024, who stated that she was at her house looking out of the window when she saw Pupil T and Pupil A outside. She described seeing a car stop and observed Miss Choudhury "*get out of the vehicle, take a bag from [Pupil T]*" and place it in the boot. She stated that Pupil T then entered the front passenger seat of the car with another teacher driving, and that Pupil A entered the back seat with Miss Choudhury before the car drove away. She identified the driver as Colleague A, described as the [REDACTED] and said the vehicle was a white car, possibly a Vauxhall, although she was not certain.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil A, who stated that Colleague A gave him a lift in her car around December 2023, that he thought Pupil T said he was going to be late to work and that was why a lift was offered, and that Pupil T's work was in Northwood, around 15 minutes in the car from the School. He stated that Pupil T was sat in the front with Colleague A and that he was sat in the back with Miss Choudhury, that he remembered he was playing music out loud through the speakers, that they were talking normally but he did not really remember what it was about and there was music in the background. He stated that his house is next to the School, so he was dropped off home on the way back from taking Pupil T to work, that he got in the car because his friend Pupil T got in the car, and that he wanted to spend more time with his friend and chill. He stated that this was the only time this happened.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil T, who stated that Colleague A gave him a lift on one occasion. He stated that after he and Pupil A finished school around 3 or 4pm, Miss Choudhury asked him in person to come to her classroom alongside Pupil A; both went to her classroom where Colleague A was also present. He stated that after they talked, he said he had work and Colleague A offered to take him there in her car. He explained that Colleague A was driving, he was sat in the front, and Miss Choudhury and Pupil A sat in the back. He stated that Colleague A drove him from the School to his work in Northwood, that the journey took no more than 25 minutes, that his original plan was to get an Uber or the bus, and that he accepted the lift because it would have saved him money instead of getting an Uber. He stated he did not remember speaking much in the car as there was music on.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written evidence provided by Miss Choudhury. The panel noted that Miss Choudhury had admitted this allegation in her oral and written evidence.

The panel noted an email dated 10 February 2024 from Miss Choudhury which referred to a car journey in which Miss Choudhury was present. The email stated that, since becoming friends with Colleague A, she had most days been dropped home by car, as she usually travelled by bus. It further stated that on the day in question, they were meant to spend the afternoon together after school. The email recorded that during the school day Miss Choudhury had been speaking to sixth-form students, some of whom attended her classroom at lunchtime. It stated that the students were speaking at that time and that Pupil T explained he was starting his first day at work that afternoon. The email further stated that Pupil T had asked to return at the end of the day to speak to Miss Choudhury and explain why his mother had not attended parents' evening, despite having booked an appointment. The email stated that, following a period 5 lesson, both pupils came to the classroom. After the conversation, the pupils left. The email further stated that, while driving, Colleague A saw the pupils and offered to drop them at a station or another location as one of them was running late. It stated that Miss Choudhury moved from the front seat to the back of the car. The email stated that she did not initially wish to enter the car but ultimately did so. It recorded that during the journey, those in the back of the car "*were worried*" and spoke very little.

The panel considered the wording of the allegation that, on or around 8 February 2024, Miss Choudhury did not stop and/or intervene when Colleague A drove Pupil A and/or Pupil T to their place of work and/or home whilst Miss Choudhury was a passenger in the car.

The panel found that Miss Choudhury did not stop or intervene when Colleague A drove the pupils to their place of work and/or home whilst Miss Choudhury was a passenger in the car. Accordingly, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found allegation 3(a) proved.

4. In relation to the incident at allegation 3, you:

a) did not report and/or inform a member of the School safeguarding team of this;

The panel noted that, in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 14 January 2026, and in her oral evidence, Miss Choudhury admitted this allegation. Notwithstanding this, the panel proceeded to consider the evidence in front of it before making a finding.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A, who stated that no permission had been sought from him or the DSL, and that following the incident Miss Choudhury acknowledged she knew it was wrong but "*did not report it.*" He referred

to the expectation in the School's code of conduct that staff must report concerns or situations which may be misinterpreted as soon as possible after the incident and stated that he believed Miss Choudhury knew she should have reported the matter on the next school day. He explained that although the School does not keep individual training records for each member of staff, attendance records are taken for all safeguarding training sessions, and these confirmed that Miss Choudhury had attended the Academy's safeguarding training. He stated that he was confident Miss Choudhury would have known it was inappropriate to give pupils lifts in cars and that she should have immediately reported the incident based on that safeguarding training.

The panel considered Miss Choudhury's oral evidence, her written statement, and the notes of her interview with the school, including the record of the transcript of the investigation meeting on 28 March 2024, which included Miss Choudhury's tracked comments.

The panel considered Miss Choudhury's oral evidence that she did not report the matter, despite the panel noting that she had access to the CPOMS system to do so.

The panel further noted that, in her oral evidence, Miss Choudhury accepted that she informed Colleague A and another junior colleague about the incident. However, she admitted that she did not inform anyone else.

The panel further considered the absence of any evidence that a report had been made.

Accordingly, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found allegation 4(a) proved in that Miss Choudhury did not report or inform a member of the School's safeguarding team.

5) Your conduct at allegation 2 and/or 4(a) and/or 4(b) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

The panel noted that, in Miss Choudhury admitted this allegation. Notwithstanding this, the panel proceeded to consider the evidence in front of it before making a finding.

The panel further noted that, having found allegations 2 and 4(a) proved, it was necessary to consider whether Miss Choudhury had acted dishonestly, and that it was not necessary to make a determination in respect of allegation 4(b) as it had found it not proven.

The panel considered whether Miss Choudhury had acted dishonestly. In doing so, the panel applied the test set out in *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords*.

The panel first considered Miss Choudhury's actual knowledge or belief as to the facts. In respect of the conduct found proven at allegation 2, the panel had evidence that she instructed a pupil to "*clear chats*" (i.e., delete the message thread) and to "*block and delete*" their conversations, with the explanation "*head is onto me.*"

At stage two, the panel considered whether Miss Choudhury's conduct would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel was satisfied that ordinary decent people would regard as dishonest: instructing a pupil to delete message threads to conceal communications with a teacher; doing so with the explanation "*head is onto me*".

The panel therefore concluded that Miss Choudhury's conduct, as found proved in relation to allegation 2, was dishonest.

The panel then considered whether Miss Choudhury's conduct at allegation 2 demonstrated a lack of integrity. In doing so, the panel had regard to the principles set out in *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority* and was mindful that professionals are not expected to be "*paragons of virtue*."

The panel considered that instructing a pupil to delete communications with a teacher, including stating "*head is onto me*", fell significantly below the standards expected of a teacher.

The panel therefore found that Miss Choudhury's conduct, as found proved in relation to allegation 2, demonstrated a lack of integrity.

The panel then went on to consider allegation 4 (a). The panel first considered Miss Choudhury's actual knowledge or belief as to the facts.

The panel considered Miss Choudhury's written acknowledgement that travelling in a car with pupils was misconduct and that her duty had been to report it. The panel further considered Miss Choudhury's oral evidence in which she stated that she did not consider the concern serious compared to other allegations which had come to light and she had been busy at the School that week.

The panel took into account that safeguarding expectations were reinforced through training and management reminders, supporting the conclusion that Miss Choudhury knew, and believed, that such conduct required transparent reporting. The panel noted that Miss Choudhury did not report the lift or otherwise formally inform the school, notwithstanding that she had access to the CPOMS system.

The panel considered Miss Choudhury's evidence that she felt uncomfortable about the situation, that she felt guilty, and that she spoke to a colleague whom she regarded as more experienced and who reassured her. The panel also noted her evidence that, at the time, she did not consider the matter to meet the threshold of a safeguarding concern.

At stage two, the panel considered whether Miss Choudhury's conduct at allegation 4 (a) would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel was satisfied that ordinary decent people would not regard her conduct as dishonest if they were aware of all of the facts.

Therefore, the panel did not find Miss Choudhury's conduct at 4(a) to be dishonest.

The panel then considered whether Miss Choudhury's conduct at 4 (a) demonstrated a lack of integrity. In doing so, the panel had regard to the principles set out in *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority* and was mindful that professionals are not expected to be "paragons of virtue."

The panel considered that Miss Choudhury's failure to report the car journey, even if she did not at the time regard it as serious, and her failure to report an incident relevant to safeguarding despite acknowledging that she had a duty to do so, fell significantly below the standards expected of a teacher. The panel emphasised that safeguarding and reporting responsibilities attach to the role of a teacher and apply irrespective of seniority, including where a teacher is relatively junior.

The panel further considered that the duty to safeguard children requires concerns, including low-level concerns, to be reported so that they can be appropriately assessed and managed. The panel found that Miss Choudhury's failure to report the incident undermined those safeguarding responsibilities.

The panel therefore found that Miss Choudhury's conduct, as found proved in relation to allegations 2 and 4(a), demonstrated a lack of integrity.

Allegation 5 was therefore found proved.

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

1. Between around November 2023 and February 2024, you:

- b) shared your social media contact details with at least one pupil;**
- c) followed at least one pupil on Instagram; and**

The panel noted that Miss Choudhury admitted allegations 1(a) and 1(b) in her response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 14 January 2026. However, in her oral evidence, Miss Choudhury clarified that she did not actively share her social media contact details. She explained that, while contact from the pupils to her existed, she did not consider that she had "*shared*" her details, as she had not taken a positive step to do so. Miss Choudhury also denied that she followed any pupil on Instagram. She clarified that the pupils had requested to follow her, rather than her initiating contact.

The panel noted that it had no screenshots or other documentary evidence showing Miss Choudhury sharing her social media contact details or following any pupils on Instagram.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Pupil N. The panel considered that in her written statement dated 15 March 2025 Pupil N stated that Miss

Choudhury's TikTok profile, as well as videos made and reposted by her, appeared in her feed. She explained that the TikTok account was public, meaning anyone could see the posts, but she recalled it changing to private at some point although she was not sure when. She said that although she did not follow Miss Choudhury, it was likely that the TikTok algorithm kept showing these posts because she followed people that followed Miss Choudhury, such as "*a lot of the boys in our class*". She claimed that Miss Choudhury did not request to follow her on TikTok and she did not request to follow Miss Choudhury.

Pupil N further stated that because they had accounts in common on Snapchat, such as being friends with the same people on the app, Miss Choudhury's profile appeared as a suggested person for her to add, and that Snapchat showed they had five accounts in common but did not specify the usernames. She stated that they did not add each other on Snapchat or exchange messages.

Pupil N noted that she was on the 'close-friends' story of boys in her class, explaining that an Instagram story is a video or image shared for no more than 24 hours, and that a 'close-friends' story is shared only with selected followers rather than all followers. She stated that on multiple occasions Pupil L put screenshots of Miss Choudhury's messages to him on his 'close-friends' story, including one message where Miss Choudhury asked him to miss his lesson and see her instead.

The panel noted that there were some inconsistencies in Pupil N's oral evidence. However, the panel considered that these inconsistencies were likely attributable to the passage of time since the events in question.

The panel also noted a screenshot of Miss Choudhury's Snapchat profile, which shows her name as "*Amani*" and her username as "*amanichoudhuryy*", all under the subheading of "*Quick Add*".

The panel noted that this screenshot did not show that Miss Choudhury had shared her social media contact details. Instead, it indicated that Miss Choudhury's account had been suggested to Pupil N by Snapchat. The panel further noted that the image did not state that Miss Choudhury and Pupil N had any accounts in common. By contrast, the panel observed that another suggested username shown on the same image indicated that it had five accounts in common.

The panel concluded that this screenshot did not provide evidence that Miss Choudhury had shared her social media contact details with a pupil. The panel found that the suggestion was likely generated by Snapchat's algorithm and may have arisen because Pupil N had Miss Choudhury's phone number.

The panel also noted a screenshot of an Instagram story regarding Miss Choudhury, which showed a message that read out: “*Okay bunk it and come see me P2*”. The Instagram story also said “*????? teacher tweakin*”.

The panel noted that Pupil N confirmed in her oral evidence that this Instagram story was shared on a “*close friends*” story, as referred to in her witness statement. The panel further noted Pupil N’s evidence that she had spoken to Pupil L about this message and that Pupil L had confirmed to her that the message came from Miss Choudhury and that it involved a request to miss a lesson.

The panel noted that Pupil N admitted in her oral evidence that she saw mutual friends when viewing Miss Choudhury’s on Snapchat account but admitted that she did not check whether these were pupils.

The panel considered the Instagram message but noted that the sender’s name had been scribbled out on the screenshot. Accordingly, the panel found that the image did not show that the message originated from Miss Choudhury.

The panel also noted Miss Choudhury’s oral evidence that she did not send this message.

The panel considered whether, on the balance of probabilities, the message had been sent by Miss Choudhury. In doing so, the panel took into account the absence of other supporting evidence, the fact that Pupil L did not attend to give evidence, and that Pupil N’s account of what Pupil L had said was hearsay. In light of these factors, and given that the sender’s name had been obscured, the panel found that the TRA had not discharged the burden of proving that the message was sent by Miss Choudhury.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil A dated 26 March 2025, who stated that Miss Choudhury was messaging on Instagram. He explained that the messages and reels were what he would describe as “*funny stuff*” and that “*we did not exchange any sexual messages.*” He stated that he did not have screenshots of the messages and that he deleted them after the incident. He sent reels to Miss Choudhury twice maybe, and that he thought she sent him around 6 or 7, and that they messaged “*every day, maybe 2-3 times per week, for around two weeks,*” and that when they did speak it was “*always during the day around lunch time.*” He explained that you do not have to be following someone on Instagram to message them but that he and Miss Choudhury were following each other, that he could not remember who followed who first, that he did not have a screenshot of Miss Choudhury following him, and that he did not remember her Instagram handle. He did not feel uncomfortable about the messages at the time. The panel noted that this was hearsay evidence. The panel noted that it had no documentary evidence of these messages.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil T dated 8 May 2025, who stated that he never had Miss Choudhury's mobile number and that he believed other pupils did. He claimed that Miss Choudhury was "*known for following pupils on social media and talking to them,*" that this was mentioned in class, and that her Instagram profile showed she was following other pupils. He stated he could not remember if he followed her on Instagram, but he probably did. He stated he "*may have messaged [her] on one occasion about a mock test,*" and if he did, this was the only time he messaged her on social media.

The panel noted inconsistencies between Pupil T's witness statement and the minutes of the school investigation meeting with Pupil T dated 9 February 2024.

The panel reminded itself that it was for the TRA, through the Presenting Officer, to prove the allegations on the balance of probabilities. The panel concluded that this burden had not been discharged. Accordingly, the panel found allegations 1(b) and 1(c) not proved.

3. On or around 8 February 2024:

b) whilst in the car, as referred to above, you put and/or attempted to put your head on and/or near Pupil A's shoulders.

The panel further noted that Miss Choudhury denied this allegation consistently, including in her oral evidence and in her response to the notice of proceedings form dated 14 January 2026.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil T, who recalled that Miss Choudhury was "*sat closely to Pupil A and was trying to rest her head on him*", which he said he found strange, and that he observed this when he turned around. Pupil T stated that Pupil A reacted by smiling and laughing. The panel noted that this account constituted hearsay evidence.

The panel further noted that Pupil T did not refer to this allegation during the initial school investigation on 9 February 2024 and that it first arose in his witness statement dated 8 May 2025.

The panel also noted that Pupil A, in his own written statement, did not refer to Miss Choudhury resting her head on or near his shoulders.

The panel also considered Miss Choudhury's oral evidence that there were bags positioned between herself and Pupil A, that she was seated to the left and Pupil A was seated to the right, and that they were not seated closely so as to allow physical contact.

The panel noted that there was no further evidence in support of this allegation.

The panel reminded itself that it was for the TRA, through the presenting officer, to prove the allegation on the balance of probabilities. The panel concluded that this burden had not been discharged. Accordingly, the panel found allegation 3(b) not proved.

4. In relation to the incident at allegation 3, you:

b. contacted Pupil A and/or Pupil T in an attempt to interfere with their version of events.

The panel noted that, in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 14 January 2026, Miss Choudhury admitted this allegation. However, the panel also considered Miss Choudhury's oral evidence, in which she denied that she interfered with the version of events of Pupil A or Pupil T and asserted that the conduct alleged was attributable to Colleague A.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil A, who stated that after the lift he messaged Miss Choudhury via Instagram asking to stop messaging, that he made up the excuse that his dad had said not to get involved but actually it was him that wanted to stop talking to her, that he did not want to upset her, and that he wanted to stop because the situation got out and problems were caused by the incident so it did not feel right. He stated that he did not recall her reacting in any memorable way to being told to stop, that she was not angry or upset about it, that the messages were deleted and he did not have any screenshots, that he did not see Miss Choudhury at the School after this because she was not at work, and that she did not message him and he had no other contact with Miss Choudhury after the lift.

The panel noted that Pupil A did not state that Miss Choudhury attempted to interfere with his account or version of events.

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil T, who stated that the last contact he had with both Miss Choudhury and Colleague A was after the lift, that they were both together sending him voice notes, that it seemed they were fishing for information as they had been interviewed about the lift by the School before they had spoken to him, and that the voice notes suggested they wanted to see what he and Pupil A would be saying to the School and indirectly "*hinting*" for them to lie for them. He stated he no longer had access to the voice notes but recalled them asking questions to see if they had been interviewed and to not mention the car ride. He stated he did not respond and removed and blocked both Miss Choudhury and Colleague A.

The panel noted that Pupil T described the conduct as "*indirectly hinting*" rather than stating that Miss Choudhury had told him to lie or had directly attempted to interfere with his evidence.

The panel considered Miss Choudhury's oral evidence, in which she stated that it was Colleague A who sent the voice notes to Pupil T. The panel found Miss Choudhury to be a credible witness in this respect.

The panel noted that there were no screenshots or contemporaneous records evidencing that Miss Choudhury had asked Pupil T to lie or otherwise interfered with his evidence.

The panel reminded itself that it was for the TRA, through the presenting officer, to prove the allegation on the balance of probabilities. The panel concluded that this burden had not been discharged. Accordingly, the panel found allegation 4(b) not proved.

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

Having found a number of the allegations proved (allegations 1(a), 1(d), (2), 3(a), 4(a) and 5), 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Choudhury, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Choudhury 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
 - ...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...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

In reaching this conclusion, the panel noted that the School's policy expressly prohibited the exchange of personal phone numbers between staff and pupils. The panel found that, by exchanging her phone number with pupils, Miss Choudhury failed to maintain proper professional boundaries.

The panel further noted Miss Choudhury's admissions in her oral evidence that she had not maintained appropriate boundaries, and that she had "*almost treated [the pupils] as members of the family*". The panel accepted that Miss Choudhury acknowledged that she had got this wrong and accepted that the manner in which she presented herself blurred professional boundaries.

The panel also had regard to the statutory safeguarding framework, including Keeping Children Safe in Education and Working Together to Safeguard Children. The panel noted that safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone's responsibility, and that all those who come into contact with children have a role to play in safeguarding their wellbeing. This requires practitioners to adopt a child-centred approach and to consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child. For these purposes, a child is defined as a person under the age of 18.

The panel noted that the guidance sets out clear expectations regarding the identification and reporting of safeguarding concerns, including low-level concerns, and the routes by which such concerns should be reported. The panel found that Miss Choudhury's conduct demonstrated a failure to act in accordance with those expectations.

The panel also considered whether Miss Choudhury'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 was satisfied that, in respect of the allegation found proved, Miss Choudhury's conduct did involve an element of dishonesty. This related to her deletion of messages which were relevant to matters connected with the School. However, the panel did not find that this dishonesty reached the threshold of serious dishonesty. In reaching this conclusion, the panel carefully considered the content and context of the messages. The panel noted that the messages related to issues arising within the School. The panel was satisfied that the deleted messages did not concern serious safeguarding matters, nor did they relate to the concealment of significant wrongdoing or harm to pupils. The panel also noted that the issues reflected in the messages overlapped with matters involving Pupil N's behaviour, rather than constituting evidence of serious misconduct by Miss Choudhury herself. Accordingly, while the panel found that whilst Miss Choudhury acted dishonestly in deleting the messages, it was not satisfied that her conduct amounted to fraud or serious dishonesty as contemplated by the Advice. Therefore, the panel found that none of the offences were relevant.

The panel considered whether the allegations relating to the lift in the car took place outside the education setting. The panel noted that the School had a clear rule prohibiting staff from driving or arranging transport for pupils. The panel found that Miss Choudhury was aware that Colleague A was driving the pupil and that she was part of the

arrangement by permitting this to occur and not intervening or stopping it. The panel therefore found that this conduct arose from an arrangement connected to the School and, as such, took place within the education setting. However, the panel went on to consider that, even if the conduct were to be regarded as having taken place outside the education setting, it nevertheless affected the way in which Miss Choudhury fulfilled her role as a teacher.

The panel noted that teachers are responsible for always maintaining appropriate boundaries with pupils. The panel further noted that the School's policies and code of conduct applied to such situations, including conduct occurring outside the immediate school premises. In addition, the panel considered that the matters flowing from the incident were not confined to the car journey itself. The panel found that Miss Choudhury failed to report what had occurred, notwithstanding that the incident raised potential safeguarding concerns. That failure to report occurred within the school context and directly engaged her professional safeguarding responsibilities. Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that the conduct was properly within the scope of the regulatory framework, whether characterised as occurring within the education setting or, alternatively, as conduct outside school which had a clear and direct bearing on Miss Choudhury's role as a teacher and her safeguarding duties.

The panel noted that Miss Choudhury admitted that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and that it was conduct which may bring the teaching profession into disrepute.

In respect of allegation 1(a), the panel noted that Miss Choudhury shared her personal mobile telephone number with a pupil. The panel found that this communication was not related to approved school methods and amounted to a breach of the school's policies. Although Miss Choudhury stated that Pupil N was a special case [REDACTED] the panel noted that there were alternative appropriate methods available to provide support, including communication via school email or in person. The panel considered that sharing a personal mobile number with a pupil was contrary to safeguarding training and the professional standards expected of a teacher and found this conduct to amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

In respect of allegation 1(d), the panel found that Miss Choudhury exchanged messages with a pupil outside appropriate professional channels. The panel considered that such communication bypassed established school systems which are designed to enable oversight and safeguarding monitoring. The panel found that communicating with pupils in this way limited the School's ability to keep appropriate safeguarding oversight and therefore created a safeguarding risk. The panel also noted that, in respect of the TikTok interaction with Pupil A, this communication occurred in response to a message and marked the end of the contact. The panel concluded that this conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

In respect of allegation 2, the panel found that Miss Choudhury asked a pupil to delete messages in circumstances where reference was made to the head finding out, namely by stating "*heads on to me*". The panel considered that this conduct undermined safeguarding processes and was inconsistent with the principle that concerns about pupil welfare or professional boundaries should be recorded and escalated, rather than concealed. The panel reminded itself that safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is a responsibility shared by all those who work with children, and that all practitioners are expected to act in a child-centred way, having regard at all times to the best interests of the child. The panel further noted that pupils under the age of 18 are children for safeguarding purposes. The panel concluded that asking a pupil to delete messages in these circumstances was incompatible with those safeguarding responsibilities and amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

In respect of allegation 3, the panel reminded itself that the allegation was in respect of not stopping or intervening when Colleague A drove. The panel found that Miss Choudhury did not stop or intervene when Colleague A gave a lift to pupils. The panel noted that, as a teacher, Miss Choudhury had safeguarding responsibilities and that the welfare of pupils should have been her priority. The panel considered that, although it was not her vehicle, she was present and, in a position, to intervene, disengage, or walk away and report the matter. The panel acknowledged Miss Choudhury's evidence and that this would have been a difficult situation socially and professionally, particularly given her relative inexperience and proximity in age to the pupils, and expressed understanding of those pressures. Based on the circumstances, the panel concluded that, while the conduct fell short of the standards expected, it did not meet the threshold for unacceptable professional conduct.

In respect of allegation 4(a), the panel considered Miss Choudhury's evidence that she spoke to Colleague A who reassured her that the situation was acceptable, and that the matter subsequently snowballed during a busy period. The panel also noted Miss Choudhury's evidence that, as a junior teacher, she found the circumstances difficult and ultimately forgot to make a report. The panel noted, however, that Miss Choudhury had access to the CPOMS system and was able to make a safeguarding report. The panel further considered that Miss Choudhury failed to report the incident notwithstanding her safeguarding training and her awareness that the situation had caused her some concern. The panel also noted Miss Choudhury's oral evidence in which she accepted that it was wrong for her to have been in the car and reflected on how the situation could be perceived. The panel considered that this demonstrated an awareness that the incident raised safeguarding concerns. The panel noted that Miss Choudhury's evidence was that she did not sufficiently appreciate the seriousness of the situation so as to prompt a report. However, the panel reminded itself that teachers have a duty to report safeguarding concerns, including low-level concerns, and that the welfare of children must come first at all times. The panel concluded that Miss Choudhury's failure to report the incident constituted misconduct and amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

In respect of allegation 5, the panel found that Miss Choudhury acted dishonestly and lacked integrity. The panel concluded that this conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Choudhury amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Miss Choudhury was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct in respect of allegations 1(a), 1(d), (2), 4(a) and 5.

In relation to whether Miss Choudhury'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 Miss Choudhury'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 Miss Choudhury was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel considered the test of the ordinary intelligent and well-informed member of the public, who understands the seriousness of the conduct, recognises the high standards expected of all teachers, and takes into account the wider circumstances of the case.

The panel considered that Miss Choudhury's misconduct had the potential to damage public confidence in the teaching profession. In particular, the panel noted that it had found her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Choudhury's actions at allegations 1 (a), 1(d), (2), 4(a) and 5 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 a 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 protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Miss Choudhury, which involved breaches of professional boundaries, requesting a pupil to delete messages, a failure to report a potential safeguarding concern, and where some such behaviour was found to be dishonest and lacking integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the findings of inappropriate contact with pupils.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Miss Choudhury 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 Miss Choudhury in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining Miss Choudhury in the profession. It noted that there was no contemporaneous evidence to suggest that any doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator. However, the panel also considered that Miss Choudhury was at a relatively early stage in her career and that there was insufficient evidence before it to demonstrate that she had established herself in the profession to such an extent, or that her contribution was so exceptional or wide-ranging, as to give rise to a strong public interest in her retention.

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 Miss Choudhury.

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;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead...;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk...;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence...;
- collusion or concealment including:
 - failure to challenge inappropriate actions... or concealing inappropriate actions;

In respect of the duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk, the panel found this factor engaged only to the extent that Miss Choudhury failed to report the car journey on CPOMS. The panel was clear that it did not find that Miss Choudhury had placed any pupil at actual risk of harm.

In relation to dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of actions or the purposeful destruction of evidence, the panel found this engaged solely insofar as Miss Choudhury asked Pupil N, on a single occasion, to delete messages. The panel noted that this was a one-off request and did not amount to sustained or repeated concealment.

In respect of collusion or concealment, the panel considered that this was met in two limited respects. First, Miss Choudhury failed to challenge Colleague A's inappropriate conduct in relation to the car journey and failed to report that incident, which the panel characterised as a failure to intervene rather than active collusion. Secondly, the panel found that asking Pupil N to delete messages, accompanied by the comment that "*the head is onto me*", constituted a single instance of concealment. The panel noted that both matters were isolated incidents and did not form part of a pattern of behaviour.

Further, the panel considered whether the misconduct seriously affected the education and/or safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, and in particular whether there was a continuing risk. The panel was not satisfied that this threshold was met. While the conduct had the potential to undermine safeguarding standards, there was no evidence that it caused actual harm to pupils, nor that there was any continuing risk. The panel considered that the misconduct arose from errors of judgment made by a junior teacher

at an early stage of her career, rather than conduct of a nature or seriousness that had resulted in, or continued to pose, a risk to pupils.

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 Miss Choudhury's actions were deliberate.

The panel considered whether Miss Choudhury was acting under extreme duress at the relevant times. There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Choudhury was acting under extreme duress.

However, the panel did take account of Miss Choudhury's oral evidence that she experienced a degree of pressure. In particular, she described feeling uncomfortable during the car journey involving Colleague A, a teaching assistant and two pupils. The panel also noted her evidence that Colleague A had reassured her following the incident, which contributed to her decision not to escalate the matter.

The panel further noted Miss Choudhury's evidence that, more generally, she felt overwhelmed by difficulties with behaviour management and the demands of her role as a junior teacher, and that this sense of being under pressure contributed to her failure to report other low-level concerns.

While the panel accepted that these factors provided some context for Miss Choudhury's actions, it did not consider that they amounted to extreme duress. Rather, the panel considered that they reflected situational pressure and errors of judgment made at an early stage in her career.

There was no evidence before the panel that Miss Choudhury had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal or professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. While the panel noted her oral evidence that she had supported pupils as part of her role, including assisting with UCAS applications, this was not demonstrative of exceptionally high standards. The panel further noted that Miss Choudhury was at an early stage in her career and that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate an exceptional or sustained contribution to the profession.

The panel did not see any evidence that she had previously been subject to disciplinary proceedings.

The panel noted that there was no evidence of statements in support of Miss Choudhury's character or that attested to her abilities as a teacher.

The panel considered Miss Choudhury's supporting statement, in which she stated that she "*wholeheartedly believe[s] that all students, given the opportunity, can excel*" and that she is dedicated to promoting an outstanding learning environment. She also expressed that she is passionate about creating a positive learning environment and upholding high standards for herself and her students. The panel noted these statements as expressions of Miss Choudhury's professional values and aspirations.

The panel did note material within Miss Choudhury's email dated 2 July 2025 which described the pressure she experienced in the weeks preceding the investigation, including reference to emotional strain, negative comments from staff and pupils, and the impact of pupil rumours. The panel also noted her reference to her [REDACTED].

The panel considered whether Miss Choudhury demonstrated insight and remorse.

The panel had regard to evidence of some insight and remorse in Miss Choudhury's written account, including her acceptance that exchanging contact details with a pupil was "*inappropriate and gross misconduct*", and her acknowledgement that, in relation to the car journey, her duty had been "*to stop it... and to report it*". The panel also noted her submission that, if faced with similar circumstances again, she would act differently. While the panel recognised these statements as reflecting an acceptance of wrongdoing, it considered that the insight demonstrated was limited.

The panel further noted that Miss Choudhury had engaged with the process and accepted that her conduct had an impact on Pupil N. In particular, the panel considered that she had shown a limited understanding of the effect of her inappropriate contact on that pupil.

The panel accepted that Miss Choudhury had expressed remorse and had reflected on the importance of maintaining appropriate professional boundaries.

The panel considered that Miss Choudhury had learned from the events and concluded that she was unlikely to be at risk of repeating her behaviour in the future.

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 panel noted Miss Choudhury's oral evidence that, for part of the relevant period, she did not have a mentor and felt that she could have been better supported. The panel also noted her evidence that she found aspects of student behaviour at the school challenging

and that she was managing responsibilities that she felt under-prepared for as a relatively junior teacher.

The panel considered that, although Miss Choudhury crossed professional boundaries in communicating with Pupil N, her intention was to be supportive rather than exploitative. The panel took into account that she was a junior teacher, early in her career, and accepted that her actions arose from poor judgment rather than malice.

In respect of the car journey, the panel accepted that Miss Choudhury failed to report the incident. However, the panel was satisfied that this failure did not arise from a deliberate attempt to conceal the matter. Rather, Miss Choudhury did not consider the incident to be sufficiently serious at the time, discussed it with Colleague A, and had been reassured by another colleague. The panel emphasised that this judgment was incorrect and that any potential safeguarding concern ought to have been reported, but noted that the failure arose in the context of inexperience rather than intentional wrongdoing.

The panel further noted that, at the relevant time, Miss Choudhury was dealing with multiple pressures associated with being a junior teacher who was new to the School. The panel considered that she had not yet had the opportunity to consolidate her professional practice, having spent only a short period in the profession and not remaining at a single school for a sustained period.

Taking these matters together, the panel considered that Miss Choudhury's conduct fell at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness for the types of behaviour identified in the Advice. While the public interest considerations were engaged, they were engaged at a relatively low level. The panel was not satisfied that the misconduct resulted in serious harm to pupils. The panel considered that the conduct happened within a relatively short period of time, within a difficult environment, and the events had rapidly unfolded given how recently she had started at the School.

In those circumstances, the panel considered that, notwithstanding the findings made, the imposition of a prohibition order would be a disproportionate response. The panel concluded that Miss Choudhury's actions were the result of inexperience, lack of confidence, and errors of judgment made at an early stage in her career, rather than conduct demonstrating a fundamental incompatibility with continued practice as a teacher.

The panel also considered the mitigating factors that were present, and that the behaviour was at the less serious end of the scale and 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 Miss Choudhury 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 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. The panel has also found some of the allegations not proven and that some proven allegations do not amount to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in relation to Miss Amani Choudhury, should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Choudhury 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
 - ...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...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that Miss Choudhury had failed to act in accordance with the expectations set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel finds that the conduct of Miss Choudhury fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include findings of dishonesty, breach of boundaries and failing to report a safeguarding concern. However, the panel has qualified these findings in the following terms,

“In respect of the duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk, the panel found this factor engaged only to the extent that Miss Choudhury failed to report the car journey on CPOMS. The panel was clear that it did not find that Miss Choudhury had placed any pupil at actual risk of harm.

In relation to dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of actions or the purposeful destruction of evidence, the panel found this engaged solely insofar as Miss Choudhury asked Pupil N, on a single occasion, to delete messages. The panel noted that this was a one-off request and did not amount to sustained or repeated concealment”.

I also note that the panel has not found that the proven conduct amounts to the level of serious dishonesty.

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 Miss Choudhury, 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, *“In the light of the panel’s findings against Miss Choudhury, which involved breaches of professional boundaries, requesting a pupil to delete messages, a failure to report a potential safeguarding concern, and where some such behaviour was found to be dishonest and lacking integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the findings of inappropriate contact with pupils”.*

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 had regard to evidence of some insight and remorse in Miss Choudhury’s written account, including her acceptance that exchanging contact details with a pupil was “inappropriate and gross misconduct”, and her*

acknowledgement that, in relation to the car journey, her duty had been “to stop it... and to report it”. The panel also noted her submission that, if faced with similar circumstances again, she would act differently. While the panel recognised these statements as reflecting an acceptance of wrongdoing, it considered that the insight demonstrated was limited”.

The panel has also commented that Miss Choudhury “...had shown a limited understanding of the effect of her inappropriate contact on that pupil”.

However, the panel has also said, “Further, the panel considered whether the misconduct seriously affected the education and/or safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, and in particular whether there was a continuing risk. The panel was not satisfied that this threshold was met... nor that there was any continuing risk”.

I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “...the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Choudhury was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession”. 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 Miss Choudhury herself. The panel comment that it “...considered that the misconduct arose from errors of judgment made by a junior teacher at an early stage of her career, rather than conduct of a nature or seriousness that had resulted in, or continued to pose, a risk to pupils”.

The panel also notes “...that she had not yet had the opportunity to consolidate her professional practice, having spent only a short period in the profession and not remaining at a single school for a sustained period”.

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

I have placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “...*the imposition of a prohibition order would be a disproportionate response. The panel concluded that Miss Choudhury’s actions were the result of inexperience, lack of confidence, and errors of judgment made at an early stage in her career, rather than conduct demonstrating a fundamental incompatibility with continued practice as a teacher*”.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "S. Blomfield".

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 16 March 2026

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