



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr David Taylor: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

March 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

Teacher:	Mr David Taylor
Teacher ref number:	9658430
Teacher date of birth:	10 January 1968
TRA reference:	19458
Date of determination:	24 March 2026
Former employer:	St Patrick's Catholic Primary School, Walthamstow, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 24 March 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr David Taylor.

The panel members were Mr Gamel Byles (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Wendy Shannon (lay panellist) and Mr Benjamin Drouet (teacher panellist).

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

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Taylor that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Taylor provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Allana Edwards of Brabners LLP.

The meeting took place in private and was not recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 19 December 2025.

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

On 12 February 2025, he was convicted at Chelmsford Crown Court of:

1. Four counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo Photograph of Children between 9 June 2020 to 9 June 2021 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a).

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

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Statement of agreed facts – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral – pages 6 to 16

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 17 to 67

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 68 to 71

The panel confirmed that it had read all of the documents provided to it in advance of the meeting.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Taylor on 11 November 2025

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Mr Taylor was employed at St Patrick's Catholic Primary School ("the School") since 1 September 2016.

He was arrested by Essex Police on 9 June 2020 at his home address and all of his electronic devices were seized.

Essex Police informed the Local Authority Designated Officer ("LADO") of the investigation and the LADO contacted the headteacher of the School on 10 June 2020.

Mr Taylor was suspended from the School on 12 June 2020 with immediate effect.

He was referred to the TRA on 18 August 2020.

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:

On 12 February 2025, you were convicted at Chelmsford Crown Court of:

- 1. Four counts of Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children between 9 June 2020 to 9 June 2021 contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a).**

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Taylor admitted that he had been convicted on 12 February 2025 of the offences as set out above. He admitted that, on 3 April 2025, he was sentenced to a 12 month community order and was made the subject of a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for five years.

The panel was provided with the certificate of conviction stating that Mr Taylor, had on his own confession been convicted of four counts of making indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child. The panel accepted the certificate as conclusive proof of the conviction as well as the necessary facts implied by the conviction. The panel noted

that Mr Taylor received a sentence consisting of a community order for 12 months; rehabilitation activity requirements for 30 days; a victim surcharge of £90; and a sexual harm prevention order for 5 years; and that he is also subject to notification requirements for 5 years. He was ordered to pay the prosecution costs of £500.

The panel was also provided with a print from the police national computer. This confirmed that two of the counts referred to offences committed on 9 June 2020, and two of the counts referred to offences committed on 9 June 2021.

The panel was provided with the sentencing remarks of the Judge. From this, the panel noted that Mr Taylor had been found in possession of a number of indecent images of children, the vast majority of which were category C, with some in category B and three in total, in category A. The Judge stated that “whatever the motivation, your behaviour is still of real concern. It is clear from all of the information that has been uploaded on your behalf, you have become obsessive and you have appointed yourself as a guardian to children, but you are not a child protection officer, you are not an academic researcher, you are not a police officer, and in fact you probably are not helping. The very fact that in downloading images a market is created, whatever the motivation of the person who downloads them. The very fact that those images are downloaded creates the market and that is a stark example, isn’t it, of whatever your motivations, your actual actions defeated the purpose, and your actual actions cause harm, which is why, if I can just say this, Mr Taylor, you would be well advised to just step away. Try and step away from this as much as you can. It is not helping you. It is not helping anybody else.”

It was apparent from the sentencing remarks that Mr Taylor had made a late guilty plea on the day of the trial.

Mr Taylor wrote a letter for the purpose of these TRA misconduct proceedings to explain the context of the offences. He stated that he had always admitted downloading the images and adjusting one to prove a point for a book that he was writing. He explained that the files of the book were dated early 2020 which clearly showed that he was writing the book at the relevant time. He referred to his determination to “out” the owners of websites that continue to show illegal images, on apparently “legal” sites day after day. He stated that, at the time, he felt that it was only by confronting those website owners with their images that he would prove the point to them and hopefully get important comments for his book. He explained that it was a serious error of judgement that will always regret, but, at the time, he felt it was a valid approach. He also stated that anyone reading his manuscript would be very aware of how deeply he feels about the safety of children; that he is a staunch supporter of children’s rights. [REDACTED] and when he became aware of “how the government was doing nothing to take down, hideous, ‘legal’ websites, I lost the plot and went all out to prove to the perpetrators of these sites that what they were doing was wrong by asking them to explain ‘their images’”.

The panel found this allegation proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity... and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the individual’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting given Mr Taylor has been convicted of an offence of making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public. Downloading such images fuels a market which perpetrates child abuse.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Taylor’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 any offence that led to a term of imprisonment will be considered a “relevant” offence. The panel noted that Mr Taylor’s behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, but he received a community order, rehabilitation activity requirements and a sexual harm prevention order, all indicating that this conviction was serious.

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

This was a case concerning an offence involving any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel took into account Mr Taylor's explanation for his actions that he was researching a book aimed at exposing why "the government refuse to take down the 'legal websites' that show illegal images". The panel noted that, in his position as a teacher, Mr Taylor was trained in safeguarding and ought to have known the risks that the research of his book exposed him to. He failed to take appropriate measures to ensure that he conducted his research in a safe manner.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Taylor'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.

The panel found that the conviction was of a relevant offence.

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 and protection of other members of the public; 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 that downloading images of children fuels a market that perpetrates abuse of children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Taylor 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 Taylor 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 Taylor in the profession. The panel was aware that Mr Taylor had likely had a long career as a teacher given that Mr Taylor had explained that his career was coming to an end. He stated that he put everything into his job and that he had been a successful teacher, albeit the panel had no independent evidence of this. The panel considered that, in this case, the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Taylor 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 Taylor.

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;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents; and
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE).

With respect to the failure of duty of care towards a child, the panel considered that by viewing and downloading indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children,

Mr Taylor had supported the market that exploited children, exposing them to risks to their safety and welfare.

The panel noted that it should attach appropriate weight and seriousness to online behaviours including online misconduct and facilitating online abuse.

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 Taylor's actions were deliberate. He confirmed that he has always admitted downloading the images and adjusting one to "prove a point" for his book.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Taylor was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. The panel did, however, note that Mr Taylor had [REDACTED]. He stated that he "lost the plot" on becoming aware that nothing was being done to take down hideous "legal" websites and "went all out to prove to the perpetrators of these sites that what they were doing was wrong by asking them to explain 'their' images". [REDACTED].

There was no evidence that Mr Taylor demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character given the period of time over which the offences were committed.

Mr Taylor did not provide any evidence of his character or attesting to his abilities as a teacher.

The panel noted that Mr Taylor had pleaded guilty in the criminal proceedings, He admitted the conduct alleged in these TRA proceedings and agreed that this matter could be dealt with at a professional conduct panel meeting, saving the time and cost of a hearing being convened. Mr Taylor also provided written representations for the panel to consider, so engaged with these proceedings.

In those representations, Mr Taylor stated that he had made a serious error of judgement that "I will regret to my dying day, but at the time I felt it was valid". He also stated that "I have felt nothing but the deepest grief for the naïve and ill thought out way that I approached the research for my book". Mr Taylor had therefore expressed remorse for his actions.

[REDACTED].

Nevertheless, the panel was concerned that Mr Taylor lacked insight. He referred to having pleaded guilty at court but only because “I had no other option available to me” and referred to being “bitter and angry” that a justice system that “I had defended so much clearly let me down”. He has referred to any suggestion that he is a danger to children being a “disgusting opinion” and that he would “never accept such a damning opinion of me from anyone simply because it could not be more false.” Mr Taylor has not demonstrated any insight that his downloading images, for whatever reason, still had the impact of fuelling an industry that abuses children. The panel was concerned that Mr Taylor lacked insight because he felt his actions were justified.

In the sentencing remarks, the Judge stated “you are not a child protection officer, you are not an academic researcher, you are not a police officer, and in fact you probably are not helping” and advised Mr Taylor to step away”. Nevertheless, Mr Taylor has stated that “I feel that I have to finish the book and it will be published”. He has provided no evidence of any measures he has subsequently taken to ensure appropriate safeguards are in place ensure any further research is conducted safely. The panel noted that he has accepted that he made a serious mistake in the way he researched the book and quoted the Judge as having said that he is “obsessed” with the safety of children. However, Mr Taylor has not demonstrated any insight as to the impact his actions would have had on the safety of children or of how he would do things differently going forwards.

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 Taylor 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 Taylor. The relevance of the offences to the teaching of children and Mr Taylor’s lack of insight were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

One of these include

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents;

Given the panel's findings that Mr Taylor lacked insight, the panel remained concerned about the risk of repetition.

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity... and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 the proven conduct amounted to a conviction relating to indecent images of children. The panel note, *“...the vast majority of which were category C, with some in category B and three in total, in category A”*.

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 Taylor, 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, *“...the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public. Downloading such images fuels a market which perpetrates child abuse”*.

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, *“Nevertheless, the panel was concerned that Mr Taylor lacked insight. He referred to having pleaded guilty at court but only because “I had no other option available to me” and referred to being “bitter and angry” that a justice system that “I had defended so much clearly let me down”. He has referred to any suggestion that he is a danger to children being a “disgusting opinion” and that he would “never accept such a damning opinion of me from anyone simply because it could not be more false.” Mr Taylor has not demonstrated any insight that his downloading images, for whatever reason, still had the impact of fuelling an industry that abuses children. The panel was concerned that Mr Taylor lacked insight because he felt his actions were justified.”*

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *“The panel considered that Mr Taylor’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.”*

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 Taylor himself. The panel comment *“There was no evidence that Mr Taylor demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character given the period of time over which the offences were committed.”*

Mr Taylor did not provide any evidence of his character or attesting to his abilities as a teacher.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Taylor 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 lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, *“Nevertheless, Mr Taylor has stated that “I feel that I have to finish the book and it will be published”. He has provided no evidence of any measures he has subsequently taken to ensure appropriate safeguards are in place ensure any further research is conducted safely. The panel noted that he has accepted that he made a serious mistake in the way he researched the book and quoted the Judge as having said that he is “obsessed” with the safety of children. However, Mr Taylor has not demonstrated any insight as to the impact his actions would have had on the safety of children or of how he would do things differently going forwards.”*

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Taylor has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

The panel has identified “...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.

One of these include

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents”

I have also considered the panel’s comments “Given the panel’s findings that Mr Taylor lacked insight, the panel remained concerned about the risk of repetition.”

The panel has also “...decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period.”

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to the misconduct found in this case, and 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 seriousness of the conduct, which involved indecent images of children, and the lack of insight.

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



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 26 March 2026

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