



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Kenley Imo (Senior): Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**April 2026**

## Contents

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

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

**Teacher:** Mr Kenley Imo (Senior)

**Teacher ref number:** 1333603

**Teacher date of birth:** 7 December 1971

**TRA reference:** 25434

**Date of determination:** 8 April 2026

**Former employer:** Larches High School, Preston

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) was part heard on 24 March 2026 and reconvened on 8 April 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Imo.

The panel members were Mr Duncan Tilley (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Tanya Callman (lay panellist) and Mr Stephen Mitchell (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Sarah Price of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Jim Olphert of Counsel.

Mr Imo (Senior) was present and was represented by Mr Gurmair Singh.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 19 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Imo (Senior) was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 13 January 2025, he was convicted at Lancaster Magistrates' Court of, on 25 September 2023, assaulting a person occasioning them actual bodily harm contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.

Mr Imo (Senior) confirmed that he admits the allegation and that it is a conviction of a relevant offence.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Notice of Referral – pages 4 to 33

Section 2: Anonymised Person List – page 34

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 35 to 82

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 83 to 136

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

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

### **Witnesses**

Given the nature of the allegation, no witnesses were called by the presenting officer.

Mr Imo (Senior) attended and gave evidence to the panel.

## Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Imo (Senior) had been employed by Lancashire County Council as a Science Teacher in a Pupil Referral Unit.

On 25 September 2023 an incident occurred whereby Mr Imo (Senior) caused an injury to another person following an altercation.

On 13 January 2023, Mr Imo (Senior) was convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. He was sentenced to a community order with an unpaid work requirement of 150 hours and compensation in the sum of £250.

A referral was subsequently made to the TRA.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**You have been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:**

- 1. On 13 January 2025, you were convicted at Lancaster Magistrates' Court of, on 25 September 2023, assaulting a person occasioning them actual bodily harm contrary to Section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.**

The allegation was admitted by Mr Imo (Senior) and was supported by evidence presented to the panel.

The panel was provided with a court extract from the Magistrates Court pertaining to this offence. This showed that Mr Imo (Senior) was convicted on 13 January 2023 of assault occasioning actual bodily harm contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861. It further confirmed that Mr Imo (Senior) received a sentence of a community order with an unpaid work requirement of 150 hours and compensation in the sum of £250.

The panel was satisfied that it could rely on this as conclusive proof of the commission of the offence.

Accordingly, the panel found the allegation proved.

## Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proven 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 Imo (Senior), in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Imo (Senior) 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

The panel noted that Mr Imo (Senior)’s actions were not relevant to teaching, working with children or working in an education setting. The offence was committed outside of the School and did not involve children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and security of members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Imo (Senior)’s behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Imo (Senior)’s behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning an offence involving violence which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel took into account the mitigating circumstances put forward by Mr Imo (Senior). In particular, the panel also took account of Mr Imo (Senior)’s unblemished record as a teacher and the positive testimonials that had been submitted.

The panel also took account of Mr Imo (Senior)’s explanation of the incident that led to his conviction. The panel recognised that this was a difficult situation. The panel was provided with some video footage of the incident. However, this did not capture the whole incident. The panel accepted that this was a “*scuffle*” that appeared to get

out of hand and resulted in Mr Imo (Senior) injuring another person. Nonetheless the panel acknowledge that Mr Imo (Senior) was convicted of a serious offence resulting in harm.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Imo (Senior)'s ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

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

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Imo (Senior), which related to a conviction for assaulting a person occasioning them actual bodily harm, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Imo (Senior) 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 Imo (Senior) 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 Imo (Senior) in the profession.

Whilst there was evidence presented to the panel of Mr Imo (Senior)'s ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above

outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Imo (Senior) in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 Imo (Senior).

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards; and
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.

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

The panel carefully considered Mr Imo (Senior)'s evidence that he felt threatened by the other individual involved in the incident. The panel heard evidence from Mr Imo (Senior) that he felt physically provoked by the individual. However, the panel concluded that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Imo (Senior) was acting under extreme duress. The panel considered that Mr Imo (Senior) should have taken steps to remove himself from and/or to de-escalate the situation. There was some evidence that indicated that his actions were deliberate. The panel noted that the video footage evidence showed at least one example of Mr Imo (Senior) unilaterally closing the physical separation distance between himself and his victim, who appeared to be stationary. This was prior to the scuffle which resulted in the injury to the other individual, for which Mr Imo (Senior) was later convicted. The panel did however note that there is no evidence that Mr Imo (Senior) had planned to cause the injury. Ultimately, Mr Imo (Senior) was convicted of a serious violent offence against another person, and his actions had resulted in an injury.

The panel considered that Mr Imo (Senior) has demonstrated some insight. Mr Imo (Senior) indicated that he accepted the conviction, he admitted the allegation before this panel, and he has expressed remorse for his actions. However, when he gave evidence to this panel, he did not appear to fully accept the incident was his fault and instead sought to blame the other individual involved in the incident.

The panel heard evidence from Mr Imo (Senior) that he has taken steps to remediate his conduct and ensure that he will not repeat this behaviour in the future. The panel questioned Mr Imo (Senior) about the extent of this remediation. He explained that this involved 40 hours of online study via the probation service, including courses on conflict management. He stated that this had helped reinforce that in future he should remain calm and remove himself from a situation. Mr Imo (Senior) told the panel that *"I knew what [the other individual] did was wrong, I would have dealt with it better if I had locked myself in the house and let the police deal with it"*. He further stated that he is *"well equipped"* for the future to avoid any kind of conflict and deal with it *"better next time"*.

The panel noted that Mr Imo (Senior) has previously worked with children who are vulnerable and have challenging behaviours. As such, the panel considered that the need to act as a positive role model was heightened. The panel was concerned that Mr Imo (Senior)'s conduct did not model positive behaviours.

Whilst this was an isolated incident, the panel was concerned that Mr Imo (Senior) had demonstrated significantly poor lack of judgment. In particular, the panel considered that Mr Imo (Senior) had several opportunities to de-escalate the situation.

Mr Imo (Senior) did have a previous good history, and the panel was provided with positive character references in the hearing bundle, including a positive reference from a Church Pastor which mentions that Mr Imo (Senior) was *"re-elected as a Head Elder for 2025"*. It was clear that the Pastor was aware of allegations against Mr Imo (Senior). The panel was also provided with a testimonial from the [REDACTED] at Larches High School which confirmed that they did not have any concerns regarding Mr Imo (Senior)'s professional conduct.

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 Imo (Senior) 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 Imo (Senior). The seriousness of the conviction was a significant factor in forming

that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life. 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 cases where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

One of these includes:

- violence.

Given the panel's findings that Mr Imo (Senior) had been convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm, this weighed in favour of a longer review period.

However, for the following reasons, the panel concluded that a longer review period was neither appropriate nor proportionate in the particular circumstances of this case.

In reaching its decision, the panel took into consideration the mitigation present, which included:

- the panel had noted the circumstances surrounding the incident were difficult;
- Mr Imo (Senior) had felt some element of provocation;
- previous good character;
- evidence of remorse;
- this was a one-off incident that took place outside of the education setting;
- mitigation, as outlined above, including some insight shown; and
- the risk of repetition was low.

In all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of 2 years.

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

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

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

In this case, the panel has found the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Kenley Imo (Senior) should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Imo (Senior) 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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of a conviction for the relevant offence of assaulting a person causing them actual bodily harm.

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 Imo (Senior), and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“The panel noted that Mr Imo (Senior)’s actions were not relevant to teaching, working with children or working in an education setting. The offence was committed outside of the School and did not involve children.”

The panel has also observed:

“The panel noted that Mr Imo (Senior) has previously worked with children who are vulnerable and have challenging behaviours. As such, the panel considered that the need to act as a positive role model was heightened. The panel was concerned that Mr Imo (Senior)’s conduct did not model positive behaviours.”

I have also taken into account the panel’s findings that Mr Imo (Senior) had demonstrated remorse but had not shown full insight into his actions. The panel has said:

“The panel considered that Mr Imo (Senior) has demonstrated some insight. Mr Imo (Senior) indicated that he accepted the conviction, he admitted the allegation before this panel, and he has expressed remorse for his actions. However, when he gave evidence to this panel, he did not appear to fully accept the incident was his fault and instead sought to blame the other individual involved in the incident.”

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

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

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Imo (Senior), which related to a conviction for assaulting a person occasioning them actual bodily harm, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Imo (Senior) were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for an assault which resulted in injury to another person in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Imo (Senior) himself. The panel has commented:

“Mr Imo (Senior) did have a previous good history, and the panel was provided with positive character references in the hearing bundle, including a positive reference from a Church Pastor which mentions that Mr Imo (Senior) was *“re-elected as a Head Elder for 2025”*. It was clear that the Pastor was aware of allegations against Mr Imo (Senior). The panel was also provided with a testimonial from the [REDACTED] at Larches High School which confirmed that they did not have any concerns regarding Mr Imo (Senior)’s professional conduct.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the seriousness of the violent offence of which Mr Imo (Senior) was convicted. The panel has said:

“The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Imo (Senior)’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.”

I have also taken account of the panel’s conclusion that, although Mr Imo (Senior) felt physically provoked, there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Imo (Senior) was acting under extreme distress and some evidence that indicated his actions were deliberate. The panel has said:

“Whilst this was an isolated incident, the panel was concerned that Mr Imo (Senior) had demonstrated significantly poor lack of judgment. In particular, the panel considered that Mr Imo (Senior) had several opportunities to de-escalate the situation.”

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

“Given the panel's findings that Mr Imo (Senior) had been convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm, this weighed in favour of a longer review period.

However, for the following reasons, the panel concluded that a longer review period was neither appropriate nor proportionate in the particular circumstances of this case.

In reaching its decision, the panel took into consideration the mitigation present, which included:

- the panel had noted the circumstances surrounding the incident were difficult;
- Mr Imo (Senior) had felt some element of provocation;
- previous good character;
- evidence of remorse;
- this was a one-off incident that took place outside of the education setting;
- mitigation, as outlined above, including some insight shown; and
- the risk of repetition was low.”

I have considered whether a 2-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offence of which Mr Imo (Senior) was convicted, the lack of full insight and the impact on the reputation of the teaching profession.

I have decided that a 2-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Kenley Imo (Senior) is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 17 April 2028, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Imo (Senior) remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Oatley', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 9 April 2026**

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