



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Liam Walker Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**April 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Liam Walker
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	19/35197
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	23 September 1994
<b>TRA reference:</b>	24723
<b>Date of determination:</b>	8 April 2026
<b>Former employer:</b>	Ormiston Meridian Academy, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire

### Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 8 April 2026, to consider the case of Mr Liam Walker.

The panel members were Ms Amanda Godfrey (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Erin Sudds (teacher panellist) and Dr Mark Sanderson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Bernard-Stevenson of Blake Morgan.

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 Walker that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Walker provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Jordan Wilford, Mr Walker or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 22 January 2026.

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

Whilst employed as a teacher at Sir William Stanier School during academic year 2023-2024, and prior to employment at Ormiston Meridian Academy;

1. He engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour towards Child A, by;
  - a. Communicating with Child A on ChatIW and/or Snapchat
  - b. Communicating with Child A when he knew or ought to have known that Child A was 13-years-old.
2. During his communications with Child A, he made comments to the effect of:
  - a. "you never know what creeps are out there trying to get into your pants"
  - b. "why you want me to come yours?"
  - c. "are you a virgin?"
  - d. "What do you want with old guys"
  - e. "They could ask for nudes"
  - f. [men would] "want more than a kiss"
  - g. "you're a virgin though, right?"
  - h. "you're defo gonna get someone in trouble haha hope you don't send nudes"
  - i. "I'm always a little worried to talk dirty to a teen as it's illegal haha"
  - j. "are you looking for sex?"
  - k. Telling a child "you defo want to though" when referring to sex;
  - l. Discussing pregnancy

3. His behaviour as may be found proven at 2 above was conduct of a sexual nature

Mr Walker admitted the facts of all the allegations.

Mr Walker also admitted that his actions 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: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 4 to 26.

Section 2: Statement of Agreed Facts and PO Submissions- pages 28 to 34.

Section 3: Documents- pages 36 to 74.

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”).

### Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Walker on 3 October 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 Walker for the allegations 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.

At the material time, Mr Walker was employed at Sir William Stanier School in Crewe and was about to start his employment as a Religious Education teacher at Ormiston Meridian Academy (‘the Academy’.)

Between 7 August 2024 and 15 August 2024, Mr Walker logged onto a chatroom named ‘ChatIW’ using the usernames ‘HungTeacherMeet’ and/or ‘Fit Teacher.’ On 7, 9, 13 and 15 August 2024, Mr Walker engaged in discussions with a 13-year-old child (Child A.) These discussions also took place on a social media platform named Snapchat. On 7 August 2024, Child A informed Mr Walker that she was 13.

In many of the messages sent by Mr Walker to Child A he asked Child A intrusive questions about her sexual history and made other sexualised remarks.

On 4 September 2024, Mr Walker was arrested for engaging in Sexual Communications with a Child and conveyed to Middlewich Custody Suite in Cheshire operated by Cheshire Constabulary ('the Police.')

[REDACTED]

On 9 September 2024, Mr Walker was dismissed from his role with immediate effect.

[REDACTED]

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

### **1. You engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour towards Child A, by;**

The panel determined that the term 'professional boundaries' and 'unprofessional behaviour' was to be given its ordinary meaning.

The panel considered allegations 1 (a) and 1(b) before considering the stem of the allegations.

#### **a. Communicating with Child A on ChatIW and/or Snapchat**

Between January 2024 until September 2024, Mr Walker retained the role of Assistant Curriculum Leader Humanities at Sir William Stanier School based in Crewe.

On 24<sup>th</sup> April 2024, Mr Walker applied for the role of Religious Education teacher at Ormiston Meridian Academy.

On 7<sup>th</sup> May 2024, Mr Walker was offered the role of Religious Education teacher at Ormiston Meridian Academy. His employment with the Academy was scheduled to start on 1 September 2024.

Between 7 and 15 August 2024, Mr Walker was employed by Sir William Stanier School.

Mr Walker admits that he communicated with Child A on ChatIW and Snapchat.

Mr Walker accordingly admits the facts of allegation 1(a.)

The panel was presented with a police case summary (MG5). The panel noted that it had not been furnished with additional information such as the method by which the conduct had been brought to the Police's attention. The panel also noted that there was no statement from Child A within the bundle of documents or a verbatim copy of the messages exchanged which had been extracted from the respective devices.

Notwithstanding this, the panel accepted Mr Walker's admission, which was consistent with the evidence before it (in particular the contents of the police case summary - MG5).

Having found the conduct specified in allegation 1 (a) proved, the panel went on to consider whether the conduct was inappropriate and unprofessional. The panel determined that engaging in messages with a child on an online platform over the course of approximately one week, as a registered teacher, was both inappropriate and unprofessional. The panel noted that it was Mr Walker who led the interaction with Child A. Child A's responses were limited in nature, and it was Mr Walker who asked a series of probing and/or intrusive questions. The panel was of the view that Mr Walker behaved in this way in order to test the boundaries with Child A and potentially invite Child A to discuss more risqué topics with him.

The panel found allegation 1(a) proved.

**b. Communicating with Child A when you knew or ought to have known that Child A was 13-years-old**

Mr Walker admits that he knew or ought to have known that Child A was 13-years-old.

In his statement, Mr Walker states that ChatIW is a platform which is advertised as 18+ but does not have sufficient age-checking systems.

In this document, Mr Walker further states that during communication with Child A, she disclosed her age.

Mr Walker accordingly admits the facts of allegation 1(b).

The panel was presented with a police case summary (MG5.) The panel noted that Child A informed Mr Walker that she was 13 years of age during their first online interaction on 7 August 2024, yet Mr Walker continued to engage in online correspondence with Child A until 15 August 2024. The panel accepted Mr Walker's admission, which was consistent with the evidence before it (in particular the contents of the police case summary (MG5.)

Having found the conduct specified in allegation 1(b) proved, the panel went on to consider whether the conduct was inappropriate and unprofessional.

The panel determined that Mr Walker's behaviour in this regard was both inappropriate and unprofessional. The panel has found that Mr Walker (a registered teacher) engaged

in protracted and risqué online communication with a child of 13 years of age. The panel considered Mr Walker's explanation that by engaging in this way with Child A he was attempting to act in a safeguarding role by attempting to gauge Child A's intentions and attempting to warn her of the risk of exploitation by other less scrupulous users of the platform. The panel did not find this explanation persuasive and was of the view that it was inconsistent with the sexually explicit content of some of the messages.

The panel found allegation 1(b) proved.

**2. During your communications with Child A, you made comments to the effect of:**

- a. "you never know what creeps are out there trying to get into your pants"
- b. "why you want me to come yours?"
- c. "are you a virgin?"
- d. "What do you want with old guys"
- e. "They could ask for nudes"
- f. [men would] "want more than a kiss"
- g. "you're a virgin though, right?"
- h. "you're defo gonna get someone in trouble haha hope you don't send nudes"
- i. "I'm always a little worried to talk dirty to a teen as it's illegal haha"
- j. "are you looking for sex?"
- k. Telling a child "you defo want to though" when referring to sex;
- l. Discussing pregnancy

Mr Walker admits that during communication with Child A, he made the comments outlined in allegation 2 (a) to (l.)

The panel was presented with a police case summary (MG5) which was consistent with the comments in the allegation.

The panel noted that it had not been furnished with additional information such as the method by which the conduct had been brought to the Police's attention. The panel also noted that there was no statement from Child A or a verbatim copy of the messages exchanged which had been extracted from the respective devices. Notwithstanding this, the panel accepted Mr Walker's admission, which was consistent with the evidence before it.

Therefore, on the balance of probability, the panel found allegation 2 proved.

**3. Your behaviour as may be found proven at 2 above was conduct of a sexual nature**

The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser which was that the panel ought to be guided by the definition of sexual that is set out in Section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 which defines 'sexual' as follows:- *'whatever its circumstances or any person's purpose in relation to it, it is because of its nature sexual or because of its nature it may be sexual and because of its circumstances or the purpose of any person in relation to it.'*

Mr Walker admitted allegation 3. However, the panel noted that in Mr Walker's statement he denied that he was communicating sexually with Child A. Therefore, the panel was of the view that this admission was equivocal in nature. The panel was mindful that it may exercise its discretion by virtue of Rule 4.90 to adjourn the matter in circumstances where a teacher has made an equivocal admission. The panel determined that it was not in the public interest to adjourn the meeting.

The panel reviewed the police case summary together with Mr Walker's statement. The panel noted that a lot of the statements made by Mr Walker in his messages to Child A were inherently sexual. The panel noted that examples of this were:- *'are you a virgin?' (2)(c), 'are you looking for sex?'(2)(j), 'you defo want to though' (2)(k)* (when referring to sex) and reference to 'nudes' (2)(e) and (2)(h.) The panel determined that some of the messages were not inherently sexual in nature. However, the panel determined that a sexual tone could be inferred from the context of these statements. The panel identified examples of this in his statements:- *'what do you want with old guys'* and *'why you want me to come yours?'* The panel was of the view that it was likely that Mr Walker had made these statements in an attempt to test Child A's boundaries by gauging how she would react. The panel's interpretation of this evidence was reinforced by the wider context of these messages which had been preceded or interspersed by inherently sexual statements.

Therefore, on the balance of probability, the panel found allegation 3 proved.

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

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

Whilst this was admitted by Mr Walker, the panel exercised its own judgment in relation to this issue.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Walker in relation to the facts found proved involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Walker was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
  - Treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child, was relevant.

The Advice indicates that where a teacher has displayed behaviours associated with such an offence, but has not been convicted of an offence, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel determined that the teacher had displayed behaviours associated with a relevant offence, therefore it concluded that the allegations found proved amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel noted that the guidance indicates that misconduct outside of the education setting will only amount to unacceptable professional conduct if it affects the way the person fulfils their teaching role or if it may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way.

The panel noted that Mr Walker's behaviour took place in the summer holidays outside of the education setting. Mr Walker failed in his duty of care to children by exposing Child A to the risk of being groomed and failing to promote Child A's safety and welfare. The panel

determined that on one interpretation of the messages, Mr Walker appeared to be testing the boundaries with Child A. The panel determined that this conduct was exacerbated by his use of the usernames *'HungTeacherMeet'* and *'FitTeacher'* which were both capable of having sexual connotations. The panel noted that the use of 'teacher' in both usernames gave the impression that Mr Walker was in a position of responsibility and could be trusted.

Therefore, the panel determined that Mr Walker's conduct did amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel determined that Mr Walker's conduct was likely to bring the profession into disrepute as his conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. In making this determination, the panel noted that the majority of Mr Walker's conduct occurred outside of the education setting and therefore, this conduct would only be considered relevant if it was of a serious nature and would likely have a negative impact on the public's perception of the individual as a teacher. However, the ordinary intelligent citizen would expect a teacher not to engage in protracted, risqué online communication with a child of 13 (or indeed with anyone under the age of 18.) The ordinary intelligent citizen would expect a teacher to end such communications as soon as they were informed (or had formed a reasonable suspicion) that the person they were conversing with was under the age of 18.

In summary, having found the facts of the allegations proved, the panel further found that Mr Walker's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and also conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found the following to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the protection of pupils and other members of the public
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession

- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings that Mr Walker had engaged in inappropriate and unprofessional communication with a minor, there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel was also satisfied that a strong public interest consideration in maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the protection of pupils and other members of the public. Mr Walker's conduct was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to these public interest considerations, the panel considered whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Walker in the profession.

Whilst there is evidence that Mr Walker has experience as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Walker 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 Walker.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Walker.

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 are relevant in this case are:

- Serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position.

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 considered that the following mitigating factors:

- Mr Walker appeared to have an otherwise unblemished record
- Prior to these allegations, Mr Walker had a successful career
- Mr Walker has expressed remorse and insight regarding the harm and impact of his conduct on his colleagues, [REDACTED]
- Mr Walker had engaged with the TRA and made full admissions
- The panel also noted that Mr Walker stated that he had been [REDACTED] and that this sometimes led to him writing things and saying things that came across the wrong way. However, no independent medical evidence had been provided to the panel.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient. The panel also noted that Mr Walker had already been dismissed from his post.

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. The panel considered whether the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient and concluded that this would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations.

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 Walker. The protracted nature of the communication with Child A and the intrusive and explicit nature of the conversation with her 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 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 is:

- any sexual misconduct involving a child;

Although the panel considered that the comments were of a sexual nature, they were not provided with evidence that they were sexually motivated. Moreover, Mr Walker displayed significant insight and remorse regarding his conduct. The panel noted that Mr Walker admitted all of the allegations and readily accepted his wrongdoing.

The panel decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of 5 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 all 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 made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Liam Walker should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
  - Treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position.
- 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 the conduct of Mr Walker displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that *“Mr Walker failed in his duty of care to children by exposing Child A to the risk of being groomed and failing to promote Child A's safety and welfare.”*

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the

profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Walker, 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, *“Mr Walker had engaged in inappropriate and unprofessional communication with a minor.”* 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, *“Mr Walker has expressed remorse and insight regarding the harm and impact of his conduct on his colleagues, [REDACTED].”*

However, the panel has not recorded evidence of Mr Walker demonstrating insight into the harm and impact of his conduct on Child A. In my view, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe that it, *“...was also satisfied that a strong public interest consideration in maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the protection of pupils and other members of the public. Mr Walker’s conduct was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.”*

I am particularly mindful of the finding of unprofessional and inappropriate communication with a minor in this case, and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Walker himself. The panel comment that Mr Walker appeared to have an otherwise unblemished record, and that prior to these allegations, he had a successful career.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Walker 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.

I have placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Walker engaged in protected communication with Child A, and that the nature of that communication was intrusive and explicit in nature.

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

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments *"Although the panel considered that the comments were of a sexual nature, they were not provided with evidence that they were sexually motivated. Moreover, Mr Walker displayed significant insight and remorse regarding his conduct. The panel noted that Mr Walker admitted all of the allegations and readily accepted his wrongdoing."*

The panel has also said that a five-year review period would be proportionate in all of the circumstances.

I have considered whether a five-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 five-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the protracted and sexual nature of the inappropriate communication with Child A and the lack of evidence of full insight.

I consider therefore that a five-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Liam Walker 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 10 April 2031, five 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 Walker remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Walker 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 that reads "S. Blomfield". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'S'.

**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 9 April 2026**

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