



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Annika Kiran Kapur: 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	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Miss Annika Kiran Kapur

Teacher ref number: 2180111

Teacher date of birth: 25 January 1996

TRA reference: 25345

Date of determination: 10 April 2026

Former employer: Djanogly City Academy, Nottingham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 10 April 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Miss Annika Kiran Kapur.

The panel members were Mr Duncan Tilley (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist) and Dr Louise Wallace (lay 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 Miss Kapur that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Miss Kapur provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Carolyn Thackstone or Miss Kapur.

The meeting took place in private and was not recorded.

Allegations

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

It was alleged that Miss Kapur was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed as a teacher of English at Djanogly City Academy between August 2024 to March 2025:

1. She displayed and/or engaged in unprofessional behaviour on or around 27 January 2025, by
 - a. Bringing alcohol onto school premises in a bottle
 - b. Consuming alcohol whilst on school premises and/or during school hours
 - c. Being under the influence of alcohol whilst on school premises and/or during school hours.
2. Her conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 above put one or more pupils at risk of harm.

Miss Kapur admitted the allegations and admitted that she was guilty of 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 referral – pages 4 to 17

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 18 to 23

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 24 to 101

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 102 to 105

The panel was also provided with the notice of meeting.

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 Miss Kapur on 13 August 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 Miss Kapur 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.

Miss Kapur was employed as a teacher of English at Djanogly City Academy (“the School”) from 29 August 2024.

Concerns regarding Miss Kapur initially came to the School’s attention when Miss Kapur appeared intoxicated whilst teaching a lesson. She was suspended from the School on 28 January 2025 and her contract was terminated on 13 March 2025.

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:

Whilst employed as a teacher of English at Djanogly City Academy between August 2024 to March 2025:

- 1. You displayed and/or engaged in unprofessional behaviour on or around 27 January 2025, by**
 - a. Bringing alcohol onto school premises in a bottle**
 - b. Consuming alcohol whilst on school premises and/or during school hours**

c. Being under the influence of alcohol whilst on school premises and/or during school hours.

2. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 above put one or more pupils at risk of harm.

In the statement of agreed facts, Miss Kapur admitted these allegations.

She accepted that on or around 25 January 2025, whilst celebrating her birthday, she had in her possession a water bottle which she used to conceal alcohol. She accepted that she brought the same water bottle onto school premises on 27 January 2025 whilst it still contained alcohol.

The panel has seen statements taken during the School's investigation of six members of staff who entered the classroom on 27 January 2025 during period 6.

Individual A described having been concerned by Miss Kapur's slurring of words and Miss Kapur seeming unsteady on her feet. He stated that a student had his head on the desk and Miss Kapur had "gently pulled him up from the desk with his hair". He stated that the way she spoke was very out of character, and Miss Kapur was gesticulating with her hands and swaying. He asked Miss Kapur to speak with him outside the classroom. He stated that once she stepped outside of the classroom, she began to "retch". He escorted her to the staff toilet, and heard her being sick, quite loudly. He stated that Miss Kapur confirmed afterwards that she had vomited. He stated that he did not smell any alcohol, but her actions, mannerisms and behaviour were that of someone who was drunk.

Individual B stated that she observed that Miss Kapur was slurring her words a little, she looked unsteady, she was struggling to call the class to attention and was overenunciating. She stated that she asked Miss Kapur on two or three occasions if she was feeling "ok", and Miss Kapur said that she was fine, just "a bit tired". She stated that some of the pupils were asking if she was "ok" and after Miss Kapur left the classroom, asked if Miss Kapur was drunk. She stated that she did not smell alcohol when she stood next to Miss Kapur.

Individual C stated that she had attended Miss Kapur's classroom because a student had come out of the classroom, saying that someone was throwing balls at the student. She stated that the students were not sitting according to their seating plan and Miss Kapur was slurring when she was speaking with her and her mannerisms were out of character. Individual C confirmed she did not smell alcohol but there had been more physical signs such as slurring. She stated that there had been no classroom control.

Individual D stated that Miss Kapur was acting in an exaggerated manner, which didn't accord with her normal movement or speech. She also reported students having asked if

Miss Kapur was drunk. She stated that her view was that Miss Kapur seemed to be drunk.

Individual E stated that Miss Kapur was slurring her words and swaying from side to side. She stated that Miss Kapur had said that "this class terrifies me". She stated that the students were not listening to her at all. She stated that Miss Kapur was speaking "really slowly", unlike how she usually spoke. She stated that Miss Kapur was holding a bottle of a "non-alcoholic drink" whilst she was teaching, although she could not see what was inside the bottle.

Individual F stated that Miss Kapur's speech sounded slurred. She stated that the students did not seem as though they noticed anything at the time.

Miss Kapur was interviewed as part of the School's investigation. She apologised at the outset, saying she had acted "out of character". She stated that when she woke that morning, she realised she had a [REDACTED]. She stated that the [REDACTED]. She stated that she had a half-filled water bottle with alcohol in it from her birthday weekend in her work bag, not realising that the alcohol was still there. She stated that she hadn't drunk from it until the end of the day. She stated that around period 6 she drank from the bottle and quickly realised it was alcohol. She stated that she could not spit it out because the children were there and they would question what was in the bottle. She stated that the bottle had contained gin with water because she did not want people to know that she topped up her drinks. She stated that she did not want people to know that she had an [REDACTED], so she hid it. She described the bottle as being the same one that Individual E had described, and that it had contained gin and lemon. She stated that she "chugged it to stop myself vomiting" and indicated that she had drunk about a third of the bottle. She stated that she thought she had been drunk because [REDACTED] as well. She stated that she had not pulled a student's head off the desk but had patted his head. She stated that she had not asked for help, as it had been the last lesson of the day, and thought she could get through the last half an hour. Miss Kapur stated that she [REDACTED] until the Saturday. She was asked if the students were safe, and she said that she "wasn't that bad", that she had a "dizzy headache" and that she remembered exactly what she was doing. She stated that she was glad other members of staff had come into her room.

In light of the evidence of six staff members and Miss Kapur, as well as Miss Kapur's own admissions the panel found allegation 1 proven.

With respect to allegation 1a, Miss Kapur has been consistent in her explanation of how she came to bring alcohol onto school premises in a bottle. She described the bottle and Individual E gave some corroboration in that she described the bottle Miss Kapur was holding and this matched the description of the bottle given by Miss Kapur.

With respect to allegation 1b and 1c, Miss Kapur has been consistent in her admission of these allegations during the School's investigation and the TRA proceedings. Her consumption of alcohol whilst on school premises during school hours was corroborated by the descriptions of her behaviour which was out of character and her slurred speech towards the end of the day. There was no indication of Miss Kapur's behaviour having been affected prior to that lesson, or any concerns being raised. Although Miss Kapur had said that she had [REDACTED] at lunch time, it was not until after Miss Kapur had consumed alcohol that concerns were raised regarding her behaviour. The panel therefore considered that it was more likely than not that Miss Kapur had been under the influence of alcohol whilst on school premises and/or during school hours. There was also no medical evidence of Miss Kapur [REDACTED] at the time. The panel accepted that may have been possible, but that the consumption of a third of a bottle of gin and lemon would more than likely have led to Miss Kapur being under the influence of alcohol during the lesson.

With respect to allegation 2, the panel noted that one child had left the classroom and there was a high degree of disruption within the class. She was responsible for the class and yet six other members of staff came into the classroom because of the concerns regarding her behaviour. Bringing alcohol onto premises in a water bottle carried the risk of accidental consumption by Miss Kapur or by others. The panel considered that Miss Kapur's actions in bringing alcohol onto school premises, consuming alcohol and being under the influence of alcohol when in charge of pupils put one or more pupils at risk of harm.

The panel found allegations 1 and 2 proven in their entirety.

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

Having found all of 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.

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 Miss Kapur, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Kapur 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...
- 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 noted that the School's Staff Behaviour Policy stated that alcohol "may not be consumed on the premises unless as part of a letting outside of normal working times". It stated that it is not acceptable to consume any alcohol during the normal working day. The policy goes on to state that it is expected that staff will attend their place of work in a fit state to carry out their duties. The School's Alcohol, Smoking and Drugs Policy (Staff) states that staff must not be in possession of alcohol or illegal drugs in the workplace and must not consume alcohol while at work. The policy refers to contravention of the rules being a very serious matter.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Kapur in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel considered that Miss Kapur breached her responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Miss Kapur in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Miss Kapur'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 found that none of these offences was relevant.

Whilst bringing the alcohol into school was in breach of the School's policy, the panel did not consider that, in itself, fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel considered that once Miss Kapur recognised she had alcohol in the bottle, she ought to have stopped consuming it immediately, rather than continuing to drink a third of the bottle. She then had the opportunity to withdraw from the class, having realised what she had done, yet instead she continued to remain in charge of the students. She

referred to not having wanted to inconvenience other members of staff in the last lesson of the day. Instead, she chose to put the students at risk by remaining in the classroom.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Kapur 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 Kapur was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct in respect of the conduct found proven at allegations 1b, 1c and 2.

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

The panel did not find that bringing the alcohol into school could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

The panel considered that Miss Kapur's conduct in consuming alcohol and being under the influence of alcohol on school premises and during school hours could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel also considered that the public would take a dim view of Miss Kapur's conduct having put one or more pupils at risk of harm.

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Kapur's actions in respect of the conduct found proven at allegations 1b, 1c and 2 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. Having done so, it found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of having been under the influence of alcohol during a lesson, whilst responsible for the students attending that lesson.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Kapur 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 Miss Kapur was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel had no evidence of Miss Kapur's abilities as an educator, albeit noted that she was at an early stage of her career and may be able to make a valuable contribution to the profession in the future. Nevertheless, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Miss Kapur in the profession, since her 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 Miss Kapur.

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;

- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; 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).

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 no evidence that Miss Kapur's actions were not deliberate. There was no evidence that Miss Kapur had planned to bring alcohol into the School. However, Miss Kapur drank at third of the bottle knowing from the moment that she tasted it that it contained alcohol. Having done so, she elected to remain in the classroom.

There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Kapur was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. During the School's investigation, Miss Kapur stated that she [REDACTED]. She also referred to having difficulties [REDACTED]. Miss Kapur referred to having already been [REDACTED]. There was no medical evidence to confirm that was the case.

There was no evidence that Miss Kapur had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. There was no evidence that she had previously been subject to disciplinary proceedings or had any warnings. As referred to above, she was at a very early stage of her career.

Miss Kapur did not provide any statements attesting to her character or her ability as a teacher.

The panel noted that Miss Kapur had apologised during the School's investigation and admitted that she had consumed alcohol whilst teaching a class. She has made full admissions of the allegations in these TRA misconduct proceedings and elected for the matter to be considered at a professional conduct panel meeting, thereby saving the cost and resources of a hearing being convened. The panel noted that she had apologised for the time she had taken and the trouble she had caused. However, although Miss Kapur admitted allegation 2, the panel was not provided with any additional evidence that Miss Kapur understood the risk she had posed to the students she was entrusted to safeguard, or the harm she could have caused to the reputation of the School.

Miss Kapur also said during the School's investigation that she had obtained [REDACTED]. She referred to having [REDACTED] However, no independent evidence was received of Miss Kapur's [REDACTED]. Miss Kapur has provided no update as to

her reflection upon the incident and how she would behave differently or have the strategies to [REDACTED] going forwards. The panel therefore did not have the necessary assurance that there was a low risk of repetition.

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 Miss Kapur 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 Miss Kapur. The lack of assurance as to the risk of repetition 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, 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.

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.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel considered that Miss Kapur had demonstrated some remorse, in that she had admitted her actions from the earliest opportunity, and that it was noted in her probation hearing that she had said that she had made a "grievous error. Horrible mistake". It also appears that she has sought [REDACTED] although the panel had no independent evidence of that support, or its efficacy. The panel considered that Miss Kapur could potentially make a valuable contribution to teaching in the future if the risk of repetition could be assessed to be low.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period after two 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 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. In this case the panel has found that allegation 1(a) does not amount to either unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Miss Annika Kiran Kapur should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Kapur 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...
 - 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 the conduct of Miss Kapur, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that Miss Kapur was under the influence of alcohol during a lesson.

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 Kapur, 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 considered that Miss Kapur breached her responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn."* 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, *"...no independent evidence was received of Miss Kapur's [REDACTED]. Miss Kapur has provided no update as to her reflection upon the incident and how she would behave differently or have the strategies to [REDACTED] going forwards."*

The panel has found that Miss Kapur has shown some remorse.

The panel has also commented that *"The panel therefore did not have the necessary assurance that there was a low risk of repetition."* In my judgement, the lack of evidence 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, *"...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Kapur were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."* I am particularly mindful of the finding of Miss Kapur being under the influence of alcohol during a lesson, and the impact this may have on public confidence in 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 Kapur herself. The panel comment *"There was no evidence that Miss Kapur had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. There was no evidence that she had previously been subject to disciplinary proceedings or had any warnings. As referred to above, she was at a very early stage of her career."*

Miss Kapur did not provide any statements attesting to her character or her ability as a teacher."

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Kapur 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.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of evidence of insight. The panel has said, *"...the panel was not provided with any additional evidence that Miss Kapur understood the risk she had posed to the students she was entrusted to safeguard, or the harm she could have caused to the reputation of the School."*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that *"Miss Kapur drank at third of the bottle knowing from the moment that she tasted it that it contained alcohol. Having done so, she elected to remain in the classroom."*

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Miss Kapur 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 evidence of full 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 two-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments *"The panel considered that Miss Kapur had demonstrated some remorse, in that she had admitted her actions from the earliest opportunity, and that it was noted in her probation hearing that she had said that she had made a "grievous error. Horrible mistake". It also appears that she has sought [REDACTED] although the panel had no independent evidence of that support, or its efficacy. The panel considered that Miss Kapur could potentially make a valuable contribution to teaching in the future if the risk of repetition could be assessed to be low."*

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

I have considered whether a two-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 allowing for a two-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct and the lack of evidence of insight.

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

This means that Miss Annika Kiran Kapur is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 23 April 2028, two years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Miss Kapur remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 13 April 2026

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