



Mr Asir Nazar 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
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	6
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	9

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

Teacher: Asir Nazar

Teacher ref number: 1737952

Teacher date of birth: 18 May 1988

TRA reference: 16853

Date of determination: 15 April 2026 and 27 April 2026

Former employer: Plantsbrook School, Sutton Coldfield.

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Asir Nazar.

The panel members were Dr Martin Coles (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist) and Ms Jo Palmer-Tweed (teacher panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Oyin Makinde of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Nazar was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 16 January 2026.

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

On or around 2 September 2024, he was convicted at Birmingham Crown Court of the offence of Violent Disorder contrary to section 2 Public Order Act 1986.

In the absence of a response from the teacher, the allegation is not admitted.

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 3 to 9

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – 11 to 58

Section 3: Teacher documents – N/A

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Proceeding in absence application form (6 pages.)

TRA flow chart (Addendum A.)

The case of Tariq Alsaifi and the Secretary of State For Education (*2016 EWHC 1519*) (Addendum B.)

The case of Zebaida v Secretary of State For Education (*2016 EWHC 1181*) (Addendum C.)

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2018 (the “Procedures”).

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Between 1 September 2017 and 29 October 2017, Mr Nazar was employed as a Math's Teacher at Plantsbrook School based in Sutton Coldfield.

On 2 September 2024, Mr Asir Nazar was convicted of violent disorder. The cause of the violent disorder was a dispute between the staff members of a family-owned gym and their former tenants and associates. The commission of this offence took place on 18 June 2017 in Digbeth in Birmingham. On this date, a public disorder took place which involved over 30 men, many of whom were wearing balaclavas and carrying weapons. During the disorder, several vehicles and individuals met at a crossroads outside a public house and a fight ensued. Many participants in this fight sustained serious injuries. Mr Asir Nazar did not leave his vehicle during the melee, however, he disabled one of the vehicles on scene which enabled the occupants of the convoy to attack others.

On 18 October 2017, Mr Nazar was arrested by the police.

On 29 October 2017, Mr Nazar resigned from his post advising his employers that he was struggling to manage the workload as a Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT) and [REDACTED].

On 15 November 2017, the matter was referred to the TRA.

On 28 October 2024, Asir Nazar was sentenced to 15 months imprisonment suspended for 12 months.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. You have been convicted at any time, of a relevant offence, in that:

On or around 2 September 2024, you were convicted at Birmingham Crown Court of the offence of Violent Disorder contrary to section 2 Public Order Act 1986.

The panel was presented with a certificate of conviction from Birmingham Crown Court and a copy of Mr Nazar's PNC record, confirming that Mr Nazar was convicted on 2 September 2024 of the offence particularised in the allegation.

The panel was also presented with the sentencing remarks of the presiding Judge sitting at Court on 28 October 2024.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of the offence by Mr Nazar.

The panel found this allegation proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the conviction amounted to a 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Nazar in relation to the facts it found proved involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Nazar 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs

Further and in addition, the panel noted that, pursuant to the Advice it is likely that:

- A conviction for any offence that has led to a term of imprisonment, including any suspended sentence will be considered “a relevant offence”.
- A conviction for an offence of violence will be considered a ‘relevant offence.’

The panel determined that both the nature and gravity of this offence were very serious. Mr Nazar has been convicted of engaging in violent disorder. The police case summary indicated that the police took the view that Mr Nazar had played a pivotal role in the disorder by disabling someone’s car, thereby allowing further violence to take place.

The serious nature of the conduct was reflected in the suspended sentence of imprisonment which was imposed by the Judge at the sentencing hearing. In the judge’s sentencing remarks, he described the conduct as ‘a very serious example of organised group violence.’ The judge went on to state that everyone involved in the conduct played an ‘integral role.’

In conclusion and for all these reasons, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was directly relevant to Mr Nazar’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 a punitive effect.

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

- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the nature of the offence the panel determined that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if appropriate action was not taken with respect to Mr Nazar's case.

As a result of this, the panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present.

Although Mr Nazar's competence as an educator had not been evidenced, in light of the nature of the allegation in this case, the panel concluded there was not a sufficiently strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.

Notwithstanding 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 Nazar.

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 Nazar. 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 pertain to this case are set out below:-

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

Even though 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 factor was present in this case:

- Mr Nazar appeared to have an otherwise unblemished teaching record (although the panel noted that Mr Nazar had not been working as a qualified

teacher at the time that the offence took place and went on to work as a teacher for a very short time thereafter.)

Weighed against this and the behaviours set out above, the panel considered there were aggravating features in this case, including that:

- Mr Nazar had not engaged with the TRA proceedings and therefore had not presented any evidence of insight and/or remorse.
- It was noted in the Judge's sentencing remarks that 'this was a very serious example of organised group violence.'

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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Nazar of prohibition.

The panel noted that the conduct took place at approximately 18.45 on a sunny Sunday evening in a residential area. The police case summary indicates that members of the public were outside enjoying the weather, and a dance class was taking place in a public house nearby. The panel determined that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public.

The panel acknowledged that at the time that the conduct occurred, Mr Nazar was not a qualified teacher and therefore would not have held a qualified teaching role. However, Mr Nazar would have at least completed part of his teacher training with a view to becoming a teacher at which time he would have been expected to model good behaviour.

The panel determined that Mr Nazar's actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. The nature and gravity of this offence was a matter of significant concern.

There were, accordingly, particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of maintaining public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring of proper standards of conduct in this case.

Mr Nazar's behaviour led to him receiving a significant sentence, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offence.

The panel was therefore of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Nazar.

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 applied 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 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 types of cases is: -

- Cases involving violence.

The panel noted that although Mr Nazar did not leave his vehicle during the melee, the police case summary indicates that Mr Nazar played a pivotal role in the conduct by using his vehicle to block another vehicle thereby preventing means of escape and enabling an attack to take place. The panel noted that the group's conduct was 'pre-planned' and that Mr Nazar had been an integral part of the group. The panel reminded itself that there were limited mitigating factors present in this case.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and as such, the panel decided that it would be proportionate, in all circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found the 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 Asir Nazar should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Nazar 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction for the

relevant offence of engaging in violent disorder, which resulted in a suspended sentence of imprisonment.

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 Nazar, 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 noted that, at the time the offence took place, "Mr Nazar was not a qualified teacher and therefore would not have held a qualified teaching role. However, Mr Nazar would have at least completed part of his teacher training with a view to becoming a teacher at which time he would have been expected to model good behaviour." The panel has also observed that "The panel determined that "the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public."

I have also taken into account the panel's comment that "Mr Nazar had not engaged with the TRA proceedings and therefore had not presented any evidence of insight and/or remorse." In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of repetition of this behaviour. 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 has observed that "In light of the nature of the offence the panel determined that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if appropriate action was not taken with respect to Mr Nazar's case."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for violent disorder 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 Nazar himself. The panel has commented that "Mr Nazar appeared to have an otherwise unblemished teaching record (although the panel noted that Mr Nazar had not been working as a qualified teacher at the time that the offence took place and went on to work as a teacher for a very short time thereafter."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Nazar 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 offence of which Mr Nazar was convicted and it's finding that Mr Nazar's actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. The panel has observed that "The serious nature of the conduct was reflected in the suspended sentence of imprisonment which was imposed by the Judge at the sentencing hearing. In the Judge's sentencing remarks, he described the conduct as 'a very serious example of organised group violence.' The judge went on to state that everyone involved in the conduct played an 'integral role.'"

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comment that Mr Nazar had not provided it with any evidence of his insight into, or remorse for, his conduct.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Nazar 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The Advice 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 types of cases is:

- Cases involving violence.

The panel noted that although Mr Nazar did not leave his vehicle during the melee, the police case summary indicates that Mr Nazar played a pivotal role in the conduct by using his vehicle to block another vehicle thereby preventing means of escape and enabling an attack to take place. The panel noted that the group's conduct was 'pre-planned' and that Mr Nazar had been an integral part of the group. The panel reminded itself that there were limited mitigating factors present in this case."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offence of which Mr Nazar was convicted and the lack of evidence of insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Asir Nazar is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Nazar shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

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



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 29 April 2026

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