



Mr Nadeem Ahmed: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

May 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	9
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	19

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

Teacher: Mr Nadeem Ahmed

TRA reference: 23449

Date of determination: 20 May 2026

Former employer: Abbey Multi Academy Trust working at Bishop Young C of E Academy, Leeds and Bradford Academy Trust at Bradford Academy.

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 18 to 20 May 2026 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Nadeem Ahmed.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Fiona Fowles (teacher panellist) and Mrs Jane Gotschel (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Helen Kitchen of Blake Morgan, solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Jim Olphert of Counsel from Mountford Chambers, instructed by Kingsley Napley.

Mr Nadeem Ahmed was present and was represented by Mr Andrew Faux of Counsel of the Reflective Practice.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation(s) set out in the notice of hearing dated 10 February 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Nadeem Ahmed was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as an English Teacher at Bishop Young Academy ("the School"):

1. Between around 4 September 2023 and 25 September 2023, he informed the School that he was not well enough to attend work, when he was in fact able to work;
2. He worked as a Teacher at Bradford Academy Trust whilst he was on sick leave from the School on:
 - a. 4 September 2023;
 - b. 5 September 2023;
 - c. 6 September 2023;
 - d. 7 September 2023
 - e. 8 September 2023;
 - f. 11 September 2023
 - g. 12 September 2023;
 - h. 13 September 2023;
 - i. 14 September 2023;
 - j. 15 September 2023;
 - k. 18 September 2023;
 - l. 19 September 2023;
 - m. 20 September 2023;
 - n. 21 September 2023;
 - o. 22 September 2023;
 - p. 25 September 2023;
3. His actions at paragraph 1 and/or 2a – 2p above were:
 - a. lacking integrity;
 - b. dishonest.

Mr Ahmed admitted the facts of the allegations.

Mr Ahmed also admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or 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: Chronology and List of key people – pages 7 to 9

Section 2: Notice of Hearing and response – pages 10 to 19

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 20 to 38

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 39 to 479

Section 5: Teacher documents (including a separately provided audio recording) – pages 480 to 527

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

A three-page Statement of Agreed Facts dated 18 May 2026 signed by both parties

A five-page statement from Witness D dated 18 May 2026

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle and listened to the audio recording, in advance of the hearing. They also read the additional documents that the panel decided to admit as the case proceeded.

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

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Witness A – [REDACTED] employed by the Abbey Multi Academy Trust (“the Trust”);

Witness B – [REDACTED] at the Trust.

The panel also accepted into evidence, with the agreement of both Mr Ahmed and the presenting officer, the uncontested statement of Witness C – [REDACTED] Bradford Academy.

The panel also heard oral evidence from Witness D – [REDACTED], Mr Ahmed’s current employer.

Mr Ahmed also gave oral 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.

In October 2020, during the Covid Lockdowns, Mr Ahmed commenced employment at Bishop Young CE Academy (“the School”) as a Supply English Teacher.

On 1 November 2021, Mr Ahmed was put on a fixed term contract as a full-time teacher of English at the School.

On 1 January 2023, Mr Ahmed was put onto a permanent contract at the School.

On 23 March 2023, Mr Ahmed was interviewed for the role of full-time Religious Education (RE) subject lead at Bradford Academy.

On 29 March 2023 Mr Ahmed was offered the role of RE subject lead at Bradford Academy subject to satisfactory checks and references.

On 16 May 2023, Mr Ahmed emailed the School requesting information on notice periods for resignations and was provided with that information, including that to leave at the end of the summer term the notice period was three months, no later than 31 May.

On 14 June 2023 Mr Ahmed attended an interview for an internally advertised senior leadership position at the School.

On 15 June 2023, Mr Ahmed submitted his resignation to the School.

On 19 June 2023, Mr Ahmed asked for confirmation of his end date and was advised by the School that he had missed the 31 May 2023 deadline and so his last day would be 31 December 2023.

In reply, on 19 June 2023, Mr Ahmed apologised and said that he thought, for various reasons, it was better for him to leave sooner rather than later.

Later on 19 June 2023, the School emailed Mr Ahmed and advised him that this would place him in breach of contract. The required notice period was to allow the School to recruit to his role. The School was willing to recruit a replacement but if this was not successful, then he would need to stay until a replacement was found, “which should be before 31 December 2023”, and a date could be mutually agreed between himself and Person E, the [REDACTED].

On 22 June 2023 Person E, met with Mr Ahmed and they discussed issues around Mr Ahmed's resignation date and recruitment of his replacement.

On 27 June 2023, the School advertised Mr Ahmed's role with a closing date of 11 July 2023.

According to the School's records, on 29 June 2023 Person E wrote to Mr Ahmed about his resignation and leaving date, formally acknowledging receipt of his resignation with effect from 31 December 2023. The letter acknowledged Mr Ahmed's wish, expressed at the earlier meeting, to leave earlier if the School was successful in appointing a replacement before the 31 December 2023. It is unclear how this letter was sent and Mr Ahmed stated that he never received it.

On 3 July 2023 Mr Ahmed was provided with feedback on his interview and presentation for the senior leadership role at the School by Witness B.

On 11 July 2023, the vacancy to recruit for Mr Ahmed's replacement at the School closed with no applicants. The role was then readvertised. Mr Ahmed was emailed about this situation by Person E. He was advised that he would be kept posted if anything changed.

On 14 July 2023 Mr Ahmed attended a team building event at Bradford Academy.

On 23 August 2023, Mr Ahmed attended an induction day at Bradford Academy.

On 29 August 2023, Mr Ahmed commenced employment at Bradford Academy.

On 4 September 2023, Mr Ahmed did not attend work at the School, having called in sick. He was contacted by WhatsApp by the [REDACTED] reminding him to inform her if he was absent.

On 5 September 2023, Mr Ahmed messaged the [REDACTED] and apologised for not messaging her the previous day. He said he would not be in that day and had telephoned the school and left a message. The School's absence line received a message from Mr Ahmed saying he was "not feeling well".

On 6 September 2023, the [REDACTED] messaged Mr Ahmed and asked if he was ok and if he would be returning the next day so plans could be made accordingly. Mr Ahmed messaged that his password had expired and was advised to contact the IT team so it could be re-set.

On 7 September 2023, the [REDACTED] messaged Mr Ahmed and asked that he message each day he was absent so it was known that he would not be in. Mr Ahmed left a message on the School's absence line saying he would not be attending.

On 8 September 2023, Mr Ahmed messaged the [REDACTED] and said that he would not be in that day. The [REDACTED] asked how he was and reminded Mr Ahmed of the need for a Doctor's note if he were still to be unwell the following week.

On 11 September 2023, Mr Ahmed messaged the [REDACTED] to say that he would not be in that day. He was asked about "cover". Mr Ahmed also contacted the School's absence line and left a message saying he was "not going to be in, will send relevant documents". The same day he submitted by email to the School a Statutory Statement of Fitness for Work. This recorded him as being not fit for work from 7 to 25 September 2023.

On 12 September 2023, Mr Ahmed messaged the [REDACTED] saying that he was not aware of the "cover side" and would be off that day.

On 21 September 2023, the [REDACTED] messaged Mr Ahmed to say she had tried to ring him to check in on him and was seeking to arrange a Zoom meeting to provide him with support and help him to return to work.

Also on 21 September 2023, Mr Ahmed attended the Principal's breakfast at Bradford Academy. In conversation with Witness C Mr Ahmed mentioned his having previously worked at the School. Witness C mentioned to Mr Ahmed his personal friendship with Witness B.

On 25 September 2023 Mr Ahmed submitted to the School, by email, a Statutory Statement of Fitness for Work. This recorded him as being not fit for work from 25 September to 24 October 2023. Person E telephoned Mr Ahmed and left him a message asking him to call her back.

On or around 25/26 September 2023, Witness C mentioned to Witness B that he was working with an ex-colleague of his, Mr Ahmed. Witness B confirmed his understanding that Mr Ahmed was still working at the School. Witness C reported the matter to Bradford Academy's HR team.

On 26 September 2023, the School confirmed to Witness C the School's understanding that Mr Ahmed was employed at the School.

On 27 September 2023, Mr Ahmed was suspended from his role at Bradford Academy and an investigation was commenced. The same day Bradford Academy Trust confirmed Mr Ahmed's role at Bradford Academy to Witness B.

On 28 September 2023 Mr Ahmed was removed from the English Department's WhatsApp group at the School.

On 7 November 2023, following an investigation, a disciplinary hearing was held in relation to Mr Ahmed at Bradford Academy Trust.

On 20 November 2023, Mr Ahmed appealed the outcome of the Bradford Academy Trust's disciplinary process.

On 31 December 2023, the School treated Mr Ahmed's employment at the School as coming to an end following his resignation in June 2023.

On 18 January 2024, following an investigation, a determination hearing was held at the School in relation to Mr Ahmed.

On 21 March 2024, Mr Ahmed was referred to the TRA by the Trust.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact were as follows:

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

1. Between around 4 September 2023 and 25 September 2023, you informed the School that you were not well enough to attend work, when you were in fact able to work:

The panel noted that Mr Ahmed had admitted the facts of allegation 1.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts it was accepted by Mr Ahmed that:

- He resigned from his post at the School by email on 19 June 2023.
- He was aware that the final date of employment for a resignation on 19 June 2023 was 31 December 2023.
- He asserts that he understood that the School would release him early but accepts, as a matter of fact, that he and the School did not reach agreement about an early release from his contract.
- Mr Ahmed asserted that he was not well enough to work within the environment of the School but accepted that he was well enough to work.
- Consequently, Mr Ahmed had accepted that by sending in the "fit notes" he was telling the School he was not well enough to attend work when he was in fact able to work.

The Panel considered, from the various communications between the School and Mr Ahmed on 16 May 2023, 19 June 2023, and 11 July 2023, that it would have been clear to Mr Ahmed that he remained in employment at the School until the expiry of his notice

period on 31 December 2023 unless a replacement for him could be found and an earlier date agreed. Mr Ahmed would have been clear of this, even if he had not received the letter dated 29 July 2023 from Person E formally acknowledging his resignation. Based on this evidence the panel found that any on-going discussions at the School would have reflected this consistently adopted position.

The panel accepted the undisputed evidence from Witness A that Mr Ahmed had reported to the School on various occasions between 4 and 11 September 2023 that he would not be attending and that he was "unwell". On 11 September 2023 he submitted to the School a Statutory Statement of Fitness for Work which recorded that he was "not fit for work" because of "work related stress" for the period from 7 September 2023 (when he was assessed) to 25 September 2023. On 25 September 2023 Mr Ahmed submitted to the School a further Statutory Statement of Fitness for Work which recorded that he was assessed on 25 September 2023 as being "not fit for work" because of "work related stress" for the period 25 September 2023 to 24 October 2023. The Panel noted that both Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work were unqualified; neither doctor had made any reference to special adjustments or arrangements to support Mr Ahmed in any particular workplace.

The Panel also noted that Mr Ahmed himself had not made any distinction in terms of his fitness to attend the role at the School and any other role he undertook when he submitted the Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work to the School.

Additionally, if Mr Ahmed had felt, and been assessed, as fit for work in one teaching position he held but not another (as he asserted) then he should have ensured that this was properly and clearly reflected in the body of the Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work. That they did not do so in these circumstances was considered by the panel to be designed to conceal that Mr Ahmed had taken up another role at the same time as working at the School.

The panel considered that these factors were consistent with Mr Ahmed not disclosing his having two roles to the medical practitioners who provided the two Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work that he provided to the School. It was also consistent with his seeking to deliberately conceal that he was working in a role for the Bradford Academy Trust when also submitting Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work to the School.

Taking these factors into account the panel determined, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Ahmed had not made the medical practitioners who provided the Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work aware that he had two roles and it was not the case that he was certified unfit for one but was fit to work in the other as he contended in the agreed statement of facts.

The panel also noted that, when contacted on various occasions by the [REDACTED] at the School about his return in September 2023, at no stage did he state that he understood that he was no longer employed by the School. The panel considered that he would have done so if this was his genuinely held belief. Instead, he maintained to the School that he was not able to work due to sickness. The panel considered that this represented a deliberate and on-going action designed to conceal from the School his working at the Bradford Academy Trust.

The panel was also concerned that Mr Ahmed appeared to be blaming colleagues for suggesting he should provide Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work to the School when the panel considered that this was solely his responsibility.

Mr Ahmed accepted that he made no contact with the Senior Leadership Team at the School to obtain confirmation of the position following his receipt of the email of 11 July from the School and after receiving the messages from the [REDACTED]. This is something the panel would have expected to happen if Mr Ahmed had a genuinely held belief that his notice period came to an end before 31 December 2023. This was the panel's expectation of Mr Ahmed as an experienced professional, even if he had wanted to distance himself from the School. That Mr Ahmed made no contact with the Senior Leadership Team was, in the panel's view, consistent with and indicative of his on-going deliberate concealment from the School of his new role at the Bradford Academy Trust.

Taking these factors, and Mr Ahmed's successful interview in March 2023 to a full-time role at Bradford Academy Trust, into account the panel was of the view that Mr Ahmed never had any intention to serve his required notice period at the School if no replacement could be found for him. Instead, he had taken up his new role with the Bradford Academy Trust and made a deliberate decision not to appear for work at the School. He had made a conscious decision to report in as unwell, including to supply Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work which stated he was not fit to work when, in fact, he was well enough to work. The panel found that he intentionally took this course to deliberately conceal from the School that he had taken up his new full-time role and so made himself intentionally unavailable to work his required notice at the School.

The panel acknowledged that Mr Ahmed was [REDACTED]. However, it noted that this had not prevented him from attending an induction day at Bradford Academy in August 2023 and working there from 4 September 2023 onwards.

On the basis of the evidence provided to it by Witness B, who told the panel of the range of avenues open to staff to raise concerns and grievances related to themselves or about others at the School, and the evidence of Mr Ahmed himself, the panel formed the view that the breakdown of Mr Ahmed's relationship with the School arose primarily, not from his having genuinely held concerns about his treatment at the School, but from his disappointment at not being appointed to the School's Senior Leadership Team. Only

after that did he more formally raise concerns, something he did in a way that seemed to the panel to be notably out of alignment with his wider aim of building cultural bridges.

On the basis of the admissions made by Mr Ahmed, which appeared to the panel to be consistent with the evidence before it and on the basis of the panel's findings as detailed above the panel found allegation 1 proven on the balance of probabilities.

2. You worked as a Teacher at Bradford Academy Trust whilst you were on sick leave from the School on:

- a. 4 September 2023;**
- b. 5 September 2023;**
- c. 6 September 2023;**
- d. 7 September 2023;**
- e. 8 September 2023;**
- f. 11 September 2023;**
- g. 12 September 2023;**
- h. 13 September 2023;**
- i. 14 September 2023;**
- j. 15 September 2023;**
- k. 18 September 2023;**
- l. 19 September 2023;**
- m. 20 September 2023;**
- n. 21 September 2023;**
- o. 22 September 2023;**
- p. 25 September 2023;**

Mr Ahmed accepted that he had worked at Bradford Academy Trust on the dates when he had submitted Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work to the School which indicated that he was not fit to work due to work stress.

For the reasons given in more detail in relation to allegation 1 above, on the basis of the evidence presented to it, the panel was of the view that submitting the Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work, in the form he did to the School, was a conscious decision by Mr Ahmed to conceal that he had taken on a new role at the Bradford Academy when he was aware that he remained employed at the School.

The panel found Mr Ahmed's admission to be consistent with the evidence before it and on the basis of the admission and the evidence before it the panel found allegation 2 proven in its entirety on the balance of probabilities.

3. Your actions at paragraph 1 and/or 2a – 2p above were:

- a. lacking integrity;**
- b. dishonest.**

Having found the facts of allegation 1 and allegation 2, including allegation 2a - 2p proven, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Ahmed's conduct in each of those allegations was dishonest and lacked integrity.

The panel noted that Mr Ahmed had admitted both dishonesty and a lack of integrity in relation to the admitted facts of allegation 1 and allegation 2, including 2a - 2p.

The panel was mindful of, and took into account, that Mr Ahmed was a person of previous good character.

In this context, being mindful of the legal advice provided to it, the panel proceeded to consider carefully if Mr Ahmed's actions in allegation 1 and allegation 2a - 2p were dishonest and lacked integrity.

Taking account of the determination of the facts as detailed in the panel's decision in relation to allegation 1 and allegation 2a - 2p above, the panel considered that Mr Ahmed was aware that

- he was required to work at the School until 31 December 2023 and
- by reporting that he was unwell and later submitting the Statutory Statements of Fitness for Work to the School whilst working at the Bradford Academy Trust, and
- by working at the Bradford Academy Trust when he was on sick leave from the School,

he had intentionally sought to mislead the School and conceal from it that he had taken up another full-time teaching role, and to conceal from the Bradford Academy Trust that he was still contracted to work at the School. He was therefore aware that his actions at allegation 1 and allegation 2a - 2p were dishonest.

The panel also considered that ordinary decent people would consider that his conduct in allegations 1 and allegation 2a - 2p were dishonest.

On this basis the panel found Mr Ahmed to be dishonest in relation to allegation 1 and allegation 2a - 2p.

Taking account of the same factual findings and its findings of dishonesty, the panel also

determined that Mr Ahmed's conduct in allegation 1 and allegation 2a - 2p represented a serious lack of integrity.

On this basis the panel found allegations 3a and 3b proven in relation to allegation 1 and allegation 2a – 2p on the balance of probabilities.

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 Mr Ahmed, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

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

Preamble to the Standards: Teachers act with honesty and integrity.

Part 2:

A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct.

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Ahmed'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 the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

Mr Ahmed's actions were an on-going and deliberate course of dishonest conduct designed to conceal the true position from the School and from the Bradford Academy Trust.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ahmed amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Ahmed was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Ahmed'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 this particular case the panel was mindful that, as an experienced teacher, other colleagues would regard Mr Ahmed as a role model.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Ahmed'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 Mr Ahmed was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Ahmed's actions 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 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 panel's findings against Mr Ahmed, which involved serious dishonesty and a lack of integrity, there was a public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession. Mr Ahmed had submitted Statutory Statements of Fitness to Work to the School which stated that he was not fit to work when he was able to work. He had concealed that he was working at the Bradford Academy whilst still under contract to the School. Mr Ahmed's conduct was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ahmed were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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 Ahmed in the profession.

The panel noted that there was clear and consistent evidence before it of Mr Ahmed making a significant contribution to education over a considerable period of time, including since the allegations had come to the attention of the TRA.

The panel noted in particular:

- The recognition by Witness B of Mr Ahmed's abilities as an educationalist, his "child centred approach" and his having the skills and knowledge to equip him to be appointed as a Senior Leader in a school setting;
- Mr Ahmed's work in building understanding and breaking down barriers between different racial, cultural and religious groups including his bringing a programme of education into schools through the development of young ambassadors to address issues of antisemitism;
- The recognition, in the professional references before the panel, of Mr Ahmed's being an "extremely professional teacher" (from a volunteer who worked at the School with him) and of having an "outstanding public reputation as a tutor" (from a parent who was aware of him as a vice-principal at another school);
- That Mr Ahmed had demonstrated that he was a creative teacher by engaging with an ex-serviceman volunteer at the school to help disadvantaged pupils to relate to and engage with war poetry in a more informed and meaningful way.

- The statement and oral evidence given by Witness D who spoke of Mr Ahmed's contributions [REDACTED] since he started working there in January 2024. In her statement she referenced his "fantastic work, commitment, honesty and reliability" and how "students and staff were benefitting from his expertise and support in whole school improvement". The college had asked him to extend his contract and had requested that he increase his hours as the "school needed him and so did the students". In her oral evidence, which the panel found powerful and compelling, she told the panel of how he had made a significant improvement to the outcomes of GCSE students he had taught. She noted he had made a particular difference to the lives of disadvantaged pupils who would have achieved poor results without his teaching and whose life chances were increased because of his commitment to them. She spoke in glowing terms of how Mr Ahmed's passion and enthusiasm for teaching had led to a notable improvement in the conduct and engagement of pupils. He was dedicated to the pupils and their work, including, for example, backmarking their work and attending parents' evenings and options evenings. As a supply teacher, he could have sought remuneration for this additional work but chose not to do so.

The panel considered that Mr Ahmed's on-going, significant and valuable contribution to education was a factor which weighed very heavily in favour of retaining him in the teaching profession.

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 recommend the imposition of a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Ahmed.

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;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions;
 - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing;

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.

In light of the panel's findings, there was evidence that Mr Ahmed's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Ahmed was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel also took into account the following factors:

- Mr Ahmed had a previously good history and was previously of good character.
- That Mr Ahmed had made admissions in the TRA hearing.
- That the issues arose in what the panel considered to be a one off set of circumstances; Mr Ahmed was under significant stress at the relevant time which the panel considered was a factor in him making wrong decisions in connection with his wishing to take up a post at a new school.
- The panel being mindful of the legal advice it had received understood that there was a spectrum of dishonesty and that it should not approach the issue of dishonesty in a binary way. It was important that it did not adopt the approach of "lump[ing] the thief and the fraudster together with the mere contract-breaker". Whilst it had found the dishonesty to be serious, the panel, when adopting the required nuanced approach to dishonesty, considered that this was not the most serious dishonesty, arising as it did in one particular situation, over a relatively limited time period and in the context of Mr Ahmed feeling under particular stress. Mr Ahmed was not, for example, seeking to gain any financial advantage by his actions, but was rather trying to find a way out of the situation in which he had found himself (albeit one of his own making). He had not fully thought through the implications of his dishonest actions and the need always to be open and transparent.
- The professional and character references produced by Mr Ahmed from Person F, Person G, and Witness D.
- The oral evidence provided by Witness D which attested to Mr Ahmed's strong contribution to education as detailed above.
- The health information provided by the [REDACTED] report [REDACTED] dated 25 March 2025 which outlined various stresses and health conditions experienced by Mr Ahmed and his associated medication regime.

- That Mr Ahmed had developed some insight into the impact on his health of the stresses he was experiencing and had taken steps to address these, including attending a series of counselling sessions.
- That the panel considered that the risk of repetition of this type of dishonest conduct was low. Albeit latterly, Mr Ahmed had admitted his dishonest conduct. He had developed some insight into the seriousness of his actions and what had led to him acting as he did. The panel considered that it was extremely unlikely that Mr Ahmed would find himself in a similar situation again.

The panel was also mindful of the consequences for Mr Ahmed and his immediate family if he were not to be able to continue to work as a teacher.

Taking these factors into account 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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Taking account of the mitigation factors detailed above the panel considered that imposing a prohibition order would be unduly punitive and disproportionate taking account of the particular facts and circumstances of the case as it was required to do. The imposition of a prohibition order would not properly recognise Mr Ahmed's significant contributions to the profession.

With these considerations in mind the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient in the particular circumstances of the case to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

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 sanction.

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/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Nadeem Ahmed should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel has found that the conduct of Mr Ahmed fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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 Ahmed, 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 does not mention having considered any evidence that Mr Ahmed's behaviour placed the safety and wellbeing of pupils in jeopardy.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse. The panel has said that it "considered that the risk of repetition of this type of dishonest conduct was low. Albeit latterly, Mr Ahmed had admitted his dishonest conduct. He had developed some insight into the seriousness of his actions and what had led to him acting as he did. The panel considered that it was extremely unlikely that Mr Ahmed would find himself in a similar situation again." 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 that "public confidence in the

profession could be weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ahmed were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of serious dishonesty 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 Ahmed himself. The panel has commented that “there was clear and consistent evidence before it of Mr Ahmed making a significant contribution to education over a considerable period of time, including since the allegations had come to the attention of the TRA.” The evidence noted by the panel including the following:

“The statement and oral evidence given by Witness D who spoke of Mr Ahmed’s contributions [REDACTED] since he started working there in January 2024. In her statement she referenced his “fantastic work, commitment, honesty and reliability” and how “students and staff were benefitting from his expertise and support in whole school improvement”. The college had asked him to extend his contract and had requested that he increase his hours as the “school needed him and so did the students”. In her oral evidence, which the panel found powerful and compelling, she told the panel of how he had made a significant improvement to the outcomes of GCSE students he had taught. She noted he had made a particular difference to the lives of disadvantaged pupils who would have achieved poor results without his teaching and whose life chances were increased because of his commitment to them. She spoke in glowing terms of how Mr Ahmed’s passion and enthusiasm for teaching had led to a notable improvement in the conduct and engagement of pupils. He was dedicated to the pupils and their work, including, for example, backmarking their work and attending parents’ evenings and options evenings. As a supply teacher, he could have sought remuneration for this additional work but chose not to do so.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Ahmed from teaching and continuing that work. 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 Mr Ahmed's contribution to the teaching profession. The panel has said that "Mr Ahmed's on-going, significant and valuable contribution to education was a factor which weighed very heavily in favour of retaining him in the teaching profession."

Whilst the panel has found that Mr Ahmed's actions were deliberate and that he was not acting under extreme duress, it has also taken account of mitigating factors including the insight shown by Mr Ahmed, the low risk of repetition and his previous good history and character. I have placed considerable weight on these factors.

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments:

"Whilst it had found the dishonesty to be serious, the panel, when adopting the required nuanced approach to dishonesty, considered that this was not the most serious dishonesty, arising as it did in one particular situation, over a relatively limited time period and in the context of Mr Ahmed feeling under particular stress. Mr Ahmed was not, for example, seeking to gain any financial advantage by his actions, but was rather trying to find a way out of the situation in which he had found himself (albeit one of his own making). He had not fully thought through the implications of his dishonest actions and the need always to be open and transparent."

In my judgement, the dishonesty in this case is a serious departure from the standards expected of a teacher. However, I have agreed with the panel that the mitigating factors specific to this case mean that a prohibition order would not be appropriate.

I have concluded, therefore, that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 27 May 2026

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