



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Daniel Duhig: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

Teacher: Mr Daniel Duhig

Teacher ref number: 2062865

Teacher date of birth: 14 June 1997

TRA reference: 23807

Date of determination: 29 July 2026

Former employer: Godwin Primary School, Dagenham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 29 July 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Daniel Duhig.

The panel members were Miss Louisa Munton (teacher panellist – in the chair), Dr Lee Longden (former teacher panellist) and Mrs Pamela Thompson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Katie Garcia of Birketts 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 Mr Duhig that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Duhig provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Carolyn Thackstone of Browne Jacobson solicitors, Mr Duhig, or any representative for Mr Duhig.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 15 July 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Duhig was guilty having been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, namely:

1. On 15 April 2025, he was convicted of one offence of Adult attempt to engage in sexual communication with a child. Contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981.

Mr Duhig admitted the allegation, including that the offence for which he was convicted was a relevant offence, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Duhig on 2 June 2026.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of referral and response – pages 4 to 20

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 22 to 25

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 27 to 75

Section 4: Teacher's documents – pages 77 to 82

In addition, the panel also received a copy of the email correspondence from Mr Duhig dated 10 July 2026 in which he agreed to waive his right to receive 10 weeks' notice of the date of the meeting.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing, along with the additional email dated 10 July 2026.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Duhig on 2 June 2026 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 9 June 2026.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Duhig for the allegation 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.

Mr Duhig commenced employment as a year 2 class teacher at Godwin Primary School ('the School') in September 2023. He completed one term of his early career teacher ('ECT') induction.

On 8 January 2024, Mr Duhig was arrested for offences related to communicating inappropriately with a child. The School was informed by the police, and Mr Duhig was placed on garden leave on 17 January 2024. He was dismissed on 2 May 2024.

On 15 April 2025, Mr Duhig pleaded guilty to, and was convicted of, an attempt to engage in sexual communication with a child.

On 19 May 2025, Mr Duhig was sentenced in respect of the offence to a prison sentence of 6 months suspended for 18 months together with a rehabilitation activity requirement and a 100-hour unpaid work requirement. He was also required to register with the police for 7 years and ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £154 and prosecution costs of £85.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 24 May 2024.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On 15 April 2025, you were convicted of one offence of Adult attempt to engage in sexual communication with a child. Contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, in which Mr Duhig admitted the allegation and further admitted that the facts of the allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher Misconduct: the prohibition of teachers ('the Advice'), which states that where there has been a conviction, at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find any exceptional circumstances applicable in this case.

The panel noted that they had not been provided with a certificate of conviction however, the panel was mindful of the Advice which states that a panel will consider all evidence presented to it to decide whether the facts of the case have been proved on the balance of probabilities. The panel therefore considered all the evidence presented to it including a document stated to be a court extract, which appeared to refer to the matters set out in the allegation, and the signed statement of agreed facts.

The panel had been provided with a copy of a court extract from Barkingside Magistrates' Court, which detailed that Mr Duhig had been convicted on 15 April 2025 of one count of Adult attempt to engage in sexual communication with a child contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981. It provided that the offence took place on 28 December 2023. The panel noted that this was an official court document and the court extract stated that Mr Duhig had pleaded guilty to this offence and was represented at the time.

In respect of this allegation, the document provided that Mr Duhig was sentenced to a prison sentence of 6 months suspended for 18 months together with a rehabilitation activity requirement and a 100-hour unpaid work requirement. He was also ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £154 and prosecution costs of £85. In addition, he was placed on the Sex Offenders Register and required to register with the police for 7 years from 19 May 2025.

The panel noted that the details contained in the court extract and the statement of agreed facts were consistent. The panel also noted that the School's telephone notes relating to calls made on 8 January 2024, together with the disciplinary investigation, confirmed that Mr Duhig had been arrested for offences relating to children following his involvement on a dating app. Whilst the panel did not rely on this information alone, it considered that it was consistent with the facts set out in the court extract and the statement of agreed facts.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, including the court extract, the panel found allegation 1 proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Duhig, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Duhig 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - not undermining...the rule of law... and mutual respect
- 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 Mr Duhig, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel considered that the teacher was in breach of the following provisions: Safeguarding in that *"all staff should have an awareness of safeguarding issues that can put children at risk of harm"* and that *"safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone's responsibility. "Children" includes everyone under the age of 18. Everyone who comes into contact with children and their families has a role to play... This means that they should consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child."*

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

The panel noted that although the offence occurred outside a school setting, Mr Duhig's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting insofar as he had been found guilty of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child under 16.

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

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

The panel noted that Mr Duhig's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual communication with a child, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence. The panel noted that this messaging was engaged in whilst he was a teacher.

The panel was not made aware of any mitigating circumstances in Mr Duhig's case, nor did the panel see any persuasive evidence demonstrating insight into, or remorse for, his conduct. The panel also noted that Mr Duhig had initially stated that he was unaware of the child's age. The panel attached weight to the fact that he was legally represented during the criminal proceedings and ultimately entered a guilty plea to the offence.

The panel saw no evidence that Mr Duhig's teaching proficiency was of particular note. The panel noted that concerns had been raised regarding Mr Duhig maintaining professional boundaries with pupils during the first term of the first year of his teaching career, which resulted in him being placed on a support plan.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour which led to the conviction was relevant to his 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 conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and that declaring and upholding

proper standards of conduct and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Duhig, which involved the conviction of a relevant offence of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Duhig involved an attempt to engage in sexual communication with a child.

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 Duhig in the profession. There was no evidence before the panel regarding Mr Duhig's abilities as an educator, and the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Duhig in the profession, since his behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with the role and professional standards expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Duhig.

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

- abuse of position or trust;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature;
- 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);
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;

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.

Mr Duhig's actions were clearly deliberate, and he had been convicted for them.

The panel found no evidence to suggest that Mr Duhig was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence before the panel that Mr Duhig demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence before it to demonstrate that the incident was out of character.

The panel noted evidence within the bundle that concerns had previously been raised regarding Mr Duhig maintaining professional boundaries with pupils during the first term of the first year of his teaching career, which resulted in him being placed on a support plan.

The panel noted that Mr Duhig entered a guilty plea in the criminal proceedings and engaged with the regulatory process. The panel noted that the offence took place on an 18 plus only website. The panel also considered the record of the disciplinary hearing, in which Mr Duhig expressed some remorse for his conduct. The minutes record that he was "*sincerely sorry*", "*deeply regretted his actions*" and "*accepted the seriousness of his mistake*". The panel further noted his assertion that, had he known the girl was underage, "*he would have blocked her straight away*", and that he "*wanted to ask the school for another chance to continue with his career*".

The Panel considered the mitigation to be very limited. Whilst there was some evidence of remorse and acceptance of responsibility, there was little evidence before the panel demonstrating insight into the wider impact of the offending on the child and also on public confidence in the profession or the reputation of teachers. The panel was further concerned by the content of the communications in which he stated, "*she must be*

popular with boys” and asking if she was “*a virgin*” and that he “*thinks she would be good*” and that he “*wanted to join her in bed*”.

The panel was also not provided with evidence of remediation or rehabilitation and had no personal statement from Mr Duhig.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Duhig of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Duhig. The obvious seriousness of the conviction, which involved an attempt to engage in sexual communications with a child and resulted in a suspended prison sentence, 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. These include serious sexual misconduct and any sexual misconduct involving a child. These factors were clearly demonstrated by the conviction. The panel further noted there was a custodial sentence (albeit suspended) given to Mr Duhig and found the offending to be extremely serious.

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 again noted that they had found that Mr Duhig had been convicted of a criminal offence concerning an attempt to engage in sexual communications with a child.

The panel noted that there was no material evidence of insight, remorse, or meaningful consideration of the impact of his offending. The panel concluded, on the available evidence, that the risk of Mr Duhig committing similar offences in the future is high, which is clearly of substantial concern.

The panel considered whether, notwithstanding the seriousness of the offence, there were factors that would justify allowing Mr Duhig the opportunity to seek a review of any prohibition order in the future. The panel concluded that there were not. The offending involved sexual communication with a child, conduct which the Advice identifies as being among the most serious categories of misconduct. The panel was unable to conclude that the concerns arising from Mr Duhig's conduct were capable of being appropriately addressed within a review period.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the 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 Daniel Duhig should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Duhig 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - not undermining...the rule of law... and mutual respect
- 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 findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction for the relevant offence of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child, which resulted in a suspended custodial sentence.

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 Duhig, 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:

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Duhig, which involved the conviction of a relevant offence of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns.”

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. The panel has found:

“Whilst there was some evidence of remorse and acceptance of responsibility, there was little evidence before the panel demonstrating insight into the wider impact of the offending on the child and also on public confidence in the profession or the reputation of teachers.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

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

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child 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 Duhig. The panel has commented:

“There was no evidence before the panel that Mr Duhig demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence before it to demonstrate that the incident was out of character.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Duhig 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 misconduct. The panel has said:

“The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Duhig. The obvious seriousness of the conviction, which involved an attempt to engage in sexual communications with a child and resulted in a suspended prison sentence, was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the findings of the panel that Mr Duhig’s were clearly deliberate and that there was no evidence of remediation or rehabilitation on the part of Mr Duhig.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Duhig 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 on the seriousness of the offending in this case:

"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. These include serious sexual misconduct and any sexual misconduct involving a child. These factors were clearly demonstrated by the conviction. The panel further noted there was a custodial sentence (albeit suspended) given to Mr Duhig and found the offending to be extremely serious."

I have also considered the panel's comments on the risk of repetition:

"The panel noted that there was no material evidence of insight, remorse, or meaningful consideration of the impact of his offending. The panel concluded, on the available evidence, that the risk of Mr Duhig committing similar offences in the future is high, which is clearly of substantial concern."

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 Duhig was convicted, the lack of evidence of full insight and the risk of repetition.

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 30 July 2026

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