Teaching Regulation Agency

Mr Elliot Wilson: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

October 2026

Contents

Introduction 3

Allegations 4

Documents 4

Statement of agreed facts 5

Decision and reasons 5

Findings of fact 6

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State 9

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State 13

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

Teacher:	Mr Elliot Wilson
Teacher ref number:	1863946
Teacher date of birth:	21 March 1995
TRA reference:	21309
Date of determination:	21 October 2026
Former employer:	Homewood School & Sixth Form Centre, Kent

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 21 October 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Elliot Wilson.

The panel members were Miss Louisa Munton (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Emma Garrett (lay panellist) and Mr Francis Ekengwu (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Amy Tinsley of Birketts 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 Wilson that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Wilson 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, Mr Wilson or any representative for Mr Wilson.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 31 July 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Wilson was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence in that on 30 October 2024, he was convicted at Canterbury Crown Court of:

1. Engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity with a girl 13 to 15 contrary to section 9(1)(a), (b), (c)(i) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003; and

2. Engaging in sexual communication with a child contrary to section 15A (1) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Mr Wilson admitted the facts of allegation 1 and 2, as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 6 October 2025 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Wilson on 19 January 2026, and further admitted that those admitted facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 7

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 8 to 25

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 26 to 31

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 32 to 183

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 184 to 196

In addition, the panel had an email chain titled "*Email from Teacher - no objection to amendment in SAF*" between the presenting officer firm and Mr Wilson, confirming that he had no objection to an amendment to the statement of agreed facts, in that it corrected a minor typographical error.

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 May 2020 ("the Procedures").

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Wilson on 19 January 2026.

Decision and reasons

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 Wilson for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Wilson commenced employment at Homewood School & Sixth Form Centre ("the School") as a teacher of Science on 27 August 2019. On 1 September 2021, he became the Key Stage 3 Coordinator of Science.

On 5 September 2022, it was reported to the School by Pupil A's mother that Pupil A was having a relationship with Mr Wilson. Mr Wilson was suspended from his role at the School, and a referral was made to the police.

It was later concluded by the LADO that there was substantial evidence to indicate there had been a relationship between Pupil A and Mr Wilson. Mr Wilson was subsequently dismissed for gross misconduct on 11 October 2022.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 20 November 2022.

On 30 October 2024, Mr Wilson was convicted at Canterbury Crown Court, following a guilty plea of: 1) one count of Offender 18 or over engage in non-penetrative sexual activity with girl 13 to 15, contrary to section 9(1)(a), (b), (c)(i) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003; and 2) one count of engage in sexual communication with a child, contrary to section 15A(1) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

On 13 February 2025, Mr Wilson was sentenced at Canterbury Crown Court to 1 year and 9 months imprisonment, suspended for 24 months. In addition, he was subject to a curfew requirement with electronic monitoring, required to participate in an accredited programme for 35 days, engage in a rehabilitation activity requirement, undertake 300 hours of unpaid work, and register with the police. [REDACTED] and made subject to a sexual harm prevention order for 10 years.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

You are guilty of having been convicted at any time of a relevant offence in that on 30 October 2024 you were convicted at Canterbury Crown Court of:

1. **Engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity with a girl 13 to 15 contrary to section 9(1)(a), (b), (c)(i) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003;**

2. **Engaging in sexual communication with a child contrary to section 15A (1) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003**

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted the facts of allegation 1 and 2, as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 6 October 2025 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Wilson on 19 January 2026, and further admitted that those admitted facts amounted to conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel considered the evidence before it.

The panel considered the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice.” Page 8 of the Advice states that where there has been a conviction at any time of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate or memorandum 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 that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Canterbury Crown Court, which detailed that Mr Wilson had been convicted on 30 October 2024 of: 1) one count of Offender 18 or over engage in non-penetrative sexual activity with girl 13 to 15, contrary to section 9(1)(a), (b), (c)(i) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003; and 2) one count of engage in sexual communication with a child contrary to section 15A(1) and (3) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003. The panel noted that the certificate of conviction stated that Mr Wilson had pleaded guilty.

On 13 February 2025, Mr Wilson was sentenced at Canterbury Crown Court to 1 year and 9 months imprisonment, suspended for 24 months. In addition, he was subject to a curfew requirement with electronic monitoring, required to participate in an accredited programme for 35 days, engage in a rehabilitation activity requirement, undertake 300 hours of unpaid work, and register with the police. [REDACTED] and made subject to a sexual harm prevention order for 10 years.

Having considered Mr Wilson's admission and the evidence before it, including the certificate of conviction, the panel found allegations 1 and 2 proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
    - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
    - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
    - not undermining fundamental British values, including … the rule of law…
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos… 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 Wilson was wholly contrary to the standards expected of the teaching profession. Teachers are placed in a privileged position of trust and Mr Wilson had abused his position.

The panel noted Mr Wilson's safeguarding training record, which confirmed that Mr Wilson had attended safeguarding training in March 2020 and August 2021.

The panel considered that Mr Wilson's actions in engaging in sexual activity and sexual communication with a pupil at the School, particularly following repeated warnings from colleagues not to be alone with Pupil A in a classroom, demonstrated a fundamental disregard for the safeguarding of a pupil and the provisions of Keeping Children Safe in Education.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting, as he had engaged in non-penetrative sexual

activity and sexual communication with Pupil A, who was both a child and a pupil at the School.

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

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Wilson'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. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children. By virtue of his position, Mr Wilson was in a position of trust and responsibility in relation to Pupil A. He abused that position. The panel also noted that Mr Wilson accepted that his conduct would likely have a negative influence on the public's perception of his ability and suitability to be a teacher and affect public confidence in the teaching profession if he were allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences 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 activity and sexual communication with a child, which the Advice states are likely to be considered relevant offences.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson's conduct was repeated and took place over a period of time and involved a young child who was under his care. The panel considered that there was a clear power imbalance and that this resulted in an abuse of a position of trust, particularly as the panel considered that Mr Wilson would have been aware of Pupil A's vulnerabilities.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Wilson's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences 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 punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found all limbs of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; the declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Wilson, which involved having been convicted of relevant offences of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of an inappropriate and unlawful relationship with a child.

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

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 Wilson in the profession. There was no evidence before the panel that Mr Wilson's teaching proficiency was of note. Nonetheless, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Wilson in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

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. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Wilson.

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 (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position; and
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE).

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Wilson's actions were not deliberate.

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

The panel had no evidence before it that demonstrated that Mr Wilson had exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector. Based on the information before it, the panel did not accept that the incident was out of character.

The panel saw evidence that showed that Mr Wilson was previously subject to warnings in respect of his conduct with Pupil A. This involved Mr Wilson's colleagues speaking to him on multiple occasions regarding being in a classroom alone with a student, particularly whilst having the door closed. Following this, Mr Wilson was required to meet with the Designated Safeguarding Lead ("DSL"), who provided safeguarding advice. The DSL asked Mr Wilson if he was in a relationship with Pupil A, to which he said he was not. Mr Wilson told the DSL that he was going to meet with Pupil A at lunchtime, and the DSL specifically advised him not to do so. The panel considered that this further demonstrated a flagrant disregard of safeguarding advice and procedures.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson provided no evidence of mitigation, and the panel had very limited evidence before it to demonstrate Mr Wilson's insight and/or remorse for his actions.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson entered a guilty plea in respect of the criminal convictions and that he had engaged with the TRA proceedings.

The panel noted the minutes of the School's disciplinary hearing, which recorded that Mr Wilson stated that he had not abused his position and that, whatever he did or did not do, he had no malicious intentions. The panel also noted that when asked about what Mr Wilson understood, he accepted that he had struggled to maintain the professional boundaries and should have spoken to someone about this. He also accepted that he was not as professional as he should have been.

The minutes also recorded that Mr Wilson acknowledged that "*if all this got out it would be potentially damaging to the reputation of the School*.," but the panel believed this undermined the extent of Mr Wilson's conduct and that he failed to demonstrate any insight as to how his conduct had impacted Pupil A in particular.

Mr Wilson had also failed to demonstrate any understanding or insight into the motivation for his misconduct, nor had he provided any evidence of rehabilitation or remediation. The panel therefore considered there was a high risk of Mr Wilson committing similar offences in the future, which was of concern.

Following this, the panel reached the conclusion that Mr Wilson had failed to demonstrate meaningful insight and/or remorse for his actions.

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 Wilson 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 Wilson. The fact that Mr Wilson was convicted of two offences involving sexual activity and sexual communication with a child 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 e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and

- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

Mr Wilson had been convicted of offences involving sexual activity and sexual communication with a child, which the panel found to be relevant offences.

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 had very limited evidence before it to demonstrate Mr Wilson's insight and/or remorse for his actions and the panel could therefore not be satisfied that Mr Wilson would not commit the same, or similar, offences again. The panel considered there was a significant and ongoing risk of repetition.

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 all of the allegations 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 Elliot Wilson should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
    - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
    - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
    - not undermining fundamental British values, including … the rule of law…

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos… 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 finds that the conduct of Mr Wilson was relevant to his ongoing suitability to teach and therefore found that it did amount to a relevant offence.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding that Mr Wilson was convicted of two sexual offences which relate to a pupil at the school.

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 Wilson, 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. The panel has observed, *"In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Wilson, which involved having been convicted of relevant offences of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of an inappropriate and unlawful relationship with a child."*

The panel also said that it, *"…considered there was a high risk of Mr Wilson committing similar offences in the future, which was of concern."*

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, *"…Mr Wilson provided no evidence of mitigation, and the panel had very limited evidence before it to demonstrate Mr Wilson's insight and/or remorse for his actions."*

The panel has also commented that *"Mr Wilson had also failed to demonstrate any understanding or insight into the motivation for his misconduct, nor had he provided any evidence of rehabilitation or remediation."*

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *"…that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Wilson were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."*

I am particularly mindful of the finding of conviction for sexual offences against 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 Wilson himself. The panel comment *"The panel had no evidence before it that demonstrated that Mr Wilson had exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector. Based on the information before it, the panel did not accept that the incident was out of character."*

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Wilson from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

I have placed considerable weight on the finding that *"…Mr Wilson's conduct was repeated and took place over a period of time and involved a young child who was under his care. The panel considered that there was a clear power imbalance and that this resulted in an abuse of a position of trust…"*

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Wilson 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.

The panel has identified that the Advice indicates 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. The panel has identified that the factors of sexual misconduct and any sexual misconduct involving a child are both engaged in this case.

I have considered the panel's comments *"The panel had very limited evidence before it to demonstrate Mr Wilson's insight and/or remorse for his actions and the panel could therefore not be satisfied that Mr Wilson would not commit the same, or similar, offences again. The panel considered there was a significant and ongoing risk of repetition."*

I have considered whether allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the sexual activity with a child and the panel's view that there is a high 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 Elliot Wilson 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 allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Wilson 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 Wilson has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

S. Blomfield

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 23 October 2026

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