Teaching Regulation Agency

Mr Asif Pandor: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

October 2026

Contents

Introduction 3

Allegations 4

Summary of evidence 4

Documents 4

Witnesses 5

Decision and reasons 5

Findings of fact 6

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State 18

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State 23

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

Teacher:	Mr Asif Pandor
Teacher ref number:	1585661
Teacher date of birth:	19 May 1992
TRA reference:	24649
Date of determination:	21 October 2026
Former employer:	Westborough High School, Dewsbury

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 12 to 16 October 2026 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, and on 19 and 21 October 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Asif Pandor.

The panel members were Mr John Martin (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Gamel Byles (teacher panellist) and Mrs Pamela Thompson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Alexander Elliott of Birketts LLP.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Lee Bridges of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Pandor was present and was represented by Mr Nicholas Kennan, counsel at Cornwall Street Barristers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 21 July 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Pandor was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a science teacher at Westborough High School:

1. Between on or around September 2023 and on or around April 2024, he behaved in an inappropriate and/or harassing manner towards Colleague A in that he:

    a) Engaged in inappropriate and/or sexual communication with Colleague A as set out in Schedule 1; and/or

    b) Sent photographs of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature to Colleague A; and/or

    c) Engaged in inappropriate and/or unwanted physical contact with Colleague A in that he:

        i. Touched or attempted to touch, Colleague A's leg and/or bottom and/or back; and/or

        ii. Kissed or attempted to kiss Colleague A's hair and/or neck and/or mouth.

2. His conduct referred to at paragraph 1 was sexually motivated

Schedule 1

[REDACTED]

Mr Pandor denied the allegations, as set out in the response to the notice of proceedings dated 29 July 2026.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, list of key people and anonymised person list – pages 5 to 8

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 9 to 20

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 21 to 52

Section 4: TRA exhibits – pages 53 to 315

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 316 to 370

A video file extracted from a virtual tour of the School

A transcript of WhatsApp messages between Mr Pandor and Colleague A from 15 September 2023 to 25 January 2024

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- a written statement of [REDACTED] dated 24 September 2026; and
- an undated written statement of [REDACTED].

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 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:

- Colleague A, [REDACTED]
- Witness A - [REDACTED]
- Witness B - [REDACTED]

Mr Pandor was present at the hearing and also gave oral evidence.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Pandor was previously employed at Westborough High School ("the School") from around September 2016 to around July 2017.

On or around 1 September 2023, Mr Pandor again commenced employment at the School.

On or around 8 April 2024, Colleague A made allegations to the School that Mr Pandor was being inappropriate and unprofessional towards her.

Mr Pandor was suspended from his employment on 9 April 2024.

The School conducted an investigation into the allegations between around 15 April and 11 June 2024. A disciplinary hearing was scheduled for 4 July 2024.

Mr Pandor's employment at the School terminated on 31 August 2024.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. Between on or around September 2023 and on or around April 2024, you behaved in an inappropriate and/or harassing manner towards Colleague A in that you:

a. Engaged in inappropriate and/or sexual communication with Colleague A as set out in Schedule 1

The panel noted that Mr Pandor denied the particulars of allegation 1(a).

The panel firstly considered the content and nature of communications between Mr Pandor and Colleague A during the relevant period.

The panel had sight of screenshots appearing to depict WhatsApp messages between Mr Pandor and Colleague A, together with a transcript of alleged WhatsApp messages between them dated 15 September 2023 to 25 January 2024. In oral evidence, Mr Pandor stated that the transcript accurately reflected WhatsApp messages he had exchanged with Colleague A. The panel accepted this to be the case.

In her written and oral evidence, Colleague A also described contact between her and Mr Pandor both in person and via Snapchat. The panel noted that no screenshots of Snapchat messages had been included within the bundle. Colleague A stated that messages sent via Snapchat disappear within 24 hours after they have been viewed, and that she did not save the Snapchat messages between her and Mr Pandor. She stated that she felt uncomfortable saving the messages or taking screenshots as she did not want to alert Mr Pandor to the fact that she was recording their conversations.

The panel had sight of emails from Colleague A dated 16 April 2024 to the investigator appointed by the School and 14 December 2025 to Kingsley Napley LLP, which appeared to contain written notes of interactions between her and Mr Pandor. In her supplementary witness statement, she stated that these were copied from the Notes application on her mobile telephone, which she created contemporaneously or shortly after the events they describe. In oral evidence, Colleague A stated that these notes accurately reflected her contact with Mr Pandor during the relevant period. She stated that she noted any comments from Mr Pandor that she perceived as odd, for her own records, as she had not previously experienced communication of that kind.

In Mr Pandor's witness statement, he accepted that he did have contact with Colleague A via Snapchat. He stated that he ceased Snapchat communication with Colleague A in around late September to early October 2023, although he stated that this resumed from mid-November 2023 after Colleague A repeatedly asked him why he was not speaking with her outside of work. In his witness statement, Mr Pandor denied making the comments that Colleague A attributed to him and, in his oral evidence, stated that he did not accept that Colleague A's notes contained an accurate record of his contact with Colleague A.

The panel noted that, save for the transcript of WhatsApp messages, it had been presented with two substantially different accounts from Mr Pandor and Colleague A of the communications between each of them.

It noted that no other witnesses had had sight of specific messages or in-person interactions between them, and that it did not have access to screenshots of any original Snapchat messages. It was therefore necessary for the panel to draw its own conclusions from the available information.

The panel considered a screenshot of a further WhatsApp message from Mr Pandor to Colleague A dated 26 May. Both Mr Pandor and Colleague A accepted that this was sent and received on 26 May 2026. The message stated "*[REDACTED], I want to ask you for forgiveness for anything I have said or done to you. Forgive me for any pain I've put you through, any stress caused, any sleep you've lost because of me. [REDACTED]*". In oral evidence, Mr Pandor stated that he sent similar messages to friends and family members [REDACTED].

The panel considered the written statement of [REDACTED], which stated that [REDACTED]. It stated that a broadly worded request for forgiveness [REDACTED], and that it should be distinguished from a statement expressly acknowledging a particular act.

Whilst the panel was mindful that it did not have the opportunity to question [REDACTED], it accepted the statement that, in a general sense, a request for

forgiveness is not equivalent to an admission of any particular act. The panel considered though that Mr Pandor's message to Colleague A indicated that Mr Pandor may have perceived that his previous actions had caused Colleague A to feel harm. However, it did not place any weight on the message in determining the specific communication or contact between Mr Pandor and Colleague A.

The panel's attention was drawn to inconsistencies between the notes Colleague A sent by email on 16 April 2024, during the School's investigation, and the notes she subsequently sent to Kingsley Napley LLP on 14 December 2025. In her oral evidence, Colleague A stated that she had added dates and context to the alleged communications at the request of the TRA. The panel carefully reviewed the two versions of Colleague A's notes. Having done so, it noted that the two versions were largely identical save for a number of important substantive amendments which, the panel considered, appeared to remove or alter several references to Colleague A's communications towards Mr Pandor. On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that Colleague A had, in the amended notes she sent to Kingsley Napley LLP, sought to minimise her own involvement in the contact between her and Mr Pandor.

The panel considered that Colleague A's notes set out within her email of 16 April 2024 contained a more candid record of her communications with Mr Pandor. The panel also noted consistencies between these notes and other available evidence, including the notes of Colleague A's interview on 8 May 2024 during the School's investigation, and events that were not contested by Mr Pandor, including a temporary reduction in contact in late 2023 and a kiss between Mr Pandor and Colleague A on 29 February 2024. The panel considered it unlikely that Colleague A had fabricated her account of her interactions with Mr Pandor.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that Colleague A's email dated 16 April 2024 contained a substantially accurate (albeit not necessarily complete) record of her communications and contact with Mr Pandor during the relevant period.

As to the nature of the communications between Colleague A and Mr Pandor, the panel considered the transcript of the WhatsApp messages together with Colleague A's email dated 16 April 2024 and other contextual evidence.

The panel considered that, between September 2023 to around mid-January 2024, Mr Pandor and Colleague A had engaged in familiar and, at times, flirtatious communication. The panel found that this level of communication was, to some extent, mutual. In particular, the panel found that Colleague A was an active participant in the communication and that it had no evidence that she had indicated at the time that it was unwanted.

The panel accepted Mr Pandor's evidence that, in or around October 2023, he reduced the level of his communication with Colleague A. The panel noted that Colleague A's notes recorded that she brought up the lack of contact following the October 2023 half term. The panel was persuaded that, in or around November 2023, Colleague A had encouraged Mr Pandor to resume communications with her, and that he did so.

The panel then considered that, from around mid-January 2024 to 29 February 2024, the communications from Mr Pandor towards Colleague A became more sexually explicit, and that this coincided with physical contact from Mr Pandor towards Colleague A. The panel found that this level of communication was not wanted or reciprocated by Colleague A.

The panel did not find any evidence that Mr Pandor and Colleague A engaged in communications of a personal nature after 29 February 2024 and accepted that Mr Pandor had ceased such communications with Colleague A after that date.

Having made the above findings of fact, the panel went on to consider the specific alleged communications set out within Schedule 1:

[REDACTED]

The panel noted that, in Witness B's witness statement, she recalled an interaction with Colleague A in March or April 2024 during which Colleague A informed Witness B that Mr Pandor had sent her unsolicited pictures, including pictures of his penis. Witness A also stated that Colleague A had described receiving a picture of Mr Pandor's "*private area*". Witness B and Witness A both accepted in written and oral evidence that they had not seen the alleged pictures.

The panel considered the notes of Colleague A's interviews during the School's investigation. During the interview on 15 April 2024, Colleague A stated that she was at work for around a month after Mr Pandor sent "*those pictures*" to her and that she was trying to forget it ever happened. During the second interview on 8 May 2024, Colleague A described receiving three pictures of Mr Pandor's "*thing*" and also referred to them as "*dick pictures*".

The panel noted Mr Pandor's witness evidence, in which he denied sending any images of a sexual nature to Colleague A. In his oral evidence, Mr Pandor specifically denied sending a photograph of his penis to Colleague A. Within Mr Pandor's interview during the School's investigation, he was asked if he had sent any pictures that he could recall being inappropriate and denied doing so.

The panel carefully considered all information available to it, including the evidence provided by Colleague A, Witness A, Witness B and Mr Pandor during the hearing.

Having done so, the panel found it unlikely that Colleague A would have fabricated or mistakenly recalled having received photographs of Mr Pandor's penis.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that, on 29 February 2024, Mr Pandor sent three photographs of his penis to Colleague A via Snapchat.

Colleague A's email of 16 April 2024 referred to Mr Pandor having said "*does it not make you want it*" after sending the photographs. The panel therefore found that Mr Pandor did make this comment.

The panel considered the comment to be a reference to Colleague A wanting Mr Pandor's penis. Therefore, the panel found that it was overtly sexual communication.

The panel considered that it was a further sexually explicit comment which was unwanted by Colleague A. Therefore, the panel found that it was inappropriate.

Having made findings of fact in relation to each alleged comment listed in Schedule 1, the panel found that Mr Pandor had engaged in inappropriate and/or sexual communication with Colleague A. Further, given the sustained and unwanted nature of some of the sexual communication, the panel found that Mr Pandor had behaved in a harassing manner towards Colleague A.

The panel accordingly found allegation 1(a) proven.

b. Sent photographs of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature to Colleague A; and/or

The panel noted that Mr Pandor denied the particulars of allegation 1(b).

The panel noted its earlier finding of fact that, on 29 February 2024, Mr Pandor had sent three photographs of his penis to Colleague A via Snapchat.

The panel found these photographs to be overtly sexual, in that it could not conceive of any plausible non-sexual reason for Mr Pandor to have sent photographs of his penis to Colleague A.

The panel considered the circumstances in which the photographs were sent. In particular, the panel noted, based on its earlier findings, that the photographs followed unwanted and sexually explicit communication from Mr Pandor towards Colleague A. Further, the panel noted that, within Colleague A's email of 16 April 2024, she stated that Mr Pandor had asked permission to send a picture "*for [Colleague A's] eyes only*" and that Colleague A had replied "*what do you mean? Nothing crazy please*". This was consistent with Colleague A's recollection during her interview on 8 May 2024. Taking

this into account, the panel found that the photographs of Mr Pandor's penis were unwanted by Colleague A, and that Mr Pandor ought to have been aware of this before sending them.

The panel noted that, based on Colleague A's email of 16 April 2024, Mr Pandor appeared to have expressed regret for sending the photographs shortly afterwards. The panel found it more likely than not that Mr Pandor did express regret shortly after sending the photographs to Colleague A. Further, given that the communications between Mr Pandor and Colleague A ceased shortly afterwards, the panel considered that Mr Pandor's regret was sincere.

The panel found that the sending of photographs of Mr Pandor's penis by him to Colleague A was inappropriate in circumstances where they were not wanted by Colleague A.

Accordingly, the panel found that Mr Pandor had sent photographs of an inappropriate and sexual nature to Colleague A. Further, the panel found that, by sending three unwanted sexually explicit photographs to Colleague A, he had behaved in a harassing manner towards her.

The panel concluded that allegation 1(b) was proven.

c. Engaged in inappropriate and/or unwanted physical contact with Colleague A in that you:

i. Touched or attempted to touch, Colleague A's leg and/or bottom and/or back; and/or

ii. Kissed or attempted to kiss Colleague A's hair and/or neck and/or mouth.

The panel noted that Mr Pandor denied the particulars of allegation 1(c)(i).

As regards allegation 1(c)(ii), Mr Pandor accepted within his witness statement that he had shared a kiss with Colleague A in February 2024 and that this was inappropriate in a professional context. However, Mr Pandor stated that this was a mutual kiss. The panel therefore proceeded to consider the allegation on the basis that it was contested.

The panel considered Colleague A's email of 16 April 2024, in which she described an incident on 1 February 2024 after school during which, she stated, Mr Pandor started touching her bottom and back and kept kissing her hair and neck although she did not let him kiss her face. She stated that Mr Pandor rubbed her legs and that he really wanted to kiss her.

The panel noted its earlier finding that Colleague A's email of 16 April 2024 contained a largely accurate record of the contact between her and Mr Pandor. Nevertheless, the panel considered the other available evidence.

The panel reviewed the record of Colleague A's interview on 8 May 2024, during the School's investigation. Colleague A stated that, on 1 February 2024, Mr Pandor touched her bottom and started kissing her neck. She stated that Mr Pandor asked several times to kiss her and that she refused. She also stated that Mr Pandor had kissed her back but that she did not kiss or touch him.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Colleague A. She stated that, on 1 February 2024 after a Year 9 lesson, she went into Mr Pandor's classroom and Mr Pandor placed his hand on her bottom. She did not refer to Mr Pandor kissing her on that occasion, although she stated that Mr Pandor repeatedly asked to kiss her.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Mr Pandor. Mr Pandor denied touching Colleague A's leg, bottom or back in a sexual or inappropriate manner, and stated that he had indicated to Colleague A that he was not interested in pursuing any personal relationship. Mr Pandor also described an incident in mid-February 2024 in which, he stated, Colleague A had sat on his lap.

The panel reviewed screenshots of text messages between Mr Pandor and another individual which appeared to be dated 25 February 2024. Within the messages, Mr Pandor appeared to express frustration regarding Colleague A coming into his room. He also described a previous incident in which, he stated, Colleague A had sat on his lap.

The panel noted that this exchange appeared to be a partial record of a conversation, and that it did not have access to the complete record. The panel considered that this was evidence of Mr Pandor's perception of Colleague A's conduct, and of a separate incident in which Colleague A may have sat on his lap. However, the panel did not find that it amounted to persuasive evidence concerning the events on 1 February 2024.

After carefully considering the evidence, the panel was persuaded on the balance of probabilities that Colleague A's email of 16 April 2024 accurately reflected her contact with Mr Pandor on 1 February 2024. The panel therefore found that Mr Pandor had touched, or attempted to touch, Colleague A's leg and/or bottom and/or back, and that he had kissed, or attempted to kiss, Colleague A's hair and/or neck.

The panel noted that, within Colleague A's email of 16 April 2024, she stated that she froze. During Colleague A's interview on 8 May 2024, she described feeling shocked and that it made her feel disgusting. In view of this, the panel found that Mr Pandor's conduct amounted to unwanted physical contact.

The panel went on to consider the interaction between Mr Pandor and Colleague A on 29 February 2024. The panel noted that both accepted a kiss had taken place.

Mr Pandor stated, in his written evidence, that on parents' evening, Colleague A had stopped him as he was leaving his classroom, said she felt that there was "*sexual tension*" between them and moved closer while playing with her hair in what he perceived to be a suggestive manner. He stated that they both left the room together and that, following this, Colleague A had suggested that they go back to Mr Pandor's classroom, which they did. Mr Pandor described a mutual kiss between him and Colleague A as they entered the room. The panel noted that this was consistent with Mr Pandor's description of the incident when he was interviewed during the School's investigation.

The panel noted Colleague A's email of 16 April 2024, which stated that, on parents' evening, Mr Pandor tried to kiss her in the classroom. During her interview on 8 May 2024, Colleague A stated that she went into Mr Pandor's classroom and perceived a "*weird tension*". She stated that they left the classroom together and that, following this, Mr Pandor had suggested that they return as he had left something. She stated that Mr Pandor then kissed her.

The panel considered Colleague A's witness statement, in which she stated that, while she was in Mr Pandor's classroom, Mr Pandor placed his hands on her back, touched her face, and then kissed her. She described that she felt pressured and unable to stop Mr Pandor. In her oral evidence, Colleague A stated that she was not alleging that the incident was a sexual assault, and that it "*sort of just happened*". However, she did state that she turned her face and that she did not reciprocate the kiss.

The panel accepted that a brief kiss between Mr Pandor and Colleague A occurred on 29 February 2024. On the balance of probabilities, the panel was persuaded by Colleague A's evidence that the kiss was unwanted by her. However, it also accepted that Mr Pandor perceived it to be a mutual kiss. The panel found that the kiss between Colleague A and Mr Pandor on 29 February 2024 amounted to unwanted physical contact.

The panel found that it was inappropriate for Mr Pandor to subject Colleague A to unwanted physical contact. It also found that the multiple instances of unwanted physical contact amounted to harassing behaviour.

The panel concluded that allegations 1(c)(i) and 1(c)(ii) had been found proven.

2. Your conduct referred to at paragraph 1 was sexually motivated

The panel noted that Mr Pandor denied the particulars of allegation 2.

The panel's attention was drawn to section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018] EWHC 3160 (Admin), Basson v General Medical Council [2018] EWHC 505 (Admin) and The General Medical Council v Haris [2020] EWHC 2518*.

The panel considered whether the conduct was sexually motivated. It noted that in *Basson* it was stated that, *"A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship"*.

The panel was also mindful of the Court of Appeal's conclusion in *General Medical Council v Haris [2021] EWCA Civ 763.* The court found in that case that, *"In the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves."*

The panel considered Mr Pandor's witness statement, in which he denied that his conduct was sexually motivated and stated that there was no sustained or planned sexual motivation underpinning his conduct. In Mr Pandor's oral evidence, he stated that he was not, at any point, attracted to Colleague A.

The panel considered its findings regarding Mr Pandor's conduct. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Pandor had, on numerous occasions, engaged in sexual communication and physical contact towards Colleague A, including touching and kissing. The panel considered that these events had led to Mr Pandor sending three photographs of his penis to Colleague A on 29 February 2024.

In view of the facts that the panel had found proven, the panel was not persuaded that there was any plausible alternative explanation for Mr Pandor's conduct, other than that it was in pursuit of a sexual relationship with Colleague A.

The panel therefore found that Mr Pandor's conduct as found proven, in relation to allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c), was sexually motivated.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 2 proven.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Pandor 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 building relationships rooted in mutual respect and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's profession.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel also considered whether Mr Pandor'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 offences of sexual activity and harassment were relevant to Mr Pandor's conduct. In particular, the panel noted that it had found Mr Pandor to have engaged in multiple instances of unwanted sexually explicit communication and unwanted physical contact towards Colleague A, and that he had sent unwanted sexually explicit photographs to her.

The panel noted that Mr Pandor's conduct as found proven in relation to allegations 1(a) and 1(b) concerned, for the most part, private messages between two adults on personal devices, unrelated to education. The panel considered that, when viewing those matters as a whole, they ought to be considered as having taken place outside the education setting.

As regards allegation 1(a), the panel considered that Mr Pandor had initially engaged in mutually familiar and, at times, flirtatious communication with Colleague A, although from late January 2024 Mr Pandor escalated this to sexually explicit communication which was unwanted and not reciprocated by Colleague A. Although the panel considered these communications to be inappropriate, it did not find that they affected the way Mr Pandor fulfilled his teaching role or that they may have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, Mr Pandor's behaviour in a harmful way. The panel found that Mr Pandor's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 1(a) was not unacceptable professional conduct.

As regards allegation 1(b), the panel considered the fact that Mr Pandor had sent three unwanted photographs of his penis to Colleague A to be more serious than the other communications, and that it displayed more overt behaviours associated with the offences referenced above. The panel did find that this affected the way Mr Pandor fulfilled his teaching role which, the panel considered, included the need to maintain appropriate professional relationships with colleagues, in particular Colleague A. The panel found that Mr Pandor's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 1(b) amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel considered that Mr Pandor's conduct as found proven in relation to allegation 1(c) occurred within the School and therefore that it took place within an education setting. The panel noted that this included unwanted physical contact towards a colleague, which was sexually motivated. The panel drew upon its own experiences and concluded that such behaviour would be considered unacceptable from a teacher in an education setting.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that Mr Pandor's conduct, as found proven in respect of allegations 1(b) and 1(c), 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 Pandor was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct by reason of his actions as found proven in respect of allegations 1(b) and 1(c). The panel did not find that Mr Pandor was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct by reason of his actions as found proven in respect of allegation 1(a).

In relation to whether Mr Pandor's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Pandor'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 Pandor was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offences of sexual activity and harassment were relevant.

The panel noted its earlier findings concerning the conduct found proven in respect of allegations 1(a) and 1(b) and treated this conduct as having taken place outside the education setting.

As regards allegation 1(a), the panel noted its finding that Mr Pandor had initially engaged in mutually familiar and, at times, flirtatious communication with Colleague A, although from late January 2024 Mr Pandor escalated this to sexually explicit communication which was unwanted and not reciprocated by Colleague A. Although the panel considered these later communications to be inappropriate, the panel was not persuaded that they amounted to misconduct of serious nature or that they were likely to have a negative impact on the public's perception of Mr Pandor as a teacher. Therefore, the panel found that Mr Pandor's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 1(a) was not conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

As regards allegation 1(b), the panel considered the fact that Mr Pandor had sent three unwanted photographs of his penis to Colleague A to be more serious than the other communications, and that it displayed more overt behaviours associated with the offences referenced above. The panel found that a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would consider the sending of unwanted sexually explicit images to be wholly unacceptable. Accordingly, the panel found that Mr Pandor's conduct, as found proven in respect of allegation 1(b) was misconduct of a serious nature and it would likely have a negative impact on the public's perception of Mr Pandor as a teacher, therefore bringing the profession into disrepute.

The panel noted that allegation 1(c) related to unwanted touching and kissing by Mr Pandor towards a colleague in the School, which was sexually motivated. The panel considered that a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would likely find unwanted sexually motivated behaviour by teachers in a school setting to be unacceptable. Accordingly, the panel found that Mr Pandor's conduct, as found proven in respect of allegation 1(c), had the potential to damage the public's perception of Mr Pandor as a teacher, therefore bringing the profession into disrepute.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that Mr Pandor's actions, as found proven in respect of allegations 1(b) and 1(c), constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel did not find that Mr Pandor's conduct, as found proven in respect of allegation 1(a), 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. The panel was mindful that 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 of proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Pandor, which involved unwanted sexually motivated physical touching and sending unwanted sexually explicit photographs to a colleague, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Pandor were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that there was also a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession. The panel considered that the conduct found against Mr Pandor, particularly the sending of unwanted sexually explicit photographs to a colleague, fell significantly outside that which could reasonably be tolerated in the teaching 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 Pandor in the profession. The panel considered the character statements that had been provided by Mr Pandor's current and former colleagues.

In particular, the panel noted that Mr Pandor had been described as a dedicated and capable educator and successful in engaging pupils, and that he was valued by both pupils and staff. Whilst the panel had no reason to doubt Mr Pandor's abilities as an educator, it found that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Pandor in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 Pandor. In doing so, 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 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; and
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature.

The panel attached particular weight and seriousness to Mr Pandor's online behaviours, which involved the use of social media to send unwanted sexually explicit photographs to a colleague.

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 Pandor's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Pandor was acting under extreme duress.

The panel considered evidence of Mr Pandor's good character from nine-character references provided by various teachers that Mr Pandor had worked with over his career. For example:

- [REDACTED], Headteacher at Mr Pandor's current school, stated "*In my interactions with Asif, I have found him respectful, honest and approachable and this is something I have witnessed in his interactions with students and staff. I have not had any reason to doubt his integrity or character at all*";
- [REDACTED], Lecturer of English at a school in the UAE, referred to Mr Pandor's classes having been singled out by the Ministry of Education as high achievers and stated that a delegation was dispatched by the Ministry to meet Mr Pandor, congratulate him and learn from his teaching experience and practice;

- [REDACTED], Teacher of science and former Director of Learning for science, stated that Mr Pandor is "*reliable, honest, and consistently demonstrates strong integrity in his professional conduct*" and that he "*builds excellent relationships with both students and staff and conducts himself with a high level of professionalism at all times*"; and
- the statement of [REDACTED], Teacher of mathematics, described Mr Pandor as principled, trustworthy and resilient and referred to his "*collaborative approach to working and openly sharing best practice with colleagues and contribute to the wider school community*".

The panel noted that the references attested to Mr Pandor's teaching ability as well as his integrity. The panel also considered 15 positive testimonials from pupils and colleagues that were included in the bundle. Having done so, the panel found that Mr Pandor had, within his role, contributed significantly to the education sector. However, the panel was not persuaded that Mr Pandor had demonstrated exceptional high standards in his personal and professional conduct.

The panel noted that Mr Pandor appeared to demonstrate some evidence of insight within his evidence. He also described how, if faced with a similar situation again, he would keep all colleague communication on formal school channels, avoid connecting with colleagues on social media, immediately address and report any situation where boundaries risk becoming blurred, and seek advice from senior leadership or the DSL at an early stage.

He set out the steps taken in his current role to maintain transparent professional boundaries, including by avoiding being alone with colleagues in closed spaces where possible, keeping doors open when having professional discussions, ensuring that any mentoring-style communications are clearly structured and time-bound, and escalating any situation that may give rise to a risk of blurred boundaries to senior leadership.

The panel also saw evidence that Mr Pandor had proactively completed training courses, since the events which were the subject of the allegations, in sexual harassment awareness, social media awareness and communication skills, all of which the panel considered to be relevant to the conduct found proven in this case.

Whilst not satisfied that Mr Pandor had evidenced remorse in respect of his actions as found proven, the panel was mindful that Colleague A had recorded that Mr Pandor had expressed regret shortly after sending the sexually explicit photographs to Colleague A and that he had promptly ceased any further personal communication with her. The panel noted its finding that the regret Mr Pandor expressed at the time was sincere.

The panel also noted that, within Mr Pandor's witness statement, he expressed deep regret for his lapse in judgment regarding the kiss with Colleague A on 29 February 2024, which he recognised to be inappropriate conduct which fell below the standards expected of a teacher.

The panel placed significant weight on the context behind Mr Pandor's conduct as a mitigating factor. Specifically, it considered that Mr Pandor's actions were part of a course of conduct that had arisen from the familiar interactions that he and Colleague A had both willingly engaged in between around September 2023 and mid-January 2024.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Pandor had, in his witness statement, demonstrated an awareness of the need for appropriate professional boundaries and how his actions may be perceived by others.

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

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. In coming to this view, the panel placed weight on the seriousness of Mr Pandor's behaviour, in particular the sending of unwanted sexually explicit photographs to Colleague A.

Despite the mitigating factors, the panel considered that a recommendation that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest in the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct in the teaching profession.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest outweighed the interests of Mr Pandor. The finding that Mr Pandor had acted in an inappropriate and/or harassing, sexual motivated, manner in sending unwanted sexually explicit photographs to a colleague 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 two 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.

In this case, the panel found that the sending of unwanted sexually explicit photographs to a colleague fell into the category of serious sexual misconduct.

However, the panel was also mindful of its view that Mr Pandor's actions formed part of a discrete course of conduct which arose from the wider context of mutual interactions that he and Colleague A had engaged in over the preceding months. The panel therefore found that, whilst Mr Pandor's conduct was very serious in itself, when viewed in all the circumstances of the case it fell on the less severe end of that scale.

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 was engaged by the panel's findings.

In determining whether to recommend a review period, the panel placed significant weight on the evidence of Mr Pandor's good character, the insight and regret he had demonstrated to date and the testimonials which, the panel considered, evidenced Mr Pandor's commitment and abilities as an educator. The panel considered that there was a strong public interest in allowing Mr Pandor the opportunity to return to the teaching profession in the future.

Accordingly, the panel decided that the findings in this case indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate. As such, it would be proportionate, in these circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period.

In considering the appropriate length of the review period, the panel took into account the evidence of Mr Pandor's good character and contribution to the teaching profession, together with the insight and regret that he had already demonstrated.

The panel placed significant weight on its view that Mr Pandor's actions formed part of a discrete course of conduct which took place in the context of a course of familiar interactions between himself and Colleague A. The panel placed weight on its finding that Mr Pandor had expressed sincere regret for his actions shortly after sending the sexually explicit photographs to Colleague A and that he had promptly ended any communications of a personal nature.

Further, whilst the panel acknowledged that Mr Pandor's actions had caused Colleague A shock and distress at the time, it did not find that it had been evidenced that she had suffered significant or lasting harm as a result of his conduct.

In addition, on all the evidence, the panel considered the risk of Mr Pandor repeating the conduct as found proven to be low.

In all the circumstances of the case, the panel determined a review period of two years would be proportionate and that it would effectively balance the adverse public interest considerations against Mr Pandor's own interests and the public interest in favour of allowing him the opportunity to return to the profession.

The panel considered that a two-year review period would provide Mr Pandor with sufficient time to develop further insight into his conduct, reflect on his motivations and actions and demonstrate that he has taken further additional steps to negate any risk of similar conduct occurring in the future.

Accordingly, the panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State was that Mr Pandor be prohibited from the teaching profession with immediate effect, with provisions for a review period of two years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts, save for allegation 1(a), amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put the matters found at allegation 1(a) entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Asif Pandor should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Pandor 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 building relationships rooted in mutual respect and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's profession.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Pandor fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexually motivated behaviour towards a colleague, including unwanted physical contact whilst on school premises. The panel has also found that Mr Pandor's conduct amounted to harassing behaviour.

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 Pandor, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has found that unwanted, sexually motivated physical conduct occurred on 1 February 2024 whilst on school premises. In my view this carries the risk that pupils could have been exposed to this behaviour, although there is no evidence to suggest that in this case any pupil was actually exposed to this behaviour. 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, which the panel sets out as follows*, "The panel noted that Mr Pandor appeared to demonstrate some evidence of insight within his evidence. He also described how, if faced with a similar situation again, he would keep all colleague communication on formal school channels, avoid connecting with colleagues on social media, immediately address and report any situation where boundaries risk becoming blurred, and seek advice from senior leadership or the DSL at an early stage."*

In relation to remorse, the panel has also commented that *"Whilst not satisfied that Mr Pandor had evidenced remorse in respect of his actions as found proven, the panel was mindful that Colleague A had recorded that Mr Pandor had expressed regret shortly after sending the sexually explicit photographs to Colleague A and that he had promptly ceased any further personal communication with her. The panel noted its finding that the regret Mr Pandor expressed at the time was sincere."*

In my judgement, this amounts to only partial insight and remorse. I note the panel's view that the risk of repetition is low. However, in my view, the lack 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 some weight in reaching my decision. However, I acknowledge the steps Mr Pandor has taken since the conduct occurred, including attending training courses.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *"In light of the panel's findings against Mr Pandor, which involved unwanted sexually motivated physical touching and sending unwanted sexually explicit photographs to a colleague, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Pandor were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."*

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated behaviour towards a colleague in this case, including sending a picture of his penis and unwanted touching, 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 Pandor himself. The panel received nine character references from people Mr Pandor has worked with throughout his career, and also 15 positive testimonials from pupils and colleagues. The panel have found that Mr Pandor has contributed significantly to the education sector, but *"…the panel was not persuaded that Mr Pandor had demonstrated exceptional high standards in his personal and professional conduct."*

I have also taken account of *"…evidence that Mr Pandor had proactively completed training courses, since the events which were the subject of the allegations, in sexual harassment awareness, social media awareness and communication skills…"*

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Pandor 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 seriousness of the conduct and the finding of the panel that *"…Mr Pandor had acted in an inappropriate and/or harassing, sexual motivated, manner in sending unwanted sexually explicit photographs to a colleague…"*

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Pandor 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 seriousness of the conduct found proven, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a two-year review period.

The panel has identified that the Advice indicates there are certain types of behaviour where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. In this case the panel has found that the category of serious sexual misconduct is engaged.

I have considered the panel's comments *"…the panel was also mindful of its view that Mr Pandor's actions formed part of a discrete course of conduct which arose from the wider context of mutual interactions that he and Colleague A had engaged in over the preceding months. The panel therefore found that, whilst Mr Pandor's conduct was very serious in itself, when viewed in all the circumstances of the case it fell on the less severe end of that scale."*

The panel has also *"…placed significant weight on the evidence of Mr Pandor's good character, the insight and regret he had demonstrated to date and the testimonials which, the panel considered, evidenced Mr Pandor's commitment and abilities as an educator."*

In this case I agree with the panel that a review period would be proportionate. Whilst the Advice states that in cases of serious sexual misconduct the public interest will weigh in favour of there being no review period, when balanced against the insight and remorse Mr Pandor has demonstrated, including the attending of relevant training, his previous good character and positive testimonials, I am of the view that a review period would be appropriate.

I have then considered whether a two-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In particular I have considered that the proven conduct amounted to a course of harassing behaviour, and that the panel found it amounted to serious sexual conduct towards a colleague. In this case, I am of the view that these factors mean that two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

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

This means that Mr Asif Pandor is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 23 October 2031 five years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Pandor remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



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.