

CAA Non- Executive Board Members:

Mr Manny Lewis - Chair
Ms Trisha McAuley



BY EMAIL TO MATTHEW SCOTT SENT VIA DEAN KINGHAM

11 December 2025

Dear Mr Scott

Regulation 6 review decision
Hearing: 20 November 2025

The Review Panel's decision is as follows:

SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

1. This is the decision of the Review Panel ('**Panel**') concerning the following matters, which have been subject to a review pursuant to Regulation 6 of the Civil Aviation Authority Regulations 1991 ('**Reg 6**'):
 - i) a proposal to revoke your Commercial Pilot Licence ('**CPL**') under Part-FCL, Annex I of UK Regulation (EU) No. 1178/2011; and
 - ii) the privileges embedded in the CPL, which include your Private Pilot Licence ('**PPL**').
2. Both parties confirmed that the scope of the hearing was as set out in paragraph 1 above.
3. On 11 July 2023, the Civil Aviation Authority's ('**CAA**') Safety and Airspace Regulation Group ('**SARG**') informed you by letter of its proposal to revoke your CPL. On 26 July 2023, you indicated that you would be exercising your right to request a Reg 6 review of SARG's proposal.
4. The proposal to revoke your licence has been considered by a CAA Panel comprised of Mr Manny Lewis and Ms Trisha McAuley, who are appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as Non-Executive Members of the Board of the CAA.
5. The Reg 6 review hearing took place on 20 November 2025 via a secure video link provided by HMP [REDACTED] which you were able to access. Although the hearing was held in public, no members of the public attended. All parties attended remotely and you were both legally represented.
6. As well as hearing submissions from each side's legal representative, and oral evidence and representations from you, Mr Kingham (your lawyer) and Mr McCorquodale on behalf of SARG, the following written material has been considered by the Panel:

- i) the Hearing Bundle;
- ii) a timeline of events, prepared by SARG;
- iii) two emails responding to the Panel's questions, one from SARG and one from Mr Kingham, both of which are dated 11 November 2025; and
- iv) two further emails from SARG, one dated 18 November and one dated 19 November 2025.

7. The remainder of this decision letter is structured as follows:

- i) Section B summarises the relevant legal and policy framework and the issues for decision.
- ii) Section C deals with the factual chronology and background.
- iii) Section D summarises SARG's proposal and its submissions.
- iv) Section E summarises the submissions made by you and on your behalf.
- v) Section F is the Panel's answers to the questions posed.

SECTION B: LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

Legislative framework

- 8. You were issued a CPL on 13 July 2010 under Part-FCL, Annex I of UK Regulation (EU) No. 1178/2011 ('**the Aircrew Regulation**'). Part-FCL sets out the requirements individuals must comply with in order to obtain a pilot licence.
- 9. Part FCL.070 of the Aircrew Regulation sets out that "*Licences, ratings and certificates issued in accordance with this Part may be limited, suspended or revoked by the [CAA] when the pilot does not comply with the requirements of this Part, Part-Medical or the applicable operational requirements, in accordance with the conditions and procedures laid down in Part-ARA.*"
- 10. Article 253(1) of the Air Navigation Order 2016 ('**ANO**') sets out that the CAA may provisionally suspend or vary a licence issued under the ANO or a Safety Regulation, pending inquiry into or consideration of the case. Article 253(2) of the ANO states that the CAA may "*revoke, suspend or vary any such certificate, licence, approval, permission, exemption, authorisation or other document*" after carrying out inquiries and being satisfied there are sufficient grounds to do so. Safety Regulation is defined in Schedule 1 of the ANO as the Basic Regulation and any implementing rule made under it, which would include the Aircrew Regulation.

CAA policy

- 11. Article 152(1) of the ANO states that the CAA must grant a flight crew licence if it is satisfied that the applicant is a 'fit' person to hold the licence. Fitness is not defined in legislation but is addressed via guidance issued by the CAA.
- 12. The CAA's Fitness of Character Policy Framework ('**FOCPF**') published on its website at <https://www.caa.co.uk/our-work/about-us/doing-business-with-the-cao/fitness-of-character-policy-framework/> sets out the behaviours that licence holders must demonstrate to be considered of fit character. The FOCPF states:

"The CAA is under an obligation to be satisfied, on a continuing basis, of the fitness of character of individuals and post holders which it licences or approves in accordance with applicable legislation. Legislation does not specify how an individual or post holder will be expected to satisfy the CAA. Therefore, the CAA has discretion in relation to how fitness of character is assessed."

The CAA must consider options for any regulatory intervention when available information indicates that a person may no longer have the fitness of character appropriate to the privileges of their licence or authorisation.”¹

13. The FOCPF states that the CAA “must be satisfied” that all individuals and post holders who hold CAA-issued licences demonstrate trustworthiness and a propensity to obey the rules. When considering these behaviours, the CAA will take into account the overriding need to protect the general public, maintain public confidence in the individual and post holder privileges that the CAA licences and maintain public confidence in the CAA’s own decision-making process.
14. The FOCPF also points out that “*in reaching a decision [i.e. as to fitness of character] we will consider all potential outcomes ranging from taking no action to proposing to revoke a privilege or licence.*”
15. SARG has set out its approach to enforcement in its policy document CAP 1074. This document sets out the range of enforcement action available to the CAA. It states that the choice of approach is guided by the seriousness of the issue and the individual’s intent and past behaviour. It provides the overarching process which SARG should follow to ensure it acts consistently and proportionately. CAP 1074 also refers to fitness of character in the context of personnel licencing, summarising the criteria in the FOCPF already set out above.²
16. SARG’s policy on licensing action states that the CAA must decide what action should be taken to rectify situations on “*the basis of its assessment of the fitness*” of a particular individual. This policy incorporates the FOCPF, stating that fitness to hold a licence means fitness of character. The policy explicitly refers to sexual offences at paragraph 5.4(a) and criminal convictions at paragraph 5.4(d).³
17. The policy on licensing action states that a decision to suspend a licence is normally “*associated with competence or qualification*” and a decision to revoke a licence is normally “*associated with fitness*”.⁴

Questions for the Panel

18. The Panel reflected on the issues as posed by SARG and has considered the questions below in its decision-making process, in light of the legislative framework and policy provisions set out in paragraphs 8 to 17 above.

On the balance of probabilities,

(1) is the Panel satisfied that Mr Scott’s offending behaviour calls into question his fitness of character to hold a licence on the basis that:

- a. Mr Scott has not demonstrated trustworthiness; and / or*
- b. Mr Scott has not demonstrated a propensity to obey the rules?*

In considering the above, the Panel will take into account the overriding need to:

- Protect the general public;*
- Maintain public confidence in the individual and post holder privileges that the CAA licenses; and*

¹ Hearing bundle, page 24

² Hearing bundle, pages 46-47

³ Hearing bundle, pages 52-53

⁴ Hearing bundle, page 54

- *Maintain public confidence in the CAA's own decision-making process.*

(2) *Where regulatory intervention is required, what form of regulatory intervention do the Panel consider is appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances pursuant to Article 253 of the Air Navigation Order 2016?*

19. The Panel informed the parties of these questions at the hearing.

SECTION C: CHRONOLOGY/BACKGROUND

20. On 13 July 2010, you were issued with a CPL.

21. On 16 January 2018, you accepted a caution, issued by the CAA, in relation to two offences of low flying over a congested area.

22. On 29 September 2022, you pleaded guilty to various offences including taking a child without lawful authority, assaulting a boy under 13 years of age by penetration and rape of a boy under 13 years of age. You did not inform the CAA.

23. On 13 February 2023, you were sentenced to 10 years and nine months detention, comprising a custodial term of nine years and nine months and a further one-year licence at Derby Crown Court. The Court imposed a Sexual Harm Prevention Order ('**SHPO**') which restricts you from (1) having any contact or communication of any kind with any male under the age of 16 unless it is inadvertent or you have the consent of the individual's parent or guardian and (2) residing at any premises in which there also resides any male under the age of 16, unless prior agreement is given by Social Care or a representative of the Chief Constable for the area. The Court also ordered you be indefinitely subject to a Sex Offender Notification Requirement.

24. On 11 July 2023, SARG wrote to you setting out the proposal to revoke your CPL.

25. On 26 July 2023, you requested a Reg 6 review of SARG's proposal.

26. On 31 October 2025, Mr Kingham supplied the Panel with the Judge's sentencing remarks.

27. Further to the Panel's written questions to the parties on 5 November 2025:

- i) On 11 November 2025, SARG confirmed that there is no duty on a licence holder to inform the CAA of any convictions they may have received and that you did not inform the CAA of your convictions.
- ii) On the same date, Mr Kingham confirmed that your SHPO is in place until further notice, effectively meaning "indefinitely", and that an application to lift it would need to be made to and accepted by the Court. Mr Kingham also confirmed that you will be on licence until your sentence expiry date and that any licence conditions would likely mimic the SHPO conditions.

28. Further to the Panel's written questions to SARG:

- i) On 18 November, SARG confirmed that its proposal covered your CPL and PPL. SARG stated that "*the PPL privileges are embedded within a CPL*", but that it was not proposed to revoke your Flight Radiotelephony Operators Licence ('**FRTOL**') as it was "*separate and distinct*"; and
- ii) SARG responded on 19 November 2025 stating that "*Both the CPL and the PPL are covered by the proposal. A CPL includes the privileges of a PPL.*" SARG confirmed that you were aware of this and that there had been no questions from your lawyer.

29. At the start of the hearing, the Panel invited the parties to make submissions on the inclusion of the PPL in SARG's proposal. SARG submitted that its brief confirmed that *"SARG has proposed to revoke MS's Commercial Pilot Licence and all licence privileges embedded within it"* and that at no point did you, or your legal representative, raise the point that you were unaware that all pilot privileges were proposed to be revoked.⁵
30. You confirmed that you were fully aware that the proposal covered both the CPL and the PPL.⁶
31. On a separate issue, SARG noted that your written response stated that there were "no concerns, complaints or issues" in relation to you prior to the convictions that were the subject of SARG's proposal. SARG informed the Panel that you had in fact been issued with a caution for two low flying offences, which you received in 2018, and this had been investigated and administered by the CAA's Investigations & Enforcement Team ('IET').
32. You accepted you were cautioned and Mr Kingham confirmed he would seek to argue that it did not go to your trustworthiness and/or your propensity to obey rules.
33. For the avoidance of doubt, the Panel has taken into account all of the documents and written representations made by and on behalf of both parties, and while it does not repeat all of the submissions in full in this decision letter, the written and oral submissions and evidence have been considered in their entirety in the Panel reaching their decision.

SECTION D: SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF SARG

34. SARG submitted that your convictions, the custodial sentence and consequential orders go beyond calling into question your fitness of character; they establish that you are not trustworthy and have not obeyed the rules. SARG conceded that although the convictions are not directly linked to your role as a pilot, you committed serious acts of sexual violence towards a 12-year-old boy whilst holding your pilot privileges. You pleaded guilty, accepting your role in the offence and the conviction is determinative of your guilt. SARG encouraged the Panel not to look behind the conviction but at the facts and confirmed that *"the facts form the substance behind the decision of SARG to propose to revoke Mr Scott's licence on the basis that he is not a fit and proper person because of those facts."*⁷
35. SARG stated that the CAA is responsible for upholding aviation safety on behalf of the UK and part of that responsibility includes overseeing those that it regulates, including pilots who hold CAA-issued licences. In discharging its statutory function, the CAA makes decisions that directly affect the rights, obligations and commercial interests of those it regulates. The decisions are public law decisions and must therefore adhere to the principles of legality, fairness and transparency. In exercising its statutory powers, the CAA must establish clear policies and procedures to explain the criteria and standards applied to its decision-making.
36. SARG submitted that in this instance, it followed the CAA's FOCPF as published on the CAA website. SARG highlighted that the FOCPF requires the CAA to consider *"regulatory intervention when available information indicates that a person may no longer have the fitness of character appropriate to the privileges of their licence."*⁸ In addition, the FOCPF requires the CAA to satisfy itself that those it regulates demonstrate "trustworthiness" and a "propensity to obey rules", whilst taking into account the CAA's overriding needs of public protection, maintaining confidence in those it regulates and maintaining confidence in its decision-making.

⁵ Hearing transcript, pages 8-9

⁶ Hearing transcript, page 9

⁷ Hearing transcript, page 15

⁸ Hearing bundle, page 24

37. In relation to the overriding needs, SARG stated that it would be hard to think of a starker example of a risk to public safety than the kidnap and sexual assault of a child. SARG added that your convictions related to a child under the age of 13, highlighting that the offence specifically sets apart children under this age because of their innocence and vulnerability. SARG noted that the Court determined you to be an offender of 'particular concern', explaining that this meant you are more of a concern to the criminal justice system and is another indication of the gravity of your offending.
38. SARG highlighted that on your release, you will be subject to a SHPO, the details of which are described above at paragraph 23, demonstrating that the Court took the view at the time of convicting that even on your release you will continue to pose a risk to public safety. SARG argued that should you be allowed to continue holding your pilot licences, the CAA could be seen to be undermining the terms of your SHPO.
39. SARG sought to address the point of suspension versus revocation. SARG stated that only revocation would be appropriate in these circumstances as *"neither suspension nor variation meets the overriding needs set out in the fitness of character policy"*. Regarding suspension, SARG noted that *"skill fade" is relevant because your "earliest eligibility for release date is 29 November 2028. He has been incarcerated since 2022. It is contrary to safety to suspend the pilot for that length of time or longer, because the CAA is, in effect, supporting skill fade which is contrary to safety. The CAA is unable to know when Mr Scott will be released from prison; that is a fact."*⁹ SARG added that *"by the time of his release, even assuming the conditions of the SHPO and licence permitted MS to exercise the privileges of a pilot's licence, the ratings on his licence will have long expired and his knowledge and skills will have deteriorated by being long un-exercised"*.¹⁰
40. In relation to future risk, SARG stated it could not pick a point in time at which you could be said to be rehabilitated and confirmed that your convictions would never be spent for the purposes of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974. SARG said this has a direct impact on your fitness of character and at what point in the future you may be deemed to possess the necessary fitness of character.
41. SARG sought to differentiate between the CAA's overriding need to maintain public safety and the Parole Board's assessment of your risk to public safety. SARG stated that the Parole Board's decision will take into account the knowledge that you are on licence, have a SHPO and notification requirements. It will be the Parole Board's decision, using their own risk assessment matrix, whether you need to remain imprisoned for the protection of the public. However, the CAA's decision is based on the FOCPE, your character and the CAA's requirements to maintain public confidence in those it regulates. SARG confirmed that the two analyses are separate and distinct.¹¹
42. SARG concluded that your offending was grave, contrary to protecting public safety, that public confidence in you as a licence holder is undermined by your offending and public confidence in the CAA will be undermined if the Panel concludes that you are a fit person to hold a licence. Mr McCorquodale noted *"My conclusion was that recognising Mr Scott has not demonstrated a propensity to obey rules and also his behaviour, I came to the conclusion that his fitness was not what we would expect, nor what the general public would expect of a professional pilot. The significance here, of course, is that whilst he holds a private pilot licence aeroplanes and a commercial pilot's licence aeroplanes, there is an expectation in the public arena that people who hold professional licences of any sort should be demonstrating and acting in a responsible and law-abiding fashion."*¹²

⁹ Hearing transcript, page 18

¹⁰ Hearing bundle, page 7

¹¹ Hearing transcript, pages 26-27

¹² Hearing transcript, page 23

SECTION E: SUBMISSIONS MADE BY YOU AND ON YOUR BEHALF

43. Mr Kingham submitted on your behalf that you recognised the overriding need to protect the public, maintain public confidence and consider present and future safety and protection of the public. Mr Kingham noted that whilst SARG sought to draw a distinction between the CAA's need to maintain public safety and the Parole Board's assessment, he did not draw the same distinction because the Parole Board solely operates a public protection test; that is, is it necessary for the protection of the public that the prisoner should remain confined.¹³ Mr Kingham said you will have to demonstrate that you are at no more than a minimal risk of committing a further offence that would cause serious harm. Mr Kingham submitted that should you meet that test, the public would be protected.
44. Mr Kingham confirmed that in making this assessment, the Parole Board would consider *"current and future risk; they will be assessing Mr Scott's insight into his risk; the level of internal control he has; importantly, an assessment of the risk of re-offending; and the extent to which any work he has completed in custody has addressed his risk and risk triggers."*¹⁴ On this point, Mr Kingham concluded that in order to achieve release you would need to demonstrate the above and therefore, any release would be consistent with achieving the need for public safety.
45. In relation to your convictions, Mr Kingham submitted that the offending was not committed in the course of your employment or in association with holding your pilot licences and there is no direct link between the offending conviction and you holding your pilot licences. Mr Kingham noted that the offence occurred in relation to a single victim over a very short time span and that you are "not a risk to the public, per se" with the risk being specific at that time to the victim.
46. Mr Kingham highlighted that at no time were any complaints raised in respect of your role or your pilot licences.
47. Mr Kingham noted that you expressed genuine remorse and this was taken into account by the sentencing Judge. You pleaded guilty at the earliest opportunity and it was noted that you were of previous good character.
48. In relation to your release, Mr Kingham pointed out that you will be subject to licence conditions which will set out necessary restrictions as would the SHPO and those dual regimes would provide an additional layer of protection to ensure you are not placed in a scenario where you have contact with a child. Mr Kingham asserted this is relevant because it demonstrates to the Panel that the public would be protected.
49. In respect of the behaviours as set out in the FOCPP i.e. trustworthiness and the propensity to obey rules, Mr Kingham noted that you accepted the conviction and were a man of previous good character, which was noted by the sentencing Judge.
50. On the point of the caution, Mr Kingham submitted that the offences were minor, which was accepted by SARG, and that you had not come to the attention of the CAA's IET prior to that. Mr Kingham questioned whether the low flying incident went to the general assertion that you showed a propensity to disobey the rules or if it was an example of a "momentary lapse" in your concentration.
51. Combining the above points, Mr Kingham submitted that the convictions alone did not suggest, on the balance of probabilities, that you are a man who is untrustworthy when looking at your whole history. Nor does a single conviction alone demonstrate a propensity

¹³ Hearing transcript, page 46

¹⁴ Hearing transcript, page 46

to disobey the rules. Mr Kingham suggested the Panel ought to view the matter holistically.¹⁵

52. In respect of any regulatory enforcement, Mr Kingham suggested that a suspension would be proportionate to achieve the need of maintaining public safety. As for public confidence, Mr Kingham stated that should you meet the test for release by the Parole Board, that would in itself suggest that the public can have confidence in the Parole process and therefore, the Panel could be satisfied that public confidence would be maintained.
53. In response to questions from the Panel regarding future prospects of employment, Mr Kingham submitted that upon your release, the probation service would be tasked with assessing your employment options to assess safeguarding risks. You added that you would seek work akin to what you previously carried out; transporting human organs across the country for transplant operations. You added that internal and external controls would be a factor: *"And for me as well, I think it's a case of making sure I've got my own safeguards in place to ensure that I'm not being subjected to any situation where a contact with a child could happen. So, theoretically, it's to say if I was working in a charter organisation, if a flight came along that involved having children onboard, I wouldn't be the pilot to do that. That way, I've safeguarded myself and any potential accusations or anything going the other way. I think that being aware of that is important as well, and being able to understand that and go, "No, I can't do that, but I can do this, this and this"."*¹⁶
54. You took the Panel through your current rehabilitation regime, which includes looking forward at one's future beyond prison and finding a sense of purpose. You emphasised that your sense of purpose is derived from flying: *"That is what's driving me with the rehabilitation to better myself, to make sure each day I am a better version of myself, so I can go back to doing some form of what I was doing."*¹⁷
55. You confirmed that your rehabilitation would consist of NHS wellbeing and counselling services as well as accredited programmes specifically tailored to sexual offences. You stated *"The rehabilitative program, the risk reduction programme, that's normally a three-month course. I've been assessed for a medium intensity programme. They've recently changed them. There used to be a low, medium high; they scrapped the low so you just have now medium and high. So they've assessed me as a medium. My risk of re-offending rate is 0.27, which is below the 0.3, which is automatically considered that you're able to be managed in the community, hence the reason why cat D could become an option much earlier. So I've been doing a lot of work with, with probation -- not with probation, but with probation services within the prison and OMU and my offender manager and everything to try and progress through moving forwards to a conclusion where the risk reduction has taken place and we can try and move forward with life."*¹⁸
56. In conclusion, Mr Kingham reaffirmed that this is your first experience of a custodial sentence and you have undertaken significant self-reflection to date. He stated that you recognise the impact of your behaviour and the impact any publicity of your offending has had on civil aviation reputations. Mr Kingham added that you have been punished by the Court via the custodial sentence, and it is not the role of the CAA to punish. Mr Kingham noted you are committed to addressing your offending behaviour and offered the above mitigations to reduce any perceived residual risk.

¹⁵ Hearing transcript, page 49

¹⁶ Hearing transcript, page 58

¹⁷ Hearing transcript, page 52

¹⁸ Hearing transcript, page 63

SECTION F: ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

QUESTION 1

On the balance of probabilities,

(1) is the Panel satisfied that Mr Scott's offending behaviour calls into question his fitness of character to hold a licence on the basis that:

- a. Mr Scott has not demonstrated trustworthiness; and / or*
- b. Mr Scott has not demonstrated a propensity to obey the rules?*

ANSWER

57. The Panel is satisfied that on the balance of probabilities, you have not demonstrated trustworthiness, nor have you demonstrated a propensity to obey the rules. The Panel considers that you have committed a very serious offence which has produced a sentence of over nine years imprisonment, a further year on licence, an indefinite Sex Offender Notification Requirement and the application of a SHPO under which you are prohibited from having any contact or communication with any male under the age of 16. You are barred under the Disclosure & Barring service from working with children and the sentencing Judge referred to you as "a person of particular concern". The Panel agrees with SARG that your criminal convictions and the underlying offences are a clear example that you have not demonstrated trustworthiness nor a propensity to obey the rules.
58. The Panel considers that a pilot licence awarded by the CAA presents a high level of status and authority based on the fact that a public authority and regulator, the CAA, has awarded such a licence. The public needs to have confidence that those licensed by the CAA will be aware of their legal obligations and be trustworthy and have a propensity to obey the rules, particularly given the high level of responsibility expected of a pilot. The Panel heard that whilst you pleaded guilty to the offences, you nonetheless did not inform the CAA of your convictions. Although the Panel notes your position regarding how events unfolded following the offence, it is clear that you could have and should have informed the CAA. The Panel also considers that whilst the caution was issued to you instead of a prosecution, you nonetheless did not inform your legal representative of those offences and allowed statements to be made in this Reg 6 process that you had an unblemished record as a pilot. These facts undermine the CAA's expectation of trustworthiness and the requirement to have a propensity to obey the rules.
59. The Panel takes into account the overriding need to protect the public. The Panel heard that by use of your pilot's licence, you could have airside access at various airports, access to aerodromes and Approved Training Organisations ('ATOs') in your capacity as a pilot. Whilst the Panel recognises that you will seek to apply self-safeguarding and seek to avoid instances where you may be in breach of the SHPO and licence, the Panel accepts the SARG case that operating your CPL as a pilot would routinely put you into a position where you risk breaching your licence and SHPO conditions. This is also in a context where the CAA actively encourages children, young people and families to engage in aviation and where they may occasionally be present at aerodromes or ATOs without your prior knowledge.

QUESTION 2

(2) Where regulatory intervention is required, what form of regulatory intervention do the Panel consider is appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances pursuant to Article 253 of the Air Navigation Order 2016?

ANSWER

60. The Panel is of the view that SARG's decision to take regulatory intervention was correct in light of the FOCPP. The Panel considered whether suspension, revocation or variation was the appropriate regulatory action to take. The Panel heard that you were understandably keen to retain your licence and keep your ratings up to date particularly to support employment after your release and maintain your motivation whilst in custody. Mr Kingham indicated that a suspension of your licence for four years would be a proportionate response and that this would align with the proposed date for your parole in November 2028. The Panel considers that a period of suspension would not be appropriate as you may not secure approval for parole in 2028. In addition, on your release, you will still be subject to restrictions under the SHPO as well as the notification requirements and disbarring. The notification requirements and disbarring are currently confirmed to be indefinite. There will always be an issue of fitness of character in light of this. Mr Kingham did put forward a proposal for a partial revocation of any future Airline Transport Pilot Licence but SARG confirmed that this was not technically an option.
61. The Panel's decision is that the proportionate and appropriate regulatory intervention is to revoke your CPL and the embedded privileges of the PPL pursuant to Article 253(2) of the ANO having considered the following:
- i) the relevant law, policy and guidance,
 - ii) the serious nature of your conviction,
 - iii) the uncertainty of the term you would serve in custody, and
 - iv) the indefinite conditions on your release and the safety of the public as well as the public confidence in you as a licence holder.
62. The Panel considered your submissions in relation to the factors you believe contributed in the leadup to the offence as well as your detailed explanation of the rehabilitation work you are currently doing and hope to do in the future. Whilst the Panel is encouraged to hear that you have insight, understand your own triggers and are very much committed to completing the necessary rehabilitative work, the Panel agrees with SARG's view that the Panel cannot go behind the face of the conviction. The rehabilitative work is an important factor in addressing your current fitness of character, but the Panel's view is that you are too early in your rehabilitation to demonstrate you currently have the necessary fitness of character to hold your pilot licences. The Panel is unable to comment on whether you will meet the fitness of character requirements at an uncertain point in the future. It is for this reason that the Panel does not consider a period of suspension is appropriate in the circumstances.
63. The Panel did consider whether the revocation should be indefinite. When asked, SARG responded "*There is no timescale attached to the proposal to revoke. For the reasons set out in the brief and earlier today, the CAA is unable to determine at this point in time when Mr Scott would be of fit character to hold the privileges of a pilot license [sic]. It is not to say that he could never be considered of the fitness of character to apply for a pilot license [sic], but at this point in time, SARG has determined that it is unable to put a timeframe on that. Therefore, there was no time frame put in the proposal to revoke. I should add that there may be a time, because no doubt Mr Scott will have interactions with probation and through his licence requirements and he will have reports, when they determine that he is of no risk and Mr Scott can start his pilot training again. As Mr McCorquodale has said, his hours will be taken into consideration should he choose to do that.*"¹⁹ Therefore, the Panel does not propose a length of time before which the CAA will not consider any application for the revocation to be lifted. You would be able to reapply for a licence at any point of your choosing but in the knowledge that you would have to be able to satisfy the FOCPP

¹⁹ Hearing transcript, page 34

at that time.

Yours sincerely



Manny Lewis
Chair of the Review Panel

CC: SARG Lawyer