Record of officer decision

we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the Count of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute 1 defendant for failing to secure the attendance of a compulsory school age registered child between 16th and 20th July 2018 contrary to \$444(1) of the Education Act 1996 using the Single Justice Procedure The defendants child was absent from school on 16th to 20th July 2018. The school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was made-no one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register It is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence. 3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations: Details of any alternative poptions considered and rejected: Details of any declarations none	Decision title:	Decision to prosecute
Decision maker: Acting Assistant Director for Regulatory, Environment and Waste Services Authority for delegated decision: Ward: Leominster East Legal Services: In accordance with \$222 of the Local Government Act 197; we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the Count of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council'. Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute 1 defendant for failing to secure the attendance of a compulsory school age registered child between 16% and 20% July 2018 contrary to \$444(1) of the Education Act 1996 using the Single Justice Procedure Reasons for decision: The defendants child was absent from school on 16% to 20% July 2018. The school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was made-no one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register it is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence. 3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations: Details of any alternative potons considered and rejected: Details of any alternative potons considered and rejected:		
Authority for delegated decision: Ward: Legal Services: In accordance with S222 of the Local Government Act 197. we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the Count of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council'. Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute 1 defendant for failing to secure the attendance of a compulsory school age registered child between 16th and 20th July 2018 contrary to S444(1) of the Education Act 1996 using the Single Justice Procedure Reasons for decision: The defendants child was absent from school on 16th to 20th July 2018. The school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was maden on one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register it is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence. 3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. In one The are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious ob	Date of decision:	18/1/2019
Leominster East	Decision maker:	Acting Assistant Director for Regulatory, Environment and Waste Services
Legal Services: In accordance with \$222 of the Local Government Act 197: we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the Count of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council? Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute 1 defendant for failing to secure the attendance of a compulsory school age registered child between 16th and 20th July 2018 contrary to \$444(1) of the Education Act 1996 using the Single Justice Procedure The defendants child was absent from school on 16th to 20th July 2018. The school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was made-no one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register it is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence. 3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. The potential of any alternative potentials of any alternative potentials of any alternative potentials of any alternative potentials of any declarations. Potentials of any declarations	-	The chief executive's scheme of delegation
Consultation: Legal Services: In accordance with \$222 of the Local Government Act 197: we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the Count of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council'. Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute 1 defendant for failing to secure the attendance of a compulsory school age registered child between 16th and 20th July 2018 contrary to \$444(1) of the Education Act 1996 using the Single Justice Procedure Reasons for decision: The defendants child was absent from school on 16th to 20th July 2018. The school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was made-no one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register It is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence. 3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. The prosecute of and provided and pro		
we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the Count of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy. Decision made: To prosecute 1 defendant for failing to secure the attendance of a compulsory school age registered child between 16th and 20th July 2018 contrary to \$444(1) of the Education Act 1996 using the Single Justice Procedure The defendants child was absent from school on 16th to 20th July 2018. The school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was made-no one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register It is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence. 3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations: Details of any alternative poptions considered and rejected: Details of any declarations none	Ward:	Leominster East
compulsory school age registered child between 16 th and 20 th July 2018 contrary to S444(1) of the Education Act 1996 using the Single Justice Procedure Reasons for decision: The defendants child was absent from school on 16 th to 20 th July 2018. The school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was made-no one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register It is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence. 3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations: Details of any alternative one population of the prosecutions of the prosecution of the	Consultation:	Legal Services: In accordance with S222 of the Local Government Act 1972 we consider a prosecution is both appropriate and reasonable in this matter for the promotion or protection of the interests of the people of the County of Herefordshire which is also in accordance with the Herefordshire Council's Enforcement and Prosecution Policy.
school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was made-no one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register It is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on maintaining community confidence. 3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations: Details of any alternative one potions considered and rejected: Details of any declarations Tone	Decision made:	compulsory school age registered child between 16 th and 20 th July 2018 contrary to S444(1) of the Education Act 1996 using the Single Justice
3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious observance etc. Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations: Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations none	Reasons for decision:	school were not aware of holiday until child was absent from school and the school text the defendant to ask where child was. Reply received stated child was on holiday. A home visit by school officer was made-no one there and a letter was left stating absence would be unauthorized. There was no reply to the letter. The child attendance at the end of the school year was 90.54% where the school policy is 95% A Fixed penalty notice was issued but not paid. Officers wrote to the defendant for an explanation but did not receive a reply. Evidence test is met via the statements, and the school attendance register It is in the Public Interest to prosecute because 1. If this matter is not prosecuted there are grounds for believing that the alleged offence is likely to continue 2. A prosecution would have a significant positive impact on
risks/finance/legal/equality considerations: Details of any alternative none options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations none		3. There are no known extenuating circumstances in respect of this matter such as illness, transportation issues or absence for religious
options considered and rejected: Details of any declarations	Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations:	none
	options considered and rejected:	
of interest made		none
	of interest made	

Signed...

... Date: 18 1 2019