*About this resource:*

This is a Suggested Wording. It is a set of paragraphs you can use to argue to the independent review panel that the governor’s decision was irrational because it took irrelevant information into account.

To understand when you might want to use this resource, read the [Step by Step Guide: Preparing Written Arguments for the Independent Review Panel](https://justforkidslaw.org/school-exclusions-hub/legal-practitioners-and-professionals/after-governors-meeting-appeal-and-3/deciding-whether-appeal-and-making-request-irp/step-step-guide-creating-written-submissions-irp).

If you want to understand more about the relevant law, read the [Quick-Guide: the Independent Review Panel](https://justforkidslaw.org/school-exclusions-hub/legal-practitioners-and-professionals/after-governors-meeting-appeal-and-3/attending-irp-advocacy-and-supporting-family/quick-guide-independent-review-panels).

To use this resource, go through the text and enter the information where prompted to do so. Prompts appear as grey text. Then copy and paste your finished text into the [Template Document: Submissions to the Independent Review Panel](https://justforkidslaw.org/school-exclusions-hub/legal-practitioners-and-professionals/after-governors-meeting-appeal-and-3/deciding-whether-appeal-and-making-request-irp/step-step-guide-creating-written-submissions-irp)*.*

This text is a guide. You might need to make amendments to fit your circumstances.

name of school’s governing body were bound by the principals of public law when considering young person’s permanent exclusion, including that the decision must be reasonable.

Reasonableness was considered in the 1948 Kings Bench Division case of Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd. v Wednesbury Corporation.

In this case, the Court found that reasonableness includes the principle that a public body must make a decision that is within a range of reasonable conclusions, having accounted for all relevant information. The governors must therefore reach a decision that follows logically from the relevant information presented to them.

There are now two sections to choose from, a yellow one and a blue one. Complete the most appropriate section by filling in the text where prompted, then remove the highlighting and delete the spare section.

The yellow section is most appropriate if you are arguing that the governors have reached an irrational conclusion considering an argument that was made to them in the hearing.

The blue section is most appropriate if you are arguing that the governors reached an irrational conclusion on one of the legal tests, but where an argument was not made to them in the hearing.

In the governors’ hearing, it was argued that argument made that the governors were irrational not to agree with.

Evidence was provided to support this argument in the form of description of the evidence that supported the argument. This document explained that “quote from the evidence that supported the argument”.

Despite this, the governors concluded that decision that was irrational.

This conclusion does not logically follow from the information and evidence presented. It is not within a range of reasonable conclusions that the governors could have reached and is therefore unreasonable under the test included in the Wednesbury case.

In the governors’ letter confirming the permanent exclusion, the governors explained that decision that is irrational. However, the governors had access to document containing relevant information, which set out that information relevant to irrational decision.

Clearly, this conclusion does not logically follow from the information and evidence presented. It is not within a range of reasonable conclusions that the governors could have reached and is therefore unreasonable under the test included in the Wednesbury case.

The IRP is therefore invited to quash the decision to uphold the permanent exclusion and direct reconsideration of it.