

Case Examiner Decision  
Simon Thomas – SW120572  
FTPS-22704

## Contents

The role of the case examiners .....	3
Decision summary .....	4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns.....	6
Preliminary issues .....	8
The realistic prospect test .....	10
The public interest.....	18
Accepted disposal .....	20

## The role of the case examiners

The case examiners perform a filtering function in the fitness to practise process, and their primary role is to determine whether the case ought to be considered by adjudicators at a formal hearing. The wider purpose of the fitness to practise process is not to discipline the social worker for past conduct, but rather to consider whether the social worker's current fitness to practise might be impaired because of the issues highlighted. In reaching their decisions, case examiners are mindful that Social Work England's primary objective is to protect the public.

Case examiners apply the 'realistic prospect' test. As part of their role, the case examiners will consider whether there is a realistic prospect:

- the facts alleged could be found proven by adjudicators
- adjudicators could find that one of the statutory grounds for impairment is engaged
- adjudicators could find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired

If the case examiners find a realistic prospect of impairment, they consider whether there is a public interest in referring the case to a hearing. If there is no public interest in a hearing, the case examiners can propose an outcome to the social worker. We call this accepted disposal and a case can only be resolved in this way if the social worker agrees with the case examiners' proposal.

Case examiners review cases on the papers only. The case examiners are limited, in that, they are unable to hear and test live evidence, and therefore they are unable to make findings of fact.

## Decision summary

Decision summary	
1 <sup>st</sup> Preliminary outcome	8 August 2025
	Amendments requested Submissions requested
2 <sup>nd</sup> Preliminary outcome	4 November 2025
	Accepted disposal proposed – conditions of practice order (18 months)
Final outcome	5 December 2025
	Accepted disposal – conditions of practice order (18 months)

## Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1 – 1.4 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1 – 1.4 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1.1 – 1.4, there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

The case examiners did not consider it to be in the public interest for the matter to be referred to a final hearing and that the case could be concluded by way of accepted disposal.

As such, the case examiners requested that the social worker be notified of their intention to resolve the case with a conditions of practice order of 18 months. The social worker subsequently accepted the proposed disposal. Having revisited the

public interest in the case, the case examiners determined that an accepted disposal conditions of practice order of 18 months, remained the most appropriate outcome in this case.

The case examiners have considered all of the documents made available within the evidence bundle. Key evidence is referred to throughout their decision and the case examiners' full reasoning is set out below.

## The complaint and our regulatory concerns

### The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer, Islington Council
Date the complaint was received	3 August 2023
Complaint summary	<p>The concerns were raised on 3 August 2023 by Islington Council where the social worker had been working from 22 May to 31 July 2023. Their contract ended after concerns were raised regarding their work not meeting required standards.</p> <p>The concerns that were raised are adequately reflected in the regulatory concerns below.</p>

### Regulatory concerns

Whilst registered as a social worker between May 2023 – July 2023:

**1. Your practise has not met the required standards in that you:**

- 1.1 Have not completed case notes in a timely manner and/or at all
- 1.2 Have not written up assessments in a timely manner and/or at all
- 1.3 Have not made initial contact with service users on your case load
- 1.4 Have not set up the required support for service users

The matter outlined in regulatory concern 1 amounts to the statutory ground of misconduct and/or lack of competence or capability.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct and/ or lack of competence or capability.

## Anonymity and redaction

Elements of this decision have been marked for redaction in line with our Fitness to Practise Publications Policy. This content will be redacted in the complainant's copy of this decision, and the social worker will be advised that text highlighted in a different colour has been redacted.

In accordance with Social Work England's fitness to practise proceedings and registration appeals publications policy, the case examiners have anonymised the names of individuals to maintain privacy. A schedule of anonymity is provided below for the social worker and complainant, and will be redacted if this decision is published.

Service User 1	[REDACTED]
Service User 2	[REDACTED]
Service User 3	[REDACTED]
Service User 4	[REDACTED]
Service User 5	[REDACTED]
Service User 6	[REDACTED]
Service User 7	[REDACTED]
Service User 8	[REDACTED]
Service User 9	[REDACTED]

## Preliminary issues

Investigation		
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has been notified of the grounds for investigation?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has had reasonable opportunity to make written representations to the investigators?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the case examiners satisfied that they have all relevant evidence available to them, or that adequate attempts have been made to obtain evidence that is not available?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the case examiners satisfied that it was not proportionate or necessary to offer the complainant the opportunity to provide final written representations; or that they were provided a reasonable opportunity to do so where required.	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Requests for further information or submissions, or any other preliminary issues that have arisen

August 2025

The case examiners identified an additional concern, which appeared to have passed the triage test but was not reflected in the regulatory concerns, as presented to the case examiners. The case examiners therefore recommended that the regulator consider amending regulatory concern 1, to add sub particular

1.4 Have not set up the required support for service users.

The case examiners consider that there is evidence to support this concern and that if they did not adjourn their consideration of the case, there would be a risk of the case against the social worker not adequately reflecting the seriousness of the concerns, as referred by the previous employer.



This was added and the social worker was offered a further opportunity to comment upon the amended concerns, before the case returned to the case examiners.

November 2025

No further preliminary issues.

## The realistic prospect test

### Fitness to practise history

The case examiners have been informed that there is no previous fitness to practise history.

### Decision summary

Is there a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired?

Yes



No



The case examiners have determined that there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory ground of misconduct, and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

### Reasoning

#### Facts

1. *Your practise has not met the required standards in that you:*

*1.1 Have not completed case notes in a timely manner and/or at all*

The case examiners have been provided with case notes relating to various service users who were allocated to the social worker during the period of concern. The case examiners are of the view that there is evidence to support this concern for six service users. The case examiners have looked particularly at case records which suggest there was action taken by the social worker, for example in management oversight notes, but there is no case note of this action recorded by the social worker.

The case examiners have been provided with the local record keeping policy which sets out an expectation that case notes will be recorded within 48 hours, except for

records on high risk and safeguarding cases which need to be recorded on the same day.

However, the case examiners have not been provided with evidence of record keeping, which was not timely, rather it generally appears to have not been done at all. The exception to this is that there appears to have been a telephone call made on 9 July, but the evidence suggests this was not written up until 20 July.

Another example of evidence provided for this concern is in relation to service user 1, it appears the social worker completed an assessment as support was subsequently put in place, but this is no record of visits or the support being arranged. There also appears to have been a review undertaken by the social worker to service user 2, but this is not recorded in the case notes.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to adjudicators.

#### *1.2 Have not written up assessments in a timely manner and/or at all*

The case examiners have been provided with evidence from the former employer to suggest that at least four assessments were not written up at all. These include for service user 3, the case examiners have been provided with a management oversight record which specifically references the assessment having been completed and instructs the social worker to type it up.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to adjudicators.

#### *1.3 Have not made initial contact with service users on your case load*

The case examiners have not been provided with a local policy setting out timescales for social workers making initial contact with service users once allocated but they consider it reasonable to assume that contact should have been made within 5 working days of allocation. They base this assumption upon the team being a fast-moving assessment team where people referred often required support to meet their basic needs.

The case examiners have noted from the case records provided that service user 4 was allocated on 29 June 2023 and no record of contact was made before the social worker left on 31 July 2023. Service user 5 appears to have been allocated on 19 July 2023, but no case notes or action appears to have been taken, and they were re-allocated on 1 August 2023. Similarly, the records show that the social worker was

allocated to two other service users in June 2023 and yet it appears that no initial contact was made until the case was re-allocated on 1 August 2023.

The case examiners acknowledge that for some of the service users, it appears that the social worker may have attempted to contact them or a family member, but given that the period between allocation and re-allocation was over a month in some cases, it appears reasonable that they would have continued to make efforts to contact service users, or escalate the issue if they could not.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to adjudicators.

#### *1.4 Have not set up the required support for service users*

The case examiners have been provided with evidence to suggest that six service users were not provided with the required support. This includes service user 6 who had to be re-assessed, due to no paperwork being completed and no support requested. Additionally, there is evidence that the social worker did initially try to organise a multi-disciplinary meeting for service user 7 but there are no further records after 13 July 2023 to suggest that this meeting was held, and support needs discussed.

The case examiners have also been provided with a complaint from the husband of service user 8 which sets out that the social worker came out and completed an assessment then set up support which was quite different to what was agreed or required and led to the couple being liable for a service they did not want nor need.

The case notes for service user 9 suggest that despite the social worker visiting and assessing service user 9 as at risk of harm due to a number of concerns, no support was put in place and service user 9 was found 3 weeks later out in the community, confused and carrying a large amount of money, they were subsequently admitted to hospital and appropriate care identified by the subsequent worker.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to adjudicators.

The case examiners have also considered the overarching concern, that the social worker's practice did not meet the required standards due to the failures described in the sub-particulars. The case examiners are of the view that the concerns described are central elements of a social worker's role and that failing to record case notes, write up assessments, provide support and make contact with service users could certainly be characterised as not meeting the required standards of their role.

Accordingly, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of all of regulatory concern 1 (1.1 – 1.4 inclusive) being found proven.

### Grounds

This case has been presented on the grounds of misconduct and/or a lack of competence or capability. The case examiners' guidance encourages them to (where possible) identify the appropriate statutory ground to proceed on, as this provides clarity as to the basis of Social Work England's case against the social worker. The case examiners are reminded, however, that in some cases they may not always be in the best position to identify one ground over another.

The case examiners have first considered whether the evidence indicates the alleged conduct could have been caused by a lack of competence or capability.

The case examiners' guidance explains that lack of competence or capability suggests a standard of professional performance which is unacceptably low. It means a social worker has demonstrated that they may lack the knowledge and skills to do their work in a safe and effective manner. This must usually be demonstrated over a fair sample of a social worker's work. There is no set definition of 'fair sample', but it suggests a sample sufficient to show the social worker's usual standard of work over a period of time.

The case examiners note that the concerns took place over a relatively short period of time, from 22 May 2023 to 31 July 2023. Although there appeared to have been concerns about the social worker's interventions with many of the service users allocated to them, given the social worker was experienced and had practiced for several years previously, it appears unlikely they lacked competence or capability. From the evidence presented to the case examiners, it appears that the social worker knew what was expected of them but frequently appeared offline or unavailable during their working hours. This is likely to have contributed to the social worker's alleged failure to complete their duties, rather than a lack of competence.

Whilst the case examiners have not been provided with evidence from previous employers which states that the social worker was competent, they are mindful that the social worker would have provided suitable references in order to register with a recruitment agency and/or take contracts with local authorities. They are therefore not satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the regulatory concerns amount to a lack of competence or capability.

The case examiners have then considered whether the conduct in regulatory concern 1 could amount to misconduct.

The case examiners are aware that there is no legal definition of misconduct, but it generally would consist of serious acts or omissions, which suggest a significant departure from what would be expected of the social worker in the circumstances.

To help them decide if the evidence suggests a significant departure, the case examiners have considered the following Social Work England professional standards (2019), which were applicable at the time of the concerns;

*As a social worker, I will:*

*3.3 Apply my knowledge and skills to address the social care needs of individuals and their families commonly arising from physical and mental ill health, disability, substance misuse, abuse or neglect, to enhance quality of life and wellbeing.*

*3.8 Clarify where the accountability lies for delegated work and fulfil that responsibility when it lies with me.*

*3.9 Make sure that relevant colleagues and agencies are informed about identified risks and the outcomes and implications of assessments and decisions I make.*

*3.11 Maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records, documenting how I arrive at my decisions.*

*3.13 Provide, or support people to access advice and services tailored to meet their needs, based on evidence, negotiating and challenging other professionals and organisations, as required.*

The case examiners have been provided with evidence about the consequences for two of the service users in particular, though they stress that even if harm did not materialise in some cases, creating a risk of harm is equally as serious. Service user 9 was left without gas and electricity for 3 weeks until found by the police and taken into care, the social worker appeared to recognise that a morning visit was required as the service user went out in the afternoons and did not have access to a phone, but the evidence suggested they never attempted to visit in the morning.

The complaint letter previously referred to, set out how much pressure the husband and carer of service user 8 was under, receiving a large, unexpected bill for a service his wife he and his wife did not require nor use. The local authority waived the bill so as to prevent further distress and potential hardship, but this may have resulted in a loss of public money, which is used to protect and support the public.

The social worker states they did not have any formal supervision during their time with the complainant employer and their manager was on leave when they began their role. The case examiners acknowledge that it appears there was no formal

supervision session during the 10 weeks the social worker was employed there. There does however, appear to have been informal management discussion and guidance provided, as set out in the case records. Additionally, whilst the social worker's manager was on leave at the beginning of their contract, the case examiners note that the social worker was an experienced practitioner, having worked in a number of local authorities and it seems reasonable to assume they could have sought support from senior colleagues, as needed.

The case examiners are of the view that they have been provided with insufficient evidence to suggest there was mitigation which would deter from a potential finding of misconduct. They are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the conduct in regulatory concern 1 to amount to misconduct.

### Impairment

Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:

1. The personal element, established via an assessment of the risk of repetition.
2. The public element, established through consideration of whether a finding of impairment might be required to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

#### Personal element

With regards to the concerns before the regulator, the case examiners have given thought to their guidance, and they note that they should give consideration to whether the matters before the regulator are easily remediable, and whether the social worker has demonstrated insight and/or conducted remediation to the effect that the risk of repetition is highly unlikely.

#### Whether the conduct can be easily remedied

The case examiner consider that the conduct in this case is easily remediable, particularly by an experienced social worker. They are of the view that with suitable reflection and evidence that they have sought learning and development around the areas of alleged omission, the social worker could demonstrate insight and remediation to reassure the regulator that any risk of repetition is low.

#### Insight and remediation

The case examiners are of the view that the social worker has demonstrated limited insight. When asked if they accept the regulatory concerns, the social worker stated no and also stated that they did not accept their fitness to practise was impaired.

However, the case examiners recognise that within their submissions, the social worker does appear to accept that their practice was affected by personal circumstances, and they state *“I didn't expect it to effect [sic] me emotionally and my job professionally. I was short sighted in this moment”*.

The case examiners acknowledge that it can be very difficult for social workers who deny the concerns, to provide insight and remediation. They recognise the social worker's right to deny the allegations against them but note these concerns are supported by objective evidence.

The social worker submits that they regularly undertake reflection but have offered no evidence or account of any reflection, so the case examiners cannot be assured that the social worker understands the significance of the allegations against them.

#### Risk of repetition

The case examiners recognise that it is possible for social workers to demonstrate remediation by providing evidence from subsequent employers, demonstrating there are no current concerns about the social worker's practice. In this case however, the case examiners have been provided with information from the subsequent employer, Camden Council which suggests that the social worker was struggling to keep on top of their workload. The manager of that team stated that they would have begun talking about performance, but the social worker decided they were better placed working in a less demanding environment. The case examiners are satisfied that this information is not suggestive of new regulatory concerns as the manager concluded *“he has not been working with us for long enough for me to give an indication of serious concerns, he also had a lot of personal things happening outside of work that may have contributed to his performance”*.

The case examiners are of the view that the most recent evidence of the social worker's practice suggests that there has been a repetition of some of the concerns. The social worker submits they have been diagnosed with a health condition, [REDACTED] and that treatment for this should improve their health and reduce tiredness at work. However, the case examiners have not been provided with sufficient evidence of insight and remediation, which could reassure them that the risk of repetition is low.

The case examiners are of the view that a risk of repetition remains.



**Public element**

The case examiners have next considered whether the social worker's actions have the potential to undermine public confidence in the social work profession, or the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

As previously stated in their consideration of facts, the regulatory concerns in this case all relate to fundamental elements of the social work role. The public would likely be concerned to know that vulnerable people were left without contact or suitable support and would expect the regulator to take action to prevent this recurring. The case examiners are of the view that public confidence would be negatively affected if no finding of impairment was made.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding that the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired.

## The public interest

### Decision summary

Is there a public interest in referring the case to a hearing?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Referral criteria

Is there a conflict in the evidence that must be resolved at a hearing?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the social worker dispute any or all of the key facts of the case?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is a hearing necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession, and/or to uphold the professional standards of social workers?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Additional reasoning

The case examiners are mindful of their guidance, which states they must refer matters to a hearing if there is disagreement about the underlying facts of the case which give rise to the allegations of impairment.

In this case, although the social worker denies the regulatory concerns and that their fitness to practise is impaired, there is other evidence which suggests that they accept their practice was negatively impacted by their personal circumstances at the time of the alleged concerns. There is no conflict of evidence to be addressed as the objective evidence provided is not challenged by the social worker, which is different to a denial, in the case examiner's view.

The case examiners have concluded that the risk of repetition of the concerns raised may remain and as such, restrictions on the social worker's practice are likely to be

required. The case examiners have the ability to offer restrictive sanctions through the accepted disposal process.

Whilst the case examiners have determined there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators would find the public interest is engaged in this case, they are of the view that the public interest can be satisfied by their decision, and the reasons for that decision, being published on Social Work England's public register which can be found on its website. The case examiners are mindful of their guidance which sets out that they "*should propose the minimum necessary sanction to protect the public*".

Publication demonstrates that appropriate action is taken in cases of alleged breaches of standards, thus enhancing the public's confidence in the social work profession. Considering all the factors discussed above, the case examiners have decided it is not in the public interest to refer this matter to a hearing. Alternatively, they will seek to resolve this matter, with the social worker's consent, by way of an accepted disposal.

## Accepted disposal

### Case outcome

Proposed outcome	No further action	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Advice	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Warning order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Conditions of practice order	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Suspension order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Removal order	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed duration	18 months	

### Reasoning

In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners had regard to Social Work England's sanctions guidance (December 2022) and reminded themselves that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker, but to protect the public.

The case examiners have decided that it is not in the public interest to refer this matter to a final hearing and have chosen the least restrictive sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest. They have started at the lowest possible sanction and worked up, testing the appropriateness of each sanction and the next sanction above it to confirm their decision is proportionate.

The case examiners have already determined that there is a realistic prospect that the social worker's fitness to practise would be found impaired. The sanctions guidance advises that if the personal element of impairment is found, "*a sanction restricting or removing a social worker's registration will normally be necessary to protect the public*". The case examiners are therefore led to consider sanctions which restrict the social worker's practice. They note that the guidance suggests it may therefore "*be reasonable to move beyond the lower sanctions (no action, advice or a warning) on this basis alone*". The case examiners have already determined that they do not consider that the social worker has demonstrated sufficient insight and therefore a risk of repetition remains. Therefore, the sanctions of no further action, advice or a warning are considered inappropriate on the basis that these outcomes will not restrict practice and therefore not sufficiently protect the public.

The case examiners have decided to suggest a conditions of practice order to the social worker that they must comply with. This will afford the social worker further opportunity to evidence any reflection and insight they may have gained, so the regulator can be assured that the risk of repetition is reduced.

The case examiners have considered whether the concerns before them require a sanction of suspension, and are of the view that this would be disproportionate given the developing insight demonstrated and the mitigation of the social worker's personal circumstances at the time of the concerns.

The case examiners consider the appropriate duration of the conditions of practice order to be a period of 18 months. By putting in place this timescale, it provides sufficient time for the social worker to gain employment which can support their ongoing remediation and evidence, once in employment, that their practice is no longer of concern. It also allows sufficient time for the social worker to reflect adequately, particularly given that they have not evidenced sufficient insight in the intervening two years since their alleged conduct occurred. The case examiners have also borne in mind, in setting this time period, the serious nature of the concerns raised, and their role in upholding professional standards and sending a message to the profession as a whole. Given that the case examiners have identified that there is some developing insight, they are of the view that a longer period of conditions is unnecessary and would be disproportionate.

The case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a conditions of practice order of 18 months duration. They will now notify the social worker of their intention and seek the social worker's agreement to dispose of the matter accordingly. The social worker will be offered 28 days to respond. If the social worker does not agree, or if the case examiners revise their decision regarding the public interest in this case, the matter will proceed to a final hearing.

## Content of the conditions of practice

Conditions 1-14 (inclusive) should be in place for an 18-month period. In accordance with paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018, the regulator must review the conditions of practice order before its expiry. The social worker and/or Social Work England can seek early review if new evidence becomes available to suggest the current order needs to be varied, replaced or removed.

1. You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact details of your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.
2. You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any reporter or workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.
- 3a. At any time you are providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England, you must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by you and approved by Social Work England. The reporter must be on Social Work England's register. This can be the same person as your workplace supervisor.
- 3b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.
4. You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 4 months and at least 14 days prior to any review and Social Work England will make these reports available to any workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions on request.
5. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.
6. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.
7. You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment / self-employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.
8. You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant authority within 7 days of the date of application [for future registration] or 7 days from the date these conditions take effect [for existing registration].
- 9a. At any time you are employed, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England; you must place yourself and remain

under the supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by you, and agreed by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register.

9b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.

10. You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 4 months and at least 14 days prior to any review, and Social Work England will make these reports available to any reporter referred to in these conditions on request.

11. You must not undertake any agency or locum posts of less than 3 months duration.

12. You must read Social Work England's 'Professional Standards' (July 2019), and provide a written reflection 3 months after these conditions take effect, focusing on how your conduct, for matters relating to this case, namely recordkeeping, making initial contact with service users and not providing the required support, was below the accepted standard of a social worker, outlining what you should have done differently.

13. You must provide a written copy of your conditions, within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect, to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at 1 to 12, above:

- Any organisation or person employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary.
- Any locum, agency or out-of-hours service you are registered with or apply to be registered with in order to secure employment or contracts to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any organisation, agency or employer where you are using your social work qualification/knowledge/skills in a non-qualified social work role, whether paid or voluntary.

You must forward written evidence of your compliance with this condition to Social Work England within 14 days from the date these conditions take effect.

14. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1 to 13, to any person requesting information about your registration status.

## Response from the social worker

On 3 December 2025 the social worker returned their completed accepted disposal response form, confirming the following:

*“I have read the case examiners’ decision and the accepted disposal guide. I admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, and that my fitness to practise is impaired. I understand the terms of the proposed disposal of my fitness to practise case and accept them in full”.*

## Case examiners’ response and final decision

The case examiners have reviewed their decision, paying particular regard to the overarching objectives of Social Work England:

- The protection of the public
- Maintaining confidence in the social work profession
- The maintenance of professional standards.

The case examiners remain satisfied that an accepted disposal conditions of practice order of 18 months duration is a fair and proportionate way to conclude this matter, and is the minimum sanction required to protect the public and the wider public interest.