

Case Examiner Decision
Zdenka Kovacova – SW130796
FTPS-23584

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.....	19
Accepted disposal	21

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	
Preliminary outcome	06 June 2025
	Accepted disposal proposed - removal order
Final outcome	30 June 2025
	Accepted disposal - removal order

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 being found to amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 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 determined that the case could be concluded by way of accepted disposal.

As such, the case examiners requested that the social worker was notified of their intention to resolve the case with a removal order. The case examiners were subsequently informed that the social worker had accepted the proposed disposal of a removal order.

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
Date the complaint was received	1 July 2024
Complaint summary	The employer, following information from the social worker, referred allegations that the social worker had sublet their council flat and had made an application to buy the flat under a 'right to buy' scheme, while no longer living there.

Anonymity and redaction

Elements of this decision have been marked for redaction in line with our Fitness to Practise Publications Policy. Text in blue will be redacted only from the published copy of the decision, and will therefore be shared with the complainant in their copy. Text in red will be redacted from both the complainant's and the published copy of the decision.

Regulatory concerns

Regulatory concerns are clearly identified issues that are a concern to the regulator. The regulatory concerns for this case are as follows:

Whilst registered as a social worker you:

1. Did not inform █████ Borough Council in 2021 that you had moved out of your council property.

2. Submitted a Right to Buy application in February 2024 for the council property at regulatory concern 1 despite having moved out of the property three years earlier.
3. Your conduct at regulatory concerns 1 and 2 was dishonest.

Grounds of impairment:

The matters outlined at regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

By reason of your misconduct your fitness to practice is impaired.

Preliminary issues

Investigation		
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has been notified of the grounds for investigation?	Yes	☒
	No	☐
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has had reasonable opportunity to make written representations to the investigators?	Yes	☒
	No	☐
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	☒
	No	☐
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	☒
	No	☐

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



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, 2 and 3 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct, and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

Reasoning

Facts

Whilst registered as a social worker you:

1. Did not inform ██████████ Borough Council in 2021 that you had moved out of your council property.
2. Submitted a Right to Buy application in February 2024 for the council property at regulatory concern 1 despite having moved out of the property three years earlier.

The case examiners have considered the evidence for concerns 1 and 2 together, as they rely on evidence from the same sources. They have carefully considered all of the information presented to them, and have particularly noted the following key evidence, in relation to these concerns:

The social worker advised Social Work England (the regulator), by way of an on-line report submitted on 13 August 2024, that they had received a letter from their county council advising them that they were subject to an investigation for alleged [REDACTED] offences under legislation to prevent social housing fraud. The social worker states that during their subsequent interview into these allegations on 19 July 2024, they were “*advised by the fraud investigation officer to immediately withdraw (their) Right to Buy application, and give notice on (their) tenancy*”, and the evidence indicates that they did so the same day.

The employer’s disciplinary report, completed September 2024, includes:

- Minutes of an employer hearing with the social worker, dated 2 October 2024, in which the social worker confirms that they had been subletting a council property to their parents. The social worker advises that they (the social worker) had been allocated the council flat in 2006, that their parents had moved in to support them in 2014, and that their parents were enrolled for council tax at the property.
- The minutes record that in 2016 the social worker had applied for the ‘right to buy’ the property, but had been unable to secure a mortgage at that time. In 2021, the social worker had moved out of the flat and their parents remained. The social worker states that the parents paid the rent on the property to the council, and did not pay them any rent.
- The minutes further record that when asked why the social worker did not inform the council of the “situation” the social worker responded that “*she didn’t have the time*”, and cited personal challenges during that period.
- In relation to submitting a ‘right to buy’ application for the council property in 2024, the social worker confirms that they included their own name on the application, as well as their parents, and that they completed the application form.
- Within the minutes, the council fraud investigator is recorded as having advised the employer that the social worker did not state that they were not living at the address in the ‘right to buy’ application, and that the ‘right to buy’ scheme would have provided a significant discount on the property purchase price.

Notes from an employer’s meeting with the social worker’s operational manager, dated 29 July 2024, record that the social worker had had an on-line meeting with the operational manager on 1 July 2024. In this meeting the social worker had discussed that they were going to be interviewed by the council in relation to alleged fraud. The social worker advised their manager that “*after checking (their) records, (they’d) never formally advised [REDACTED] (the) Council that (their) parents had moved*

into the flat with (them), and that (they'd) moved out of the flat at a later date". The operational manager advises that while the social worker is "a very good social worker. I don't know why she didn't think about what she was doing. She would be aware of housing rules as a social worker".

In their own employer's disciplinary meeting held 13 August 2024, the social worker confirms that they did not advise the council that they were moving out of the flat, and cites working full time and family pressures as meaning their "*mind was elsewhere*". When asked if they were aware that it was "*illegal*" to sublet, responds "*I didn't think about it and I should have. We do have training in this as a social worker. From my point of view, the flat was my parents' home for 7 years although they were not on the tenancy agreement. They've been helping and supporting me. I don't think I could have asked them to leave after all their support, I didn't think of it as subletting*".

The case examiners have also had sight of a communication dated 23 July 2024 from a business support manager at the relevant council 'right to buy' enquiries team. This is addressed to the social worker and two others, confirming that they had received a request to cancel an application to purchase a property that they presently rented from the council. The case examiners are of the view that this provides evidence that such an application was made by the social worker, as alleged at concern 2, and cancelled by the social worker following their investigation interview with the council.

In their submissions the social worker admits both regulatory concern 1 and 2.

The evidence suggests that the social worker did not inform the council when they moved out of the property. Further, the evidence suggests that although they were no longer living there, the social worker submitted a right to buy application jointly with their parents.

In light of the above evidence, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the facts of both concern 1 and concern 2 proved.

3. Your conduct at regulatory concerns 1 and 2 was dishonest.

When considering if concerns 1 and 2 amount to dishonesty, the case examiners have applied two tests, in line with relevant case law. Firstly, they have assessed the evidence to establish what adjudicators may determine the social worker's actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts was at the relevant time (the subjective

test). Secondly, they have considered whether the social worker's conduct could be deemed as dishonest by the standards of ordinary, decent people (the objective test).

In assessing the social worker's actual state of mind at the time, the case examiners have reviewed the evidence, and they consider the following to be key to their decision making:

- In relation to concern 1, there is no evidence that the social worker profited financially from not informing the council that they had moved out of the council flat while their parents remained, although there was potentially a benefit for their parents in terms of living in council accommodation, to which they may not otherwise have been entitled. There is evidence to indicate that the social worker knew that they were required to inform the council that they were no longer residing at the property, and would also have known that their parents may not have been allowed to remain residing at the property, once the social worker left. For example, the minutes of the employer's investigation meeting, dated 13 August 2024, record the social worker as stating that *"on reflection, I should have informed the council that I'd moved out of flat but I didn't. I'm not trying to make excuses, but working full time, having (personal challenges) [REDACTED] my mind was elsewhere. My parents living at the flat was not a secret, and I didn't notify the council that I'd moved out of the flat, and I should have"*(sic).
- The social worker also indicates in the investigation meeting that they were aware that they were not allowed to sublet their council flat, and that they had received training about social housing as a social worker. However, they did allow their parents to remain without informing the council, because they felt unable to ask their parents to leave the property, *"I didn't think about it and I should have. We do have training in this as a social worker. From my point of view, the flat was my parents' home for 7 years although they were not on the tenancy agreement. They've been helping and supporting me. I don't think I could have asked them to leave after all their support, I didn't think of it as subletting. ... I shouldn't have done what has happened, and I should have done what I needed to do as a tenant"*.
- In relation to concern 2, the social worker, in their statement to their employer for the hearing of 2 October 2024, advises that they were not aware that they were committing *"fraud"*; rather their intention was to provide their parents with a *"stable home"*.

- The case examiners also note evidence to indicate that the social worker and their parents would have received a significant financial discount on the purchase costs of the council property under the right to buy scheme, if their application was successful. While the social worker appears to have withdrawn the application to buy the property, the evidence indicates that this occurred only after a fraud investigation by the council had commenced.

- In the social worker's disciplinary hearing of 2 October 2024, there is evidence indicating that while the social worker no longer resided at the council flat they had submitted an application in the names of themselves and their parents, despite knowing that they themselves no longer resided at the property nor paid the rent. During the course of the employer's disciplinary hearing it was raised that the social worker would have known they had to live at the premises to make a 'right to buy' application. There is no record of the social worker challenging these assertions in the hearing. It is again also raised that the social worker would have had relevant training with regards to social housing, which the social worker does not dispute.

- The case examiners note that in their submissions to the regulator the social worker admits concern 3, although their comments suggest that they are not admitting knowing that what they did was wrong at the time, The social worker states that their *"dishonesty was neither malicious nor intentional"*, and *"resulted from poor judgment and a genuine misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the Right to Buy application. Although I now fully understand where I went wrong, I am not a dishonest person."*

Having carefully considered the evidence summarised above, the case examiners are of the view that while the social worker denies being aware that they may have been committing any "fraud", the available evidence suggests otherwise. There is evidence to suggest that the social worker would have been aware of a duty to inform the council that they had moved out of a council property where they were recorded as the tenant. Similarly, the evidence suggests the social worker is also likely to have known that they were not entitled to make a 'right to buy application' for a council property where they no longer resided. In the case examiners' view, adjudicators would be highly likely to conclude that the social worker knowingly did not inform the council about their leaving the property and submitted a right to buy application, whilst being aware that they were not living there.

In applying the objective test, the case examiners are of the view that in all the circumstances of this case, an ordinary, decent member of the public would consider that a social worker failing to inform the council that they had moved out of a council property and thus facilitating their parents remaining there, when they were aware that they should inform the council, would be dishonest. In addition, such a member of the public would also consider a social worker making an application through a 'right to buy' scheme offering a financial discount on a property when they had not resided there for a number of years, would be dishonest.

The case examiners are thus satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding concern 3 (dishonesty) proven, in relation to both concern 1 and concern 2.

Grounds

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. This can include conduct that takes place in the exercise of professional practice, and also conduct which occurs outside the exercise of professional practice, but calls into question the suitability of the person to work as a social worker.

To help them decide if the evidence suggests a significant departure from what would be expected in the circumstances, the case examiners have considered the following professional standards, which were applicable at the time of the concerns.

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.

3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.

5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.

The case examiners are aware that falling short of the standards may not always amount to misconduct. However, adjudicators may determine in this instance that the alleged conduct is a significant departure from the expected professional standards.

The social worker is alleged to have failed to provide information to the council in respect of no longer residing a council provided property, an act which had the potential to provide their own parents with an advantage; i.e. access to a council property, when there may have been other persons on the waiting list entitled to that property. The social worker is also alleged to have submitted a right to buy application

indicating that they were still a tenant of a council property, when this was not the case.

Where it is alleged that a social worker has failed to provide accurate and/or provided inaccurate information in relation to council housing, this would not align with Social Work England standards 2.1 and 3.1.

With regards to concern 3, the allegation is one of dishonesty which, if subsequently found proven, is likely to be viewed as particularly serious. Social workers are required to be open and honest, where they are not, this can put people at risk and may damage confidence in them as a social worker and the social work profession.

Where it is alleged that a social worker has acted dishonestly, this would not align with Social Work England standards 2.1 and 5.2.

If the matters were to be found proven, the case examiners conclude the conduct described is likely to suggest a significant departure from the professional standards detailed above.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding concerns 1, 2 and 3 to amount to the statutory grounds of 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.

The case examiners note from their guidance that, while it is difficult to remediate alleged conduct which includes attitudinal or character flaws such as dishonesty, a social worker may attempt remediation by reflecting upon their conduct and trying to develop and demonstrate insight. The case examiners are also aware that every case must be treated on its own merits, and that a finding of dishonesty need not inexorably

lead to a finding of impaired fitness to practise. This may be the case, for example, where dishonest actions are isolated in nature, and there is evidence of early insight and remediation.

In this case, however, the case examiners consider insight and remediation to be limited. Whilst the social worker admits the concerns in their submissions to the regulator, including concern 3 (dishonesty), the social worker advises that their actions were “*not malicious or intentional*”, and state that their actions “*resulted from poor judgment and a genuine misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the Right to Buy application*”. As such, the case examiners are not of the view that the social worker does fully admit having been dishonest.

Also, while in their employer’s disciplinary hearing statement dated 2 October 2024, the social worker states that they are “*acutely aware of the seriousness of (their) actions*”, the social worker does not proceed to outline why their actions were “*serious*”, such as in terms of the impact on others waiting for social housing, or on public confidence in the profession. Rather, in the case examiners’ view, the social worker places more focus on the adverse impact on themselves in terms of any sanction for their actions. This is evidenced by the social worker advising that they are “*not yet sure how the social housing fraud allegations are going to impact me and my professional career*”, and in asking their employer, if considering dismissal, to negotiate a resignation option instead, as the social worker is “*concerned that a history of gross misconduct would prevent me from being able to find employment in the future which seems deeply unfair*”.

While the social worker does express “*deep remorse*” and regret for their actions in their submissions to the regulator, they have not, in the view of the case examiners, provided any substantial evidence of remediation, other than to highlight that they had withdrawn their application to buy the council property and cease their tenancy agreement, as per the recommendations of the fraud investigation officer when the social worker was interviewed in relation to housing fraud allegations.

In their employer’s disciplinary hearing statement, the social worker asserts that their “*morals and values underpin everything I do, and its reflective in my daily practice*”, but they do not consider how their alleged actions outside of work may not have demonstrated this to be the case. Similarly, in their submissions to the regulator, the social worker does not address the potential impact of their alleged actions on any member of the public who may otherwise have been allocated the council premises the social worker left, or on public confidence in the profession.

Risk of repetition

In view of the limited evidence of insight and remediation, and considering the potential attitudinal concerns in this case, the case examiners conclude that the risk of repetition is high.

Public element

The case examiners next considered whether the social worker's actions have the potential to undermine public confidence in social workers and whether this is a case where adjudicators may determine that the public interest requires a finding of impairment. Public interest includes the need to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour and the need to maintain the public's trust and confidence in the profession.

The case examiners have reminded themselves that the public interest includes responding proportionately to regulatory concerns. However, they consider that the adjudicators may determine that a member of the public would be concerned where a social worker is alleged to have acted dishonestly as alleged in this case.

Dishonest conduct has the potential to seriously undermine public trust in social workers and to damage the reputation of the profession. The case examiners note from their guidance that concerns involving dishonesty are *'likely to be viewed particularly seriously given the access social workers have to people's homes and lives'*; and that *'it is essential to the effective delivery of social work that the public can trust social workers implicitly'*.

The case examiners are of the view that the public would be concerned by allegations that a social worker had acted in a way that may have prevented another member of the public from receiving social housing when they may have been entitled to do so, and may also have acted in a way that had the potential for financial gain through a discounted council house purchase, when the social worker does not appear to have been entitled to such a discount. In all the circumstances alleged in this case, members of the public would expect a finding of impairment.

Accordingly, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators making a finding of current impairment.

The public interest

Decision summary

Is there a public interest in referring the case to a hearing?	Yes	☐
	No	☒

Referral criteria

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

Additional reasoning

The case examiners have given careful consideration to whether a referral to a hearing may be necessary in the public interest. The case examiners have noted the following:

- The case examiners guidance reminds them that “*wherever possible and appropriate, case examiners will seek to resolve cases through accepted disposal. This is quicker and more efficient than preparing and presenting a case to a fitness to practise panel*”.
- While the social worker does not accept that their fitness to practise is currently impaired, the accepted disposal process will also provide the social worker with the opportunity to review the case examiners reasoning on grounds and impairment and reflect on whether they do accept a finding of impairment.

- It is open to the social worker to reject any accepted disposal proposal and request a hearing if they wish to reject the case examiners finding on facts and grounds or explore the question of impairment in more detail.

The case examiners are aware that a case cannot be concluded through an accepted disposal process where a social worker does not agree that they are currently impaired. At this stage, however, the case examiners' proposal for an accepted disposal process does not mark the conclusion of the case, as that requires a response from the social worker for the case examiners' consideration. It is also subject to a final review of the case by the case examiners, who may still determine to send the matter to a public hearing, following any response received.

Accepted disposal

Case outcome

Proposed outcome	No further action	☐
	Advice	☐
	Warning order	☐
	Conditions of practice order	☐
	Suspension order	☐
	Removal order	☒
Proposed duration	Where a social worker is removed from the register, there is no defined end to the finding of impairment. A social worker that has been removed from the register may only apply to be restored to the register 5 years after the date the removal order took effect. The adjudicators will decide whether to restore a person to the register.	

Reasoning

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

The case examiners are reminded by this guidance that that should consider mitigating and aggravating factors when considering which sanction may be appropriate or proportionate. In relation to this case, the case examiners consider there to be limited mitigating factors, comprising:

- full engagement with the investigation with their employer and regulator;
- some personal mitigation, with regards to personal life challenges at the relevant time;
- an absence of previous fitness to practise history.

The case examiners have identified the following aggravating factors:

- a repetition of concerns, in terms of the period concern 1 occurred over, and evidence of repeated dishonest acts;
- limited evidence of insight;
- limited evidence of remediation.

In determining the most appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case, the case examiners have next considered the available options in ascending order of seriousness.

The case examiners determined that taking no further action was not appropriate in a case of serious misconduct which includes allegations of dishonesty. Taking no further action is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which the case examiners view the social worker's alleged conduct and fails to safeguard the wider public interest.

The case examiners also concluded that offering advice or a warning to the social worker was unlikely to be appropriate in a case of serious misconduct, and where it was considered that a risk of repetition remained. The case examiners believe this is applicable in this case due to the limited insight and remediation demonstrated by the social worker to date. Furthermore, the case examiners consider that offering advice or warning would not be sufficient to mark the seriousness of the alleged concerns in this instance.

Next, the case examiners turned their minds to a conditions of practice order. The primary purpose of a conditions of practice order is to protect the public whilst the social worker takes any necessary steps to remediate their fitness to practise. Conditions are most commonly applied in cases of lack of competence or ill health. The sanctions guidance states that conditions are less likely to be appropriate in cases of character, attitudinal or behavioural failings. The case examiners carefully considered if conditions of practice may be appropriate in this case, but note that any conditions must be appropriate, proportionate and workable. Given the alleged conduct took place outside of the workplace and in light of the aggravating factors identified in this case, the case examiners do not consider conditions of practice to be appropriate or workable. Further, the case examiners consider that in the circumstances of this case, conditions would not protect the public and wider public confidence, and would not reflect the seriousness of the alleged concerns.

As such, the case examiners went on to consider suspension. The sanctions guidance states that suspension is appropriate where no workable conditions can be formulated that can protect the public or the wider public interest and where the case falls short of requiring removal from the register. However, the case examiners

are of the view that, while every case must be treated on its own merits, this is not a case that falls short of requiring removal, given the aggravating factors identified, evidence of repeated dishonesty, and risk of repetition.

The case examiners are aware from their guidance that a removal order may be appropriate in cases involving dishonesty, especially where persistent and/or concealed, and/or where there is a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of actions or consequences. The case examiners consider that in this case the evidence suggests that the alleged dishonesty was persistent as it took place over a period of at least three years, and there is a continuing absence of insight by the social worker into the consequences of the alleged behaviour.

Further, guidance reminds the case examiners that a removal order must be made where they conclude that no other outcome would be enough to achieve the overarching objectives of the regulator, i.e. to protect the public; and/or maintain confidence in the profession; and/or maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England. Again, noting the aggravating factors identified in this case, and that the alleged conduct at concerns 2 had the potential to bring significant personal financial gain to the social worker, the case examiners are of the view that no other outcome than a removal order is sufficient to achieve the regulator's overarching aims, as set out above.

To conclude, the case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a removal order. They request that the social worker is notified of their proposal 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.

Response from the social worker

On 27 June 2025 the social worker responded to the proposed accepted disposal as follows:

"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 removal order 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.