

Case Examiner Decision
Kallum Emlyn Edwards
SW139484
FTPS-22806

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	9
The public interest	19
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	
Preliminary outcome	17 July 2025
	Accepted disposal proposed - removal order
Final outcome	18 August 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, 3 (i and ii), 4, 5 and 6 being found proven by the adjudicators. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2, 3 (i and ii), 4, 5 and 6 being found to amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1, 2, 3 (i and ii), 4, 5 and 6, 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 removal order. The social worker responded on 18 August 2025, confirming their acceptance of the case examiners' proposal.

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.

Anonymity and redaction

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

The complaint and our regulatory concerns

The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer, Oldham Children's Social Care Services
Date the complaint was received	17 November 2023
Complaint summary	The complainant alleged that the social worker had failed to conduct visits and meetings and had created false records in order to cover up their conduct. The complainant further alleged that the social worker had failed to communicate with families and professionals and had failed to progress cases allocated to them.

Regulatory concerns and concerns recommended for closure

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 between March-November 2023:

1. You have not conducted visits to children on your case load, as required
2. You have not conducted child in need meetings for children on your case load, as required
3. You have falsified records, namely:
 - i. Visit records
 - ii. Child in need meeting records
4. Your conduct as outlined at regulatory concern (3) was dishonest

5. You have not communicated with families and professionals as required
6. You have not completed required case progression actions for cases on your case load

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns 1 and/ or 2 and/or 3 and/or 4 and/or 5 and/or 6 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Concerns being recommended for closure:

Concerns being recommended for closure are concerns raised by the complainant, for which no evidence has been found during the investigative process or where the evidence obtained negates the concerns. Decisions regarding concerns being recommended for closure remains the remit of the case examiners.

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	☐

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, 3 (i and ii), 4, 5 and 6 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 between March-November 2023:

- 1. You have not conducted visits to children on your case load, as required**
- 2. You have not conducted child in need meetings for children on your case load, as required**
- 3. You have falsified records, namely:**
 - i. Visit records**
 - ii. Child in need meeting records**

The case examiners have considered regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 together as there is considerable overlap in the evidence relevant to each concern.

The case examiners have carefully reviewed local investigation documentation, which includes case records, interviews with colleagues and managers, and email correspondence exchanged with families and professionals. Having done so, the case examiners were satisfied that there is cogent evidence available to them to suggest that the social worker did not conduct visits and meetings for children on their caseload (regulatory concerns 1 and 2), and falsified records to suggest those visits and meetings had taken place (regulatory concern 3).

The case examiners' key reasoning is as follows:

- The local authority have reported that the social worker held a caseload of 20 children, all with additional needs stemming from disability or wider health concerns.
- Initial concerns about the social worker's visits and meetings were identified after a parent spoke with one of the social worker's colleagues and indicated that they had never met the social worker.
- This prompted the local authority to scrutinise 11 of the social worker's cases, contacting parents, foster carers, residential homes and other professionals to check the validity of visit and meeting records produced by the social worker. The case examiners have received records and relevant correspondence for 10 of these children (3 of which were siblings).
- The case examiners have independently cross-referenced visit records with emails from parents and carers and found 16 Child in Need visit records and 5 statutory visit records that are disputed by parents and carers (in total, encompassing 10 children allocated to the social worker). In each case, parents and carers were clear that the visits did not take place. In all cases, policy documentation available to the case examiners would suggest visits were required within set timescales. In one case [REDACTED] the family had moved home in July 2023 and it was identified by the local authority that their new address was not held on record. This meant that the social worker's visit records continued to record the family's old address as the location for visits. Such an omission provides further evidence that visit records were highly likely to be fabricated.
- With regards to meetings, the case examiners found 13 Child in Need meeting records that are disputed by parents, carers and other professionals (in total, encompassing 7 children allocated to the social worker). In each case, parents, carers and/or professionals (including nurses and school staff) were clear that the meetings did not take place. In all cases, policy documentation

available to the case examiners would suggest Child in Need meetings were required to take place within set timescales.

- For both visits and meetings, the case examiners were satisfied that the available evidence is clear and cogent, suggesting that they did not take place. The case examiners have had access to the social worker's records for all relevant visits and meetings, and given the evidence suggests they did not actually take place, the case examiners are satisfied that adjudicators could reasonably conclude that the records were falsified.

Within submissions made during local investigation proceedings, the social worker stated that they took 'full responsibility' for their actions. In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker has admitted regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3. The social worker states that they understand and accept the information contained in the regulator's investigation report amounts to misconduct, they take responsibility for their decision making and actions, and they do not dispute or excuse the concerns before the regulator.

In light of the above, there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2 and 3 (i and ii) being found proven.

4. Your conduct as outlined at regulatory concern (3) was dishonest

In considering regulatory concern 4, the case examiners have applied the test for dishonesty, which consists of two parts – the subjective test and the objective test.

The subjective test

The subjective test requires the case examiners to assess the evidence to ascertain the social worker's actual knowledge or belief as to the facts. The question is not whether the social worker's beliefs are reasonable, but whether they were genuinely held at that time.

As set out earlier in this report, the social worker has provided admissions to the regulator in respect of regulatory concern 3. The social worker has also admitted that the conduct in regulatory concern 3 was dishonest. As to the social worker's knowledge or belief as to the facts, they have provided limited additional commentary for the case examiners to consider. As set out earlier, the social worker has been clear that they take responsibility for their decision making and actions, and they do not dispute or excuse the concerns before the regulator.

The case examiners are satisfied, based on the evidence before them, that it is likely the social worker knew that the visits and meetings they recorded had not taken place. Even if the social worker's admissions were not taken at their highest, the case

examiners are satisfied that the volume of evidence in this case would suggest the social worker was aware that their recordings were false. Put simply, given the number of records concerned, and the number of families they related to, the likelihood of the social worker having inadvertently mis-recorded visits and meetings (for example, by entering an incorrect date) is very low. This point is further emphasised by reports from more than one of the families, that they had never actually met the social worker.

The objective test

The objective test requires the case examiners to consider whether the social worker's alleged conduct may be considered dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement for the social worker to appreciate that their conduct is, by the objective standards of ordinary decent people, dishonest.

The case examiners are satisfied that ordinary decent people would consider it dishonest for a social worker to record that visits and meetings had taken place, when no such visit or meeting had occurred. The case examiners consider that ordinary decent people would consider the conduct alleged in this case to be particularly dishonest, given all relevant records in this case were particularly detailed and included reflections, observations and analysis of intimate details of the families' private lives, none of which could possibly be considered accurate.

In light of the above, there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 4 being found proven.

5. You have not communicated with families and professionals as required

Having reviewed correspondence exchanged between the local authority and parents, carers and professionals (relevant school staff and teams), the case examiners are satisfied that there is evidence to suggest the social worker did not communicate with families and professionals as required.

In reaching this conclusion, the case examiners noted the following in particular:

- In one case [REDACTED] allocated to the social worker in May 2023, correspondence with the family concerned (exchanged in November 2023) suggests they had never met the social worker and had only exchanged a few text messages and a single phone call. The child's school confirmed in separate correspondence that they had had no email or telephone contact with the social worker since May 2023. The case examiners observed within case records that the child in question was on a Child in Need plan. The case examiners are therefore satisfied that communication with both the family

and professionals was a necessity and the social worker's level of communication could not reasonably be considered adequate or appropriate.

- In a second case [REDACTED] allocated to the social worker in June 2023, correspondence with the family concerned (exchanged in November 2023) suggests that they had not had any contact at all with children's social services since the previous social worker (allocated prior to this social worker) went on long term leave. The case examiners observed within case records that the child in question was on a Child in Need plan. The case examiners are therefore satisfied that communication with the family was a necessity and the social worker's level of communication could not reasonably be considered adequate or appropriate.
- In a third case [REDACTED] correspondence with the family concerned (exchanged in November 2023) suggests that they had not had any contact at all with the social worker between June 2023 and 10 October 2023. The child's school confirmed in separate correspondence that they believed the child's case with children's services was closed as they had not had any contact from the social worker since May 2023. The case examiners observed within case records that the child in question was on a Child in Need plan. The case examiners are therefore satisfied that communication with both the family and professionals was a necessity and the social worker's level of communication could not reasonably be considered adequate or appropriate.

Within submissions made during local investigation proceedings, the social worker stated that they took 'full responsibility' for their actions. In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker has admitted regulatory concern 5. The social worker states that they understand and accept the information contained in the regulator's investigation report amounts to misconduct, they take responsibility for their decision making and actions, and they do not dispute or excuse the concerns before the regulator.

In light of the above, there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 5 being found proven.

6. You have not completed required case progression actions for cases on your case load

Having reviewed correspondence exchanged between the local authority and parents, carers and professionals (relevant school staff and teams), the case examiners are satisfied that there is evidence to suggest the social worker did not complete required case progression actions for cases allocated to them.

In reaching this conclusion, the case examiners noted the following in particular:

- In one case [REDACTED] the family raised a complaint with the local authority about entitlement to additional personal assistant time. The case examiners noted that the family provided screenshots of messages exchanged with the social worker, where the social worker advised that they would be attending a short breaks panel to formalise an increase in personal assistant hours. There is no evidence available to the case examiners to suggest this work took place.
- In a second case [REDACTED] manager in the child's residential home raised a complaint with the local authority, expressing "deep dissatisfaction" about the social worker's lack of action. The manager reported that the social worker had failed to make arrangements for the child to undertake a Duke of Edinburgh scheme through their school, failed to secure arrangements for the management of the child's finances (leading to loss of financial benefits), failed to find an independent advocate for the child, failed to support with registering the child in college, failed to support in arranging medical surgery for the child, and failed to arrange a contact review meeting to agree future arrangements for the child. There is no evidence available to the case examiners to suggest this work took place.

Within submissions made during local investigation proceedings, the social worker stated that they took 'full responsibility' for their actions. In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker has admitted regulatory concern 6. The social worker states that they understand and accept the information contained in the regulator's investigation report amounts to misconduct, they take responsibility for their decision making and actions, and they do not dispute or excuse the concerns before the regulator.

In light of the above, there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 6 being found proven.

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 standards, which were applicable at the time of the concerns.

Social Work England – Professional Standards (2019)

As a social worker, I will:

1.3 Work in partnership with people to promote their well-being and achieve best outcomes, recognising them as experts in their own lives.

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.

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

As a social worker, I will not:

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.

5.3 Falsify records or condone this by others.

The case examiners are mindful of the importance of social workers being open and honest. Honesty is key to good social work practice. Families and professionals rely on the honesty and integrity of social workers when making important decisions about service users, their relatives and carers.

In this case, it is alleged that the social worker failed to communicate with families and professionals, failed to progress cases, failed to undertake visits and meetings as required, and created false records. The case examiners are satisfied that it is highly likely that adjudicators would consider the conduct alleged across regulatory

concerns 1 to 6 to represent a significant and particularly serious departure from the professional standards listed above.

Children made subject to Child in Need plans and children placed into care are invariably in need of support. It is rightfully expected that social workers will fulfil their duties and conduct themselves honestly in order to ensure that such children receive the best possible care and support. The concerns in this case suggest the social worker failed to deliver even a basic level of support in a significant number of cases allocated to them. The concerns also suggest that the social worker sought to cover this up by creating false records. The case examiners consider the social worker's conduct to have placed children at risk and their decision making guidance is clear that such conduct represents one of the most serious examples of dishonesty in professional practice.

The case examiners consider the risk of harm to have been particularly high in this case, elevated by the nature and content of the social worker's false records. The case examiners were seriously concerned by commentary in records, for visits that the evidence suggests did not take place, which laid out in detail issues that had reportedly arisen in families' homes. Commentary about a parent's mental health, who the evidence suggests the social worker had not actually met, were particularly unpalatable and could feasibly have led to unjust and unnecessary interference in the family's life. The case examiners were further concerned to note that the social worker's manager explained in a local interview that some cases allocated to the social worker had been closed down, based on the social workers records. The manager reported that these cases had to be reopened, so that genuine assessment could be undertaken and support put in place.

If proven, the case examiners consider the social worker's conduct to represent a fundamental failure by the social worker to meet their professional duties to both vulnerable children and their families.

In light of the above, there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the statutory grounds of misconduct are engaged.

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 consider 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 examiners are mindful of their guidance, which explains that the most serious instances of dishonesty in professional practice are those which have the potential to put service users at risk. The guidance explains that this can include falsifying records (such as falsely recording that visits have been carried out).

The case examiners are aware that it can be challenging for social workers to remediate concerns that raise questions of character (such as dishonesty). In this case, given the level of concern raised by the conduct alleged, and the breadth of the families that appear to have been impacted, the case examiners consider that it is highly unlikely that the social worker could successfully and fully demonstrate that they have remedied their conduct.

The conduct therefore cannot be easily remedied.

Insight and remediation

The case examiners have received limited submissions from the social worker. In broad terms, the social worker's submissions offer admissions in respect of the conduct alleged in all six regulatory concerns, and a small amount of reflection on the circumstances in which the social worker's conduct arose.

The case examiners consider there to be some evidence to support the social worker's mitigation, which relates to aspects of their private life. However, the case examiners consider that adjudicators would be highly unlikely to accept that the mitigation raised by the social worker could reasonably explain or excuse the social worker's alleged conduct. The case examiners note that the social worker accepts that this is the case and they are clear that they take full responsibility for their actions and decision making.

The case examiners note that the social worker has offered some reflection and remorse for the impact of their actions on the families allocated to them, and they recognise that they let those families down. The case examiners would have hoped, however, for more detailed reflections from the social worker as to exactly how and

why their conduct was so serious, and the significant risk of harm that arose as a result.

The case examiners note that the social worker has made clear, however, that they have moved away from social work practice and they do not intend to practise again in the future.

Risk of repetition

In light of the social worker's limited evidence of insight, the case examiners can only conclude 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 the case examiners have set out at the grounds stage, they consider the conduct alleged in this case to be particularly serious. They are satisfied that the available evidence suggests the social worker took little to no action in relation to a significant number of their allocated cases, thereby leaving children at risk and without support. The case examiners have also set out in this decision their view that the dishonest conduct alleged in this case is of the utmost seriousness.

In such circumstances, the case examiners are satisfied that a failure to find impairment would fundamentally undermine public confidence in the social work profession, and the maintenance of proper professional standards for social workers.

Accordingly, there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining 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	☐
	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 are satisfied that there is no conflict in the evidence before them, and that the social worker accepts all key facts. The case examiners consider that the public would be reassured by the regulator taking prompt action in this case, through the accepted disposal process, which includes imposition of an agreed sanction and publication of a decision on the register. The case examiners are satisfied that such steps are sufficient to safeguard the public interest.

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

Having found a realistic prospect the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the case examiners then considered what sanction they should propose in this case. The case examiners have taken into account the sanctions guidance published by Social Work England. They are reminded that a sanction is not intended to be punitive but may have a punitive effect and have borne in mind the principle of proportionality and fairness in determining the appropriate sanction.

The case examiners are also mindful that the purpose of any sanction is to protect the public which includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator, and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

The case examiners have taken into account the principle of proportionality by weighing the social worker's interests with the public interest when considering each available sanction in ascending order of severity.

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

No further action, advice and warning

The case examiners consider that the outcomes of no further action, advice, and warning order would be insufficient in this case. In reaching this conclusion, they reminded themselves that the regulator's sanctions guidance is clear that all three outcomes, which offer no restriction to a social worker's practice, are not appropriate where there is a risk of repetition.

In addition, given the concerns in this case relate to particularly serious allegations of dishonest conduct, the case examiners considered that all three outcomes would be wholly insufficient to mark the serious nature of the concerns before the regulator.

Conditions of practice order

With reference to the regulator's sanctions guidance, the case examiners note that conditions of practice are less likely to be appropriate in cases of character, attitude or behavioural failings. They may also not be appropriate in cases raising wider public interest issues.

The case examiners are satisfied that a conditions of practice order would therefore be insufficient in this case, which includes conduct that could reasonably be viewed as a particularly serious example of dishonesty. The case examiners consider that a conditions of practice order would fail to properly address the wider public interest, which includes upholding public confidence in the social work profession, and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers.

In addition to this, conditions of practice are unlikely to be realistic or workable, given that the social worker has expressed an intention not to practise again.

Suspension order and removal order

With reference to the regulator's sanctions guidance, the case examiners note the following:

Suspension may be appropriate where (all of the following):

- *the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards*
- *the social worker has demonstrated some insight*

- *there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate their failings*

Suspension is likely to be unsuitable in circumstances where (both of the following):

- *the social worker has not demonstrated any insight and remediation*
- *there is limited evidence to suggest they are willing (or able) to resolve or remediate their failings*

A removal order must be made where the decision makers conclude that no other outcome would be enough to (do one or more of the following):

- *protect the public*
- *maintain confidence in the profession*
- *maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England*

As the case examiners have set out earlier in this decision, although they consider the social worker to have shown a degree of insight, they are not satisfied that the risk of repetition has been reduced, or that the conduct in this case can be easily remedied. In addition, given the social worker has now made clear on more than one occasion that they have no intention of returning to practice, the case examiners are satisfied that there is no evidence to suggest the social worker is willing or able to resolve or remediate.

In such circumstances, the case examiners consider that a suspension order would be insufficient and would be highly unlikely to lead to anything short of removal upon review. The case examiners consider also that a suspension order would be insufficient on the basis that it would fail to adequately address the exceptionally serious nature of the conduct alleged and admitted in this case. The case examiners consider that nothing short of removal from the register would be likely to safeguard public confidence in the social work profession, or the maintenance of proper professional standards for social workers.

The case examiners consider that the level of dishonesty in terms of alleged fabrication of records, is so serious, that it would also amount to an abuse of trust. The case examiner guidance clearly states that the most serious examples of professional dishonesty and abuses of trust would ordinarily warrant a sanction of a removal order.

The case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a removal order. 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.

The case examiners note that there is an interim order currently in effect, which would be revoked upon enactment of any agreed order.

Response from the social worker

On 18 August 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 considered the public interest in this matter and, as they have not been presented with any new evidence that might change their previous assessment, they are satisfied that it remains to be the case that the public interest in this case may be fulfilled through the accepted disposal process.

The case examiners therefore direct that the regulator enact a removal order.