

Social worker: Hilary Margaret
Tideswell
Registration number: SW69171
Fitness to practise: Final hearing

Dates of hearing: 12 May 2021 to 13 May 2021

Hearing Venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome: Removal order

Interim order: Interim suspension order – 18 months

Introduction and attendees

1. This is a hearing of the Fitness to Practise Committee held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018.
2. Mrs Tideswell (hereafter “Ms Tideswell”) did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Harriet Tighe of Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Name: Michael McCulley	Chair
Name: Belinda Henson	Social Work Adjudicator
Name: Louise Wallace	Lay Adjudicator

Name: Simone Ferris	Hearings Officer
Name: Kathryn Tinsley	Hearing Support Officer
Name: Paul Moulder	Legal Adviser

Service of Notice:

4. Ms Tideswell did not attend and was not represented. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) was informed by Ms Tighe that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Tideswell by email and by special recorded delivery to her registered email address and her address on the Social Work Register (the Register), the latter had been established on enquiry with HMP Prison Service finder. Ms Tighe submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
5. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice. He advised the panel that, in accordance with Rule 14 of Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules (updated April 2020) (“the Rules”) service had to be given at least 28 calendar days before the hearing. Service could be effected by sending notice to Ms Tideswell’s address on the Register, and also by email to her email address.

6. The panel was provided with an updated Statement of Service document, which indicated that the Notice of Hearing letter was sent on 12 April 2021 to the correct prison address, as well as by email.
7. Having had regard to Rule 14 of the Rules and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Tideswell in accordance with Rules 14, 44 and 45.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

8. The panel heard the submissions of Ms Tighe on behalf of Social Work England. Ms Tighe submitted that notice of this hearing had been duly served, no application for an adjournment had been made by Ms Tideswell and as such there was no guarantee that adjourning today's proceedings would secure her attendance.
9. Ms Tighe further submitted that Ms Tideswell had voluntarily absented herself. She had corresponded with Social Work England to state she would not attend and would not be represented. Ms Tighe submitted that Ms Tideswell had asked to be removed from the Register. She submitted that there would be no point in adjourning the hearing. She therefore invited the panel to proceed in the interests of justice and the expeditious disposal of this hearing.
10. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering this application. This included reference to Rule 43 of the Rules and the cases of *R v Jones [2003] UKPC*; *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162 etc*; and Rule 43 of the Rules.
11. The panel considered all of the information before it, together with the submissions made by Ms Tighe on behalf of Social Work England. The panel considered that Ms Tideswell had been clear in correspondence that she wished Social Work England to move on with proceedings. She had stated that she could not afford representation and she would not be attending the hearing. Noting that Ms Tideswell was currently in custody as a serving prisoner, the panel considered that she had been clear that she did not wish to attend and had voluntarily absented herself.
12. The panel noted that Ms Tideswell had been sent notice of today's hearing and the panel was satisfied from her response that she was or should be aware of today's

hearing. She commented on the length of time for which the proceedings had been taking and had provided some written submissions in her letter dated 09 April 2021.

13. The panel considered that there would be no point in adjourning the hearing. Ms Tideswell had not requested an adjournment. Although Social Work England did not intend to call live evidence, the case was based on convictions supported by a certificate of conviction. Ms Tideswell had admitted the regulatory concerns and the convictions. She had pleaded guilty to the criminal offences.
14. The panel noted that on 06 July 2020 Ms Tideswell had received a sentence of imprisonment for seven years and nine months. Therefore, she was still serving her sentence in prison. She had written from prison on 09 April 2021 to confirm that she would not attend and not be represented.
15. The panel, therefore, concluded that Ms Tideswell had chosen voluntarily to absent herself. The panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in Ms Tideswell's attendance. Having weighed the interests of Ms Tideswell in regard to her attendance at the hearing with those of Social Work England and the public interest in an expeditious disposal of this hearing, the panel determined to proceed in Ms Tideswell's absence.

Allegations

Regulatory concern 1

Whilst registered with the Health and Care Professions Council as a registered social worker and in respect of acts committed whilst employed as a community care officer ~~as a social worker for~~ by Bradford Council

On the 02 March 2020 you were convicted of criminal offences namely:

1.1 Between 04/05/2010 and 23/12/2016 you did dishonestly make a false representation to make gain for self/another or cause loss to another/expose to risk.

1.2 Between 01/06/2012 and 30/08/2012 conspiracy to obtain a pecuniary advantage by deception.

1.3 Between 04/05/2010 and 23/12/2016 conceal/disguise/convert/transfer criminal property.

By reason of your conviction in regulatory concern 1 your fitness to practise as a social worker is impaired.

Regulatory concern 2 (discontinued on application by Social Work England)

~~Your actions in regulatory concern 1 were dishonest.~~

~~Your actions in regulatory concern 2 amount to misconduct and your fitness to practise is impaired.~~

Preliminary matters

16. At the start of the hearing Ms Tighe applied to the panel to discontinue Regulatory concern 2, on the basis that it covered the same issues and facts as in the convictions in Regulatory concern 1, and that the allegation of dishonesty was dealt with in the convictions. She submitted that notice of this amendment had been sent to Ms Tideswell and it gave rise to no prejudice to her.
17. The Legal Adviser advised the Committee that since, pursuant to paragraph 25(2) of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, conviction of an offence in the UK was a ground of impairment in itself, the additional regulatory concern was unnecessary. The offences were dishonesty offences and the facts were the same. Since there was a reduction in the charges proposed, it did not appear to prejudice Ms Tideswell.
18. The panel determined that there was no prejudice to Ms Tideswell from the amendment and the amendment could be fairly made. The panel noted that Ms Tideswell has been notified of the proposed application on two occasions. The panel determined to grant the application. The Amended Allegation is set out above.
19. The panel noted that the convictions were some time after the events in question and in respect of acts committed whilst an employee as a community care officer by Bradford Council. The panel considered that the head of the Allegation should be amended pursuant to its powers under Rule 32 to correct the position, as it created no prejudice to Ms Tideswell.

Summary of Evidence

20. On 10 June 2016, the Health and Care Professions Council (the “HCPC”) received a referral regarding the Respondent social worker, Hilary Tideswell (“Ms Tideswell”). The referral was made by the Office of the Public Guardian (“OPG”).

21. At the time Ms Tideswell was employed by Bradford Council as a Community Care Officer. The concern was in relation to Ms Tideswell, who was the named attorney on a registered Lasting Power of Attorney (“LPA”) for a service user.
22. The OPG conducted an investigation and alleged that Ms Tideswell had financially exploited a vulnerable service user by using false information. Police subsequently identified a second vulnerable service user, whom it was alleged Ms Tideswell had exploited.
23. Before Ms Tideswell’s criminal trial commenced on 2 March 2020 at Leeds Crown Court, Ms Tideswell pleaded guilty to the following offences:
- a. Between 04/05/2010 and 23/12/2016 you did dishonestly make a false representation to make gain for self/another or cause loss to another/expose to risk.
 - b. Between 01/06/2012 and 30/08/2012 conspiracy to obtain a pecuniary advantage by deception.
 - c. Between 04/05/2010 and 23/12/2016 conceal/disguise/convert/transfer criminal property.
24. Ms Tideswell was sentenced on 6 July 2020. She received a custodial sentence of 7 years and 9 months. The sentencing was on the basis that Ms Tideswell had obtained in excess of £750,000 as a result of financial exploitation. Both vulnerable service users have since passed away.
25. Social Work England relied on the certificate of conviction dated 09 July 2020 and the sentencing remarks of HHJ Batiste at the Crown Court at Leeds. Ms Tighe submitted that Ms Tideswell’s contact with the two service users had at first been legitimate. She had obtained Powers of Attorney over each service user in order to gain financial control. The Case Presenter referred the panel to the Summary of Case produced by the Crown Prosecution Service, which was in the hearing bundle.

Finding and reasons on facts

26. The Committee had before it the certificate of conviction and copies of the Judge’s sentencing remarks. In the judge’s sentencing remarks, the judge said that Ms Tideswell’s actions were ‘cynical in the extreme, carefully thought out and planned

and great efforts were made to hide Ms Tideswell's criminality'. The case was one of the 'highest culpability'. The judge said that Ms Tideswell had abused a position of trust to carry out the offences, which were sophisticated offences requiring considerable planning and were committed over a sustained period, of approximately 6 years. The judge said that Ms Tideswell had deliberately targeted her victims and used her position of responsibility within the councils services to do so.

27. The Crown Prosecution produced a summary estimating the total loss as £979,658 from two vulnerable victims who at the time were in need of assistance from the local authority.
28. In addition, the panel had received the response of Ms Tideswell, in which she admitted the convictions. She had also confirmed that she had pleaded guilty to criminal offences in her letter to Social Work England dated 09 April 2021.
29. Ms Tideswell did not attend and was not represented at the hearing before the panel. In her letter, Ms Tideswell stated that she had been suffering from grief from 2001 to 2015. [PRIVATE]. She had pleaded guilty to the offences at court.
30. Ms Tideswell said that the criminal and regulatory proceedings had been a considerable strain on her. Ms Tideswell stated that she did not contest the case and had asked for her registration to be removed, but this had not happened so far.
31. The Committee was satisfied, having read the certificate of conviction and the evidence bundle that Ms Tideswell had been convicted of the offences set out in the certificate and in the Amended Allegation.

Finding and reasons on grounds

32. Paragraph 25(2) of the Social Workers Regulations 2018 sets out under sub-paragraph (c) that "a conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence" is a ground for giving rise to a question as to a social worker's fitness to practise for the purposes of paragraph 25(1).
33. The panel was satisfied that there were grounds for considering whether Ms Tideswell's fitness to practise is impaired, as a result of the convictions in this case.

Finding and reasons on current impairment

34. Ms Tighe referred the panel to the Statement of Case and developed her submissions from it. She reminded the panel that it should apply any standards of conduct which were applicable to the social worker by virtue of Part 5 of the Health Professions Order 2001, at the time.

35. Ms Tighe submitted that the actions for which Ms Tideswell received her convictions were a significant and serious departure from the following standards of the Health and Care Professions Council (“HCPC”).

1.1 You must treat service users and carers as individuals, respecting their privacy and dignity;

1.7 You must keep your relationships with service users and carers professional;

7.4 You must make sure that the safety and well-being of service users always comes before any professional or other loyalties;

9. Be honest and trustworthy

9.1 You must make sure that your conduct justifies the public’s trust and confidence in you and your profession;

36. Ms Tighe referred the panel to the test of impairment in the case of *CHRE v NMC and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin):

‘Do our findings in respect of the doctor’s misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction, caution or determination show that his/her fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that s/he:

a) has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or

b) has in the past and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or

c) has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession; and/or

d) has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.’

37. She submitted that all parts of the test were engaged in this case.
38. Ms Tighe referred the panel to the sentencing remarks of the judge, which referred to Ms Tideswell's abuse of her position, and her cynical actions. She pointed to the Pre-Sentence Report ("PSR") which highlighted the period of 6 years over which the offences were committed, not as a spur of the moment matter, but as 'years of manipulation and lies'.
39. Ms Tighe submitted that Ms Tideswell lacked insight and had provided no evidence of remediation. She asked the panel to note again the PSR, which referred to a difficulty on the part of the reporter in establishing exactly for what Ms Tideswell accepted responsibility and Ms Tideswell's attempts at minimisation of her own responsibility.
40. Ms Tighe submitted that any admission was tainted and that there remained a risk of repetition. She submitted that impairment was a matter for the panel, but a finding of impairment would seriously undermine the overriding objective (of Social Work England). When asked by the panel, Ms Tighe noted that Ms Tideswell stated that she had referred herself to the CQC, but said this appeared to be contradicted by the Case Summary provided.
41. The panel received legal advice from the Legal Adviser. He advised the panel that impairment was a matter for its own judgement and it should consider whether any impairment found was *current* impairment. He re-iterated the test in *Grant* and the test in *Cohen v GMC* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) as to whether conduct was remediable, had been remedied and was highly unlikely to be repeated. He also reminded the panel that it could find impairment on the basis that to do so was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct and behaviour, and to maintain public confidence in the profession.
42. The panel was mindful that whether Ms Tideswell's fitness to practise was a matter for its own judgement. Not every matter would automatically result in a finding of impairment.
43. The panel first considered the risk of repetition and whether there had been remediation. The panel noted that Ms Tideswell had breached several of the HCPC

standards and agreed that these were those submitted by Ms Tighe. It noted that, despite a considerable lapse of time, there had been no acknowledgement of any breach by Ms Tideswell.

44. Although she acknowledged and admitted the regulatory concerns, Ms Tideswell had not indicated that she had any understanding of the impact of her actions. In her correspondence, Ms Tideswell appeared to try to go behind the convictions and the findings and blame a third party. There was no evidence of any attempt to mitigate the effects of her offending, or to learn from it. Ms Tideswell appeared to want to 'wash her hands' of the profession and move on.
45. The panel agreed with the sentencing judge's characterisation of Ms Tideswell's offending. The offending had preyed on vulnerable people, had been persistent, planned and she had attempted to conceal it. Ms Tideswell had sought to involve others, including her own family, in her actions.
46. In the view of the panel, Ms Tideswell's offending had caused more than just extreme financial loss. She had been in control of the lives of vulnerable service users. In the case of one of them, she had put the service user through a move of home, simply because she did not pay the home fees. She had shown no remorse or remediation for this.
47. In the panel's view it was correctly submitted that all of the limbs of the test of impairment in *Grant* were engaged. Ms Tideswell had put service users at risk of harm, she had brought the social work profession into disrepute, she had breached fundamental tenets for the profession, of honesty and care, and she had acted dishonestly.
48. All of Ms Tideswell's correspondence had been inward-looking, concerned with her own plight and losses. The panel agreed that she lacked insight and had not provided evidence of any remediation. Accordingly, the panel concluded that there was a risk of repetition by Ms Tideswell of her past behaviours.
49. In addition, the panel was sure that a finding of impairment was necessary, in order to promote and maintain public confidence in the profession and to promote and

maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England. It was in no doubt that members of the public would be horrified to learn that a professional social worker, engaged to assist vulnerable service users, had engaged in such behaviour.

Decision on sanction

50. The panel having found that Ms Tideswell's fitness to practise is currently impaired, next considered what, if any, sanction to impose pursuant to Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, paragraph 12.
51. Ms Tighe submitted that the purpose of sanction was not punishment but public protection. She submitted that the panel should start with the least serious sanction and work upwards, imposing the sanction which was proportionate with the seriousness of the case.
52. Ms Tighe submitted that it would be wholly inappropriate to end the case with no further action, in view of its seriousness. She also submitted that imposing conditions of practice would not be appropriate in view of the risk of repetition that the panel had found. Further, the panel had found that Ms Tideswell had displayed no remorse for or remediation of her conduct leading to the convictions. She had not acknowledged the impact on others. Ms Tighe submitted that these were also reasons that conditions of practice were inappropriate and not proportionate.
53. Ms Tighe submitted that this was a case where no other sanction than a removal order was appropriate. Ms Tideswell had engaged in a prolonged abuse of trust in relation to two vulnerable service users. She referred the panel to paragraphs 97, 103 and 106 of the Sanctions Guidance ("SG") which deal with abuse of trust and dishonesty. She submitted that the case involved large amounts of money obtained from two service users and that the panel should make a removal order.
54. The panel noted the submissions contained in Ms Tideswell's correspondence. The panel noted that Ms Tideswell suggested that she had been caused to act in some respects by her partner, but also noted that this had not been accepted by the judge in sentencing. The panel also noted that Ms Tideswell had asked for removal of her

registration and had complained about the time the regulatory proceedings had taken.

55. The Legal Adviser advised the panel that it should have regard to all the evidence before it and the submissions made on behalf of Ms Tideswell and Social Work England. The purpose of sanctions was not intended to be punishment. The panel was concerned with protecting the reputation of the profession rather than punishment, though any sanction might have a punitive effect.
56. He advised the panel to work up through the sanctions from the least serious, imposing that sanction which met the level of seriousness of the convictions and impairment found. The panel should balance the interests of Ms Tideswell with the public interest. He reminded the panel of the sections of the SG concerning abuse of trust and dishonesty, though it should consider all of the SG's guidance.
57. The Legal Adviser also advised the panel concerning the 'general principle' in *CHRE v GDC and Fleischmann* [2005] EWHC 87 (Admin), namely that a person serving a criminal sentence ought not to resume practice until that sentence has been served.
58. The panel considered all the information carefully, including the evidence provided, the submissions and the SG. The panel was mindful of its finding that Ms Tideswell has demonstrated no insight into her offending, nor provided any evidence of remediation. It had found a risk of repetition to exist, as well as a need to find impairment in the wider public interest.
59. The panel acknowledged that it had not been informed that Ms Tideswell had any other regulatory findings against her. It noted that she had pleaded guilty to the offences, thereby avoiding a trial. It acknowledged that Ms Tideswell had engaged with her regulator in these proceedings. The panel took these matters into account when determining any sanction.
60. The panel first considered taking no further action. It considered that this would be wholly inappropriate, given the seriousness of the case. Such a course would completely fail to protect the public. It also considered that giving of advice or warning

would result in no restriction on Ms Tideswell's practice and would also completely fail to protect the public.

61. The panel next considered a conditions of practice order, noting that this could be imposed for 3 years and provide some restriction. However, it determined that there were no conditions that were possible to protect the public from the attitudinal issues displayed by Ms Tideswell, in relation to her sustained and extremely serious dishonesty. The panel was also of the view that a conditions of practice order did not meet the extreme seriousness of the case.

62. The panel next considered making a suspension order. It noted paragraph 92 of the SG, which states:

"92. Suspension orders can be imposed for a period of up to three years. Suspension is appropriate where no workable conditions can be formulated that can protect the public or the wider public interest, but where the case falls short of requiring removal from the register or where removal is not an option."

63. The panel also noted the guidance which indicated that *"suspension will only be appropriate in circumstances where the adjudicators determine that the concerns are remediable and social workers are expected to use the period of suspension to achieve this"*. In that regard the panel having determined the lack of insight and remediation displayed to date by Ms Tideswell, her views about any future employment and remaining on the Social work Register indicate this sanction would not lead to the expected remediation.

64. The panel therefore considered whether the seriousness of the case required the removal of Ms Tideswell's name from the register. To this end, the panel noted paragraph 97 of the SG, as follows

"97. A removal order must be made where the adjudicators conclude that no other outcome would be enough to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession or maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England. A decision to impose a removal order should explain why lesser sanctions are insufficient to meet these objectives."

65. The panel noted that there had in this case been a very serious abuse of trust, carried out over an extensive period, involving two vulnerable service users and very large sums of money. It noted paragraph 102 of the SG, which states in part:

“Any abuse of trust by a social worker is a serious and unacceptable risk in terms of public protection and confidence in the profession as a whole.”

66. The panel also noted paragraphs 106 and 107 of the SG, concerning dishonesty. These state:

“106. Social workers are routinely trusted with access to people’s homes, and highly sensitive and confidential information. They are also routinely trusted to manage budgets including scarce public resources. Any individual dishonesty is likely to threaten public confidence in the proper discharge of these responsibilities by all social workers.

107. Financial dishonesty, whether in the course of professional work or in matters outside the social worker’s practice, is likely to damage the trust the public places in social workers. Theft or fraud leading to losses of public funds that would otherwise have been used to deliver services, or losses of property by service users and their families, is particularly serious.”

67. In addition to the seriousness of the financial losses to the service users, the panel had already recorded in its determination that there had been harm caused to at least one service user, by moving them from their care home to another home. This had no doubt also caused distress and harm to any family of the service user.

68. In the panel’s determination this is clearly a case where no other sanction than a removal order is appropriate. Ms Tideswell had caused significant loss and harm to the two vulnerable service users. The public required protection from any risk of repetition and there was a clear need to maintain public confidence and maintain standards by declaring that this behaviour would absolutely not be tolerated.

69. The panel bore in mind the principle in *Fleischmann*, that Ms Tideswell should not be allowed to resume practice whilst still subject to a criminal sentence. However, in the

circumstances of a removal order, there was no conflict with the general principle in that case.

70. The panel was aware that making a removal order will have an effect on Ms Tideswell's ability to earn a living in the future and also cause her professional damage. However, in the circumstances, it was clear that the public interest very much outweighed Ms Tideswell's interests in this matter.

71. The panel therefore makes a removal order.

Interim order

72. Ms Tighe applied for an interim order of suspension for 18 months pursuant to paragraph 11(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018. She reminded the panel that, in view of its findings there was a need to protect the public. She reminded the panel that protection of the public may include the wider public interest. Ms Tighe informed the panel that there was a 'high bar' for making an interim order purely in the public interest. Ms Tighe informed the panel that there was currently an interim order of suspension in place, which was due to expire on 08 October 2021.

73. Ms Tighe submitted that it would be inconsistent with the panel's finding of a need for removal from the register for there to be no order in place during the appeal period, or until disposal.

74. The panel received advice from the Legal Adviser that it could make any interim order necessary for protection of the public or in the interests of the social worker. It should first consider an interim conditions of practice order and then an interim suspension order.

75. The panel noted that it had made a finding of a risk of harm through repetition of Ms Tideswell's previous conduct. The panel noted that it had found a risk to safety of the public through the financial harm that may be caused and this was a case which also embraced the wider public interest in maintaining confidence in the profession. In the circumstances, the panel considered that the public required immediate protection

and such an order was necessary. Moreover, public confidence would be undermined if there was no order in place during the currency of any appeal period.

76. The panel determined to make an interim order pursuant to paragraph 11(1)(b) of the Social Workers Regulations 2018.
77. The panel considered an interim conditions of practice order but determined that, for the same reasons as applied to the substantive order, this was not appropriate in light of its finding of a need for public protection. The panel determined to make an interim order of suspension. The panel further determined that the interim order should be in place for a period of 18 months, to allow for the time that any appeal might take to be disposed of, if made. The panel noted that in the event that no appeal is made, the interim order will fall away after the end of the appeal period.
78. The panel noted that there was already in place an interim order, which had been made pursuant to paragraph 8 of Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018. However, this had been made prior to the hearing. Since then this panel had made findings of fact against Ms Tideswell and determined to make a fresh interim order on the basis of its findings. Therefore the panel determined to revoke the other interim order.
79. In order to cover any period necessary to serve notice of this panel's interim order of suspension, the panel determined to revoke the earlier (paragraph 8) interim order with effect from 21 May 2021.

Right of Appeal

1. Under paragraph 16 (1) (a) of schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, the Social worker may appeal to the High Court against the decision of adjudicators:
 - (i) to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - (ii) not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - (iii) to make a final order.

2. Under paragraph 16 (2) schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018 an appeal must be made within 28 days of the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
3. Under regulation 9(4), part 3 (Registration of social workers) of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, this order can only be recorded on the register 28 days after the Social Worker was informed of the decision or, if the social worker appeals within 28 days, when that appeal is exhausted.
4. This notice is served in accordance with rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019.

Review of final orders

5. Under paragraph 15 (2) and 15 (3) of schedule 2, part 4 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018:
 - 15 (2) – The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker.
 - 15 (3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under regulation 25(5), and a final order does not have effect until after the expiry of that period.
6. Under rule 16 (aa) of Social Work England’s fitness to practise rules, a registered social worker requesting a review of a final order under paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

