

Social worker: Rajbansjit Kaur-Dhuga

Registration number: SW50864

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Meeting

Date of meeting: 27 September 2023

Meeting venue: Remote meeting

Final order being reviewed:

Suspension order – (expiring 28 October 2023)

Hearing Outcome: Impose a new order namely removal order with effect from the expiry of the current order

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is a review of a final suspension order originally imposed upon Ms Kaur-Dhuga for a period of 6 months by a panel of adjudicators on 24 March 2023.
2. Ms Kaur-Dhuga did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Capsticks LLP and their written submissions are set out within the notice of hearing letter.

Adjudicators	Role
Catherine Audcent	Chair
Vicki Lawson-Brown	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Paul Harris	Hearings officer
Natarliya James	Hearings support officer
Charlotte Mitchell-Dunn	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the review of the final hearing order dated 24 August 2023 and addressed to Ms Kaur-Dhuga at her address which she provided to Social Work England
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as at 24 August 2023 detailing Ms Kaur-Dhuga's registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 24 August 2023 Niamh Priestly of Capsticks LLP sent by Royal Mail Special Delivery to Ms Kaur-Dhuga at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
 - A copy of the Royal Mail Track and Trace Document indicating "signed for" delivery to Ms Kaur-Dhuga's address at 08.51am on 25 August 2023.
5. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.

6. The panel noted the considerations of the previous panel at Paragraph 11 namely;

“...the panel noted that the postal address for Ms Kaur-Dhuga would have been provided to the HCPC but rule 2 of the FTP Rules defined “the regulator” as “Social Work England or a person carrying out the functions of the regulator set out in the Regulations” and that that definition did not include the HCPC or any predecessor to Social Work England as regulator of social workers in England. The panel considered that, if the reference to “the regulator” in rule 44(a) were interpreted as required by rule 2, the result would be that social workers who had not provided their address to Social Work England but to an earlier regulator (and who did not agree to service via their SWE account or appoint a representative) could not be subject to fitness to practise proceedings because notice of those proceedings could never be served on them at an address which complied with the rule 44(a). The panel did not consider that this was the intention of the authors of the FTP Rules, as it would appear to run contrary to Social Work England’s overarching objective of protection of the public. Accordingly, the panel decide to construe the reference to “the regulator” in rule 44(a)(ii) in line with its ordinary natural meaning of Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s regulator for the time being, rather than strictly in accordance with the definition in rule 2.”

7. The panel agreed with the previous panel’s interpretation of the Rules and also noted that the previous panel was in possession of a copy of a letter dated 8 December 2022 to Capsticks LLP from a firm of tracing agents, in which the tracing agents stated that their enquiries had revealed that Ms Kaur-Dhuga continued to reside at the postal address given in her entry in the HCPC Register and that they had confirmed this with one of her neighbours.
8. Having had regard to Rules 16 of the Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended) (the Rules) and Regulation 15(1) of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Kaur-Dhuga in accordance with the Rules.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

9. The notice of final order review informed Ms Kaur-Dhuga that the review would take place as a meeting. The notice stated:

“If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm on 7 September 2023 Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you do not want to attend a hearing and Social Work England may decide to deal with the review as a meeting. If Social Work England do hold a meeting, the adjudicators will be provided with a copy of this letter setting out Social Work England’s submissions and a copy of any written submissions you provide.”

10. The panel received no information to suggest that Ms Kaur-Dhuga had responded to the notice of final order review.
11. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) which provides:

“Where the registered social worker does not state within the period specified by the regulator whether they intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may determine whether to make an order by means of a meeting.”

12. The panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(c).

Review of the current order:

13. This final order review hearing is taking place under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).
14. The current order is due to expire at the end of 28 October 2023.

The allegations found proved which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

15. The allegations against Ms Kaur-Dhuga (the “Allegations”) were as follows:

Whilst registered as a social worker, you:

1) Knowing that a child arrangements order had been made by the court on 23 November 2018, in respect of Family A, you did not follow the correct procedure in that:

i. On or around dates of 30 November 2018, and/or 3 December 2018 and/or 8

January 2019 you undertook unnecessary foster care supervision.

ii. Between 23 November 2018 and 20 February 2019, you failed to explain to Family A that they were no longer required to undertake a Kinship Foster Carer Assessment.

iii. On and/or after 23 November 2018, you failed to take appropriate steps to stop foster carer payments to Family A.

iv. On 20 February 2019, you required Family A to attend an unnecessary Fostering Panel

2) Since 7 October 2019, you have failed to engage with the Regulator’s investigation into concerns about your fitness to practise, in that you have failed to respond to any correspondence sent by the Regulator.

The matters set out at paragraphs 1 and 2 above amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

The final hearing panel on 24 March 2023 determined the following with regard to Impairment:

16. The final hearing panel on 24 March 2023 determined the following with regard to impairment:

“104. The panel considered whether Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s fitness to practise was currently impaired as a result of her misconduct in failing to engage with her regulator’s investigation into concerns about her fitness to practise by failing to respond to any correspondence sent to her by her regulator since 7 October 2019.

105. The panel did not consider that the nature of Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s misconduct was such as would pose a risk to the health, safety or well-being of the public.

106. With regard to the public component of impairment:

-As stated above, Standard 9.6 of HCPC’s Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics 2016 and Standard 6.7 of Social Work England’s Professional Standards (2019) placed a clear obligation on Ms Kaur-Dhuga to co-operate with any investigation into her fitness to practise by her regulator.

- However, apart from her response of 23 September 2018 to the HCPC’s email of 15 August 2019 informing her of its investigation into her fitness to practise, she had, for almost three and a half years, persistently failed to respond to any subsequent communications from either the HCPC or Social Work England concerning the investigation, nor was there any indication that she would respond in the future. Moreover, she had not provided any clear reason or evidence as to why she was unable to engage more fully, other than saying that it was for her own “well-being”.

-The panel considered that this failure to engage in, and cooperate with, the regulatory process was so blatant that proper professional standards for social workers would be undermined, and public confidence in social workers would be diminished, if a finding of impairment were not made.

- In arriving at that view, the panel noted that the regulatory system in general, and fitness to practise investigations in particular, relied upon the engagement and cooperation of registrants. The panel therefore considered that such engagement and co-operation was a fundamental tenet of the social work profession and that the failure on the part of a social worker to engage with their regulator in relation to a regulatory investigation not only breached that fundamental tenet but also brought the profession into disrepute.

107. The panel therefore found that Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s fitness to practice was currently impaired in that such a finding was required in order to maintain proper professional standards for, and public confidence in, social workers in England.”

The final hearing panel on 24 March 2023 determined the following with regard to Sanction:

17. The final hearing panel on 24 March 2023 determined the following with regard to sanction:

“116. In considering the appropriate and proportionate sanction in the present case, the panel had regard to the Allegation which had been found proved, the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, the advice of the Legal Adviser and the Guidance.

117. The panel first considered the aggravating and mitigating factors of the present case.

118. The panel considered the following to be aggravating factors:

- the sustained period during which Ms Kaur-Dhuga failed to respond to communications from her regulator; and*
- her wilful repeated failures to engage with her regulator despite being given the opportunity to do so on several occasions.*

119. The panel considered the following to be mitigating factors:

- the possibility that Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s unwillingness to respond to communications from her regulator may, to some extent, have been caused by concerns about her health (although there is no clear evidence of this);*
- the absence of any previous regulatory findings in respect of Ms Kaur-Dhuga and the fact that the failure to engage with her regulator which led to the present finding of impairment arose from a single incident;*
- Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s decision to remove herself from social work after the concerns about her practice which formed the subject of Allegation 1 had arisen (which appeared to indicate a degree of self-awareness on her part); and*
- the possibility that Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s decision to remove herself from social work, to which her failure to respond to regulatory communications related, was linked to workplace stress.*

120. The panel then considered each measure available to it in turn.

121. Given Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s blatant and sustained flouting of her duty to engage with her regulator, the panel considered that taking no further action would be wholly inappropriate and would send the wrong message to practitioners.

122. For the same reasons, the panel considered that giving advice would not be a strong enough signal of the panel's disapproval of Ms Kaur-Dhuga's conduct. It considered that both other professionals and the public would expect such behaviour to attract a stronger sanction.
123. The panel gave careful consideration to making a warning order in respect of Ms Kaur-Dhuga, given that it would show clear disapproval of her misconduct given the mitigating factors mentioned above. However, the panel decided against that course of action because of the aggravating factors mentioned above, which the panel considered outweighed the mitigating factors. In addition, the panel considered Ms Kaur-Dhuga's prolonged and deliberate failure to respond to communications from her regulator regarding the investigation into her fitness to practise was a sustained and wilful breach of one of the core requirements of a registered social worker, which, in the panel's view, was extremely serious. The panel therefore considered that a warning order was inadequate and would not uphold proper professional standards and maintain public confidence in social workers.
124. The panel did not consider that a conditions of practice order would be appropriate in the circumstances of the present case. This was because, there were no concerns about Ms Kaur-Dhuga's practice to be addressed and conditions of practice are less well suited to address public interest concerns. In any event, given her prolonged and deliberate failure to comply with her professional obligation to cooperate with the fitness to practice process today, the panel had no confidence that she would comply with any conditions of practice.
125. At the other end of the scale, the panel considered that a removal order would be disproportionate in the present circumstances, notwithstanding that the Guidance stated that a removal order may be appropriate where the social worker is unwilling and/or unable to remediate and cited as an example the situation where there is clear evidence that a social worker does not wish to practise as such in the future. This was because, in the absence of any up-to-date evidence about Ms Kaur-Dhuga's current intentions or condition, the panel was reluctant to immediately remove from the Register someone who was an experienced social worker and who, apart from the error to which Allegation 1 related, had no regulatory findings against them. Accordingly, the panel considered that it would be fair and appropriate to allow her a final opportunity to engage with Social Work England and return to practice, if she wished to do so.
126. With those matters in mind, the panel considered that the appropriate and proportionate order would be a suspension order as this would be sufficiently stringent to maintain both public confidence and professional standards whilst, at the same time, affording Ms Kaur-Dhuga a final opportunity to engage with her regulator. In arriving at that decision, the panel noted that the Guidance stated that a suspension order is likely to be unsuitable where a social worker has not demonstrated any insight or remediation and there is limited evidence to suggest they are willing or able to remedy their failings. However, given the mitigating factors

identified above and the matters mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the panel considered that, on balance, making a suspension order would be appropriate at this stage.

127. In terms of duration, the panel considered that a suspension order of six months duration would afford Ms Kaur-Dhuga reasonable opportunity to reconsider her position and reengage with her regulator whilst, at the same time, not being so long as to unnecessarily prolong the present fitness to practise process, given that it will be open to the panel reviewing the suspension order in six months' time to make a removal order.

128. The panel therefore determine that, in the circumstances of the present case, a six-month suspension order was the appropriate and proportionate final order."

Social Work England's submissions:

18. The panel noted the written submissions from Social Work England. These set out the following;

"In light of the Social Worker's lack of engagement at any stage of the adjudication process, and the lack of evidence that she wishes to remain a social worker, Social Work England will invite the Panel to make a Removal Order.

On 23 September 2019 the Social Worker indicated:

- it was the last day of her employment as a social worker;*
- she had an alternative job which did not require her to be a social worker,*
- she had ended her payments to the HCPC; and*
- she had no intention of participating in the HCPC's investigation into her fitness to practise for reasons of her own well-being.*

Following that email, the Social Worker has not responded to any communication sent by Social Work England or otherwise participated in the fitness to practise process or the review process.

The Panel who imposed the Suspension Order concluded that it was appropriate to allow the Social Worker a final opportunity to engage with the regulator and to return to social work practice. She has failed to do so.

It is submitted that the Panel should now conclude that the Social Worker does not wish to continue to work as a social worker, and there is no useful purpose in holding her on the Register. In addition, there is no evidence that the Social Worker has kept her skills and knowledge as a social worker up to date through either her present employment and/or training so there is now a concern that she is becoming deskilled.

In all the circumstances, and in the absence of any engagement or indication that the Social Worker wishes to remain on the Register, the Panel are invited to find that her fitness to practise remains impaired and to make a Removal Order.”

Social worker submissions:

19. There has been no engagement by Ms Kaur-Dhuga with Social Work England. The panel noted the summary of Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s email sent in September 2019, as set out above.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

20. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the previous panel. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s ‘Impairment and sanctions guidance’.
21. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Social Work England. The panel has not received any submissions or documentation from Ms Kaur-Dhuga.
22. The panel took into account the advice it received from the legal adviser as to the proper approach it should adopt. In particular, that:
 - i. The purpose of the review is to consider the current impairment based on the agreed disposal, the extent to which Ms Kaur-Dhuga has engaged with the regulatory process, the scope and level of her insight, and the risk of repetition.
 - ii. The persuasive burden is on Ms Kaur-Dhuga.
 - iii. In terms of whether the regulatory concerns have been sufficiently, and appropriately remediated, relevant factors include whether Ms Kaur-Dhuga is:
 - a. fully appreciative of the gravity of the previous panel’s finding of impairment;
 - b. up-to-date with her skills and knowledge;
 - c. likely to place service users at risk if she were to return to unrestricted practice.
 - iv. The panel should take into account any information that it has received relating to Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s ability to practise safely and effectively and the wider public interest which includes promoting and maintaining proper professional standards of behaviour and promoting and maintaining public confidence in the profession.
 - v. It is only if the panel determines that Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s fitness to practise remains impaired, that it should go on to consider what, if any, sanction to impose by applying the guidance as set out in the Sanctions Guidance (SG), the Regulations and the principles of proportionality which require Ms Kaur-Dhuga’s interests to be balanced against the interests of the public.

23. The panel first considered whether Ms Kaur-Dhuga's fitness to practise remains impaired.
24. As a consequence of Ms Kaur-Dhuga's non-attendance and the absence of any written submissions on the issue of insight and remediation, there was no evidence before the panel that Ms Kaur-Dhuga has acquired an understanding of the seriousness of the regulatory concerns or the impact these concerns had on the reputation of the social work profession as a whole.
25. The panel does not have before it any evidence to suggest that Ms Kaur-Dhuga has rectified the deficiencies in her practice. Further, the panel have no information in respect of any work which Ms Kaur-Dhuga may currently be undertaking.
26. In the absence of any evidence of insight and remediation, the panel concluded that there has been no material change in circumstances, since the adjudicators decision in March 2023. This was despite the fact that Ms Kaur-Dhuga was provided with a clear opportunity to engage with her regulator.
27. Ms Kaur-Dhuga has not provided any information pertaining to her engagement with any reflection, or any evidence of training or CPD. She has not provided any testimonials from paid or unpaid work, social work or otherwise.
28. Ms Kaur-Dhuga has not engaged with Social Work England for a significant period of time.
29. The panel noted the previous panels findings at Paragraph 125, namely

"...the panel considered that a removal order would be disproportionate in the present circumstances, notwithstanding that the Guidance stated that a removal order may be appropriate where the social worker is unwilling and/or unable to remediate and cited as an example the situation where there is clear evidence that a social work does not wish to practise as such in the future. This was because, in the absence of any up-to-date evidence about Ms Kaur-Dhuga's current intentions or condition, the panel was reluctant to immediately remove from the Register someone who was an experienced social worker and who, apart from the error to which Allegation 1 related, had no regulatory findings against them. Accordingly, the panel considered that it would be fair and appropriate to allow her a final opportunity to engage with Social Work England and return to practice, if she wished to do so.

30. The panel considered that the Ms Kaur-Dhuga had been given a final opportunity to engage and had chosen not to take that opportunity. There remains no demonstration of regret, insight, remorse or remediation by Ms Kaur-Dhuga. The panel therefore concluded that there is no evidence provided to suggest that the risk of repetition of the misconduct has reduced and as such there remains a very real risk of repetition.
31. The panel noted that a significant aspect of the public component is promoting and maintaining public confidence and promoting and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers. Members of the public would be extremely concerned if a social worker

was permitted to resume unrestricted practise in circumstances where the regulatory concern which led to a suspension order had not been remediated.

32. The panel concluded that, in these circumstances, a finding of no impairment would seriously undermine public trust and confidence in the profession and Social Work England as a professional regulator. Therefore, the panel concluded that Ms Kaur-Dhuga's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons:

33. Having found Ms Kaur-Dhuga's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case.
34. The panel considered the submissions made by Social Work England, during which they invited the panel to consider imposing a Removal order.
35. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
36. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Kaur-Dhuga, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Ms Kaur-Dhuga's interests with the public interest.
37. The panel bore in mind Social Work England's overarching objective which is to protect the public which is achieved by:
- a. protecting, promoting and maintaining the health, safety and wellbeing of the public;
 - b. promoting and maintaining public confidence in social workers in England; and
 - c. promoting and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers in England.

Decision on whether to revoke order/make no further order

38. The panel noted the following paragraphs of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance:

"215. If a social worker remains not fit to practise, the adjudicators will make a decision on what order should be imposed.

216. A social worker must not be allowed to resume unrestricted practice unless the decision makers are satisfied their fitness to practise is no longer impaired."

39. The panel concluded that, in view of Ms Kaur-Dhuga's impairment which has not been remedied, and in the absence of any evidence of insight or remediation (and apparent unwillingness to do so) it would not be appropriate to take no further action. Furthermore,

such an outcome would be insufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession, given the risk of repetition.

Decision on whether to issue advice or warning on expiry of suspension order

40. The panel then considered whether to issue advice or a warning. The panel noted that neither of these sanctions would restrict Ms Kaur-Dhuga's ability to practise and therefore such sanctions would not be appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety and public confidence in the profession. Therefore, the panel concluded that issuing advice or a warning would be inappropriate and would provide insufficient protection of the public.

Decision on whether to impose a conditions of practice order on expiry of suspension order

41. The panel went on to consider a conditions of practice order. The panel took the view that, given the misconduct findings in this case, which relates to lack of engagement with the regulator a conditions of practice order would not be suitable. The panel noted Ms Kaur-Dhuga's lack of engagement following the imposition of the suspension order. Further, the panel noted that it had no information in respect of Ms Kaur-Dhuga's current work situation. For this reason the panel concluded that it could not formulate workable conditions of practice in this case.

Decision on whether to extend the period of the suspension order

42. The panel noted Ms Kaur-Dhuga's email expressing her desire not to engage with her regulator (at the relevant time the HCPC).
43. The panel concluded that given the prolonged period of non engagement from Ms Kaur-Dhuga, despite her being in receipt of communications from Social Work England, she is unlikely to engage with Social Work England in the foreseeable future, or take the necessary steps in order to satisfy any reviewing panel that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.
44. Ms Kaur-Dhuga has not taken the opportunity to demonstrate sufficient insight, remorse, and remediation that was afforded to her at the final hearing. The panel noted the following paragraph of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance:

149. A removal order may be appropriate in cases involving (any of the following): ...

- social workers who are unwilling and/or unable to remediate (for example, where there is clear evidence that they do not wish to practise as a social worker in the future)*

45. Given the panel's conclusion that Ms Kaur-Dhuga has not engaged at any stage of the hearing, and is unlikely to engage with Social Work England in the foreseeable future, or take the necessary steps in order to satisfy any reviewing panel that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired, the public interest is not served by keeping Ms Kaur-Dhuga on the register, with the associated requirement for future review hearings.

Decision on whether to impose a removal order

46. The panel was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Ms Kaur-Dhuga's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of misconduct as set out in regulation 25(2)(a) of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended).
47. The panel noted that a removal order is a sanction of last resort where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest. The panel took the view that a removal order would be appropriate because Ms Kaur-Dhuga had not engaged with her regulator at any stage of the hearing process, and is unlikely to engage with Social Work England in the foreseeable future or take the necessary steps in order to satisfy any reviewing panel that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The panel considered its conclusions that the public interest is not served by keeping Ms Kaur-Dhuga on the register.
48. The Panel notes with genuine regret, Ms Kaur-Dhuga's decision not to engage has resulted in the end of her career in social work, however the panel balanced this against the need to protect the public, and concluded it had no alternative but to remove Ms Kaur-Dhuga from the register.

Right of appeal:

49. Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the social worker may appeal to the High Court against:
- a. 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,
 - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
50. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
51. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.
52. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

53. Under regulation 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended):

- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.
- 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).

54. Under Rule 16(aa) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), a 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.

The Professional Standards Authority

55. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a review decision made by Social Work England's panel of adjudicators can be referred by the Professional Standards Authority ("the PSA") to the High Court. The PSA can refer this decision to the High Court if it considers that the decision is not sufficient for the protection of the public. Further information about PSA appeals can be found on their website at:

<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work-with-regulators/decisions-about-practitioners>