

Social Worker: Jonathan Singers

Registration number: SW94127

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review meeting

Date of meeting: 04 October 2023

Meeting venue: Remote meeting

Final order being reviewed:

Suspension order – (expiring 17 November 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 the first review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 15 months by a panel of adjudicators (appointed by Social Work England) on 20 July 2022 and coming into effect on 18 August 2022.
2. Mr Singers did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was not represented at the meeting, but written submissions had been set out within the notice of hearing letter dated 05 September 2023.
4. The adjudicators (hereinafter referred to as “the panel”) and other people present at the meeting are set out in the table below.

Adjudicators	Role
Gill Mullen	Chair
Jasmine Nembhard-Francis	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Natasha Quainoo	Hearings officer
Natarliya James	Hearings support officer
Natalie Amey-Smith	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final hearing review dated 05 September 2023 and addressed to Mr Singers at his electronic mail address which he provided to Social Work England.
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 05 September 2023 detailing Mr Singers’ registered electronic mail address.
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 05 September 2023 the writer sent by electronic mail to Mr Singers at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and enclosures.

- A copy of the Mimecast notification to confirm that Mr Singers accessed the email on 05 September 2023 at 14:51.
6. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
 7. Having had regard to rule 16 and all the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Singers in accordance with rules 44 and 45 of Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules (as amended) ("the rules").

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting and in the absence of Mr Singers:

8. The notice of final order review informed Mr Singers 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 20 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.'
9. The panel took into account the email sent by Mr Singers to Capsticks LLP on 05 September 2023. The email states (in part):

'I will not be attending the hearing and I have nothing to submit for the hearing.

- I am have not practiced as a social worker since November 2018 and I have no plans to return to social work.

- My current circumstances make it very difficult for me to fill out and return the forms you have requested I complete so I regretfully will be unable to do that also.'
10. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering whether it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the review in the absence of Mr Singers. This included reference to rule 43 and the cases of *R v Jones [2003] UKPC*; and *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. The panel also considered the Social Work England guidance '*Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker*'. In relation to holding the hearing as a meeting, the panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to rule 16(d) of the rules which provides:

'Where the registered social worker makes written submissions and states that they do not intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may direct that the question of whether an order should be made is determined by means of a meeting.'

11. 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(d) and in the absence of Mr Singers, on the basis that:

- Mr Singers has had an opportunity to make submissions within the time periods specified under rule 16(b) of the rules.
- Mr Singers has indicated on more than one occasion that he does not want to attend and that he has no plans to return to social work. His non-attendance today appears to be a deliberate and voluntary action.
- Mr Singers has not requested a postponement or adjournment, but in any event, the panel did not consider that a postponement or adjournment would result in Mr Singers' future attendance, given his unequivocal view about not taking part in the process.
- It would not be in the public interest or in Mr Singers' interest to adjourn the mandatory review of the final order.

Preliminary matters:

12. The panel noted at the outset of the meeting that parts of the substantive hearing which related to Mr Singers' health had taken place in private.

13. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser who referred to rules 32(a), 37 and 38.

14. The panel took into account that rule 38(a)(ii) required that any reference to health must be heard in private and concluded that the panel would move into private session when considering any health matters. Further, it would ensure the written determination was redacted to remove any reference to health matters.

Review of the current order:

15. This final order review hearing falls under the Transitional and Savings Provisions (Social Workers) Regulations 2019 and as a result the review will be determined in accordance with 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).

16. The current order is due to expire at the end of 17 November 2023.

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

'1. On 29 May 2019, you were convicted of Common Assault, contrary to Section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.

2. Whilst registered as a social worker, you failed to notify the relevant regulator of the following:

a. That on the 29 November 2018, you were suspended from work and subject to employer investigation as a result of incident that occurred on the 23 November 2018;

b. That you were subject to police investigation and court proceedings.

3. You have an unmanaged health condition as set out in Schedule 1.

4. The matters outlined at particular 1 above amounts to the statutory ground of criminal conviction in the UK.

5. The matters outlined at particulars 2(a) and 2(b) above to the statutory ground of misconduct.

6. The matters outlined at particular 3 above amounts to the statutory ground of adverse physical or mental health.

7. Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of:

a. Your criminal caution or conviction in the UK;

b. Misconduct;

c. Your adverse physical or mental health.

(PRIVATE)

The final hearing panel on 15 – 20 July 2022 determined the following with regard to impairment:

'The panel considered that Mr Singers' conviction indicated that he had placed individuals, one of whom was a work colleague, in fear of violence. It considered that his response showed a lack of insight on his part in relation to the offence. The conviction showed a risk of a loss of control (PRIVATE)

- 17. The panel concluded that the conviction attacked a fundamental tenet of the profession, that he should not cause harm to the public. The conviction also brought the profession into disrepute, as the public would be rightly concerned over a social worker who had a conviction for an offence of violence, even for conduct which had occurred outside of direct practice, although linked to a work event.*

18. *The panel concluded that the failure to report the matters in paragraph 2 of the Allegation, undermined public confidence in the profession because it attacked an important safeguard for the public. For a considerable period, the regulator had been unaware of what had occurred and had been unable to take steps to protect the public. The panel did not consider Mr Singers explanations for this to be adequate to excuse his behaviour. The panel considered Mr Singers' response to indicate inadequate insight into matters and therefore it concluded that there was a risk that he might repeat his behaviour in the future.*

In relation to Mr Singers' health condition, the panel concluded that public confidence in the profession and professional standards were undermined by a social worker being in practice, whilst being subject to an unmanaged health condition. (PRIVATE)

The panel considered that the conviction undermined public confidence in the profession and represented a failure to maintain professional standards. The failure to report matters in paragraph 2 also affected public confidence in the system of regulation of social workers. (PRIVATE)

19. *In all the circumstances, the panel concluded that, in relation to each of the conviction, the misconduct and the adverse physical or mental health, Mr Singers' fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal and wider public interest elements of current impairment.'*

The final hearing panel on 15- 20 July 2022 determined the following with regard to sanction:

20. *'The panel took time to consider its decision carefully. It paid due regard to the SG and worked up the sanctions in order of severity, in order to be proportionate. The panel first considered whether there were any particular mitigating or aggravating features of the case.*
21. *The panel took into account, in terms of mitigation, that Mr Singers has no previous adverse fitness to practise history. There was no evidence of direct patient harm having occurred, although the panel had noted that at times Mr Singers' had been absent from work due to his ill-health. It appeared likely that the service had been affected by that and his colleagues would have had to deal with his absence.*

On the other hand, the panel was of the view that Mr Singers had demonstrated no real insight into the conviction or the effect on the victims. He offered no apology or remorse for it. The panel noted a tendency on Mr Singers' part to blame other people. (PRIVATE)

22. *The panel first considered taking no action. It took into account that to take no action would result in Mr Singers being able to resume unrestricted practice. The panel considered that there were no exceptional features about this case, which might justify such a course.*

Further, having found there was a risk of repetition, the panel concluded that taking no action would not protect the public.

23. *The panel noted that giving advice or a warning would not mark the panel's finding of impairment. These would neither deal with the risk of repetition which had been found, nor sufficiently mark the seriousness of the misconduct. It was not sufficient to end the proceedings with advice or a warning.*

The panel next considered a conditions of practice order. The panel noted that it had been (PRIVATE). The SG indicated that conditions might be appropriate where the case involved health.

24. *However, the panel took into account that Dr S's examination had been carried out in 2020. Since then, Mr Singers had not consented to further examination. Therefore, the panel was without current information on how conditions might be made workable and protect the public.*

The panel took into account that it was also dealing with the misconduct found proved and the conviction. (PRIVATE), the failure to report matters had extended over a considerable period. This led the panel to conclude that it was not satisfied that Mr Singers would comply with conditions of practice at this time. Nor had Mr Singers showed any appropriate insight into his conviction, or the failure to report matters to his regulator.

25. *The panel agreed with the submission that this indicated attitudinal issues, particularly a disappointing disregard for his health conditions. In consequence, at this time, conditions of practice would not be appropriate. Therefore, the panel decided that a conditions of practice order was not sufficient to protect the public.*

26. *The panel next considered a suspension order. It noted that it had power to suspend Mr Singers' registration for up to 3 years. The panel took into account paragraphs 92 and 96 of the Sanctions Guidance, which state:*

"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."

And

"96. As a general principle, longer periods of suspension may be appropriate where this is necessary to protect public safety. If the suspension is aimed primarily at maintaining confidence in the profession or setting the professional standards to be observed, then a sanction of suspension up to one year may be appropriate."

The panel took into account the evidence of Ms A, that when Mr Singers had been working, his work had been, in her words, "more than adequate". The panel noted that the conviction had possibly had its roots in Mr Singers (PRIVATE). Although he had failed to report matters appropriately, which was a serious matter, he had previously made appropriate declarations in 2013.

27. *The panel concluded that Mr Singers did have the potential for remediation, if he decided to fully re-engage with the process, and could be a competent social worker. It recognised that there is a public interest in returning a social worker who has fully remediated his past misconduct and managed any health condition to safe practice, where possible.*
28. *The panel looked at the next option, of a removal order. However, in that it considered that a lesser sanction was sufficient, the panel concluded that it was not necessary to go so far. It would also prevent the potential of Mr Singers' undertaking remediation and returning to the profession. The concerns with Mr Singers had started when his pre-existing health conditions had become unmanageable, but for a time, they had been managed. The panel concluded that a removal order would be disproportionate.*
29. *The panel decided that a suspension order was therefore the appropriate and proportionate order to make. It concluded that such an order would also mark the seriousness with which the conviction and misconduct would be regarded by the public and so satisfy the public interest.*
30. *As to the length of the period of suspension, the panel sought to strike a balance between marking the seriousness of the matter, giving sufficient time for an opportunity for Mr Singers to demonstrate remediation and avoiding his complete de-skilling. The panel determined that the period of suspension should be 15 months.*
31. *The panel made a final order of a suspension order for 15 months on Mr Singers' registration.*
32. *Towards the end of the suspension, a review of this order will be undertaken by another panel. Mr Singers will be invited to attend for the review and may wish to attend to provide information to demonstrate that his fitness to practise is no longer impaired. To that end, a further panel may be assisted by the following:*
- *A written reflective statement, preferably written using a recognised reflective tool such as Gibbs' Reflective Cycle, reflecting on the findings of the panel and the impact of his behaviours on workplace colleagues and the reputation of the wider profession*
 - *Any testimonials and references, from appropriate persons for whom Mr Singers works or who otherwise have knowledge of his character and performance*
 - *Any evidence that Mr Singers has kept his social work knowledge and skills up to date, including any evidence of Continuing Professional Development undertaken.'*

Social Work England submissions:

33. The panel received written submissions from Social Work England set out in the notice of hearing letter dated 05 September 2023. The letter set out the following submissions:
- 'Social Work England invite the Panel to make a Removal Order.*

The Social Worker has not attempted to remediate his conduct or to gain or develop any insight during these proceedings. He has provided no evidence of even attempting to meet the panel's recommendations (or of wanting to).

*The Social Worker did not attend the final hearing. At the final hearing the panel were of the view that a Suspension Order was necessary and proportionate – they concluded that they were not satisfied that the Social Worker would comply with conditions of practice at that time, nor had he shown any appropriate insight into his conviction or the failure to report matters to the regulator. The panel were of the view there was a risk of repetition, and concluded these were attitudinal issues and a Suspension Order was necessary to protect the public. Social Work England also rely upon, and refer the Reviewing Panel to, the comments of the Final Hearing Panel regarding **(PRIVATE)***

The panel were of the view that the Social Worker did have the potential for remediation “if he decided to fully re-engage with the process”. The panel sought to strike a balance in imposing a 15 month Order, between marking the seriousness of the matter, giving sufficient time for an opportunity for the Social Worker to demonstrate remediation, and avoiding his complete de-skilling. The panel made recommendations.

The Social Worker has not taken that opportunity to demonstrate remediation. In fact he has taken active steps to remove himself from the register, indicating an unwillingness to remediate. On 22 June 2023 the Social Worker emailed the Case Review Officer saying “I have no wish or need to remain registered as I do not intend to return to Social Work Practice. If you require any further action from me to confirm my position please let me know”. On 25 July 2023 the Social Worker attempted to apply for voluntary removal by an incorrect process by email. He has since been provided with an electronic form to complete and Social Work England have shared the Voluntary Removal guidance with the Social Worker.

The risk to the public remains and the Social Worker has taken no steps to remediate himself or demonstrate why that risk has been reduced.

There is no evidence of the Social Worker being capable of safe and effective practice, and the clear indication from him is that he is unwilling to take steps to achieve that, and that he does not wish to practise as a social worker in the future. A further period of suspension and further review would not be useful.

Removal Order is now the appropriate and proportionate order to make.'

Social worker submissions:

34. Mr Singers did not attend the hearing, nor did he provide written submissions prior to the hearing for the panel's consideration, save for the email dated 05 September 2023 as set out at paragraph 9 of this decision. The panel was provided with a copy of a telephone attendance note dated 05 September 2023. In part it states as follows:

'SW stated that he does not wish to attend the IOR and has previously mentioned he does not wish to continue working as a SW... QAM advised that SW can send an email instead of

filling out forms...SW stated that the Public hearing is impeding his chances of finding work and is currently looking for VR [Voluntary Removal] [sic] options. SW asked if QAM needs any specific details, QAM explained that we would need to know if SW is attending and if any SW intends to forward submissions. SW he does not wish to attend or submit submissions and stated that he will send an email soon confirming in writing.'

35. The Panel was provided with copies of various email exchanges between Mr Singers and Social Work England enquiring about Voluntary Removal. On 01 August 2023, Mr Singers was advised by Social Work England (in an email) that due to him being subject to ongoing fitness to practise proceedings, if he wanted to voluntarily leave the Social Work Register, he is required to follow a different process from that of which he had previously been advised. On 01 August 2023, Mr Singers was provided with the correct application details for submitting a Voluntary Removal application.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

36. 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.

37. The panel took into account Social Work England's '*Impairment and sanctions guidance*' ("Sanctions guidance") dated 19 December 2022.

38. The panel received and accepted the advice of the legal adviser, which it incorporated into the decision set out below.

39. It reminded itself of the importance of a review hearing, and it followed the sequence of decision making set out by Blake J in *Abrahaem v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 183*:

- Address whether the fitness to practise is impaired before considering conditions.
- Whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction.
- In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision, or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments.

40. The panel had regard to the over-arching objective of protecting the public which involves the pursuit of the following objectives:

- To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public.
- To promote and maintain public confidence in the profession.

- To promote and maintain proper professional standards of conduct for members of the profession.

41. It also bore in mind that in deciding whether Mr Singers' fitness to practise is still impaired it should follow the approach of Dame Janet Smith endorsed by the High Court in *CHRE v NMC and P Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin)*. Do our findings of fact in respect of the (registrant's) misconduct, adverse health, conviction, show that his fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that he:

- 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
- has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the ... profession into disrepute; and/or
- 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

42. The panel first considered whether Mr Singers' fitness to practise remains impaired. It kept in mind that there had already been a finding of impairment and asked itself whether Mr Singers had demonstrated that he had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the previous panel.

43. The panel concluded that Mr Singers' fitness to practise remains impaired, having regard to both the personal and the public interest for the same reasons as the substantive panel. Mr Singers has only partially engaged with Social Work England since the substantive hearing, which took place in his absence, and has taken no steps towards compliance with the recommendations of that panel. Whilst it is not mandatory for Mr Singers to have adhered to those recommendations, the panel considered that even with a suspension order in place, the recommendations would have enabled and assisted Mr Singers to provide relevant information for the review.

44. The substantive hearing panel decision set out that Mr Singers, '*did have the potential for remediation, if he decided to fully re-engage with the process, and could be a competent social worker*'. Despite this, Mr Singers has not provided any evidence for this panel to review. The panel has no information in relation to Mr Singers' reflections on the facts found, no evidence of insight from him to say how he could have acted differently, and no evidence of remediation including how he has updated his skills and knowledge and of how he is managing his health condition.

45. The panel concluded that there has been no evidence of change that would reduce the risk of repetition since the substantive hearing, and that there is an ongoing risk of harm to members of the public.

46. Further, considering Mr Singers' lack of evidenced insight and remediation, together with his lack of constructive engagement in this review hearing, the panel concluded that a failure to find Mr Singers impaired would undermine public confidence in the profession and the regulator.

Decision and reasons on Sanction:

47. Having found Mr Singers' fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to the submissions made, along with all the information before it, and accepted the advice of the legal adviser having particular regard to the Social Work England '*Sanctions guidance*' previously mentioned in this decision.

48. The panel kept in mind that sanction is a matter for its own independent judgment, and that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish Mr Singers but to protect the public.

49. It reminded itself that the protection of the public includes not only maintaining the health, safety, and well-being of the public but also maintaining public confidence in the profession and promoting and maintaining proper professional standards of conduct for members of the profession.

50. Furthermore, a sanction must be proportionate, so that any order that it makes should be the least restrictive order that would suffice to protect the public and the public interest.

51. The panel concluded that the misconduct demonstrated by Mr Singers combined with his criminal conviction, have the potential to have adverse consequences for service users and impact on the public confidence in the profession. Therefore, some restriction on his practice is required. As a result, the panel concluded that options that would not restrict practice would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.

52. The panel considered whether a conditions of practice order could be imposed, noting that conditions of practice are commonly applied in cases of ill health. The panel kept in mind that in Mr Singers' case the statutory grounds included not just health, but also a criminal conviction and misconduct. The panel had regard to the '*Sanctions guidance*' and took into account that '*Conditions of practice are less likely to be appropriate in cases of character, attitude or behavioural failings.*' Mr Singers' actions, including a conviction for Common Assault and misconduct in failing to inform his regulator, accompanied by a subsequent lack of insight and remediation are what the panel considered to be attitudinal in nature. Therefore, the panel could not formulate any workable conditions which would sufficiently protect the public.

53. In finding that it could not formulate any conditions of practice which would be sufficient to protect the public, the panel also had regard to the '*Sanctions guidance*' at paragraph 117. Given Mr Singers' email of 05 September 2023 to indicate that he does not want to practise

as a social worker and has no intention to return to practice, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Singers would be willing to comply with conditions of practice even if conditions could have been formulated.

54. The panel next considered the option of extending the current suspension order. The substantive hearing panel had found Mr Singers' conduct to have the potential for remediation and it provided clear and reasonable recommendations as to how Mr Singers could seek to demonstrate to this review panel any insight and remediation. Despite this, Mr Singers has not engaged with the process of seeking to address the issues in relation to his professional conduct. The panel had no evidence to suggest Mr Singers is willing and able to resolve or remediate his failings. His failure to constructively engage appears entirely consistent with his indication in his emails that he wants to be removed from the Social Work England Register.
55. The panel considered that Mr Singers has been given a full opportunity, over a period of fourteen months since the final hearing, to demonstrate that he is willing and able to resolve or remediate his failings, however he has not done so.
56. In the circumstances, and with reference to paragraph 138 of the 'Sanctions guidance', the panel decided that there was little prospect that if the panel were to impose a suspension order, Mr Singers would engage with Social Work England or provide evidence for a future review hearing. In the panel's judgment the imposition of a suspension order would serve no purpose. It is not in the public interest for the panel to impose a suspension order in circumstances where there is no realistic prospect that Mr Singers will constructively engage with his regulator. The panel concluded that a suspension order would not be appropriate or sufficient to meet the public interest.

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

Removal order

57. The panel was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Mr Singers' fitness to practise was originally found impaired based on misconduct and because of his conviction, not solely on health grounds.
58. 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 Mr Singers' fitness to practise remains impaired, but he is not able to or does not wish to remediate the deficiencies in his practice. The 'Sanctions guidance' (paragraph 149) states that a removal order may be appropriate for '*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)*'. Mr Singers has given an indication, in both email correspondence and in telephone calls with

Social Work England, that he does not want to practise as a social worker. There was evidence before the panel that Mr Singers had applied for Voluntary Removal in June 2023, albeit he had been provided with the incorrect form, and was therefore advised of the appropriate paperwork that would need completing before an application for Voluntary Removal could be considered. The panel considered this to be a clear intention from Mr Singers that he does not wish to practise as a social worker in the future.

59. The Panel concluded that a removal order is the appropriate and proportionate order.

Right of appeal:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

5. 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).
6. 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

7. 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>