



Social Worker: Jim Wild

Registration Number: SW41471

Fitness to Practise: Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 28 November 2022- 1 December 2022

9 October 2023- 20 October 2023

7 October 2024- 10 October 2024

Hearing Venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome: Removal Order

Interim Order: Interim Suspension Order - 18 months

Introduction and attendees

1. This is a hearing held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018.
2. The hearing was listed on the following dates; 28 November 2022- 1 December 2022, 9 October 2023- 20 October 2023 and 7 October 2024 – 10 October 2024.
3. Mr Wild attended the hearing between 28 November 2022 to 1 December 2022 when this matter was adjourned. He did not attend the reconvened hearing listed on 9 October 2023 to 20 October 2023, or the reconvened hearing listed on 7 October 2024 to 10 October 2024. Mr Wild was not represented at any stages of the hearing.
4. Social Work England was represented by Ms Bucklow, as instructed by Capsticks LLP, at all hearings.
5. Ms Tighe was instructed as Special Counsel and attended the hearing on 28 November 2022 to 1 December 2022. Since Mr Wild did not attend the re-listed hearing which began on 9 October 2023 or any subsequent dates, Ms Tighe withdrew as Special Counsel on the basis that she did not have sufficient instructions to continue in this case.

Adjudicators	Role
Alexander Coleman	Chair
Joanna Bowes	Social Worker Adjudicator
Jane Dalton	Lay Adjudicator

Harry Frost	Hearings Officer 28 November - 01 December 2022
Paul Harris	Hearings Officer 09 October 2023 – 20 October 2023
Wallis Crump	Hearings Officer 07 October 2024 – 10 October 2024
Thanvi Hoque	Hearings Support Officer 28 November - 01 December 2022
Natarliya James	Hearings Support Officer 09 October 2023 – 20 October 2023
Paul Harris	Hearings Support Officer 07 October 2024 – 10 October 2024
Charlotte Mitchell-Dunn	Legal Adviser

Hearing scheduled on 28 November 2022 – 1 December 2022

Service of Notice:

6. Mr Wild attended and was not represented. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) noted that Mr Wild was sent notice of the hearing by email to his address on the Social Work Register (the Register). Mr Wild did not raise any issues in respect of service of notice. The panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had therefore been served on the social worker in accordance with the Rules.

Allegation(s)

7. The allegations arising out of the regulatory concerns referred by the Case Examiners on 2 February 2022 are:

Whilst as a registered as a social worker:

1. *Between the period of 2015 and 2021, you sent the correspondence at Schedule A that was individually and/or collectively, inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening to Person A and employees of Council 1, Council 2, Council 3, **Council 4** and Council 5*
2. *On 8 July 2015, you attended an Association 1 conference held at The Midland Hotel, Manchester and posed as a journalist and engaged in inappropriate, vexatious and /or threatening behaviour, which cause Person A to fear for their safety*
3. *On a date unknown between January 2016 to July 2017, you sent an unsolicited DVD to senior employees of Council 1, which was threatening in nature*

The matters outlined at 1 – 3 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Preliminary matters

8. Ms Bucklow on behalf of Social Work England made an application at the outset of the hearing to amend particular 1 of the allegation to include Council 4, alongside the other councils which featured within particular 1. She made this application on the basis that the amendment was minor in nature and was required to reflect the evidence in the case, namely that Schedule A contained correspondence sent to employees of Council 4.
9. Mr Wild did not oppose the application to amend the allegation.
10. The panel accepted advice from the legal adviser. The panel noted that it has a wide discretion as to the management of the hearing in accordance with paragraph 32(a) of the Social Work England (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2019 (as amended), provided

that it ensures that a hearing is conducted fairly. The panel were provided advice in relation to the authorities of *R (Wheeler) v Assistant Commissioner House of the Metropolitan Police* (2008) EWHC 439, *R (Johnson) v Nursing and Midwifery Council* [2008] EWHC 885 (Admin) and *PSA v HCPC & Doree* [2017] EWCA Civ 319 and were reminded that allegations should be sufficiently particularised for the social worker to know what it is alleged that he failed to do and in what respect. The panel were reminded that they needed to consider the prejudice to the Registrant, but temper this with their duty to ensure that cases are not under-prosecuted.

11. The panel noted that the amendment was relatively minor in nature and reflected the evidence which had been provided to Mr Wild. The panel further noted that Mr Wild did not object to the amendment of the allegation. The panel determined that in all the circumstances it was fair to amend the allegation. The panel concluded that there was no prejudice to Mr Wild in amending the allegation, as Council 4 featured within the evidence at Schedule A and Mr Wild raised no objection to this amendment.
12. The panel therefore granted the application to amend particular 1 of the allegations to include Council 4.

Matters dealt with in private

13. During the hearing Mr Wild made reference to his health. At this stage the panel enquired whether such matters should be heard in private. Mr Wild stated "*I don't mind them being in open session*" ... "*I am very happy for anyone in the public who is listening to know what my emerging disability is and it will help them understand the narrative I am explaining over the next few days. I really, honestly, am very transparent and happy about this.*"
14. Ms Bucklow on behalf of Social Work England stated that she did not have any instructions on this matter, and she therefore remained neutral in respect of Mr Wild's position that he wished for his health matters to be heard in public.
15. The panel were provided with legal advice. It was explained that at the current stage there was no application to deal with matters in private before them. The panel were reminded that they had the ability to deal with matters in private and were referred to paragraph 37 and 38 of the fitness to practice Rules 2019 namely;

Subject to Rule 38, a hearing under these Rules shall be held in public.

38. (a) *A hearing, or part of a hearing, shall be held in private where the proceedings are considering:*
 - (i) *whether to make or review an interim order; or*
 - (ii) *the physical or mental health of the registered social worker.*

(b) The regulator, or adjudicators as the case may be, may determine to hold part or all of the proceedings in private where they consider that to do so would be appropriate having regard to:

- (i) the vulnerability, interests or welfare of any participant in the proceedings; or*
- (ii) the public interest including in the effective pursuit of the regulator's overarching objective.*

16. The panel were advised that in the present circumstances Mr Wild was clear that he wished for his health to be discussed in public and there was no application made on behalf of Social Work England in respect of the matter. The panel were reminded that Mr Wild could revisit this position during the hearing.
17. Following the legal advice Mr Wild stated "*I am very comfortable with sharing this information openly with anybody else listening*" ... "*am very comfortable about explaining that and, if anybody is listening, it will assist them in understanding matters as far as I am concerned. Transparency is one of the key central themes of this case.*"
18. The panel noted that it was of benefit to Mr Wild to go into private session when dealing with matters of health, however it considered that Mr Wild had explicitly and repeatedly indicated that he did not want the benefit of his health being discussed in private. The panel noted that Mr Wild specifically requested that the presumption that health matters would be dealt with in private was not followed in this case. The panel considered that although Mr Wild would benefit from privacy, given his specific request not to deal with matters in private, the panel agreed that it would not go into private session when dealing with references to Mr Wild's health.

Application to adjourn

Background

19. On the third day of the hearing, Mr Wild made an application to adjourn the hearing. The application was based on two issues, the first was Mr Wild's health, the unavailability of his supporter and the impact of these factors on his ability to participate in the hearing.
20. The second issue related to the fact Special Counsel who had been appointed in the case to cross examine all witnesses, and as a result had been briefed by Mr Wild, was unavailable for the remainder of the hearing, having only been instructed for days 2 and 3 of the hearing.
21. Mr Wild submitted he suffers from hypertension which has resulted in muscular degeneration. This impacts upon his visual abilities and is a serious condition which could result in blindness. Mr Wild described his visual condition as an emerging

disability. He explained his sight deteriorated further when he was anxious, due to his hypertension.

22. Throughout the first two days of the hearing, Mr Wild was supported by a friend who provided him with a computer to access Microsoft Teams, and supported him with using the functions, such as the mute and camera function.
23. On the morning of day three of the hearing, Mr Wild informed the panel, that his supporter was not able to assist him with the hearing for the rest of the week, as she had urgent work to attend to at her university and would need to leave, with the computer he was using by 12pm or at 1pm at the latest. He stated he had made attempts to use an iPad to access Microsoft Teams but this had been unsuccessful. Mr Wild stated that although he was able to attend via telephone, his sight had further deteriorated, and as a result he was unable to read the statements and exhibits in the case at present.
24. During party discussions, a summary of which was put on transcript, Ms Tighe, instructed as Special Counsel, indicated that she was not in the position to call any of the three remaining witnesses, as she would not be able to take further instructions from Mr Wild, due to his sight issues. Ms Tighe was however unavailable for the remainder of the hearing, having only been instructed to attend on days 2 and 3 of the hearing. Inquiries were made of Ms Tighe, and she estimated that the preparation required for the case was at least one day, should another Special Counsel be appointed.

Submissions

25. Mr Wild submitted that he was having IT difficulties which would be further complicated without his friend to support him with the functioning of Teams. He explained his friend had initially invited him to stay with her and was intending to help him intermittently throughout the hearing, however due to the nature of the hearing, and his sight difficulties, she was having to remain close by throughout the day, and this had put her significantly behind with her work. He explained she had urgent work to attend to at her university and would need to leave, with the computer and he had been unable to access Teams via his iPad.
26. Mr Wild submitted that he could return home and set up a projector to access the hearing and participate but this would take some time as he would need to travel to Wales. He submitted that he had not read some of the statements in this case himself and had relied on others to read them for him. He explained when speaking to Ms Tighe he discovered matters, he was unaware of. He stated his sight had deteriorated so he could not read the statements or exhibits without assistance today.
27. Mr Wild stated he could return to his address in Wales and set up a projector to participate in the hearing, but this would take a day, and the support of the hearings team. He further submitted that he has spent a significant amount of time briefing Ms

Tighe and was confident in her ability and did not wish for there to be a change of Special Counsel.

28. When asked to clarify whether he was seeking a short adjournment or to vacate the hearing he explained that he wished for the present hearing to be vacated, as he had confidence in Ms Tighe and did not wish for there to be a change of Special Counsel at this stage of the hearing.
29. Ms Bucklow on behalf of Social Work England set out that Social Work England's position was that they would not be seeking an adjournment, and were prepared to continue, however they remained neutral as to Mr Wild's application.
30. Ms Bucklow submitted that Social Work England had put in place steps to assist Mr Wild, but he had not been clear as to the reasonable adjustments he required. Ms Bucklow submitted that Mr Wild was given the option of attending the Social Work England offices from tomorrow to engage in the hearing but had not accepted this offer.
31. Mr Wild sought clarification of the point raised by Ms Bucklow in respect of the Social Work England Offices. He stated that it was not explained that attending the office would mean attending Social Work England's physical offices in Sheffield and having in-person support from the hearings team and he would be delighted to accept that offer at a later stage if the hearing were adjourned. He further enquired as to whether Social Work England could assist with his accommodation.
32. The panel received advice from the legal adviser that Social Work England's overarching objective is to protect the public, which is best served through the efficient, fair and effective determination of fitness to practise concerns. This includes concluding cases as quickly as is reasonable. Any decisions to delay hearing dates must balance the interests of the social worker with delivering Social Work England's overarching objective. The panel were advised in determining whether to grant an adjournment, the panel should have regard to the following factors, derived from the decision in *CPS v Picton [2006] EWHC 1008 3*, namely the general need for expedition in the conduct of proceedings; where an adjournment is sought by the social worker, if not granted, whether they will be able fully to present their case and, if not, the degree to which the ability to do so is compromised; the likely consequences of the proposed adjournment, in particular its likely length and the need to decide the facts while recollections are fresh; the reason that the adjournment is required. If it arises through the fault of the party asking for the adjournment, that is a factor against granting the adjournment, carrying weight in accordance with the gravity of the fault. If that party was not at fault, that may favour an adjournment and the history of the case, and whether there have been earlier adjournments, at whose request and why.

Panel's determination

33. In considering Mr Wild's application the panel considered all the circumstances of the case, including Mr Wild's health conditions. The panel further noted Mr Wild's participation in the hearing to date. The panel determined based on the submissions advanced, that Mr Wild was not in the position to continue with the hearing today, due to both his sight deterioration and the loss of his supporter.
34. In making this determination the panel noted the concerns expressed by Ms Tighe in the parties' discussions that she was not in the position to call any of the three remaining witnesses, as she would not be able to take further instructions from Mr Wild, due to his sight issues.
35. The panel was also aware of the level of support that Mr Wild had required to date to participate in the hearing, due to his sight. The panel took into consideration the fact that this support would no longer be available, alongside the fact that Mr Wild had informed the panel that his sight had further deteriorated.
36. The panel noted Social Work England's neutral position in respect of the application, and further noted that there was no challenge of the evidence provided in respect of Mr Wild's medical conditions or the fact that his health had deteriorated.
37. The panel determined that if an adjournment was not granted, Mr Wild would not be able to fully present his case, given the appointment of Special Counsel and the concern expressed by Special Counsel regarding her ability to question the witnesses.
38. On the basis that Special Counsel has been appointed in respect of all witnesses in the case, the panel determined that Mr Wild's ability to fully present his case would be significantly compromised if an adjournment were not granted, on the basis that Special Counsel was not in the position to proceed.
39. The panel noted that in determining that Mr Wild was not in a position to continue at present due to his sight deterioration and the loss of his supporter, this would have the inevitable consequence that the currently instructed Special Counsel, Ms Tighe, would become unavailable tomorrow.
40. The panel noted this would mean that a replacement Special Counsel would need to be instructed, if the hearing was to resume once Mr Wild had fixed his technical problems with Teams and had the support to access and read the relevant material. Alternatively, if a replacement Special Counsel could not be found, the hearing would need to be vacated, as it has been determined by a case management meeting that Special Counsel is required for this case.
41. The panel noted that Social Work England had made no submissions in respect of whether an alternative Special Counsel was available to replace Ms Tighe, or in respect of the consequences of instructing an alternative Special Counsel on the hearing timetable, given the preparation time estimate advanced by Ms Tighe.

42. Further, Social Work England were neutral in respect of the position advanced by Mr Wild that Mr Wild had confidence in Ms Tighe and did not wish for there to be a change of Special Counsel at this stage of the hearing.
43. Balancing the interests of Mr Wild with delivering Social Work England's overarching objective, the panel determined that the hearing should be vacated. The panel concluded that instructing Special Counsel at such a late stage of the hearing would have an impact on the anxiety of Mr Wild and would also have an impact upon the hearing timetable.
44. Instructing an alternative Special Counsel would result in a maximum of two days being available to conclude the hearing, as at least one day's preparation would be required by any alternative Special Counsel, prior to recommencing the hearing.
45. The panel are aware that three of Social Work England's witnesses are still to be called, and Mr Wild has not yet opened his case. On this basis, even if it were proportionate to instruct an alternative Special Counsel at this late stage, the hearing would end up part heard in any event, and it is likely that the hearing would be part heard in the middle of the evidence of Social Work England's witnesses, with the possibility of a witness being on oath or affirmation until the resumed hearing. The panel concluded that this was not in the best interest of Social Work England or Mr Wild.
46. Further, the panel noted that Mr Wild's was not at fault for the lack of availability of Special Counsel, his health concerns or the loss of his supporter. For the reasons set out above the panel determined that it was fair in all the circumstances to adjourn and therefore vacate the hearing listing.

Case management directions:

47. Having decided to adjourn the hearing, the panel decided to make the following case management directions:
 - (1) The resumed hearing of this matter will be listed as soon as practicable. The resumed hearing will take place remotely;
 - (2) Mr Wild must provide to Social Work England an up-to-date report from a medical professional(s) on his health conditions, in particular his eyes no later than 14 days prior to the commencement of the resumed hearing;
 - (3) Through discussions and cooperation with Social Work England, Mr Wild should set out any reasonable adjustment he requires to engage in the hearing 21 days prior to the commencement of the hearing.
 - (4) Through discussions and cooperation with Social Work England, Mr Wild should organise his means of attending and test the technology he is using for the hearing 21 days prior to the commencement of the resumed hearing;

(5) Mr Wild must not contact directly or indirectly by any means (including but not limited to email, phone, text or social media) any Social Work England witness.

Hearing scheduled on 9 October 2023 – 20 October 2023

Service of Notice:

48. Mr Wild did not attend this resumed hearing and was not represented. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) was informed by Ms Bucklow that notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Wild by electronic mail to his address on the Social Work Register (the Register). Ms Bucklow submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
49. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final hearing service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final hearing dated 28 February 2023 and addressed to Mr Wild at his email address as it appears on the Social Work England Register;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register detailing Mr Wild’s registered email address;
 - A copy of a signed Statement of Service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 28 February 2023 the writer sent by electronic mail to Mr Wild at the address referred to above: Notice of Hearing and related documents;
 - Correspondence between Social Work England and Mr Wild regarding the hearing between 1 December 2022 and 17 October 2023.
50. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
51. Having had regard to Rule 14-15 and 44-46 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (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 Mr Wild in accordance with Rules.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

52. The panel heard the submissions of Ms Bucklow on behalf of Social Work England. Ms Bucklow submitted that notice of this hearing had been duly served, no application for an adjournment had been made by Mr Wild and as such there was no guarantee that adjourning today’s proceedings would secure his attendance. Ms Bucklow further submitted that attempts had been made by Social Work England to facilitate Mr Wild’s attendance. Ms Bucklow reminded the panel that Mr Wild had indicated in his final correspondence that he did not wish to attend the hearing, as such she submitted that there was no guarantee that adjourning today’s proceedings would secure Mr Wild’s attendance. Ms Bucklow therefore invited the panel to proceed in the interests of justice and the expeditious disposal of this hearing.

53. 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*. The panel also took into account Social Work England guidance 'Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker'.
54. The panel considered all of the information before it, together with the submissions made by Ms Bucklow on behalf of Social Work England. The panel considered that Social Work England had taken a number of steps to seek to facilitate Mr Wild's attendance and despite this he had indicated that he did not wish to attend the final hearing. The panel noted that Mr Wild had been sent notice of today's hearing and the panel was satisfied that he was aware of the hearing. The panel also noted that Mr Wild had sent written submissions including his comments on the allegations.
55. The panel therefore concluded that Mr Wild had chosen voluntarily to absent himself. The panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in Mr Wild's attendance. Having weighed the interests of Mr Wild in regard to his 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 Mr Wild's absence.

Preliminary matters:

56. The panel noted its decisions at the previous hearing to amend the allegation. The panel were provided with a copy of the transcript from that hearing and read this in detail. The panel took into consideration the evidence given by Person B, a summary of which is produced below.

Application to amend Schedule A

57. During the panel's deliberations the panel noted that there was a typographical error and three potentially duplicated paragraphs within Schedule A, prior to concluding their deliberations the panel sought clarification of these matters from Social Work England.
58. As a result of the panel's enquiries Social Work England made an application to amend Schedule A of Paragraph 1 of the allegation. Social Work England submitted that the amendments were minor in nature and related to a typographical error in respect of a single date, clarification as to exhibit numbers and the removal of duplicate paragraphs. Social Work England submitted that there was no prejudice caused to Mr Wild by the amendment to Schedule A.
59. The panel was provided with legal advice in which their attention was drawn to the case of *PSA v HCPC and Doree [2017] EWCA Civ 319*.
60. The panel noted that the amendments clarified Schedule A which formed part of Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel noted that some of the amendments were

typographical, and others resulted in the removal of paragraphs from Schedule A. The panel considered the prejudice to Mr Wild in respect of this late amendment but tempered that with the duty to ensure that cases are not under-prosecuted. Given the fact that the amendments were minor in nature and resulted in fewer paragraphs within Schedule A the panel considered that it was fair to amend Schedule A.

Matters dealt with in private

61. On the basis that Mr Wild was not in attendance and was not therefore able to express whether or not he wished for his health matters to remain in public, the panel determined that any further evidence in this case which related to Mr Wild's health should be heard in private because it touched upon personal matters in his private life.
62. The panel had regard to rules 37 and 38 of the Rules which provide:

37. Subject to Rule 38, a hearing under these Rules shall be held in public.

38. (a) A hearing, or part of a hearing, shall be held in private where the proceedings are considering:

- (i) whether to make or review an interim order; or*
- (ii) the physical or mental health of the registered social worker.*

(b) The regulator, or adjudicators as the case may be, may determine to hold part or all of the proceedings in private where they consider that to do so would be appropriate having regard to:

- (i) the vulnerability, interests or welfare of any participant in the proceedings; or*
- (ii) the public interest including in the effective pursuit of the regulator's overarching objective.*

63. The panel bore in mind the evidence that it had read and the need to hold as much of the hearing as possible in public. Ms Bucklow did not object that evidence in respect of Mr Wild's health should be heard in private.
64. Balancing all matters, and in the absence of Mr Wild, the panel decided that it would hear parts of the evidence relating to the health of Mr Wild in private.

Allegation(s)

65. The allegations arising out of the regulatory concerns referred by the Case Examiners on 2 February 2022 are:

Whilst as a registered as a social worker:

- 1. Between the period of 2015 and 2021, you sent the correspondence at Schedule A that was individually and/or collectively, inappropriate, vexatious*

*and/or threatening to Person A and employees of Council 1, Council 2, Council 3, **Council 4** and Council 5*

2. *On 8 July 2015, you attended an Association 1 conference held at The Midland Hotel, Manchester and posed as a journalist and engaged in inappropriate, vexatious and /or threatening behaviour, which cause Person A to fear for their safety*
3. *On a date unknown between January 2016 to July 2017, you sent an unsolicited DVD to senior employees of Council 1, which was threatening in nature*

The matters outlined at 1 – 3 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Admissions:

66. Rule 32c(i)(aa) Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended)(the Rules) states:

Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved.

67. The panel noted that Mr Wild denied all of the allegations. Therefore, in line with Rule 32c(i)(a) of the Rules, the panel then went on to determine the disputed facts.

Factual Background

68. On 25 March 2018, the Health and Care Professions Council received a referral from Person A, regarding the Respondent social worker, Jim Wild (Mr Wild).
69. In September 2012, it is alleged that Mr Wild approached Person A, [Private], with allegations of historic child sex abuse against another employee of Council 2. Mr Wild had previously been employed by Council 2 but at the time of raising his concerns with Person A, he was a freelance trainer.
70. The index allegations made by Mr Wild to Person A do not form part of the current proceedings, however brief details are required for context to these proceedings. The historic child sex abuse allegations made by Mr Wild were alleged to have taken place between 1985 and 1991, 20 years or so prior to Person A being appointed to Council 2. The alleged perpetrator was no longer working in a frontline role as a residential care worker but remained employed by Council 2 in a policy position.
71. In response to the concerns raised by Mr Wild, Person A instituted the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) procedures on 18 September 2012. The LADO investigation concluded that there was a lack of evidence to support the allegations

made by Mr Wild. The outcome of the LADO procedure was communicated to Mr Wild by Person A, and Mr Wild was dissatisfied with the outcome. Mr Wild was advised of the complaints procedure.

72. In February 2013 the police confirmed that they also would be taking no further action in respect of Mr Wild's allegations of historic abuse, due to insufficient evidence and a lack of identifiable victims. However, in or around October 2013 the police reopened their investigation as Operation Alana. However, at the conclusion of Operation Alana in 2016, no charges were brought.
73. Around the same time, Mr Wild made a statutory social work stage 3 complaint, which allows for an independent investigation to be commissioned by Council 2. In May 2014 Person A commissioned an independent report for Council 2 in response to Mr Wild's complaint. This report was completed with revisions in June 2015, and made some recommendations to Council 2 but there were no findings of abuse, and no criticisms of Person A.
74. Following the conclusion of the LADO procedure, police operation and the independent report commissioned for Council 2, Mr Wild is alleged to have persistently emailed Person A with allegations of corruption and misconduct in public office.
75. Person A is alleged to have received hundreds of emails from Mr Wild between 18 September 2012 and January 2021 even when moving to new roles in other Councils. It is alleged that the emails frequently copy in or are addressed to other members of staff at Council 5, Council 1, Council 3, Council 4 and Council 2 and their wider partners.
76. It is alleged by Social Work England that the quantity, content and tone of the emails are inappropriate, vexatious, and/or threatening.
77. Social Work England allege that the emails sent by the Social Worker through this period accuse Person A of duplicity, misconduct in public office, criminal conduct, cover ups and dishonesty. Social Work England allege that accusations in the emails are frequently accompanied by offers or 'conditions' set out by the Social Worker to Person A and other senior employees of the various councils named in the Allegation. These conditions included meeting with Mr Wild, allowing Mr Wild to mentor Person A or to engage the services of Mr Wild's training service for which Mr Wild would receive expenses, and financial compensation.
78. It is alleged that in April 2015 Mr Wild wrote to the Commissioner's Office at Council 1 requesting a meeting with "*all the Commissioners*", concerning the viability of Person A, and further advising that he was proposing to hand out leaflets. This was responded to by the Lead Commissioner, who declined a meeting with Mr Wild but invited Mr Wild to put his concerns in a written statement and offered Council 1's legal services to take a formal statement. It is alleged that Mr Wild did not engage with this offer.

79. In July 2015, an Association 1 conference was held at the Midland Hotel in Manchester. Person A attended [Private] of Association 1, [Private]. The conference was attended by staff and media.

80. It is alleged that Mr Wild travelled from Sheffield to Manchester and gained entry to the foyer of the hotel where the conference was held by lying about his identity and posing as a journalist from a national media outlet. Once in the foyer, Mr Wild is alleged to have distributed flyers about Person A titled 'A crisis in child protection... Area 1 again' which states Person A is unfit to [Private] and should step down.

81. Following the conclusion of the Police Investigation in January 2016, Mr Wild is alleged to have sent a DVD and DVD player to employees at Council 1. It is alleged that it was addressed to the Commissioner, Person A and the Chief Executive. The DVD contains video footage of the Social Worker in which he makes demands to meet with Person A and is alleged to say "*and before you know it there's going to be a fucking riot in Area 1, so we need to talk to do a dignified ending and a departure for me for my career...I am travelling up to London tomorrow and a lot of people know about it, and if I don't make it there, there's going to be a chain reaction of the like that Grenfell Towers will seem like a little party*" and "*There's going to be thousands of survivors surrounding Area 1, kicking off, and [name redacted] your career is going to be over, and [Person A], you're probably going to prison or something*".

82. In April 2018, Person A reported a complaint of harassment by Mr Wild to the police. It is alleged that the trigger for this was when Person A obtained a new role at Council 5, and Mr Wild allegedly wrote to Person A's perspective employer. No formal charges of harassment were brought by the Crown Prosecution Service.

83. It is alleged that on 18 December 2018 Mr Wild left a voicemail at Council 5 questioning Person A's appointment and threatening to go to the press.

84. In 2019, Mr Wild made a complaint to the Independent Office for Police Conduct, in which he alleged that [Private] Police had been 'inactive' over his allegations about Person A, who was implicated in 'misconduct in public life and/or the perversion of the course of justice'. Mr Wild repeated his allegations of corruption and duplicity regarding Person A and other managers.

85. In the summer of 2020, it is alleged Mr Wild also reported Person A to the [Private] Police with the allegation that Person A was corrupt and not fit [Private]. The allegations were considered outside the remit of the police.

Summary of Evidence

i) Social Work England

Person B

86. Person B was called to give evidence at the first adjourned hearing. She gave evidence on 29 November 2022. At this stage Mr Wild was in attendance at the hearing and Special Counsel was appointed for the purpose of cross examination following a case management hearing.
87. Person B was called to give evidence. She confirmed the content of her witness statement was true and accurate to the best of her knowledge and belief.
88. In cross examination Person B was asked a number of questions by the appointed Special Counsel. Person B was asked whether her role would have extended to the scrutinising of the appointment of senior members within Council 4 and she confirmed that it would. She confirmed that Mr Wild set out his concerns about the appointment of Person A and asked for a round table discussion. Person B confirmed that there was a document entitled “*Whistleblowing in Area 2 and Area 1*”. She confirmed that she had read the document. Person B was asked what stopped her from responding to Mr Wild and she confirmed “*I had a conversation with Person A. I found the email confused and not coherent in terms of what it was actually suggesting. I get the suggestion of a roundtable and the mentoring, but [not] what it was actually accusing Person A of having done*”. She was asked whether she could have responded to Mr Wild and asked for clarity, and she stated “*That would have been an option. It was not the route I chose to take.*” Person B stated “*Because, as a Councillor, particularly as leader of Council 4, you receive a lot of confused emails, I think is the polite way to put it, so receiving this email was not unique, shall we say, in terms of jumping all over the place and suggesting different things. I chose to have a conversation with [Person A] and I also, as I say in my witness statement, sent it to the Monitoring Officer, who is our legal representation.*”
89. Person B confirmed that she was informed that the CPS were not pursuing an investigation in respect of Mr Wild. She was asked if at this stage she felt she should speak with Mr Wild she stated “*No, I didn't feel it would be appropriate. He was requesting an apology from Person A and then, just re-reading the email, he implied - - well, he now said I am implicated in misleading fellow councillors, and I did not feel that that was correct.*”
90. Person B was asked why she did not think it was appropriate to respond to Mr Wild setting out her views. She stated, “*I didn't feel it would help the situation by me responding.*” She stated “*clearly, there was communications that had happened between Mr Wild and Person A, and that my involvement in that would muddy the waters as opposed to clarify anything that was happening. If Person A had requested the Crown Prosecution Service look into harassment, that was not a matter for me as Council Leader, in my opinion, as an experienced councillor of 20 years. Well, probably about 17 by that point.*”

91. Person B confirmed that Person A did not tell her not to talk to Mr Wild. Person B was asked about whether the whistleblowing document led to concerns about Person A she stated “*So the document led to a conversation, which was not minuted. As Council Leader you meet regularly with the chief executives, those are private meetings which are not minuted, to discuss many different matters. We had a conversation and, whilst I cannot remember the full details of that conversation, this being several years later, I do remember being completely satisfied that Person A had acted appropriately at the time and, therefore, there was no -- nothing to answer in terms of the allegation within this whistle-blowing document.*

92. Person B was asked if the document caused her to ask anyone else about Person A’s suitability, she stated “*Not that I recall. The only conversations that I recall was with Person A and -- I can't remember whether there was conversations or just emails with the Monitoring Officer of Council 4 at the time, in all honesty. I can't remember whether we spoke about it or just exchanged emails on it, but they were the only two people that I had any communication with regard to this document.*” She confirmed this was QB.

93. In re-examination Person B was asked whether she ever received anything, such as evidence or documents, that actually outlined what it was that Person A was alleged to have done. She stated “*I think it is very unclear from the emails what exactly the accusations were against Person A and then, subsequently, against myself as Council Leader in terms of – there are other emails that talk about misconduct in public office, I think against myself, and the misleading of fellow councillors. I am unclear as to what the evidence/accusations exactly were, to be honest.*” Person B was asked if this impacted her response she stated, “*Once I had satisfied myself that there was nothing for Person A to answer in terms of that original whistle-blowing document we saw, I think I filed it*”.

94. Person B was asked further questions in cross examination by Special Counsel. She was asked whether a particular email references Person A’s appointment as a positive step she stated “*Well, what it says is that he felt there were grounds for optimism, that Person A had taken over in position -- the position, and what the positive step was that Person A had deployed, I don't know what we are referring to the next name as, to undertake a LADO investigation. That is the positive step. And I might be being pernickety here, but that is different to Person A taking up the employment as a positive step. The actions of Person A was the positive step.*”

95. Person B was asked about Mr Wild’s comments that Person A had stated that he was interested in protecting children and young people presently subject to safeguarding concerns. She was asked whether this caused her concern she stated “*That is Mr Wild's interpretation of when he met with Person A. I was not present so I cannot say that Person A was not interested in historical concerns, and when I had a*

conversation with Person A, they had a different take on the situation. I don't remember the exact details, but I do remember that Person A stated that they very much were interested -- concerned about anything like that. I mean, we had come through a lot of historic abuse cases in the media and in councils and, you know, other organisations, as well as, you know, as mentioned here, the Jimmy Savile case, so I didn't - it is not that that didn't concern me, it is that when I spoke to the person, they had a different take on it and I didn't choose to reference that -- Mr Wild's comments over the other person's."

96. Person B confirmed that the whistleblowing document contained Mr Wild's opinion. She stated, "*it did not raise any concerns with me that somebody had an opinion such as this, which was not the opinion of any backing with, you know, prosecutions or anything like that.*" Person B confirmed that the document did not read like a rational document. She stated "*I did not feel that this was a valid complaint against Person A.*"
97. Person B was asked if she had looked into Mr Wild's social work background, and she confirmed she had not. She was asked if she had dismissed the validity of the concerns raised and she stated "*I felt that I had received the explanation from Person A, that I was satisfied with the response that I had received. I also, as I have said, sent it to the Monitoring Officer, who is our legal counsel, and would be the normal procedure for councillors, who are not employees of Council 4, as you will be aware, to go to their Monitoring Officer if they feel that there is a potential issue, so I logged it all with our Monitoring Officer, who also did not feel there was anything to follow up on.*"
98. In response to questions from the committee Person B was asked to confirm how she found the tone of Mr Wild's emails . She stated "*Passive aggressive, I suppose would be the term, sort of "if you don't take me seriously, then I'm going to go to the media" was a regular part of it. "I will email all the other councillors", and, obviously, we are political and there's opposition councillors as well, and how they might be used -- something might be used against you. It did get to the point -- I will be honest, I have had far, far, far worse threats than anything that was in those emails. You know, I am a politician, I get threats, but there was the, you know, "you are guilty of misconduct in public office", or words to that effect. So I -- I didn't find them threatening, as such, but I found them confused, I found them unclear, I found them passive aggressive of wanting to go and, you know, show me up for some reason.*" She confirmed Mr Wild's emails "*got more passive aggressive over the course of the time*".

Person A

99. Person A gave evidence on 9 October 2023. At this stage Mr Wild was not in attendance at the hearing and Special Counsel was not instructed to assist with this matter. Person A was therefore not cross examined.
100. Person A was called to give evidence. He confirmed the content of his witness statement was true and accurate to the best of his knowledge and belief.
101. He confirmed that at the time of the alleged historical sexual abuse allegations, which were alleged to have occurred during the 1980's and 1990's, he was not working for the council and [Private].
102. Person A confirmed that he has never worked with the person that Mr Wild was making allegations against. He confirmed that the person was however working at the Council at the time the complaint was made. Person A stated that this person was not a front-line worker and was working as a policy officer at the time.
103. Person A was asked about an email within the bundle sent by Mr Wild to Council 4. Person A confirmed that when he started a new role Mr Wild would write to his employers in an attempt to get him sacked. He described that Mr Wild also wrote to the appointment panel chair and attempted to get her to reconsider his appointment. Person A described that Mr Wild left a voicemail attached to the email on the answer machine service of the [Private] to the previous incumbent at Council 4 about him. He stated that the [Private] had told him that she had received the voicemail, and he recalled that she had told him that she felt disconcerted. Person A stated the [Private] didn't know him, and the voicemail had made her concerned about the person that she was going to be working with.
104. The voicemail left by Mr Wild (paragraph 23 of Schedule A) was played to Person A. Person A confirmed that he was not made aware of the voicemail at the time that it was left.
105. Person A confirmed that he was offered the role at Council 4 on 6 December 2018 and there was some media coverage around this. He explained the voicemail was left on 18 December 2018. He explained that the information in the voicemail was sent to Council 4's senior lawyer, and they undertook due diligence checks. He confirmed he started in his role in January 2019, and it was after this and developing a working relationship with the [Private] that he was told by her how disconcerting she felt the voicemail was.
106. Person A was asked about a DVD which was sent to his work address when working at Council 1. Person A explained that the DVD was not addressed to him, and it was addressed to SK, Council 1's CEO, [Private]. Person A explained that SK told him about the DVD and invited him into the office to watch it. Person A described the DVD as disturbing.
107. Person A described the impact of Mr Wild's actions, he stated that they caused him a lot of emotions and he had been abused and harassed by Mr Wild for years. In respect of the content of the DVD he described feeling deeply concerned and scared. He stated the tone was sinister and noted that Mr Wild had stated 20 people would

be “watching”. Person A stated the DVD contained rude, offensive and aggressive language.

108. Person A stated he felt really concerned and scared by Mr Wild’s behaviour. He was concerned about the lengths he would go to and was concerned about his reference to making the Grenfell Tower tragedy seem like a party.
109. Person A described the DVD as scary and hard to watch. He explained the language and threats used were made at a time when there were high tensions among abuse survivors.
110. Person A described the link made to the Grenfell Tower tragedy as unforgivable and stated this was a chilling factor.
111. Person A stated he last heard from Mr Wild in the summer of 2020. He stated he believed the only reason he stopped making contact was these proceedings. He stated the complaints raised by Mr Wild had been the subject of a full investigation [Private]. He stated Mr Wild had exhausted the council’s complaints procedure but had not escalated matters to the Ombudsman. He noted that ‘Operation Alana’ had been instigated and resulted in no charges being brought.
112. Person A confirmed that he really thought he was in danger, but contact had stopped when the regulatory process commenced.
113. Person A was asked questions by the panel. Person A was asked why he felt it was necessary to report Mr Wild to Social Work England. Person A stated he had been subject to six years of unrelenting abuse by Mr Wild, and his wife was worried about Mr Wild’s behaviour. He stated that she was aware of the deaths of [Private] and he and his wife were concerned that Mr Wild would attend his home address.
114. Person A confirmed that he was concerned that Mr Wild would carry out the threat to come to London. He described Mr Wild’s actions as unrelenting. He stated he felt it was necessary to report Mr Wild to prevent further abuse. He stated he didn’t think someone as evil and wicked as Mr Wild should be practising as a social worker and stated the profession deserves better.
115. Person A stated he found the matter regrettable because he didn’t want to have to raise a complaint, which had the consequence of Mr Wild not being able to work or losing money. He stated he didn’t come to the proceedings to see the demise of Mr Wild and it was regrettable. Person A stated however that he felt he had no choice. Person A stated he had been subject to nearly 8 years of abuse for something that he has not done. He stated he was not guilty of malpractice, and he was not going to prison for misconduct in public office. He stated he has worked with lots of people and his track record bears that out.
116. Person A was asked about the level of threat that he felt, he described being scared and fearful. In respect of a potential physical threat, he stated “*it takes an individual who is troubled to spend money and create flyers and travel to Manchester to distribute flyers*”. Person A made reference to hundreds of emails he had been sent by Mr Wild. Person A further stated Mr Wild had attempted to get him dismissed, even

when he left the area. With regard to threats by Mr Wild Person A stated, “*the DVD speaks for itself*” and noted the comment made by Mr Wild “*we have 20 people watching you*”.

117. Person A described that Mr Wild had mobilised all of the survivors, who were an angry group of mainly women who had been let down. He noted Mr Wild used aggressive and abusive language namely “*you are fucked.*”
118. Person A confirmed that when his wife saw the DVD made by Mr Wild she was really scared, he confirmed Mr Wild had followed him [to the Midland Hotel] before and confirmed that this caused him fear.
119. Person A was asked about the Midland Hotel incident. He confirmed that when he arrived that the hotel he was ushered in the back door under a cover, as there was a “*mob*” outside the hotel of lobbyists. He confirmed that he entered the hotel in this way on the advice of others.
120. Person A confirmed he received a call from the policy team, who noted that there was a ‘*mob*’ outside the conference. He described that they felt he should be ushered in the back as it was a place of safety. He described that the ‘*mob*’ of people was described as intimidating and hostile, and he was worried about his safety at that point.
121. Person A stated Mr Wild had lied and pretend to be a Times journalist to get into the conference in order to distribute flyers. Person A confirmed that he didn’t see Mr Wild. However, he stated he was concerned that Mr Wild had gone to the lengths of designing and printed the flyers. Person A confirmed that the flyers were distributed to a number of people and that he had been provided with a copy by a colleague.
122. Person A stated the incident caused him both fear and embarrassment. He stated he had to explain himself and stated he found it harrowing having to explain himself all the time as a result of Mr Wild’s actions.
123. Person A was asked why he has noted that there may have been a [Private] issue in respect of Mr Wild’s actions. He confirmed this was a presumption and he was curious about why he is at the centre of Mr Wild’s campaign and why it is being directed towards him.
124. Person A stated the alleged incidents which were the subject of Mr Wild’s complaints occurred when his ex-boss was in charge, yet he is the person being vilified.
125. In respect of the Midland Hotel incident, Person A confirmed that he drove to the event by car. He was unable to remember who had told him about the ‘*mob*’ outside the event, but he believed it was a policy advisor. He explained that he was told that “*a guy was handing out flyers*”.
126. Person A noted that Mr Wild had attached himself to the ‘*mob*’ of people and distributed flyers which were critical of him. Person A recalled that the tensions were high in Area 1 due to historical abuse, and [Private] Person A explained Mr Wild was now telling lies and saying he was responsible for abuse in Area 2.

127. Person A described feeling felling intimidated, embarrassed, beleaguered and tired. Person A described Mr Wild being on a non-stop campaign. He stated he was “sick of it”. Person A stated he believed Mr Wild “*wouldn’t stop at anything*”.
128. In respect of the incident at the Midland Hotel, Person A explained that Mr Wild had attached himself to a ‘*mob*’ of people who had a problem with directors at Area 1 because of past abuse. He stated that by naming him Mr Wild gave the group something to centre their anger at. He stated Mr Wild was “*whipping up hysteria*”, and he gave people who were angry someone to be angry at. Person A indicated that this caused him to fear for his safety.

Person C

129. Person C was called to give evidence on 10 October 2023. At this stage Mr Wild was not in attendance at the hearing and Special Counsel was not instructed to assist with this matter. Person C was therefore not cross examined. Person C confirmed that her witness statement was true to the best of her knowledge and belief.
130. Person C was asked about what she found threatening about Mr Wild’s emails. She confirmed that from the first email that was sent things moved rapidly to accusing her of being complicit and responsible in the matters. She explained she had no knowledge of the subject matter, and Mr Wild was quickly suggesting she was culpable. She said she found the emails threatening and intimidating.
131. Person C referred to an email in which Mr Wild indicated there was clear evidence that the staff involved had been misleading, she said the email referred to transparency and justice. It referred to people losing their careers and custodial sentences. She confirmed that she found this to be threatening.
132. Person C confirmed that the recording that she heard (paragraph 40 of Schedule A) was concerning particularly in respect of the accusations being made. Person C confirmed that she was shocked by the content of the recording, and she found it very unusual.
133. The panel had no questions for Person C.

Person D

134. Person D gave evidence on 10 October 2023. At this stage Mr Wild was not in attendance at the hearing and Special Counsel was not instructed to assist with this matter. Person D was therefore not cross examined.
135. Person D was called to give evidence. She confirmed the content of her witness statement was true and accurate to the best of her knowledge and belief.
136. Social Work England and the panel had no questions for Person D.

ii) Social worker

137. Mr Wild was not in attendance, and therefore did not give evidence. The panel took into account the written submissions provided by Mr Wild, the documentation that he had provided in response to the allegations and the audio recordings submitted by him.

Finding and reasons on facts

138. The panel accepted the advice from the legal adviser, which included the following:

- a. It is for Social Work England to prove disputed allegations on the balance of probabilities;
- b. All the evidence should be considered before making findings of credibility, and when making such findings, the panel should not rely exclusively on demeanour;
- c. Hearsay evidence must be treated with caution and consideration given to its admissibility and then the weight, if any, that can be afforded to it;
- d. The panel were reminded that they could take Mr Wild's good character into consideration when assessing Mr Wild's propensity to act in the manner alleged and his evidence in relation to the circumstances of the allegations.
- e. The panel was reminded of the case of SRA v Beckwith [2020] EWHC 3231 (Admin) in respect of allegations relating to matters in a Social Workers private life and Kuzmin v GMC [2019] EWCA 2129 Admin in respect of the circumstances in which the panel may draw adverse inferences if a Social Worker declines to give evidence.
- f. The panel were reminded that it should have regard to the guidance in respect of drafting decisions.

Allegation 1

- 1. Between the period of 2015 and 2021, you sent the correspondence at Schedule A that was individually and/or collectively, inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening to Person A and employees of Council 1, Council 2, Council 3, Council 4 and Council 5.**

139. The panel considered the evidence of Person A, Person B, Person C and Person D in respect of the correspondence sent within Schedule A.

140. The panel noted that Mr Wild did not dispute sending any of the emails, documents or recordings contained within Schedule A. Mr Wild did also not dispute leaving a voicemail on the [Private] phone number at Council 4, on 18 December 2018. Mr Wild contends only that his actions were not inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening.

141. The panel considered Social Work England's submissions in respect of drawing an adverse inference from Mr Wild's failure to give evidence. The panel considered that although Mr Wild had been warned about the potential for the panel to draw an adverse inference, Mr Wild was not in attendance at the hearing and had not been provided with an opportunity to explain why it would not be reasonable for him to give evidence, in line with the authority of *R (Kuzmin) v General Medical Council* [2019] EWHC 2129 (Admin). The panel did not consider that it was appropriate, in this particular case, to draw an adverse inference from Mr Wild's failure to give evidence. The panel noted that this case is largely documentary in character, and that Mr Wild had participated in the first hearing, including utilising Special Counsel.

142. The panel considered the context in which the emails, documents and voicemails/recordings were sent by Mr Wild. Namely, that three years prior to the sending of the first email set out within Schedule A, in September 2012, Person A had instituted LADO procedures in response to the concerns raised by Mr Wild about the person Mr Wild accused of historic abuse. The LADO investigation had concluded that there was a lack of evidence to support the allegations made by Mr Wild. The outcome of the LADO procedure was communicated to Mr Wild by Person A, and Mr Wild was dissatisfied with the outcome. Mr Wild was advised of the complaints procedure. In October 2013 the police reopened their investigation into matters, this operation was named 'Operation Alana'. In May 2014 Person A [Private] for Council 2 in response to Mr Wild's complaint. This report was completed with revisions in June 2015 and made some recommendations to Council 2 but there were no findings of abuse, and no criticism of Person A. 'Operation Alana', the police investigation, was also concluded in 2016, with no charges being made against the person Mr Wild had accused of historic abuse.

143. Person A was not working at Council 2 at the time that the alleged incidents of sexual abuse against children took place.

144. Further, the panel considered the evidence provided by Mr Wild, which included a recording of a conversations with a police officer in respect of Person A's interview with the police. The panel considered this recording with care and concluded that Mr Wild's account that the officer had stated that Person A had disclosed to the police that everyone knew the that alleged abuser was a severe risk to children and young people, was not consistent with what the panel heard in the recording.

145. The panel noted that it had not been provided with any evidence to suggest that Person A had committed any wrongdoing in respect of the investigation instigated in respect of the person Mr Wild accused of historic abuse.

146. The panel considered each email, letter and voicemail set out within Schedule A (see table below) individually in order to determine whether these correspondences were inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening. The panel's conclusion in respect of each is set out below.

<p>1. Email sent by the Social Worker to SC on 12 January 2015</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to SC by Mr Wild. The panel noted that the email was sent by Mr Wild on 10 January 2015 and was then forwarded on by SC on 12 January 2015. The panel noted that SC is a Member of Parliament and not an employee of any of the Council's set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation. In, any event the panel did not consider the content of the email to be inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening. The panel were not provided with any attachments to this email.</p>
<p>2. Email sent by the Social Worker to DM on 9 April 2015 (0906 hours)</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to DM by Mr Wild. The panel noted that DM is a commissioner and is not an employee of any of the Councils set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation. In any event, the panel did not consider the content of the email to be inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening.</p>
<p>3. Email sent by the Social Worker to DM on 9 April 2015</p> <p><i>“ Well next week we are likely to meet in person as I am coming over mid- week with leaflets to hand out to anyone and everyone. The level of complacency is absolutely astonishing”</i></p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to DM by Mr Wild. The panel noted that DM is not an employee of any of the Councils set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation. In any event, the panel did not consider the content of the email to be inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening.</p>
<p>4. Email sent by the Social Worker to VH on 14 April 2015</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to VH, Commissioner Services Officer at Council 1. The panel considered that VH was an employee of Council 1. The panel therefore went on to consider the content of the email. The panel considered that while the email sets out Mr Wild's strong opinions in respect of the management of Council 2, the panel considered the email was not inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening.</p>

<p>5. Email sent by the Social Worker on 9 July 2015 (1814 hours)</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to DM and MN by Mr Wild. The panel noted that DM and MN are commissioners and not employees of any of the Councils set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation.</p>
<p>6. Email sent by the Social Worker on 9 July 2015 (2048 hours)</p> <p><i>“ my dossier ‘Any Blood Lie Will do’ is now up and running on my website – take a look, its only a summary.....there is no place to hide.....this is ‘Part One’ of a 19 year ‘journey’ of a qualified social worker....more to come....”</i></p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to DM, MN and IT by Mr Wild. The panel noted that DM and MN are commissioners and IT works for the government’s education department. The panel considered the recipients of the email were not employees at of any of the Council’s set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel therefore considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation.</p>
<p>7. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A on 22 January 2016</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to Person A. The panel considered that within the email Mr Wild makes a direct and personal attack on Person A’s abilities as a manager, in stating <i>“Sooner or later Person A, people will discover what a terrible manager you were”</i>. The panel note that there is then a quote in bold namely <i>“It comes down to your values. That’s what brought me here. If you have got a moral compass you go back to it, your moral sense of purpose tells you it’s right to act, to disrupt and to protect. My inclination is always to protect and to safeguard children. Nothing should deter us or deviate from that.”</i> The panel considered the context in which this email was sent to Person A and concluded that the email was vexatious, inappropriate and threatening in nature. The panel considered the ordinary meaning of the word vexatious, namely <i>“the causing or tending to cause annoyance, frustration or worry”</i>. The panel also considered the ordinary meaning of the word inappropriate, namely <i>“not suitable or proper in the circumstances”</i>. The panel noted that the comment made by Mr Wild that Person A was a “terrible</p>

	<p><i>manager</i>" was not substantiated and therefore the panel considered that it was inappropriate. Having regard to the context prior to the email and regard to Person A's evidence in respect of how Mr Wild made him feel, the panel considered that this email would have caused Person A either annoyance, frustration or worry, and was therefore vexatious. The panel considered the ordinary meaning of the word threatening, to mean "<i>having a hostile or deliberately frightening quality or manner</i>". The panel considered that the use of the term "<i>sooner or later</i>" was threatening.</p>
<p>8. Email sent by the Social Worker on 17 February 2016</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to IJ, an employee at Council 2. The panel noted that the content of the email is duplicated below at paragraph 9 of Schedule A. The panel concluded that the tone of the email is threatening in nature and in particular the words "<i>I hear you are retiring, please do not think this is an end to the Person E affair.</i>" The panel noted the words "<i>Area 2 is blighted by your lies</i>" and considered these to be vexatious in nature, particularly given that they were not substantiated by any evidence of lies by the individual concerned. The panel concluded that the tone of the emails and the demand for an apology and explanation was also inappropriate.</p>
<p><i>"I hear you are retiring, please do not think this is an end to the Person E affair. Whatever good you did in Area 2 is blighted by your lies about this very peculiar business. Its not over. I am still waiting to an apology and explanation. We are about to start a documentary on this and related issues."</i></p>	<p>On the basis that the email above at paragraph 8 is duplicated in paragraph 9, the panel did not make a separate determination in respect of paragraph 9. The panel considered that there was a numbering error and paragraph 8 and 9 should have formed one paragraph.</p>

10. Email sent by the Social Worker to JP on 17 June 2016	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to JP, CEO at Council 1. The panel considered in the context and history of this matter the email was both vexatious and inappropriate but not threatening. Mr Wild states within the email “[Private] <i>I went to see him, a man who was indifferent and towing the party line-who moved to Area 1 of all places</i>” Mr Wild refers to his opinion that in his experience senior manager are “terribly corrupt”. The title of the email is “<i>concerns abuse in LAC and Cover up</i>” The panel considered that the receipt of such an email by the CEO of Council 1 would cause or tend to cause worry. Further, the panel considered that the opinions expressed by Mr Wild were not substantiated and therefore the panel considered that they were inappropriate.</p>
11. Email sent by the Social Worker to JP on 6 September 2016	<p>The panel considered in the context and history of this matter, the email sent on 6 September 2016 to JP was both vexatious and inappropriate but not threatening. The email states “<i>I include a summary of my issues. It says, 'Area 1 ISSUES' only because the trail of outrage (via Person A) continues</i>” The panel considered that the receipt of such an email by Assistant Director of Children’s Services at Council 2, JP would cause or tend to cause worry, given Person A’s previous position within Council 2. Further, the panel considered that the opinions expressed by Mr Wild were not substantiated by any evidence and therefore the panel considered that comments within the email were inappropriate.</p>
12. Email sent by the Social Worker to JP on 12 September 2016	<p>The panel considered that in the context and history of this matter, the email sent on 12 September 2016 to JP was both vexatious and inappropriate. The panel did not consider the email to be threatening. The email names Person A as being implicated in very concerning practice, for having closed down the investigation into the person Mr Wild had accused of historic sexual abuse. Without substantive evidence of issues in respect of Person A’s practice, the panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild was both vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered that the receipt of such an email by the CEO of Council 1 would cause or tend to cause worry, given Person A’s [Private].</p>
13. Email sent by the Social Worker to MS, JP, SD and AP on 21 September 2016	<p>The panel noted that the email was sent to a number of employees within Council 1 and Council 2 and was addressed to DM a commissioner for Area 1. The panel considered the title of the email namely “<i>Confidential: Concerns Person A [Private]</i>” was titled so to raise concerns about Person A. The email states “<i>I think you need to agree to see me. I have, in the past, requested that I meet with you and your fellow commissioners in order to discuss my concerns over Person A’s fitness to practice.</i>” The email goes on to state “<i>My conditions to meet are as follows: I meet with you and other</i></p>

	<p><i>commissioners with Person A, around a table and I ask Person A several questions. This must be recorded for transparency and for the Area 1 public to access. I am sure you believe in transparency. There will be no breech in confidentiality to the wider public as we can use disguised names...so as not to implicate others.... The reason I wish to meet you (I have said this in so many emails) is that Person A has, it would seem, been party to cover-ups and incompetence - although I am willing to accept that, after the interview with him, matters could be resolved. This, as you know, relates to abuse of children and young people in care and what was not done by Person A (then in Area 2) to ensure their safety. Serious stuff."</i></p> <p>The panel considered that the email set out conditions which were vexatious and inappropriate given the history of the matter. The panel considered that the content of the email would cause or tend to cause worry to the recipients given Person A's [Private] at Council 1. Further, again the panel noted that Mr Wild's concerns in respect of Person A's fitness to practise are not substantiated by any evidence. The panel considered that there was no direct threat within the email but concluded that in all the circumstances it was vexatious and inappropriate.</p>
<p>14. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK, Person A, JP and RO on 6 August 2017</p>	<p>The panel noted that the email was sent to employees of both Council 3, Council 2 and Council 1 and is copied to [Private] Police. The email is entitled "<i>Harassment of Jim Wild, Whistleblower of Historic Abuse</i>" and states as follows; "<i>I realise that the intention of both Council 1 and Council 3 was to harass me in relation to my persistent allegations of corruption and duplicity all organisations face from the issues I raise. These now span well over a decade (Council 3) and 17 years in Council 1 (linked to Area 2, Person A)... I again request a meeting with Council 3, Council 1 and Council 2 officials to explore the complexities that are clearly indicating wilful duplicity and corruption in high office.</i></p> <p><i>I await a response. The days of these arduous games are over. You will all be held accountable.</i>"</p> <p>The panel considered that the email was vexatious and inappropriate with a repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations of corruption and duplicity. The panel also considered the last line of the email "<i>The days of these arduous games are over. You will all be held accountable</i>" was threatening in nature.</p>

<p>15. Email sent by the Social Worker to RO, SK and JP on 21 August 2017</p>	<p>The panel noted that the email was sent to employees of both Council 3, Council 2 and Council 1. The panel considered that the content of the email namely "<i>I would further seek clarity to whether Person A (who I accuse of duplicity and incompetence in relation to historical abuse) had any input into what I consider to be harassment of a whistleblower.</i>" The panel noted that Mr Wild accused Person A of duplicity and incompetence in relation to historical sexual abuse, without any evidence. The panel considered that the email was vexatious and inappropriate with a repetition of unevienced and unsubstantiated allegations. The panel considered that while there was no direct threat within the email itself, the accusatory language was threatening in nature.</p>
<p>16. Email sent by the Social Worker to DP, SK and Person A on 11 September 2017</p>	<p>The panel noted that the email was sent to employees of both Council 3 and Council 1. In the context of the panel previous finding the panel considered the title of the email vexatious and inappropriate namely "<i>CORRUPTION & Issues relating to Person A (competence)</i>". Within the email Mr Wild states "<i>As OM made clear to you, it was a legal requirement of Council 2 and Council 1 to ascertain whether there was any concern about Person A's competence when appointed to Council 1. Given the issues I raise go back 17 years there is little doubt in my mind on this matter. In Person A's own words at a meeting with me: 'I am not interested in the past, I am more concerned about the protection of young people in the present ... 'I have no doubt Person A will defend himself and evidence a range of procedures (ie LADO all of which were managed in the most appalling way). The issue here is whether Council 1 enquired or Council 2 supplied information on this issue (or whether Person A freely gave this at interview) as incompetence or indifference around historical abuse issues must surely raise concerns.</i>"</p> <p>The panel considered that the language used by Mr Wild was aggressive and adversarial. Given the context of the panel's previous findings and the history of the case the panel considered that the email was both inappropriate and vexatious. The panel did not consider that the email was threatening.</p>

<p>17. Email sent by the Social Worker to JP on 13 September 2017</p>	<p>The panel noted that the email sent to JP of Council 2 which stated <i>“It may also interest you all to know that there would seem there has been a lack of transparency over Person A’s appointment to Council 1. By law the concerns over Person A’s apparent incompetence (or duplicity) in relation to his ‘investigation’ into the concerns over...were not communicated. There are now legal concerns in relation to this issue.”</i></p> <p>The panel considered the email to be both vexatious and inappropriate. By using the words <i>“There are now legal concerns in relation to this issue”</i> the panel considered Mr Wild was using vexatious language. Further the panel considered that the email was inappropriate in its repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations. The panel did not consider that the email was threatening.</p>
<p>18. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK, Person A, JP and RO on 17 September 2017</p>	<p>The panel noted the email sent to employees of Council 1 and Council 2. The panel considered that the content of the email was vexatious and inappropriate. The email states <i>“You do not acknowledge the specifics of this case. These are that upon Person A’s [Private], I referred my concerns to him. His response was inadequate, unresponsive, defensive and inept. It lacked professional and intellectual rigour and indicated a desire to avoid difficult questions. The question must be asked - is this man involved in a cover-up?”</i> The panel considered the language used by Mr Wild was critical of Person A both professionally and personally and was based on Mr Wild’s unevidenced and unsubstantiated opinion. The panel considered that the final line of the email was threatening, namely <i>“I again make the offer to put this whole issue to a conclusion - meet with me, with all senior staff and Person A. Let me ask him a range of questions. This will be recorded and put on Council 1’s website-complete transparency”</i></p> <p>The panel considered that Mr Wild was making demands and stating that matters <i>“will”</i> occur, as opposed to making a request, as such the panel considered the email to be threatening in nature.</p>

<p>19. Email sent by the Social Worker to DP, SK, Person A, JP, SC, JS, Panorama, Ofsted, PL and NY on 22 September 2017</p>	<p>The panel considered that this email was copied to employees within Council 1 and Council 2 but also included the police, Ofsted and television firms. The panel noted that the email did not contain any direct threats and was not threatening in nature, however the panel considered the email to be both vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered the phrase “<i>none are worthy of public office</i>” to be particularly vexatious and inappropriate, given the unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations being made by Mr Wild.</p>
<p>20. Email sent by the Social Worker to JP, and Person A on 30 March 2017</p>	<p>The panel considered that this email was copied to Person A and JP (an employee at Council 2). The panel considered the language used within the email was both vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted Mr Wild’s comments as follows “<i>The duplicity and outrageously corrupt of successive directors have acted is very concerning. Conscious avoidance is the art of not answering difficult questions.</i>” The panel found this comment to be vexatious and inappropriate given the unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations being made by Mr Wild.</p>
<p>21. Email sent by the Social Worker to JN, JP, Person A, SK and DP on 21 October 2017</p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent to JN, JP, Person A, SK and DP contained a significant number of redactions, such that it was difficult to ascertain the issues raised by Mr Wild. The panel considered the comment within the email namely “<i>Could you tell me why the police lack such intellectual curiosity and are so unable to provide any insight into this question?</i>” The panel considered that it was inappropriate for Mr Wild to send an email to professionals asking them to comment of the police’s alleged lack of intellectual curiosity. The panel considered that the remaining content of the email, which was heavily redacted, was not vexatious or threatening in nature.</p>
<p>22. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK, Person A, DP, RO, JP, JL and JM on 12 January 2018</p>	<p>The panel agreed to amend Schedule A and remove paragraph 22 on the basis that it was a duplication of paragraph 25.</p>

<p>23. Voicemail 12.22 18 December 2018 left by the Social Worker at the [Private], Council 4</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the voicemail left by Mr Wild at the [Private] and Council 4. Within the voicemail Mr Wild refers to duplicity and poor practice. He notes that Person A was appointed to a role within Council 4 but states he may not be in this for much longer. Mr Wild then goes on to state "<i>I can help Person A go through these difficult circumstances</i>". Within the voicemail Mr Wild states "<i>I will go to the press...you really don't want that to happen</i>". The panel considered that the voicemail was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The voicemail suggests that Person A will not remain in his post or be appointed for much longer and makes a threat that Mr Wild will go to the press. The panel considered the evidence of Person A in respect of the voicemail and the impact it had upon him. Given the nature and circumstances of the case the panel considered the voicemail to be both vexatious and inappropriate as it represented further repetition of unevienced and unsubstantiated allegations against Person A.</p>
<p>24. Email sent by the Social Worker to RO, JP, JL, SK, DP, Person A and JM on 8 January 2018</p> <p><i>"You are all guilty along this crooked path and I do not wish you good fortune"</i></p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent to multiple recipients was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered the words "<i>you are all guilty</i>" to be threatening in nature, given the context and history of the matter. Further, the panel noted the unpleasant tone of the email which states "<i>I do not wish you good fortune</i>". The panel considered these words to be inappropriate and vexatious.</p>
<p>25. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK on 12 January 2018</p> <p><i>"To my adversities, who attempted to subvert me, who are corrupt and have absolutely no right to hold public office, all documentation has been delivered to:</i></p> <p><i>https://www.iicsa.org.uk/ and I now move on. I will edits book of my</i></p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent to multiple recipients was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted the words "<i>I really hope, you get the wrath of justice.</i>" The panel considered these words to be threatening in nature given the context of the case. The panel considered that the phrase "<i>You are absurd and wicked people</i>" was also vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that this amounted to a personal attack on the recipients of the email.</p>

<p><i>own experiences and the experiences of others. I hope, I really hope, you get the wrath of justice. You are absurd and wicked people. I choose my words after a good deal of reflect."</i></p>	
<p>26. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK dated 24 January 2018</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to SK at Council 1, which was also sent to Person A, JP and others. The panel considered the tone of the email to be threatening. The panel particularly noted the words "<i>In the end I hope it will result in your demise.</i>" The panel considered the content of the email to be vexatious, noting that it begins "<i>To my adversaries</i>". The email calls for the recipients to feel "<i>ashamed</i>". In all the circumstance of the case, the panel considered that the content of the email was inappropriate including [Private].</p>
<p>27. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK dated 20 March 2018</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to SK at Council 1. The email states as follows "<i>I will get the transcript back to you ASAP. I understand Person A has a new job. I presume you and the CEO know the protocol for disclosure for this situation and I expect (and hope) you have given Person A's new employer objective information about the concerns I have and that I am about to sign a legal statement to that effect?</i>" The panel considered that there was nothing within the email which could be considered threatening, vexatious or inappropriate.</p>
<p>28. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK dated 20 March 2018</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to SK at Council 1, the email states as follows "<i>On a secondary matter, could you tell me who was party to [Private], who was party to the decision making ?</i>"</p> <p>The panel considered that this was a request for information and there was nothing within the email which could be considered threatening, vexatious or inappropriate.</p>

29. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK, dated 26 March 2018	<p>The panel considered the email sent to SK at Council 1. The panel considered that this email amounted to a request for a meeting with Person A and there was nothing within the email which meant in isolation that it was threatening, vexatious or inappropriate.</p>
30. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person B dated 12 December 2018	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to Person B by Mr Wild. The panel noted the evidence of Person B and noted that she is a Councillor and not an employee of any of the Council set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation.</p>
31. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person B dated 12 December 2018	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to Person B by Mr Wild. The panel noted the evidence of Person B and noted that she is a Councillor and not an employee of any of the Council set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation.</p>
32. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person B on 17 December 2018	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to Person B by Mr Wild. The panel noted the evidence of Person B and noted that she is a Councillor and not an employee of any of the Council set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation.</p>

<p>33. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person B on 18 December 2018</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to Person B by Mr Wild. The panel noted the evidence of Person B and noted that she is a Councillor and not an employee of any of the Councils set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation.</p>
<p>34. Email sent by the Social Worker dated 31 December 2018</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to Person B by Mr Wild. The panel noted the evidence of Person B and noted that she is a Councillor and not an employee of any of the Council set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation.</p>
<p>35. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person B and Person A on 12 March 2019</p> <p><i>"I have requested from Person A (sic), a public apology for his slanderous and untrue accusations against me....Person A is also implicated in a very serious accusation of Misconduct in Public Life. These issues are and were made aware to you prior to [Private]. It would seem that you too are now implicated in misleading fellow councillors over the now tarnished reputation of Person A"</i></p>	<p>The panel noted the email was sent to both Person A and Person B, Councillor for Council 4. The panel considered the comments made by Mr Wild about Person A were inappropriate and vexatious. The panel noted that the email stated Person A is "<i>implicated in a very serious accusation of Misconduct in Public Life.</i>" The email continues by stating that Person B, having been made aware of the alleged issues, is now also implicated. The panel noted the evidence of Person A in respect of Mr Wild's behaviour and his attempts to have Person A sacked whenever he moved roles. The panel considered that Mr Wild's email which declares that Person A is "<i>implicated in a very serious accusation of Misconduct in Public Life</i>" was vexatious. The panel considered the content of the email would have been alarming and worrying for Person A. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate on the basis that as it represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations against Person A. The panel considered that there was no direct threat within the email, but concluded that in all the circumstances it was vexatious and inappropriate.</p>

<p>36. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A on 12 March 2019</p> <p><i>“in the first instance I request, in writing, an apology within 48 hours. I will then seek to address your duplicity in relation to historical abuse issues within the confines of Misconduct in Public Life – a very serious charge indeed. It is my intention to copy in councillors and senior representative staff in Council 4, I do believe you are not worthy of [Private]”</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the comments made by Mr Wild towards Person A were inappropriate, vexatious and threatening. Mr Wild makes a demand for an apology and sets a deadline for this apology. He goes on to state that he will copy in councillors and senior representative staff at Person A's place of work. The panel noted that the email would have caused Person A worry and is vexatious. Further, the panel concluded that it was inappropriate in nature as it represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations against Person A. In addition, the panel considered the email threatening since it demanded an apology and set a deadline for said apology.</p>
<p>37. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A and Person B on 13 March 2019</p> <p><i>“We both know that there are elements of duplicity in your practice. The consequences are that you require a level of rehabilitation..”</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the comments made by Mr Wild towards Person A were inappropriate and vexatious but not threatening. The panel considered that informing Person A that it was Mr Wild's opinion that there was duplicity in Person A's practice, was vexatious as it would have caused Person A annoyance, frustration or worry. The panel considered that the use of the words <i>“The consequences are that you require a level of rehabilitation”</i> was highly inappropriate, as it represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations against Person A.</p>
<p>38. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person B and Person A on 13 March 2019</p> <p><i>“You have 2 options, the first to continue with ‘business as usual’ approach to this matter, or to work alongside my service, with Person A, to collaborate in the context of transparency and openness. You have until Friday 15 March</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person B and Person A to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that the email sets out clear actions that Mr Wild intended to take if his conditions were not complied with. The panel considered that all of these conditions had the intention of bringing about the professional demise of Person A. The panel noted that Mr Wild made a threat to come in person to the area where Person A was working. The panel considered this in light of the evidence provided by Person A about Mr Wild. Further, the panel considered setting a time limit for a response also added to the level of threat. The panel concluded that the email was vexatious as it would have caused Person A annoyance, frustration or worry. The panel</p>

<p><i>2019 to respond. This is what I expect:</i></p> <p><i>A public apology from Person A over his harassment claims.</i></p> <p><i>Admission that matters need to be transparent</i></p> <p><i>A willingness of you, your CEO and allied third parties to work with my services towards improvement and transparency.</i></p> <p><i>Should this collaborative venture not be forthcoming I will take the following action:</i></p> <p><i>Distribute a report to all elected counsellors explaining, in my view, you misled them over the appointment of Person A</i></p> <p><i>Contact safeguarding services to provide them with information on Person A's poor practice in relation to historical abuse issues.</i></p> <p><i>Contact media outlets and communicate what I know.</i></p> <p><i>I will visit Council 4 and distribute leaflets based on what I know</i></p>	<p>also concluded that the tone of the email was highly inappropriate and represented further repetition of unevienced and unsubstantiated allegations against Person A.</p>
<p>39. Emails sent by the Social Worker to SK on 27 October 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered the emails sent to SK, Council 1's CEO, on 27 October 2019, as threatening, inappropriate and vexatious. The emails states “You should know (redacted) is a corrupt official who allowed (redacted) to continue and [Private], knowing that this man was a serious risk to children and young people. He should not resign, he should be sacked and face criminal proceedings. He has an opportunity to absolve himself by meeting me and providing assurances he has learnt from errors of judgement. This will be pursued via the Independent Police body charged with undertaking inquiries into these matters. There are also links here with Council 1 and Council 2. (redacted) stepping down’ is absolutely no resolution to this matter. I offer a meeting with</p>

	<p><i>and impress upon him the gravity of this situation. If anyone considers I am making defamatory accusations then please sue me. The days of standing down are over....., meet me and sort this out.</i>" The panel considered that the tone of this email was vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered the email related to Person A and represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations against Person A. The panel concluded that SK who was in receipt of this email would have considered it to be worrying given its tone and the reference to links with Council 1. In respect of the second email sent that day which stated "<i>You do know you are implicated in the wider issues? Happy to talk so you can clean up your act.....</i>" the panel also concluded that this was vexatious and inappropriate. The email refers to SK being "implicated", which would have caused worry on her part. The panel also considered the words "<i>Happy to talk so you can clean up your act</i>" highly inappropriate. Further, the panel concluded that Mr Wild was making an implied threat by stating that he would pursue matters through the '<i>Independent Police body</i>'; however Person A could absolve himself by meeting with Mr Wild.</p>
<p>40. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C and DS on 28 October 2019</p>	<p>The panel noted that the email sent by Mr Wild to Person C and DS contained a recording of a telephone conversation that Mr Wild had with Council 2. The panel considered that this recording contained inappropriate, vexatious and threatening content. Within this recording Mr Wild makes a number of threats including reference to there being "<i>terrible trouble</i>" and the days being "<i>limited</i>" for Person A. Within the recording Mr Wild sets a time limit for a response with the consequence of non-compliance being him reporting matters to the Police Complaints Commission and Channel 4 news. The panel considered the tone of Mr Wild while speaking to DS was patronising. The panel noted that Mr Wild was seeking to be vexatious in the matters that he was raising in the recording. The panel also considered the email that was attached the recording namely "<i>Can I suggest you, Person C, study this tape. DS, can you please confirm receipt of this recording. I would like your assurances that you will pass this recording to: BL, PG (head of Area 2 Police). I seek collaboration and assurances of transparency, along with disciplinary proceedings against those who attempted to subvert me.</i>" The panel concluded that this was inappropriate on the basis that it represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations.</p>

<p>41. Email sent by the Social Worker to person C on 29 October 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered the email to Person C to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered the following phrases to be threatening “<i>You are now implicated</i>” ... “<i>If you are a good CEO you will meet with me.</i>” “<i>Show you have some level of credibility. Meet me.</i>”... “<i>My next step is to contact the police under ‘Perversion of the course of justice’ and will update the Child Sexual Abuse Inquiry in London to update them. I will also go to C4 news as they will accept my story as I have clear and credible evidence of misconduct.</i>” The panel noted Person C’s evidence in respect of finding the emails to be intimidating. The panel considered that the email was highly vexatious and inappropriate in nature. The panel noted from Person C’s evidence that the email clearly caused worry and concern. The panel concluded that the email was inappropriate on the basis that it represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations.</p>
<p>42. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK, JM, Person C and JB on 31 October 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered the content of the email sent by Mr Wild to SK, JM, Person C and JB on 31 October 2019 to be inappropriate, vexatious and threatening. The email states “<i>I am sending to The Independent Police Complaints Commission. Do please be aware I am sending this to a range of individuals who I trust or feel may have supported me in the past. It is ‘blind copied’ to you. I am also sending it to professionals who could have done so much more. You know who you are. This specific letter is in relation to Person A, but similar letters are being dispatched to incriminate the CEOs of Council 3 and Council 1. This letter is a first draft. Please take into account that typos and coherence - it will be improved ! The implication here are shocking, outrageous and now, after accumulating a great deal of information over several year, possibly subject to judicial proceedings. These will be dispatched by recorded delivery to a range of individuals and servants of the state - local MP’s, councillors,.....and The Child Sexual Abuse Inquiry.</i>” The panel considered that the email refers to implications and states that the document will be sent to a wide range of individuals. It states that letters are being dispatched to incriminate CEOs. The panel considered this to be threatening. In addition, the panel found the tone of the email to be highly vexatious, as it was likely to cause the recipient worry. Further, the panel found the email to be inappropriate on the basis that it represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations.</p>

<p>43. Letter from the Social Worker to the Police Complaints Commission attached to the email sent on 31 October 2019</p>	<p>The panel noted that within the draft letter prepared by the social worker there are numerous accusations of misconduct. The panel considered the letter to be vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted the reference made to the Independent Police Authority assessing whether Person A should face a criminal conviction. The letter also refers to a number of different professionals not being fit for office. The panel considered that the letter was vexatious and would cause those in receipt of it to worry about the possible implications. The panel further concluded that the letter was inappropriate on the basis that it represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations. The panel concluded that the letter was not threatening.</p>
<p>44. Email sent by the Social Worker to ES, HC and SK on 4 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered the email to ES, HC and SK on 4 November 2019 to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that the email states, “<i>you will face disciplinary action</i>”. The panel considered that this phrase was threatening. Further the email makes reference to “<i>those who were pathetic in their corrupt professional misconduct</i>”. The panel considered that this was vexatious in nature and inappropriate on the basis that it represented further repetition of unevidenced and unsubstantiated allegations.</p>
<p>45. Letter from the Social Worker to the Independent Officer for Police Conduct dated 4 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered that the letter sent by Mr Wild to the IOPC (and copied into council employees at Councils 1 and 3) was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that within the email Mr Wild stated “<i>copies of this letter have been sent to MP's who represent the constituencies where [Private]'s live</i>” which suggests Mr Wild has researched where Person A and other [Private]’s involved in this matter live. The panel noted the fears expressed by Person A in respect to Mr Wild coming to London or and his wife’s fear of Mr Wild attending his address. The panel therefore considered the content of the letter to be threatening. Further, the panel considered that the letter was vexatious, it makes reference to serious allegations of misconduct which are not evidenced and as such the panel also concluded that the letter was inappropriate.</p>

<p>46. Email sent by the Social Worker to Council 4 Democratic Services, Person A and JB on 4 November 2019</p> <p><i>"if you do not act you will all face disciplinary proceedings...This information is now with organisations charged with independent investigation. To be crude about this Person A, you are fucked. It is nothing less you than you deserve"</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A and others to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted the phrase "<i>To be crude about this Person A, you are fucked. It is nothing less you than you deserve</i>". The panel considered this to be threatening in nature given the history and context of the issues involved, and the use of abusive language. The panel also found for the same reasons that the email was vexatious. The panel noted the language used within the email was highly inappropriate and the panel again observed that Mr Wild was making serious allegations of misconduct against Person A which were not evidenced.</p>
<p>47. Email sent by the Social Worker to ED, ZG, SK, JM, Person C and Person A on 5 November 2019</p> <p><i>"The implications for Person A are dire. He is a corrupt person.....these are serious issues the appointing individuals were informed about. They did not take me up on my offer to sit round and ask Person A searching questions. A mistake worthy of an investigation itself".</i></p>	<p>The panel considered this email to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted the phrase "<i>The implications for Person A are dire</i>" and considered that this amounted to a threat towards Person A. The panel noted that the content of the email was highly vexatious as it made reference to Person A being corrupt, without any substantive evidence. The email also referred to an investigation being necessary, on the basis that Mr Wild's offer of sitting round and asking Person A searching questions, had not been taken up. The panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email again makes serious allegations of misconduct against Person A which are not evidenced.</p>
<p>48. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A, SK, JM and Person C on 7 November 2019</p> <p><i>"you must know you are now in an invidious position. You are likely to face criminal proceedings and a misconduct in public life charge...face very serious charges. If you</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the email to Person A and others to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that it refers to the recipients being in an "<i>invidious position</i>" and needing to produce an escape plan. The panel considered this in the context of the case to be threatening in nature. The panel considered the email was vexatious on the basis that it made reference to Person A facing "<i>very serious charges</i>" which would likely cause worry to the Person A. The panel considered the email to be inappropriate on the basis that Mr Wild while making threats states that the recipient of the email must "<i>work with</i>" him and that he will mentor them. The panel considered that the email was also inappropriate for the</p>

<p><i>believe you can somehow produce an escape plan.. all along in these incidents I have suggested you sit around a table and talk to me, that together ran through mentoring ... work with me, it's not too late... Copies of this email will be sent to all connected with this matter”</i></p>	<p>same reasons as other emails, the email again makes serious allegations of misconduct which are not evidenced.</p>
<p>49. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A, SK, Person C, ES and HC on 7 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to Person A, SK, Person C, ES and HC to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that there were threats made within the email to report recipients to their respective regulators. The panel considered the email to be vexatious, as the tone would have created worry for the recipients. Further, the panel considered that the email was also inappropriate as there was no evidenced reason for the recipients to be reported to their respective regulators.</p>
<p>50. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C dated 8 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to Person C to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted Person C's evidence in respect of how the emails of Mr Wild made her feel “<i>intimidated</i>” and she was shocked by their quick escalation. The panel considered the use of the words “<i>If you do nothing, nothing changes, and you are implicated</i>” to be threatening. The panel noted that the tone of the email was highly vexatious and was drafted in order to cause worry to Person C, and it was clear from her evidence that the email did have that effect. The panel considered that the email included inappropriate language such as “<i>this woman</i>” when referring to JP. Further, the panel considered that the email was also inappropriate as there was no substantiated reasoning or evidence for the allegations made.</p>
<p>51. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C dated 8 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered that this email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted the reference made by Mr Wild to a “<i>final offer</i>” which the panel considered to be threatening given the context and history of this matter. The panel also considered that Mr Wild’s email was threatening in the sense that it set a timescale to respond before he would report matters to council officials, local press and radio along with election candidates in the present election. The panel noted that within the email Mr Wild made personal attacks towards JP suggesting she was “<i>corrupt...a liar and full of duplicity</i>”. The panel noted Mr Wild then refers</p>

	<p>to JP as “<i>the appalling JP</i>”. The panel considered the content of the email to be vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered that there was no substantiated reasoning or evidence for the accusation made by Mr Wild.</p>
<p>52. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C , JA, BA, CD, JC, RA, KA, SB1, SB2, SB3 and SB4 dated 21 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered that this email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered that the email contained an implied threat that a failure to respond would lead to the realisation that staff may be implicated in covering up historical abuse. The panel considered the tone of the email to be vexatious and had regard to section of the email which stated, “<i>I call on the selection of counsellors I have blind copied in this email to draft a vote of no confidence in your leader of the council.</i>” The panel considered that there was no substantiated reasoning or evidence for the accusation made by Mr Wild and as such the email was both vexatious and inappropriate.</p>
<p>53. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C on 22 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to Person C, namely “<i>you need to meet me and discuss the process of the lapse investigation. There are several anomalies here and some clear concerns over misconduct in public life in relation to staff who occupied prominent positions. I would also welcome an apology that will go some way towards acknowledging that my duty as a public servant was compromised and discredited by previous staff.</i>” The panel considered that while the email makes reference to unsubstantiated allegations, it does not name any individual. In consequence the panel consider the email is not vexatious or threatening. However, by referencing unsubstantiated allegations, the panel concluded that the email was inappropriate.</p>
<p>54. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C on 23 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person C to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that Mr Wild stated within the email “<i>You must realise that there is a need here to accept the concerns raised and to apologise.... Matters will conclude, for better or worse for your service.</i>” The panel considered that this was an implied threat. The panel also noted that the email stated, “<i>If the process of inaction is taken, then further casualties will inevitably take place.</i>” The panel considered this to be a direct threat. The panel determined that the email was vexatious</p>

	<p>and alleged corruption. The panel considered that the email would have caused the recipient to worry, and this was confirmed by Person C's evidence in respect of her reaction to Mr Wild's emails. The panel considered that there was no substantiated reasoning or evidence for the accusations made by Mr Wild and as such the email was inappropriate.</p>
<p>55. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A on 24 November 2019</p> <p><i>"I have also sent a copy to the [Private] police with a request to investigate Misconduct in a Public Life issues. Let us see what unfolds....."</i></p>	<p>The Panel considered the email to Person A to be vexatious and inappropriate but not threatening. The panel noted the evidence of Person A and noted that anyone receiving an email accusing them of misconduct in public life would have cause for concern or worry. As such the panel considered that the email was vexatious. The panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email again makes serious allegations of misconduct against Person A which were not evidenced.</p>
<p>56. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person B on 24 November 2019</p>	<p>The panel reviewed the content of the email sent to Person B by Mr Wild. The panel noted the evidence of Person B and noted that she is a Councillor and not an employee of any of the Council set out in Paragraph 1 of the allegation. The panel considered that this email therefore did not fall within paragraph 1 of the allegation.</p>
<p>57. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C on 24 November 2019</p> <p><i>"You have explanations to convey. You also need to be clear that lessons have been learnt. I will embark on a campaign in the early new year"</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to Person C was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that the email demands an explanation and makes the threat that Mr Wild will be "<i>embarking on a campaign</i>" where he will "<i>attempt to engage with any media outlets</i>" and "<i>anyone who will listening</i>". The panel considered the email to be vexatious and noted Person C's evidence in respect of her feeling intimidated by Mr Wild's emails. The panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails. The email requests an explanation in respect of what actions have been taken with regard to serious allegations of misconduct made by Mr Wild, that are both unsubstantiated and unevidenced.</p>

<p><i>where I will attempt to engage with any media outlets available. I will produce YouTube recordings and attempt to engage with anyone who will listen”</i></p>	
<p>58. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C on 20 December 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent to Person C was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted Person C's evidence in respect of Mr Wild's emails being intimidating. The panel noted the email states “<i>You should realise that it is only a matter of time before matters reach a critical mass on these issues... Given this wretched affair has spanned over 2 decades, I have seen out many senior managers and also the 'premature' departure of 2 CEO's due to my rigorous and persistent nature. I await a response.</i>” The panel considered that these comments were threatening in nature. The panel considered that the tone of the email was vexatious and considered Person C's evidence in this regard. Further the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email again makes serious allegations of misconduct against Person A which are not evidenced.</p>
<p>59. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A on 21 December 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A and employees of Council 2, Council 3 and Council 1 was both vexatious and inappropriate. While the email appears to be a festive greeting it states “<i>let's work for transparency, collaboration, erudite practice or..... a fall from grace</i>” given the history and context of the allegations the panel considered that this email would have caused annoyance, frustration or worry to the recipients. The panel concluded that the email was inappropriate given the history of this matter and it was clear that the email was sent specifically to recipients that Mr Wild had previously accused of misconduct. The panel concluded the email was not threatening.</p>

<p>60. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C, JM, SK, Person A and Person B on 21 December 2019</p>	<p>The panel agreed to amend Schedule A and remove paragraph 60 on the basis that it was a duplication of paragraph 61.</p>
<p>61. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C, JM, Person A, SK and Person B on 31 December 2019</p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A and employees of Council 2, Council 3 and Council 1. The email is titled “<i>HN</i>Y from <i>The Centre for Active & Ethical Learning</i>” within the email it states, “<i>TRANSPARENCY IS ALL but not apparently [Private]</i>” it has next to it a laughing emoji. Given the history and context of the allegations the panel considered that this email was vexatious as it would have caused annoyance, frustration or worry to the recipients. The panel felt that the email was inappropriate as it accused the recipients of a lack of transparency despite this being another unevienced and unsubstantiated accusation. The panel did not consider this email threatening.</p>
<p>62. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A, Person B, SK and Person C on 3 January 2020</p> <p><i>“You now face severe challenges....you will now face the charge of misconduct in a public life – very serious indeed. It is highly likely you will face the full weight of due process, a possible custodial sentence awaits. This information has been shared far and wide....you have absolutely no credibility”</i></p>	<p>The panel considered Mr Wild’s email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered the tone of the email to be threatening and noted that Mr Wild referred to serious consequences namely facing “<i>the full weight of due process</i>” and a “<i>possible custodial sentence</i>”. The panel considered these words to be threatening and vexatious. The panel noted that Mr Wild referred to the recipients of the email having “<i>no credibility</i>” and the panel considered that this would cause annoyance, frustration or worry to the recipients. The panel concluded that the email was inappropriate given the history of this matter and the serious accusations made without evidence.</p>

<p>63. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A, Person B, SK, Person C, JM, JB, JS, HC and RH on 4 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that within a poem which featured in the email the words “<i>Blade that was broke</i>” were highlighted. The panel also noted that Mr Wild used the phrase “[Private], justice will be done.” The panel considered that highlighting the words “<i>Blade that was broke</i>” and stating justice will be done was threatening. The panel noted that the email was vexatious, as the recipients would be caused worry by the content of the email, particularly given the highlighted words. The panel also concluded that the email was inappropriate given the history of this matter and the serious accusations being made which were unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>
<p>64. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A and Person B on 4 January 2020</p> <p><i>“there is a way out of this terrible mess...Person A, you will need to be mentored by me and put under scrutiny. I do not know whether you are good people..... Meet with me’.</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that Mr Wild refers to Person A needing to meet with him as a “<i>way out of this terrible mess</i>”. Mr Wild stated Person A would need to be “<i>put under scrutiny</i>”. The panel considered given the history and context of the case, this was threatening in nature, and implied Mr Wild would only end his pursuit of Person A if he could put him under scrutiny. The panel considered that the email was vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered that the email would cause Person A to worry, particularly given the reference to him being put under scrutiny. The panel also felt that the email was inappropriate given the offer to mentor Person A. The panel considered that the email again raised serious accusations which were unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>
<p>65. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A, Person B, SK and Person C on 13 January 2020</p> <p><i>“My report will soon go to the IOPC after local police conduct an investigation. Person A, you have become too certain of yourself and you will fall from grace. I have absolutely no idea</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A, Person B, SK and Person C. The panel considered that the email was vexatious, inappropriate and threatening. The panel noted that Mr Wild set out that his report would be sent to the IOPC. The panel also considered that Mr Wild made a number of personal attacks towards Person A, stating “<i>you have become too certain of yourself, and you will fall from grace</i>”. The panel considered that this phrase was threatening. The panel also considered the email to be vexatious, it stated that Person A was “<i>embroiled in a very serious charge</i>” and “<i>other officials are now implicated in Area 1 and Area 2</i>”. The panel considered that the content of the email would cause the recipients of the email to be worried. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email</p>

<p><i>whether you and Person B are good people, but you are now embroiled in a very serious charge. Other officials are now implicated in Area 1 and Area 2..... as I have always suggested, there is a way through this. I have given my conditions which are very reasonable.'</i></p>	<p>again makes serious allegations of misconduct against Person A and others which are unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>
<p>66. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person D on 16 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to SK and Person D. The panel noted that the email had been redacted and it was unclear from the content who the email was referring to. While there was reference to an individual being implicated it was unclear who this individual was. The panel concluded that there was insufficient evidence before it to determine whether or not the email was threatening, vexatious and/or inappropriate.</p>
<p>67. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK and Person D on 17 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent by Mr Wild to SK and Person D was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted within the email Mr Wild stated as follows "<i>You are all in precarious situations. You need to contemplate and consider the consequences of the lack of activity, silence.....On Monday I will send details of my willingness to stop all my attempts to seek justice. It will not be negotiable.</i>" The panel considered that the tone of the email was threatening and demanding. The panel considered that the content of the email would cause the recipients of the email to be worried about what conditions Mr Wild may set and was therefore vexatious. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email again makes serious allegations of misconduct against Person A and others which are unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>

<p>68. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK and Person D on 17 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to SK and Person D. The panel determined that the email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The email follows on from the email sent on the same date as set out above at paragraph 67. The email sets out again that Mr Wild will send his “<i>conditions</i>” The email states “<i>You are all implicated. You need to open up channels and heal this. You all need to work with me.</i>”. Given the history and context of the matter the panel considered the tone of the email to be threatening. The panel considered that the content of the email would cause the recipients of the email to be worried about what conditions Mr Wild may set and was therefore vexatious. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email refers to the recipients being implicated in serious allegations which are unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>
<p>69. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A, Person B, DP, SK and Person C on 17 January 2020</p> <p><i>“You are all implicated. You need to open up channels and heal this. You all need to work with me. I will send my conditions on Monday.</i></p>	<p>On the basis that the email above at paragraph 68 is duplicated in paragraph 69, the panel did not make a separate determination in respect of paragraph 69. The panel considered that there was duplication of paragraph 68 and 69. The panel maintains its decision as set out above in respect of paragraph 68.</p>
<p>70. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK and DP on 20 January 2020 (at 12.29 hours)</p>	<p>The panel considered the email from Mr Wild to SK and DP. The panel determined that the email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that the title of the email was “<i>COUNCIL 1 & [Private] POLICE’S DIRTY LITTLE SECRET</i>” The panel also noted that the email demanded a response from the recipients within one month. The email states “<i>find 11-page opening document (charge to be proven) and my offer. I will need a response by the end of this month. Good luck, it’s wonderful how resilience works....don’t you think ?</i>” The panel considered the demand for a response and the tone of the email to be threatening. The panel noted that the email conveyed disrespect for the recipients by facetiously stating “<i>Good Luck</i>”. The panel considered that the content of the email would cause the recipients of the email to be worried about Mr Wild’s conditions and was therefore vexatious. Further, the panel considered the tone of the email and comments made within it to be inappropriate.</p>

<p>71. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A and Person B on 20 January 2020 (at 1232 hours)</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A and Person B. While the panel noted its previous conclusions in respect of Person B not being an employee of the council, the panel noted that Person A was also a recipient of the email. Therefore, the panel went on to consider the content of the email and its impact on Person A. The panel considered the email to be vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that the language towards Person B would have caused Person A concern in that it stated <i>“you might want to think very, very seriously about the charges that implicate you. I’m happy for you to consider my offer. Do the [Private] realise you are up to your neck in something rather distasteful?”</i> This led the panel to conclude that the email was vexatious. Further, the panel considered the tone of the email and comments made within it to be highly inappropriate.</p>
<p>72. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C on 20 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent by Mr Wild to Person C was not threatening but was vexatious and inappropriate. Whilst the content of the email was not vexatious or inappropriate, the subject of the email was <i>“COUNCIL 2’S AND [Private] CONSTABULARY’S DIRTY LITTLE SECRET”</i>. The panel found this inappropriate. This wording would also have the potential to cause worry, and the panel therefore found it vexatious.</p>
<p>73. Letter attached to email sent by Social Worker on 20 January 2020, also sent in email dated 9 October 2020</p> <p><i>This communication represents my final offer to you.....OFFER: A general apology and acceptance matters were badly dealt with by the service you manage. No details, just acceptance. In collaboration with my service, The Centre for Active and Ethical Learning, a group of whistleblowers and survivors will be set up in the service you represent as a reference point and evidence of transparency. I would charge expenses only</i></p>	<p>The panel considered that the letter produced by Mr Wild and attached to the email of 20 January 2020 was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The letter denoted that this is Mr Wild’s <i>“final offer”</i> and makes clear demands in respect of what he expects from the recipients, in the context of previous threats. The panel considered that the demands were highly inappropriate including a demand that the recipients collaborate with Mr Wild’s company, in order that he could set up a survivor’s group for which Mr Wild would receive expenses and further that he receives expenses for setting up a conference. Further, the panel considered it highly inappropriate that Mr Wild requested damages and compensation to be awarded by the recipients of the email or their respective councils. The panel considered that the content of the offer was vexatious and would have caused the recipients to be worried about the conditions set by Mr Wild. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email makes the offer on the basis of serious accusations raised by Mr Wild which are unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>

for the establishing of such a group. This would be a 'line in the sand' for me and acceptance that ethical guidelines will be followed and adhered to in the future. The development of protocol for future reference relating to public apologies, adherence to modest compensation for victims, survivors and whistleblowers. This should be seen as progressive and organisations that collaborate with me will gain from the ingenuity in progressive activity. Those representatives on such a panel will undertake training (see point 4).

I will organise a conference on these matters, edit with others a publication and obtain the services of national and international speakers. Over 2 days they will present on thematic issues I raise in my 11-page report. Again, I would only claim expenses for the organisation of this event. This will lead to a publication which will act as a future reference point. I have an international publisher willing to engage in this project. You will gain credibility from this. Initial discussions with local university staff show a willingness to collaborate.

4) A certificate in transparency and ethical standards in public life will also become a mandatory unit for all public servants in your organisation. They will undertake such a certificate to evidence they have reached insight and understanding of the use and abuse of power and access learning from past scandals and reports. This

<p><i>would be regulated by a university and individuals of national and international academic standing who know my work and are willing to facilitate this innovative and progressive action.</i></p> <p><i>5) Damages and compensation to be awarded to me for my severe treatment and disreputable subjection to severe duress and the undermining of my professional status. The amounts should be proportionate to the extent and duration of time I have endured in conflict with your service. This will be negotiated between my legal representatives and those legal individuals in the service you manage. NOTE: I do not expect or want this to be a significant award but based on loss of earnings over 5 years and shared between the services and organisations on a proportionate basis</i></p>	
<p>74. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK on 21 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent by Mr Wild to SK, Person C and CA on 21 January 2020 was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that Mr Wild was making a “final offer” and states, “<i>You must realise the absence of any communication indicates bad faith</i>” The panel considered the tone of the email to be threatening. The panel considered the comment made by Mr Wild, namely “<i>Dear CEO’s I think it is shameful and disturbing that women have reached the highest level in public service but seem to be ambivalent about ethics and values</i>”, to be highly inappropriate. The panel concluded that the content of the email was vexatious and would have caused the recipients to be worried about the conditions set by Mr Wild. The conditions are attached to the email in a document entitled “<i>General Letter to Adversaries</i>” and are accompanied by a report to the IOPC. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email makes a final offer on the basis of serious accusations raised by Mr Wild which are unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>

<p>75. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A and Person B on 22 January 2020</p> <p><i>"I have made my offer to support you. Given I will be living in London in the Autumn it is an opportunity for you to be mentored by me. You undoubtedly believe in the power of mentoring.....soon the police will have no option but to be involved. It is wise indeed to collaborate with me. This is not going away...."</i></p>	<p>The panel considered that the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A and Person B on 22 January 2020 was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel considered the evidence it heard from Person A in respect of concerns about Mr Wild following him or attending his home address. The panel noted that Mr Wild stated within the email "<i>I will be living in London in the Autumn it is an opportunity for you to be mentored by me.</i>" The panel noted Mr Wild went on to state "<i>It is wise indeed to collaborate with me. This is not going away</i>" The panel considered that this was an implied threat. The panel concluded that the content of the email was vexatious and would have caused Person A to be worried, particularly given his evidence on this issue. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email insists the Person A engage in mentoring on the basis of serious accusations raised by Mr Wild, which are unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>
<p>76. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C dated 22 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person C on 22 January 2020. The panel concluded that the email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted that Mr Wild stated, "<i>I have given you until the end of this month to respond to my document</i>" and "<i>You, [Private] are now very implicated in this whole sordid affair. You need to take responsibility for this mess and put it right.</i>" The panel considered the tone of the email to be threatening and noted Person C's evidence in respect of her considering that the emails sent by Mr Wild were intimidating. The panel considered that the content of the email was vexatious, aggressive and confrontational. The panel considered that the tone of the email would have caused Person C to be worried. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email insists Person C is implicated in respect of serious accusations raised by Mr Wild, which are both unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>

<p>77. Email sent by the Social Worker to CA, Person C, Person A, Person B and SK, dated 23 January 2020 link not part of material.</p>	<p>The panel noted that the email sent by Mr Wild to CA, Person C, Person A, Person B and SK includes a YouTube link. The panel were not provided with the link as part of the material. As such the panel considered that it had insufficient information to determine whether or not the email was or was not inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening. In the circumstances the panel determined that the email was not inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening.</p>
<p>78. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK and Person D dated 25 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to SK and Person D on 25 January 2020. The panel considered that the email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted the tone of the email was threatening. The panel noted the comment made by Mr Wild namely "<i>My question is this - are you brave enough to undertake a transparent and open investigation on these matters?</i>" The panel considered this confrontational and threatening given the history and circumstances of the matter, and the previous emails sent by Mr Wild. The panel noted that the subject of the email was in capitals and read "SEVERAL SENIOR MANAGERS ARE IMPLICATED IN BAD PRACTICE". The panel considered this inappropriate. The panel noted that these were serious accusations raised by Mr Wild, which were unevidenced and unsubstantiated. The panel considered the tone and content of the email was vexatious and considered that the recipients receiving the email would be worried about the accusations made by Mr Wild.</p>
<p>79. Email sent by the Social Worker to SK, Person A, Person C and CA on 25 January 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to SK, Person A, Person C and CA on 25 January 2020. The panel considered that the email was vexatious and inappropriate but not threatening. The email states, "<i>For those completely devoid of ethical standards.....</i>" and attaches an extract from the Committee on Standards in Public Life. The panel considered that this was vexatious in nature as it implies that those receiving the email do not have ethical standards which would cause annoyance, frustration or worry to those recipients. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the email seeks to question the ethical standards of the recipients on the basis of their knowledge or involvement in relation to accusations raised by Mr Wild which are both unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>

80. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C dated 10 February 2020	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person C on 10 February 2020. The panel considered the content of the email to be vexatious and inappropriate but not threatening. Mr Wild states “<i>It would now seem that you, as the head of Council 2 have to be associated with these highly corrupt people and ignoring my concerns is simply an example of service leads ‘riding out’ the storm. Things must change, and there must be examples of change</i>”. The panel considered that this was vexatious in nature as it accuses Person C of associating with corrupt people, which would cause annoyance, frustration or worry to her. Further, the panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, the makes strong accusations which are both unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>
81. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A, CA and Person C on 24 February 2020 link not part of material.	<p>The panel noted that the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A, CA and Person C includes a YouTube link. The panel were not provided with the link as part of the material. As such the panel considered that it had insufficient information to determine whether or not the email was or was not inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening. In the circumstances the panel determined that the email was not inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening.</p>
82. Email sent by the Social Worker to CA, SK, Person C and Person A on 24 February 2020	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to CA, SK, Person C and Person A on 24 February 2020. The panel considered that the email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted the tone of the email was threatening in that Mr Wild had attached a draft press release titled March 2020, suggesting that the release would be sent within 4 days. The email stated “<i>I contacted all [Private] in January 2020 to discuss historical abuse concerns and duplicity in high office. I have received nothing back from any of the [Private] over my offer to collaborate and support movement towards an open and transparent culture. This remains a genuine and serious offer of support to each respective service.</i>” The panel considered that the email suggested that the press release would be sent unless there was collaboration with Mr Wild. The panel considered given the nature and circumstances of the matter the email was threatening. The panel considered that the email was also vexatious in nature as it would have caused the recipient worry or concern that a press release would be sent in respect of Mr Wild’s unsubstantiated accusations. The panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same</p>

	reasons as other emails, as it relates to unevidenced and unsubstantiated accusations made by Mr Wild.
83. Document entitled "Press Release, March 2020 (attached to the Email sent by the Social Worker)	<p>The panel considered the document entitled “<i>Press Release</i>”, dated March 2020. The panel considered that the press release was both vexatious and inappropriate but not threatening. The panel considered that the press release was vexatious on the basis that it would have caused those named in the document worry, as their names would have been connected to a highly emotive subject and the press release stated that they were implicated in duplicity and a lack of transparency. The panel considered that the email was inappropriate for the same reasons as other emails, as it relates to unevidenced and unsubstantiated accusations made by Mr Wild.</p>
84. Email sent by the Social Worker on 16 June 2020	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person D on 16 June 2020. The panel considered that the email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The email attaches a web link to a Ted Talk on the subject of resilience and states, “<i>you are going to need this</i>” it further stated, “<i>why did you help (redacted) to write that letter about me possibly harassing him</i>” The panel considered that the email had a threatening tone and suggested that Person D would need to learn how to be resilient, when dealing with Mr Wild. The panel considered that the email was vexatious on the basis that it would have caused Person D concern and worry, as it contained an implied threat. The panel also considered that the tone of the email was inappropriate, as was Mr Wild’s questioning of Person D.</p>

<p>85. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A on 17 August 2020</p> <p><i>“do please contemplate how you are going to approach and unreserved apology. You have a ‘Misconduct in a Public Life’ concern and time is short for you. I have contacted you so many times with various offers. Do you really want me to come down to Council 4 and leaflet the public? Would you appreciate me seeking legal aid and sue you personally for defamation?”</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A on 17 August 2020. The panel considered that the email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The panel noted the phrase use by Mr Wild “<i>time is short for you</i>” The panel considered this to be extremely threatening. The panel also considered the rhetorical question posed by Mr Wild namely “<i>Do you really want me to come down to Council 4 and leaflet the public</i>”. The panel noted Person A’s evidence in respect of his concerns about Mr Wild potentially visiting his home address. The panel also noted the evidence of Person A in respect of Mr Wild having previously turned up at a conference in Manchester, where Person A was speaking, to hand out flyers. The panel considered the comments made by Mr Wild were threatening. The panel considered that the email was vexatious on the basis that it would have caused Person A concern and worry, and this was clear from Person A’s oral evidence in that he confirmed the actions of Mr Wild scared him. The panel also considered that the tone of the email was inappropriate, as Mr Wild was making serious accusations about Person A which were unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>
<p>86. Email sent by the Social Worker to MF (Social Work England), Person A, ES and RO on 22 September 2020</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to MF at Social Work England, which copied in Person A, ES and RO. The panel considered that this email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. Mr Wild copies Person A into his email to Social Work England and states “<i>there are clear concerns of Misconduct in Public Office and or / a case of perjury or libel against Person A. This could lead to a custodial sentence and is a very serious charge.</i>” The panel considered the tone of the email and the references to perjury and libel to be threatening towards Person A. Mr Wild would have been aware that Person A had raised a complaint against him, and the panel considered it alarming that he would think that it was appropriate to respond to the complaint by copying in Person A. The panel considered that the email was vexatious on the basis that it would have caused Person A concern and worry, given the accusation which were made within the email. The panel also considered that the email was inappropriate, as Mr Wild was again making serious accusations about Person A which were unevidenced and unsubstantiated.</p>

<p>87. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person A and CK on 9 October 2020</p> <p><i>“I do not feel Person A should necessary be sacked, but he does need moral guidance.....my conditions are set out below”</i></p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person A and CK on 9 October 2020. The panel considered that this email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. Mr Wild would have been aware at this stage that Person A had raised a complaint against him to HCPC/Social Work England. The email suggests that Person A needs “<i>moral guidance</i>” and raises the notion of him being sacked, albeit Mr Wild states he does not feel this necessary. Given the history and context of the matter the panel considered the email to be threatening. The panel considered that the email was vexatious on the basis that it would have caused Person A annoyance, frustration or worry, given the fact that Mr Wild is referring to him requiring “<i>moral guidance</i>”. The panel also considered that the email was inappropriate, as Mr Wild was continuing to make serious accusations about Person A which were unevidenced and unsubstantiated. The panel also noted that the email sets out the conditions previously raised by Mr Wild, which the panel have already concluded were inappropriate.</p>
<p>88. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C and JL on 18 March 2021</p>	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person C and JL on 18 March 2021 at 06.54am. The panel considered that this email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The email refers to Council 2’s “<i>dirty little secret</i>” and states “<i>It also seems a rather problematic issue that you yourself are now implicated in these somewhat outrageous child abuse issues (because to know these matters exist and to do nothing implicates people). I must presume that legal credentials to practice in this area are somewhat prone to hypocrisy.</i>” Having stated that Person C is implicated in matters the email continues “<i>I’m very happy to come to the table and discuss these matters, I have amassed a huge amount of information. My career was blighted by these matters, but I am happy to discuss mutually agreed conclusions that can lead to transparency and more effective practices and a settlement that reflects the harm caused.</i>” The panel considered that Mr Wild was seeking to threaten Person C into providing a settlement. The panel considered that this was highly inappropriate. The panel also concluded that the email was vexatious on the basis that it would have caused Person C worry, and indeed this was reflected in the evidence that she gave to the panel.</p>

89. Email sent by the Social Worker to Person C and JL on 18 March 2021	<p>The panel considered the email sent by Mr Wild to Person C and JL on 18 March 2021 at 11.17am. This email is entitled “offer to adversaries” and attached to the email is an email previously sent by Mr Wild which sets out his offer. Given the context and history of the case the panel considered that the email was threatening, vexatious and inappropriate. The email was sent after Person A had raised a complaint with HCPC/Social Work England and was sent in an attempt to seek a settlement from Council 2. The panel considered that the attachment included threatening language. The panel also had regard to its previous conclusion at paragraph 73, as the attachment replicated the offer which was set out within that document. In all the circumstances the panel found the email and attachment to be threatening, vexatious and inappropriate.</p>
--	--

147. Having made a determination in respect of each individual paragraph within Schedule A, the panel went on to consider whether the emails, documents and recordings within Schedule A were collectively, inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening. The panel considered that the emails, documents and recordings were collectively, inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening.

148. The panel noted that it had determined that a vast majority of the emails, documents and recordings within Schedule A were inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening. The panel considered that the emails and documents were cumulative and increased in their vexatious, inappropriate and/or threatening tone with the passage of time.

149. The panel concluded that the volume of emails amplified their inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening nature. The panel noted that Mr Wild made frequent and repetitious demands of Person A and various employees at Council 1, Council 2, Council 3, and Council 4. These demands escalated as matters progressed and led to Mr Wild eventually requesting compensation and expenses for the use of his professional services.

150. The panel considered that the emails, documents and recordings sent by Mr Wild were sent against the backdrop of a number of independent investigations being instigated into Mr Wild’s claims, which either resulted in no action being taken or no wrongdoing found. The panel concluded that Mr Wild’s correspondence were repetitive in respect of the issues which they raised, and the panel noted that none of the serious accusations raised by Mr Wild about Person A or the various employees of Council 1, Council 2, Council 3, and Council 4 were substantiated by evidence.

151. Having considered all of the evidence the panel determined that allegation 1 was proved.

Allegation 2

2. On 8 July 2015, you attended an Association 1 conference held at The Midland Hotel, Manchester and posed as a journalist and engaged in inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening behaviour, which cause Person A to fear for their safety.

152. The panel carefully reviewed the evidence of Person A in respect of Mr Wild's attendance at Association 1's conference held at The Midland Hotel.

153. The panel noted that Mr Wild did not dispute attending the Midland Hotel in order to distribute leaflets on the day of the Association 1's conference. Mr Wild also set out within his response to the allegations on 8 November 2019 that he posed as a Sunday Times Journalist. Mr Wild however disputes that he engaged in inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening behaviour.

154. The panel considered the leaflet provided by Mr Wild which he acknowledged was created and handed out by him at the Association 1 conference. Within the leaflet Person A is named. The leaflet also states there were previous failures by Person A to *"deal effectively with the Area 2 child sexual abuse scandal"*. Mr Wild states within the leaflet *"Person A is unfit to work in child protection and as a matter of some urgency he should step down"*.

155. The panel first considered whether the actions of Mr Wild amounted to inappropriate, vexatious and/or threatening behaviour. The panel considered its previous findings in respect of the accusations made against Person A and their unsubstantiated and unevidenced nature. The panel considered the actions of Mr Wild creating and distributing the leaflet were both inappropriate and vexatious.

156. With respect to whether or not the actions of Mr Wild were threatening the panel noted the oral evidence of Person A in which he expressed that on the day of the conference he was concerned about his physical safety. While the panel noted that Mr Wild did not approach Person A directly, the panel considered the evidence of Person A that Mr Wild attached himself to a group of people who were angry about failures in respect of the handling of historic abuse allegations. Person A recalled that Mr Wild's actions gave the group his name and a person to target their anger at.

157. The panel considered that Person A was justified in fearing for his safety, and this was reflected in the fact that event organisers ushered him through the back of the conference under a sheet. The panel considered the evidence of Person A that the actions of Mr Wild caused him fear and anxiety.

158. Person A noted in his evidence that Mr Wild had lied about being a journalist in order to gain entry into the conference foyer, and he described Mr Wild's actions as sinister. He stated within his witness statement the following "*When I found out Jim Wild was at the conference I was really upset. Each attempt was really upsetting when you are the victim of a barrage of the types of attempts. I was always feeling upset and angry. I felt very intimidated that he might have a gun given his apparent obsession with seeing my downfall and the assassinations of public figures at the hands of people intent on hurting them. I also felt vulnerable as I did not know who was reading the flyer or indeed his Internet postings which have now taken down. I had to explain myself many times to various people as every single employer I have had Jim Wild has written to. I have had to provide evidence to my employers and replay the story and ensure that my good character remains intact.*"

159. Having reviewed all the evidence in respect of the events which occurred at the Midland Hotel, the panel considered that the actions of Mr Wild did amount to threatening behaviour. The panel acknowledged the fear that the actions had caused Person A. The panel noted that Mr Wild had taken significant steps to create and print vexatious material about Person A; he had travelled specifically to the conference and had then attached himself to a group of people, who were already angry about historic abuse allegations. The panel then considered that while at the conference Mr Wild had lied to gain entry to the foyer of the conference in order to continue to distribute his material about Person A. The panel considered that these actions were deliberate on the part of Mr Wild and were intended to cause Person A distress.

160. In all the circumstances the panel therefore found paragraph 2 of the allegation proved.

Allegation 3

3. *On a date unknown between January 2016 to July 2017, you sent an unsolicited DVD to senior employees of Council 1, which was threatening in nature.*

161. The panel reviewed the DVD produced by Mr Wild with care. The panel noted that Mr Wild did not dispute creating or sending the DVD and indeed the panel observed Mr Wild in the recording.

162. The panel heard evidence that the DVD was received by senior employees of Council 1 and there is no dispute that the DVD was unsolicited.

163. The panel therefore went on to consider whether the DVD was threatening in nature. The panel considered that the DVD was threatening in nature, the behaviour of Mr

Wild was deliberately hostile, and it was clear from the evidence of Person A that the DVD caused him and his wife significant fear.

164. Within the DVD Mr Wild states that he is “*very angry*”. He states as follows;

“I have about 20 people round the country who know all about this and you didn’t know that I have been surreptitiously leaving messages when you haven’t been looking on the cameras, and things like that....well you’re going to have to contact me and say Mr Wild will meet you next week and I’ll call off my meeting with Channel 4. Well, I’m walking into Channel 4 tomorrow. I’m being completely transparent on this. Several people know this, several people know that if I end up having an accident or arrest or something like that, there’s going to be a surge of survivors around Area 1 ... like the .. it’s going to be unbelievable there’s going to be thousands of survivors surrounding Area 1, kicking off, and DM, your career is going to be over, and Person A, you’re probably going to go to prison or something, so let’s do it well, because I know there are good people in Area 1 trying to do great work, and you know that as well, and I don’t know whether DM and the Chief Executive, or Person A, are good people, I have no idea. let’s make Area 1 real, because Area 1 at the moment is shite and we all know that don’t we, you know, JS is being harassed. It’s awful, and we have information about you lot, because if this is being filmed , and /or if I’m being bugged, you need to know that we’ve been doing things like that with our networks, and click of a switch, about 20 people around the country, about half of them you don’t know anything about, are going to be alerted about this, and that’s going onto social network sites and before you know it there’s going to be a fucking riot in Area 1, so we need to talk to do a dignified ending and a departure for me for my career. You need to contact me and you need to talk to me and we need to meet. I will call off my meeting with Channel 4 News, or the BBC, I am travelling up to London tomorrow and a lot of people know about it, and if I don’t make it there, there’s going to be a chain reaction of the like that Grenfell Towers will seem like a little party. You need to contact me and you need to pass this to your solicitors, and we need to come up with some transparent deal.”

165. The panel considered Mr Wild’s references to there being “*thousands of survivors surrounding Area 1, kicking off*” and Person A “*going to go to prison or something*”. The panel noted that the tone of these comments was threatening.

166. The panel noted that Mr Wild made the following comment “*.....let’s make Area 1 real, because Area 1 at the moment is shite and we all know that don’t we, you know, JS is being harassed. It’s awful, and we have information about you lot, because if this is being filmed , and /or if I’m being bugged, you need to know that we’ve been doing things like that with our networks, and click of a switch, about 20 people around the country, about half of them you don’t know anything about, are going to be alerted about this, and that’s going onto social network sites and before you know it there’s*

going to be a fucking riot in Area 1, so we need to talk to do a dignified ending and a departure for me for my career.”

167. The panel considered that these words caused Person A a significant amount of fear and as set out within his witness statement he was very intimidated at the notion that there were 20 people watching him.
168. The panel reviewed the evidence within Person A’s witness statement in respect of the DVD in which he states *“The thing that disturbed me about this particular transcript is that Jim Wild made reference to Grenfell. DM used to be Chief Executive of Council 6. It is disturbing that he is likening to what he feels happened in Area 2 to what happened in Grenfell. This is calculated and sinister in my view.”*
169. The panel considered that Mr Wild’s words *“there’s going to be a chain reaction of the like that Grenfell Towers will seem like a little party”* were extremely threatening and alarming given the nature and scale of that particular tragedy, and the number of lives that were lost.
170. In all the circumstances the panel concluded that the unsolicited DVD sent by Mr Wild was threatening in nature.
171. The panel therefore found paragraph 3 of the allegation proved.

Resumed hearing 7 October 2024

Service of Notice:

172. Mr Wild did not attend this resumed hearing and was not represented. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) was informed by Ms Bucklow that notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Wild by electronic mail to his address on the Social Work England Register (the Register). Ms Bucklow noted the various correspondence sent by Mr Wild to Social Work England in the lead up to the hearing including an email sent today. She submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
173. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final hearing service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of hearing dated 12 August 2024 and addressed to Mr Wild at his email address as it appears on the Social Work England Register;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register detailing Mr Wild’s registered email address as of 21 August 2024;
 - A copy of a signed Statement of Service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 12 August 2024 the writer sent by electronic mail to Mr Wild at the address referred to above: Notice of Hearing and related documents;
 - Correspondence between Social Work England and Mr Wild regarding the hearing between 12 August 2024 and 07 October 2024.

174. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
175. Having had regard to Rule 14-15 and 44-46 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (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 Mr Wild in accordance with Rules.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

176. The panel heard the submissions of Ms Bucklow on behalf of Social Work England. Ms Bucklow submitted that notice of this hearing had been served upon Mr Wild and he had indicated in an email today as follows "*On reflection, I have nothing to contribute to the hearings today*". Ms Bucklow noted that Mr Wild had not applied to adjourn the hearing and as such there was no guarantee that adjourning today's proceedings would secure his attendance. She noted the history of the case and submitted that an adjournment would not be expedient. Ms Bucklow reminded the panel that Mr Wild had indicated in his final correspondence that he did not wish to contribute and that he had previously had a history of non-attendance, as such she submitted that there was no guarantee that adjourning today's proceedings would secure Mr Wild's attendance. Ms Bucklow submitted that Mr Wild was deliberately absent. She therefore invited the panel to proceed in the interests of justice and the expeditious disposal of this hearing.
177. 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*. The panel also took into account Social Work England guidance 'Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker'.
178. The panel considered all of the information before it, together with the submissions made by Ms Bucklow on behalf of Social Work England.
179. The panel noted the correspondence between Mr Wild and Social Work England and had regard to Mr Wild's latest email (dated 07 October 2024) which stated, "*On reflection, I have nothing to contribute to the hearings today*". The panel noted that it was clear from the correspondence between Social Work England and Mr Wild that he was aware of today's hearing. The panel also noted that Mr Wild had sent written submissions including his comments on the hearing process. The panel took into consideration its previous decision that service of notice had been properly sent.
180. The panel determined that Mr Wild had voluntarily absented himself from today's hearing. The panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in Mr Wild's attendance. Having weighed the interests of Mr Wild in regard to his 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 Mr Wild's absence.

Summary Submissions–Grounds and Impairment:

181. The panel took into account the previous submissions made by Ms Bucklow. These were set out in full within a transcript provided to the panel. By way of summary Ms Bucklow submitted that the facts found proved amounted to misconduct. She submitted that Mr Wild's actions breached 2.7 and 9.1 of the HCPC standards of conduct, performance, ethics and proficiency, namely "*You must use all forms of communication appropriately and responsibly including social media and networking websites*", and "*You must make sure that your conduct justifies the public's trust and confidence in you and your profession*". Ms Bucklow submitted that Mr Wild's conduct also breached The Social Work England Professional Standards 2019, particularly 5.2, which states, "You must not behave in a way that would bring into question your suitability to work as a social worker while at work or outside of work".

182. In respect of impairment Ms Bucklow emphasised the overriding objective and submitted that protection of the public includes the risk to colleagues and other members of the profession. Ms Bucklow submitted that Mr Wild poses a risk to his professional colleagues and those relying on the services of his professional colleagues. She stated the nature and quantity of emails sent by Mr Wild could be considered "intimidating and threatening" to the recipient, and she submitted that this has "implications for their wellbeing and their sense of safety in the workplace." Ms Bucklow submitted that there was a "direct risk to professional colleagues but also an indirect risk to service users and the wider public who may suffer from the consequences of (Mr Wild's) actions."

183. Ms Bucklow submitted members of the public fully appraised of the facts of this case would be extremely concerned about the social worker having unrestricted registration. She noted members of the public would consider that it was inappropriate for the social worker to "pursue completely unfounded allegations of this nature" in the manner that Mr Wild has. Ms Bucklow addressed the panel in respect of the test set by Dame Janet Smith in the 5th Shipman Report and submitted that limbs (a)-(c) were engaged. Ms Bucklow submitted that Mr Wild has demonstrated no insight. Ms Bucklow submitted "*the closest (Mr Wild) has ever come to any insight is accepting that his conduct has become unorthodox but, again, he then goes on to say that it is necessary, and he believes it's a legitimate course of action*". Ms Bucklow submitted that what Mr Wild has done is to "*harass these professionals under the guise of whistleblowing*".

184. Ms Bucklow submitted that there was no remediation demonstrated by Mr Wild in this case and as such the risk of repetition was high. Ms Bucklow submitted a finding of impairment is necessary to uphold public confidence in the profession but also to promote and maintain proper professional standards for social workers.

185. The panel took into consideration all of the documentation provided by Mr Wild in respect of this case including an email sent on 07 October 2024, the day of the hearing, which stated as follows;

“As you may know, I refused to play a part in this hearing for a few years now, I am no longer a social worker, I do not describe myself as a social worker, I am a community activist. There are many reasons for not participating in this fiasco. These will no doubt become evident as time progresses. I think it would seem necessary for the panel to obtain information on when I was last a registered social worker. The fact that Social Work England have no information on my registration history and to my knowledge I have not paid subscriptions for at least the period of time I have been adjudicated against, would lead me to the assumption that any conclusions this tribunal reaches has no jurisdiction over me.

I have also stated that I'm not a social worker and refused to be involved with such a pernicious organisation that scapegoats former social workers over their assertions that there have been historical abuse concerns and there have been covered ups and duplicity - not only that, but those individuals who there is major concern about in relation to children and young people have been promoted to a prestigious post (quality protects: associated with Sir William Uttings report, 1997, PEOPKE LIKE US) and that senior staff knew that Person E was, Person A's words: "a risk around children and young people".

It is lamentable that social work has actually become a hunting ground to scapegoat social workers who attempt to raise concerns about abuse in the looked after system and historical abuse.

The tribunal can scrutinise my communications for years and obtain masses of information that would lead them to the assumption that I had broken some sort of code of conduct. However, taken in the context of my original attempts to raise concerns in 1997, we would hope and expect that the tribunal could understand that an ethical worker would feel somewhat frustrated with a system that is lacking in transparency and openness and that there is widespread collusion between agencies to subvert good intentions. If the panel were to look historically at these issues they would realise that.”

Finding and reasons on grounds:

186. The panel considered all the evidence and the submissions. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser and was aware that:

- a. The overriding objective of Social Work England is to protect the public, which includes maintaining public confidence in social workers and maintaining professional standards of social workers.
- b. Whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct is a matter for the panel's independent judgement.
- c. There is no statutory definition of misconduct, but the panel had regard to the guidance given in *Roylance v GMC (No2) [2001] 1 AC 311*:

"Misconduct is a word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances. The standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a... practitioner in the particular circumstances".
- d. The conduct must be serious and fall well below the required standards.
- e. A social worker's conduct should be considered in the light of any standards of conduct, performance and ethics or other fitness to practise requirements that were applicable to the social worker at the time of the alleged misconduct.
- f. The test for impairment set out by the court in *Council for Health and Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin)* was whether the panel's findings in respect of the practitioner's competence and capability show that the practitioner's fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that they have in the past and/or are liable in the future (a) to put service users at unwarranted risk of harm; (b) to bring the profession into disrepute; (c) to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the profession; (d) to act dishonestly and/or be liable to act dishonestly in the future.
- g. At the impairment stage the tribunal should take account of evidence and submissions that the conduct (i) is easily remediable, (ii) has already been remedied; and (iii) is highly unlikely to be repeated.
- h. The panel should also consider whether Mr Wild's fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that a finding of impairment is required to maintain public confidence or proper professional standards.

187. The panel considered that the proved facts of the allegation amounted to serious breaches of the following HCPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics (2016) :

2.7 - You must use all forms of communication appropriately and responsibly, including social media and networking websites.

9.1- You must make sure that your conduct justifies the public's trust and confidence in you and your profession.

188. The panel also considered that the proved facts of the allegation amounted to a serious breach of the Social Work England Professional Standards 2019:

As a social worker, I will not:

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

5.6 - Use technology, social media or other forms of electronic communication unlawfully, unethically, or in a way that brings the profession into disrepute.

189. The panel acknowledged that Mr Wild's breaches of the above standards occurred in circumstances where he perceived that he was whistle blowing in respect of perceived abuses. However, the panel considered its previous finding that Mr Wild's actions occurred against the backdrop of a number of independent investigations, which either resulted in no action being taken or no wrongdoing found. The panel noted its previous finding that none of the serious accusations raised by Mr Wild about Person A or the various employees of Council 1, Council 2, Council 3 and Council 4 were substantiated by evidence. In this respect, the panel determined that the above breaches amounted to serious misconduct.

190. The panel concluded that Mr Wild failed to conduct himself in a manner that would justify the public's trust and confidence in the social work profession. Mr Wild's actions caused Person A and his wife notable fear and emotional distress. The panel noted its previous finding in respect of Allegation 2 that the actions of Mr Wild were deliberate and were intended to cause Person A distress. Further, in respect of Allegation 3 Mr Wild used the words "*there's going to be a chain reaction of the like that Grenfell Towers will seem like a little party*". The panel considered this to be extremely threatening and alarming.

191. The panel considered that the actions of Mr Wild were not isolated in nature but amounted to a pattern of repeated failures to communicate appropriately across all three allegations and a systematic campaign of vexatious and threatening behaviour towards Person A and others.

192. The panel noted that threatening behaviour of any kind is very serious, and the panel was satisfied that members of the public and profession would be very concerned at Mr Wild's behaviour, particularly given the panel's finding in respect of Person A feeling intimidated and fearful.

193. The panel considered that Mr Wild's actions would breach the public's trust and confidence in the social work profession. The panel therefore determined that the

proved facts represented a significant failure to adhere to the standards expected of a social worker and amounted to serious misconduct.

194. The panel considered that the facts found proved (paragraphs 1-3) demonstrated that Mr Wild's actions fell far below what is expected by fellow practitioners and the panel therefore concluded that individually and cumulatively, they amount to misconduct.

Finding and reasons on current impairment:

195. Having determined that the proved facts amount to misconduct, the panel considered whether Mr Wild's fitness to practise is currently impaired. When considering the question of impairment, the panel took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.

196. The panel had regard to the questions posed by Dame Janet Smith in her fifth Shipman report endorsed in the case of Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 Admin. In light of its findings on misconduct the panel concluded that Mr Wild had, in the past:

- a. acted so as to put a member of the public at unwarranted risk of harm;
- b. brought the profession of social work into disrepute;
- c. breached fundamental tenets of the social work profession (in relation to safeguarding the vulnerable);
- d. ...

197. The panel considered that Mr Wild's conduct was very difficult, but not impossible, to remediate. The panel considered that Mr Wild's actions demonstrated a deep-seated attitudinal concern. There has been limited engagement from Mr Wild in the current hearing, and he has failed to demonstrate any meaningful insight in respect of the allegations found proved. Mr Wild in his undated witness statement, offered an apology in these terms "*I accept that after 25 years of pursuing this matter, my patience was a little in short supply and some of my language was at times, robust and intemperate and for that I apologise*". This does not address the gravity of the allegations found proved and fails to acknowledge the impact of his repeated behaviour towards others.

198. The panel concluded that Mr Wild has not evidenced remediation, for example in his efforts to address the cause of his pattern of inappropriate, vexatious and threatening communications.

199. The panel has no information regarding what, if any, work Mr Wild is undertaking currently and within his correspondence Mr Wild has been very clear about his intentions not to return to the social work profession.
200. The panel noted Mr Wild has provided no evidence of meaningful insight. The panel observed that within his representations Mr Wild has focused upon the impact of the proceedings upon himself, as opposed to others, and has not developed insight into the concerns found proved or their impact upon his colleagues within the profession.
201. Mr Wild has not expressed meaningful remorse or regret, particularly in respect of the findings in relation to Person A. He has not sought to show that he has reflected on his conduct or its impact on other professionals, or the social work profession as a whole.
202. The panel therefore considered that Mr Wild has not demonstrated remediation or meaningful insight. The panel considered that Mr Wild has had ample opportunity to provide such evidence within either his written responses or during the hearing.
203. Mr Wild's conduct caused Person A to be intimidated and fearful. His misconduct therefore relates to failings in a core obligation as a social worker, namely treating people in such a way that promotes respect, dignity and maintains professional integrity. The panel considered that Mr Wild's repeated pattern of threatening and vexatious communications breached a fundamental tenet of the profession. Due to these findings, together with an absence of evidenced remediation or insight, the panel concluded that there was a high risk of repetition of the misconduct.
204. The panel was satisfied that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to protect the public.
205. Further, as regards to the public impairment element, the panel considered that reasonable, well informed, members of the public would be shocked about Mr Wild's inappropriate, vexatious and threatening conduct.
206. Given that Mr Wild's misconduct relates to breaches of fundamental tenets of social work, the panel was satisfied that professional standards would not be promoted and maintained by a finding that Mr Wild's fitness to practise is not currently impaired, particularly considering the panel's assessment of him demonstrating no insight and there being an absence of remediation.
207. The panel therefore concluded that, because of Mr Wild's misconduct, a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to protect the public, promote and maintain public confidence in the social work profession and declare and uphold proper professional standards.

Summary Submissions–Sanction

208. Ms Bucklow submitted that the appropriate sanction was a Removal Order.
209. Ms Bucklow submitted that Mr Wild’s conduct represented a significant departure from the standards expected of a social worker. She noted that the behaviour of Mr Wild was threatening and referred to Mr Wild attempting to seek personal gain from his conduct through his comments in respect of compensation. He also mentioned making threats of police involvement. Ms Bucklow submitted that Mr Wild was seeking a personal platform and there was no evidence that any abuse survivors were actually involved with his activities.
210. Ms Bucklow submitted that all three limbs of the over-arching objective were engaged in this case. Ms Bucklow noted that Mr Wild’s conduct was intimidating and threatening to the recipients. She submitted that Mr Wild made reference to his “adversaries” in respect of individuals who disagreed with his conduct. Ms Bucklow noted that other social workers or other professionals that come into contact with Mr Wild should not be put in a position where they themselves are prevented from exercising their professional judgement or taking a particular course of action due to a fear of reprisal from the social worker. Ms Bucklow therefore submitted that Mr Wild’s conduct represented a risk to both the public and professional colleagues.
211. Ms Bucklow noted that Mr Wild has not worked as a social worker for a significant period of time, and noted there was no evidence before the panel in respect of his skill level. She noted the repeated pattern of behaviour demonstrated by Mr Wild and referred the panel to the content of the DVD recording made by Mr Wild.
212. In respect of aggravating factors, Ms Bucklow noted that the course of conduct pursued by Mr Wild occurred over a six-year period. She submitted that Mr Wild disengaged with the regulatory process when he became aware that it was not a forum in which he could raise his own concerns. Ms Bucklow referred to Mr Wild’s lack of insight in respect of the impact that the proceedings would have had on Person A and in respect of the allegations as a whole. She continued that the closest Mr Wild got to demonstrating insight was acceptance of his “*unorthodox*” behaviour, however he indicated this was necessary and legitimised his actions. Ms Bucklow linked Mr Wild’s lack of insight with a high risk of repetition of the behaviours. Ms Bucklow noted that there was no evidence of remediation and that the concerns demonstrated a behavioural concern on the part of Mr Wild.
213. Ms Bucklow submitted that a removal order was the suitable order to protect the public in light of the concerns in this case. She submitted that taking no action, providing advice or issuing a warning would not adequately protect the public or maintain public confidence in the profession given the panel’s findings. In respect of

conditions of practice Ms Bucklow referred to the fact that Mr Wild was not working as a social worker and has no intentions to do so. Ms Bucklow noted that there would be no workable conditions which could be formulated to adequately protect the public given the nature of the concerns. In respect of a suspension, Ms Bucklow noted Mr Wild's lack of insight and his disengagement with the regulator; consequently, she stated that there was no evidence of a willingness on Mr Wild's part to resolve matters.

214. Ms Bucklow noted public confidence in the regulator required Mr Wild to be removed from the register. She submitted that his conduct was fundamentally incompatible with registration. She asserted that public confidence would be undermined if a lesser sanction were imposed.
215. Ms Bucklow was asked to confirm whether Mr Wild had any previous regulatory findings, and she confirmed that he did not.

Determination and reasons – Sanction

216. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser, that it must again pursue the overarching objective when exercising its functions. The panel must apply the principle of proportionality, balancing Mr Wild's interests with the public interest. The purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive but is to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and its regulator and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel were advised to consider any aggravating and mitigating factors. The panel noted that it must consider each available sanction in ascending order of severity. The panel had regard to the Social Work England Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, published in December 2022, together with its determination of grounds and impairment.
217. The panel reminded itself that it had concluded that Mr Wild's fitness to practise was found to be currently impaired, due to his misconduct.
218. In respect of the aggravating features of this case, the panel noted that Mr Wild's conduct presented a repeated pattern of inappropriate, vexatious and threatening behaviours, which were significant in duration, spanned a six-year period and were directed towards numerous individuals at various local authorities. The panel further noted that Person A had suffered fear and distress as a result of Mr Wild's conduct, which has had a significant impact on both him and his family.
219. The panel considered its findings in respect of Mr Wild's lack of meaningful insight and the absence of remediation or remorse. Further, the panel found an aggravating feature of the case was that Mr Wild demonstrated a disregard for the regulatory process in his latest communications referring to the proceedings as a “fiasco”.

220. In relation to mitigating features, the panel noted that Mr Wild had an absence of previous fitness to practise history. The panel also took account of Mr Wild's personal testimonials.

221. The panel considered that taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not adequately reflect the serious nature of Mr Wild's misconduct. These outcomes would not adequately protect the public, as they would not restrict Mr Wild's practice. The panel has assessed there to be a high risk of repetition, and so considered that the public could not currently be adequately protected unless Mr Wild's practice is restricted. Further, taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not maintain public confidence in the profession or promote proper professional standards, considering the panel's finding that Mr Wild breached several professional standards and caused fear and distress to Person A.

222. The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be sufficient to protect the public and wider public interest. The panel, however, noted paragraph 114 of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, which states:

114. Conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where (all of the following):

- *the social worker has demonstrated insight*
- *the failure or deficiency in practice is capable of being remedied*
- *appropriate, proportionate, and workable conditions can be put in place*
- *decision makers are confident the social worker can and will comply with the conditions*
- *the social worker does not pose a risk of harm to the public by being in restricted practice*

223. The panel noted its findings in relation to insight and determined that it could not be confident that Mr Wild could or would comply with any conditions imposed. The panel noted that Mr Wild has not worked as a social worker for a significant period of time and has been clear that he does not wish to return to the profession. The panel was satisfied that workable conditions could not be formulated to adequately protect the public given Mr Wild's deep-seated attitudinal shortcomings. Further, considering the seriousness of the misconduct, the panel was satisfied that conditions would not be sufficient to maintain public confidence, or to promote proper professional standards.

224. The panel went on to consider making a suspension order. The panel considered paragraphs 137-138 of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, which state as follows:

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

- *the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards*
- *the social worker has demonstrated some insight*
- *there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate their failings*

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

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

225. The panel considered that the facts proved involved serious breaches of the professional standards, as set out in its earlier findings.
226. The panel has found that there was no meaningful insight demonstrated by Mr Wild into his misconduct. Mr Wild’s conduct resulted in fear and distress being caused to Person A and led to a significant number of professionals being subjected to inappropriate, vexatious and threatening communications. Mr Wild has however failed to accept or acknowledge the impact of his conduct or demonstrate any meaningful remorse. Mr Wild has also failed to demonstrate any insight or remorse into the adverse impact that his actions may have had on the social work profession or the public perception thereof.
227. Further, the panel have seen no evidence of an intention on the part of Mr Wild to take any steps to resolve or remediate his conduct.
228. The panel considered paragraph 148 of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, which states:

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

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

229. The panel considered that Mr Wild’s misconduct has had a significant impact on Person A, causing fear and distress. Mr Wild’s misconduct involved a systematic campaign, over a prolonged period, of inappropriate, vexatious and threatening

behaviour towards Person A and many other professionals. The panel concluded that such misconduct raises serious concerns about Mr Wild's suitability as a social worker.

230. The panel noted its conclusions about Mr Wild's lack of meaningful insight, remorse or attempts to remediate. The panel concluded that Mr Wild's repeated pattern of inappropriate, vexatious and threatening behaviour was fundamentally incompatible with registration and, on the information before the panel, was behaviour which was highly unlikely to be resolved or remediated.
231. The panel recognised the impact a removal order would have on Mr Wild and took this into account. However, it considered the public interest outweighed Mr Wild's interests. The panel therefore concluded that the only sanction which achieved the aim of public protection on all three limbs was a removal order, with no lesser sanction being sufficient or proportionate.

Interim Order

232. In light of its findings on sanction, the panel next considered an application by Ms Bucklow for an Interim Suspension Order to cover the appeal period before the final order becomes effective.
233. Ms Bucklow submitted that, in view of the panel having made a removal order, an interim order would be appropriate to protect the public and the wider public interest. She submitted that an interim order was necessary because the panel had directed the removal of Mr Wild's name from the register, and in the event that there might be an appeal. Ms Bucklow submitted that the interim order should be imposed for 18 months.
234. The panel was advised that it had power to make any interim order if it considered this necessary to protect the public, or in the best interests of the social worker. The panel was mindful of its earlier findings. The panel decided that it would be wholly incompatible with those earlier findings to not protect the public with an interim order to cover the appeal period, or the period until any appeal is resolved.
235. The panel was mindful that it could make any interim order. It considered that, in light of its findings, it was necessary to make an Interim Suspension Order. Since any appeal, if made, might take a long time to resolve, the panel decided to make the Interim Suspension Order for 18 months.
236. Accordingly, the panel concluded that an Interim Suspension Order is necessary for the protection of the public. When the appeal period expires, this interim order will come to an end unless an appeal has been filed with the High Court. If there is no

appeal, the final order of a removal order shall take effect when the appeal period expires.

Right of appeal

237. Under Paragraph 16(1)(a) of Schedule 2 of the regulations, the social worker may appeal to the High Court against the decision of adjudicators:

- 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.

238. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of the regulations 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.

239. Under Regulation 9(4) of the regulations this order may not be recorded until the expiry of the period within which an appeal against the order could be made, or where an appeal against the order has been made, before the appeal is withdrawn or otherwise finally disposed of.

240. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

241. Under Paragraph 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of the regulations:

- 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), and a final order does not have effect until after the expiry of that period

242. Under Rule 16(aa) of the rules 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:

243. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a final 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>.