

Social worker: Gurcharan
Dhaliwal
Registration number: SW24728
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review meeting

Date of meeting: 01 November 2024

meeting venue: Remote meeting

Final order being reviewed:

Suspension Order– (expiring 13 December 2024)

Hearing Outcome:

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

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 24 months by a panel of adjudicators on 10 November 2022.
2. Mr Dhaliwal did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Capsticks LLP and their written submissions are set out within the notice of hearing letter.

Adjudicators	Role
Linda Owen	Chair
Pervez Akhtar	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Wallis Crump	Hearings officer
Andrew Brown	Hearings support officer
Charlotte Mitchell-Dunn	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. Mr Dhaliwal did not attend and was not represented. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) was informed that notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Dhaliwal by next day special delivery to an address provided by Mr Dhaliwal (namely his registered address as it appears on the Social Work England Register).
5. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 26 September 2024 and addressed to Mr Dhaliwal at the postal address which he provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as at 26 September 2024 detailing Mr Dhaliwal’s registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 26 September 2024 the notice was sent via next day special delivery to an address held by Social Work England for Mr Dhaliwal;

- A copy of a Royal Mail track and trace proof of delivery, confirming that the documents were signed for at 13:53 on 27 September 2024 ;

6. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
7. Having had regard to 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 Dhaliwal in accordance with Rules 16, 44 and 45 of Social Work England (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2019 (as amended) (the “Rules”).

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker and as a meeting:

8. The notice of the final order review hearing informed Mr Dhaliwal that the review would take place electronically. The notice stated:

“If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm on 11 October 2024. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you do not want to attend a hearing and Social Work England may decide to deal with the review as a meeting. If Social Work England do hold a meeting, the adjudicators will be provided with a copy of this letter setting out Social Work England’s submissions and a copy of any written submissions you provide.”

9. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) which provides:

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

10. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when deciding whether it was fair and appropriate to conduct the final order review in Mr Dhaliwal’s absence. This included reference to the cases of *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162* and *Sansui v General Medical Council [2019] EWCA Civ 1172*. The panel also took into account Social Work England’s guidance: ‘Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker’.
11. The panel considered all of the information before it. The panel noted that no application had been made by Mr Dhaliwal for an adjournment. The panel considered its findings in respect of service and noted that Mr Dhaliwal should have been aware of today’s hearing.
12. The panel considered Mr Dhaliwal had not engaged with Social Work England for a substantial period of time and has not provided any information in respect of this review.
13. The panel was of the view that there was a strong public interest in the expeditious disposal of the review. Having carefully balanced Mr Dhaliwal’s interests and the public interest, the panel decided that it was fair and appropriate to proceed in Mr Dhaliwal’s absence.

14. In all the circumstances, the panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(c).

Review of the current order

15. This final order review hearing is taking place under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).
16. The current order is due to expire at the end of 13 December 2024.

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

"During the course of your employment as a Social Worker with Coventry County Council, you:

1) In or around July 2015, did not adequately complete and/or record a review for Service User 1.

2) In the case of Service User 2:

a. on or about 20 March 2017, did not ensure that an SG1 safeguarding form was created;

b. did not adequately complete safeguarding forms;

c. on or about 26 October 2017:

i. did not discuss a new safeguarding referral with your line manager;

ii. did not complete an SG2 safeguarding form adequately or at all;

iii. did not conduct a strategy discussion and/or document such a discussion;

iv. did not make an adequate record around risk management.

3) In the case of Service User 3:

a. did not complete and/or record a support plan in a timely manner following a CTR meeting on 15 May 2017;

b. in or around June 2017, did not adequately record;

i. reduction in health funding;

ii. adjusted level of support;

c. on or about 19 February 2018, did not complete and/or record an adequate case transfer summary.

4) In the case of Service User 4:

- a. did not complete and/ or record needs and/ or wellbeing assessment in a timely manner following allocation in May 2017;*
- b. did not obtain and/or record adequate legal advice by 13 October 2017 as requested;*
- c. did not act on legal advice provided and/or record your actions;*
- d. on or about 20 December 2017, completed a case transfer summary prior to completing a needs and wellbeing assessment and/or support plan;*
- e. did not complete and/ or record the following in a timely manner:*
 - i. needs and wellbeing assessment;*
 - ii. support plan.*

5) Did not progress safeguarding concerns in a timely manner for Service User 5 following allocation on 22 September 2017.

6) In the case of Service User 6, in or about July 2017 did not:

- a. progress the case to panel to obtain authority for funding in a timely manner;*
- b. complete and/or record a needs and wellbeing assessment;*
- c. adequately complete and/or record a support plan.*

7) In the case of Service User 7, in or about December 2017, did not:

- a. conduct and/or record a contact assessment in a timely manner;*
- b. record any next steps.*

8) In the case of Service User 8:

- a. did not make contact with the service user in a timely manner following a safeguarding referral;*
- b. on or about 3 November 2017:*
 - i. allowed the alleged perpetrator of harm to be present at a home visit to the service user;*
 - ii. did not make an adequate record around the outcome of the home visit;*
- c. did not complete a SG1 safeguarding form in a timely manner and/or adequately;*
- d. in or around August 2017, did not complete and/ or record a contact assessment.*

9) In respect of Service User 9, did not complete an SG4 safeguarding form/investigator's report.

10) In the case of Service User 10:

- a. on or about 11 January 2018, did not adequately complete and/ or record an assessment;*

b. on or about 18 January 2018, did not send correspondence about Service User 10 as requested.

11) In the case of Service User 11, in about July 2017, did not adequately complete and/or record a:

a. needs and wellbeing assessment;

b. support plan;

c. case transfer summary;

12) In or around July 2017, did not complete and/or record a support plan for Service User 12.

13) In the case of Service User 13:

a. on or around 8 June 2018, did not complete and/or record an adequate Continuing Health Care review;

b. did not complete and/or record a support plan:

i. in a timely manner;

ii. adequately.

14) In the case of Service User 14:

a. on or about 18 July 2016, did not adequately complete a review record;

15) In the case of Service User 15:

a. did not complete and/or record a review in a timely manner;

b. on or about 15 February 2018, did not complete and/or record:

i. a support plan;

ii. an adequate needs and wellbeing assessment.

16) In the case of Service User 16, did not complete an investigator's report for the safeguarding meeting which took place on 24 July 2018.

17) The matters set out in paragraphs 1 – 16 constitute misconduct and/or a lack of competence.

18) By reason of such misconduct and/or lack of competence, your fitness to practise is impaired."

The final hearing panel on Monday 7 November to Thursday 10 November 2022 determined the following with regard to impairment:

“ The panel considered the four factors which may indicate impairment, as identified by Dame Janet Smith in the Shipman Inquiry and as referred to in the case of Grant.

The panel concluded that it was readily apparent from the proven allegations that Mr Dhaliwal’s failings resulted in a risk to the well-being and safety of the vulnerable service users concerned in this case. The panel also concluded that Mr Dhaliwal’s conduct brought the social work profession into disrepute and breached fundamental tenets of the profession. The panel considered that the fourth factor, integrity, did not arise in this case.

The panel considered whether the conduct was remediable and whether it had been remedied. The panel concluded that the misconduct was remediable in principle but was mindful, however, that despite the support provided to Mr Dhaliwal during his employment at the Council, he had not remedied the deficiencies brought to his attention during that time.

The panel had received no evidence indicating that the deficiencies had since been remedied. Mr Dhaliwal had decided not to engage in this hearing process. He had not submitted evidence to show that he has sought in any way to address the concerns in this case.

In his letter, Mr Dhaliwal acknowledged that his social work practice at the Council did not meet the required standards. He stated that these matters have deeply affected his confidence and morale, and he apologised unreservedly. He has not sought to contest the evidence presented by his former employer. The panel acknowledged Mr Dhaliwal’s response, but also took the view that it showed insight of a very limited nature and did not indicate any recognition by Mr Dhaliwal of the impact of his conduct on the vulnerable service users under his care, upon the social work profession or upon public confidence in the profession.

In the light of all the above, the panel concluded that there would be a real risk of repetition of the past misconduct were Mr Dhaliwal to be permitted to practise as a social worker in the future without restriction.

In the circumstances, the panel decided that a finding of current impairment was necessary on public protection and public interest grounds. It was satisfied that a reasonable and fully informed member of the public would be disturbed if no such finding was made. Such a finding is necessary to maintain the reputation of the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct for members of the profession.”

The final hearing panel on Monday 7 November to Thursday 10 November 2022 determined the following with regard to sanction:

“The panel next considered aggravating factors which it concluded were:

- a. the risk of harm Mr Dhaliwal's actions caused to a significant number of vulnerable service users over a substantial period of time;*
- b. the very limited nature of the insight shown by Mr Dhaliwal and the absence of evidence of remediation;*
- c. Mr Dhaliwal's failure to engage in person with this hearing process.*

As mitigating factors, the panel considered:

- a. the absence of any adverse fitness to practise history;*
- b. the apology and admissions expressed by Mr Dhaliwal in his letter of 19 October 2022;*
- c. the indication in the evidence of the witness JC and in correspondence from Mr Dhaliwal that, during his employment at the Council, [Private]. However, the panel was able to give limited weight to these matters given the lack of information or evidence relating to them.*

The panel was mindful that mitigation evidence carries limited significance in regulatory proceedings where public protection and public interest are the primary considerations.

The panel considered the available sanctions in ascending order of gravity. It had regard to the principle of proportionality and its responsibility to impose the least restrictive sanction which would satisfy the public interest.

The panel concluded that to give a warning would clearly be inappropriate in this case.

The panel had identified a risk of repetition of the misconduct and a warning would not restrict Mr Dhaliwal's ability to practise. Further, a warning would not be a proportionate response to the seriousness of the matters found proved.

The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be adequate to protect the public and the public interest in this case.

The panel concluded that, given the risk of harm it had identified and the gravity of its findings, conditions of practice would not be a proportionate response. In addition, the panel did not consider that it would be possible to formulate conditions which would satisfactorily address the risk of repetition. The panel was also mindful that Mr Dhaliwal had not rectified the deficiencies in his practice during his employment at the Council, even with the high level of supervision and support provided at that time. The panel was also mindful that Mr Dhaliwal had not engaged with this hearing process to indicate he would be

willing to comply with conditions of practice: on the contrary, he had indicated in correspondence with Social Work England that he did not intend to seek employment as a social worker again. The panel therefore concluded it could not have confidence that Mr Dhaliwal would be willing to comply with conditions of practice.

For all these reasons, the panel concluded that a conditions of practice order were not appropriate in this case. The panel next considered an order of suspension.

The panel referred to the factors relevant to suspension at paragraphs 93 to 97 of the Sanctions Guidance. The panel was satisfied that a suspension order would provide protection against the risks it had identified. It also considered that a period of suspension would appropriately mark the seriousness of the issues in this case and would ensure that public confidence in the social work profession was maintained.

The panel gave careful consideration to whether a removal order was required in this case. Taking account of the Sanctions Guidance at paragraphs 98 and 99, the panel was not satisfied that no other outcome than removal would be sufficient to achieve the purposes of a sanction, namely protection of the public and maintenance of public confidence and proper professional standards. The panel was satisfied these would be achieved by a period of suspension.

The panel therefore determined to impose an order of suspension and next considered the appropriate duration of the order.

The panel concluded that a period of two years' suspension was necessary in order to protect the public and to mark the seriousness of the concerns, and to maintain public confidence and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England. In addition to these paramount considerations, the panel also bore in mind the indications of [Private] at the Council. It was mindful of the risk of de-skilling, given that it appeared that Mr Dhaliwal may not have practised as a social worker since leaving the Council in 2018.

The panel concluded that a period of two years' suspension would provide time for him to address his return to fitness to practise, should he so decide, in spite of the current indication that he does not wish to practise as a social worker again.

The panel therefore determined to impose an order of suspension for a period of two years.

There will be a further hearing to review this order before its expiry. The panel indicated that the following would assist a future reviewing panel:

- a. Mr Dhaliwal's attendance at the review hearing;*
- b. a written reflective piece in which Mr Dhaliwal reflects upon the concerns found proved in this case and upon the impact of his actions upon service users and the social work profession;*
- c. evidence of continuing professional development and training undertaken;*
- d. testimonials, if available, including in relation to any relevant employment Mr Dhaliwal might undertake by the time of the review hearing."*

Social Work England submissions:

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

"Subject to any evidence of further insight or remediation provided prior to the review, Social Work England will invite the Panel to consider imposing a Removal Order.

The final hearing panel set out four recommendations that would assist a review hearing panel in making their determination:

- a. the Social Worker's attendance at the review hearing;*
- b. a written reflective piece in which the Social Worker reflects upon the concerns found proved in this case and upon the impact of his actions upon service users and the social work profession;*
- c. evidence of continuing professional development and training undertaken;
and*
- d. testimonials, if available, including in relation to any relevant employment the Social Worker might undertake by the time of the review hearing.*

The Social Worker has not supplied evidence in relation to any of these. Moreover, he has not engaged throughout the duration of the current order, despite being encouraged to do so by his Case Review Officer on the following six occasions:

- e. 20 December 2022 - Initial letter sent to the Social Worker about suspension order;*
- f. 15 May 2023 - Reminder letter sent about suspension recommendations;*

g. 3 October 2023 - the Social Worker was notified of change in case review officer;

h. 22 November 2023 - Another reminder letter sent about recommendations;

i. 15 May 2024 - Further reminder letter sent about recommendations; and

j. 2 August 2024 - Final request for evidence letter sent.

The Social Worker did not attend the final hearing, and has not communicated with Social Work England since October 2022, in which he explained that he did not intend to attend the final hearing. The Social Worker has not practised in social work since November 2018.

The review panel is invited to find that the Social Worker has not discharged his persuasive burden to demonstrate he has reflected or remediated the matters identified by the Final hearing Panel. Accordingly, the review panel is invited to find that the Social Worker's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The option of a suspension order has now been explored and has been ineffective insofar as it has not resulted in the Social Worker's engagement. It is therefore submitted that there is no realistic or reasonable basis to believe the Social Worker will engage in future.

Social Work England submits that no order short of a Removal Order would satisfy the need to protect the public, as well as the wider public interest, which includes not incurring unnecessary costs in holding multiple review hearings in circumstances such as this."

Social worker submissions:

18. There has been no engagement by Mr Dhaliwal with Social Work England. The panel therefore did not have any representation before it to consider.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

19. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the previous panel. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
20. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Social Work England. The panel has not received any submissions or documentation from Mr Dhaliwal.

21. The panel took into account the advice it received from the legal adviser as to the proper approach it should adopt. In particular, that:

- i. The purpose of the review is to consider the current impairment based on the agreed disposal, the extent to which Mr Dhaliwal has engaged with the regulatory process, the scope and level of his insight, and the risk of repetition.
- ii. The persuasive burden is on Mr Dhaliwal.
- iii. In terms of whether the regulatory concerns have been sufficiently, and appropriately remediated, relevant factors include whether Mr Dhaliwal is:
 - a. fully appreciative of the gravity of the previous panel's finding of impairment;
 - b. up to date with his skills and knowledge;
 - c. likely to place service users at risk if he were to return to unrestricted practice.
- iv. The panel should take into account any information that it has received relating to Mr Dhaliwal's ability to practise safely and effectively and the wider public interest which includes promoting and maintaining proper professional standards of behaviour and promoting and maintaining public confidence in the profession.
- v. It is only if the panel determines that Mr Dhaliwal's fitness to practise remains impaired, that it should go on to consider what, if any, sanction to impose by applying the guidance as set out in the Sanctions Guidance (SG), the Regulations and the principles of proportionality which require Mr Dhaliwal's interests to be balanced against the interests of the public.

22. The panel first considered whether Mr Dhaliwal's fitness to practise remains impaired.

23. As a consequence of Mr Dhaliwal's non-attendance and the absence of any written submissions on the issue of insight and remediation, there was no evidence before the panel that Mr Dhaliwal has acquired an understanding of the seriousness of the regulatory concerns or the impact these concerns had on the reputation of the social work profession as a whole.

24. The panel does not have before it any evidence to suggest that Mr Dhaliwal's has rectified the deficiencies in his practice. Further, the panel have no information in respect of any work which Mr Dhaliwal may currently be undertaking.

25. In the absence of any evidence of insight and remediation, the panel concluded that there has been no material change in circumstances, since the adjudicators' decision in November 2022. This was despite the fact that Mr Dhaliwal has been provided with clear opportunities to engage with his regulator and has been contacted by the Case Review officer on six occasions.

26. Mr Dhaliwal has not provided any information pertaining to his engagement with any reflection, or any evidence of training or CPD. He has not provided any testimonials from paid or unpaid work, social work or otherwise.

27. Mr Dhaliwal has not engaged with Social Work England for a significant period of time. He did not attend the final hearing and has not communicated with Social Work England since October 2022, at which time he explained that he did not intend to attend the final hearing. The panel also believed Mr Dhaliwal has not practised in social work since November 2018.

28. The panel noted the previous panel's recommendations as follows;

There will be a further hearing to review this order before its expiry. The panel indicated that the following would assist a future reviewing panel:

a. Mr Dhaliwal's attendance at the review hearing;

b. a written reflective piece in which Mr Dhaliwal reflects upon the concerns found proved in this case and upon the impact of his actions upon service users and the social work profession;

c. evidence of continuing professional development and training undertaken;

d. testimonials, if available, including in relation to any relevant employment Mr Dhaliwal might undertake by the time of the review hearing."

29. The panel considered that the Mr Dhaliwal had been given an opportunity to engage and had chosen not to take that opportunity. The panel noted the clear recommendations which had been advanced, which have not been followed by Mr Dhaliwal.

30. Despite the passage of time there remains no demonstration of regret, insight, remorse or remediation by Mr Dhaliwal. The panel therefore concluded that there is no evidence provided to suggest that the risk of repetition of the misconduct has reduced, and as such there remains a very real risk of repetition.

31. The panel noted that a significant aspect of the public component is promoting and maintaining public confidence and promoting and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers. Members of the public would be extremely concerned if a social worker was permitted to resume unrestricted practice in circumstances where the regulatory concern which led to a suspension order had not been remediated.

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

Decision and reasons:

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

Decision on whether to revoke order/make no further order

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

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

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

39. The panel concluded that, in view of Mr Dhaliwal's impairment which has not been remedied, and in the absence of any evidence of insight or remediation (and apparent unwillingness to engage with this) it would not be appropriate to take no further action. Furthermore, such an outcome would be insufficient to protect the public, maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the profession, given the risk of repetition.

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

40. The panel then considered whether to issue advice or a warning. The panel noted that neither of these sanctions would restrict Mr Dhaliwal's ability to practise and therefore

such sanctions would not be appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety and public confidence in the profession. Therefore, the panel concluded that issuing advice or a warning would be inappropriate and would provide insufficient protection of the public.

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

41. The panel went on to consider a conditions of practice order. The panel took the view that, given the misconduct findings in this case and Mr Dhaliwal's lack of engagement with the regulator, a conditions of practice order would not be suitable. The panel specifically noted Mr Dhaliwal's lack of engagement following the imposition of the suspension order, despite efforts made by the Case Review Officer. Further, the panel noted that it had no information in respect of Mr Dhaliwal's current work situation. For this reason, the panel concluded that it could not formulate workable conditions of practice in this case.

Decision on whether to extend the period of the suspension order

42. The panel noted Mr Dhaliwal's lack of engagement following his suspension and agreed with the submissions of Social Work England that a suspension order has been ineffective insofar as it has not resulted in the Social Worker's engagement.
43. The panel concluded that given the prolonged period of non-engagement from Mr Dhaliwal, despite his being in receipt of communications from Social Work England, he is unlikely to engage with Social Work England in the foreseeable future or take the necessary steps in order to satisfy any reviewing panel that his fitness to practise is no longer impaired.
44. Mr Dhaliwal has not taken the opportunity to demonstrate sufficient insight, remorse, and remediation that was afforded to him at the final hearing. The panel noted the following paragraph of the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance:

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

...

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

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

Decision on whether to impose a removal order

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

Right of appeal:

50. Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the social worker may appeal to the High Court against:
- a. the decision of adjudicators:
 - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - iii. to make a final order,
 - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
51. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
52. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.
53. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

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

- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.
- 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker.
- 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5).

55. Under Rule 16(aa) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), a social worker requesting a review of a final order under paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

The Professional Standards Authority

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

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