

Social worker: Thomas Norris
Registration number: SW95480
Fitness to Practise
Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 27 February 2025 to 06 March 2025

Hearing venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome: Fitness to practise impaired, warning order (1 year)

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is a hearing held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the regulations”).
2. Mr Norris attended and was represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Kennedy instructed by Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Debbie Hill	Chair
Michael Branicki	Social worker adjudicator
Angela Duxbury	Lay adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Poppy Muffett	Hearings officer
Chiugo Eze	Hearings support officer
Dido Ofei-Kwatia	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. 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 January 2025 addressed to Mr Norris at both the email and postal address which he provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 28 January 2025 detailing Mr Norris’s registered email and postal address;
 - A copy of the Royal Mail Track and Trace Document indicating “signed for” delivery to Mr Norris’s address at 09.32am on 30 January 2025.
5. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
6. Having had regard to Rule 14, 15, 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that effective notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Norris accordance with Rules.

Preliminary matters:

7. Ms Ramage made an application for the evidence of Ms Ryan, the evidence in chief of Mr Norris and that of his witnesses to be held in private due to the personal and sensitive nature of the content of their evidence. The panel heard the advice of the legal adviser and it decided to grant the application as there was no public interest in personal matter being heard in the open.

8. The panel decided that the video footage would be played when specific reference was made to sections of video as all parties had already had the opportunity to view the footage and to limit any potential distress to Mr Norris. It was agreed by Ms Kennedy that if any of the clips depicted third parties, those excerpts can be dealt with in private.

Background:

9. On 20 April 2020 (9 April 2020) Social Work England received a self-referral from Mr Norris. He stated that he had received a caution on 5 April 2020 for possession of a Class B drug.

Allegations:

10. The allegations against Mr Norris are as follows:

1. Between on or around 5 and 6 April 2020, and whilst employed as a social worker, you:

- a. Breached coronavirus regulations
- b. Were in possession of a controlled drug, namely amphetamine
- c. Attempted to conceal the presence of a controlled drug, namely amphetamine, from the police
- d. Told the police, when asked what you did for employment that you were unemployed.

2. Your actions at 1c and/or 1d were dishonest.

Admissions:

11. 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.

12. Following the reading of the allegations the panel chair asked Mr Norris whether he admitted any of the allegations.

13. The panel noted that Mr Norris denied all the allegations.

14. In line with Rule 32c(i)(a) of the Rules, the panel then went on to determine the disputed facts.

Summary of evidence:

- i) Social Work England

15. Ms Kennedy summarised the background as set out in the statement of case. She called four witnesses in total on behalf of Social Work England, who gave evidence as set out below.

DC Faruque

16. The first witness DC Faruque adopted his witness statement and accompanying exhibits in chief. In evidence he was not able to recall if Mr Norris was in the kitchen when he entered the property but confirmed that he was not the one who answered the door for him to enter. He also stated he did not remember Mr Norris being in the living room. DC Faruque stated that the scattering of the white powder happened before his body camera was on. Whilst the incident happened 5 years ago, he recalls that Mr Norris was asked to step away from the white substance and he did so without the need for police assistance. However, as Mr Norris was following the instruction he swiped away the white powder that was on the countertop behind him. DC Faruque was not of the opinion that Mr Norris's action happened accidentally while being restrained.
17. In cross examination DC Faruque confirmed that he had repeatedly told Mr Norris to 'stop resisting' even though Mr Norris kept on saying he was not resisting. When asked he stated that he could not comment on why his other colleague did not have his body camera on and he was unaware that Mr Norris had asked for the other officer to turn his body camera on. From recollection DC Faruque said on arrival at the scene he went to the back of the property and remembered there being a delay before the door was opened. DC Faruque's belief was that Mr Norris was in the kitchen the entire duration they were there and the spot he occupied was in front of the kitchen worktop on which he was leaning. He however admitted that he could be wrong as the incident took place 5 years ago.
18. In response to the question of if any paraphernalia or drugs were found on Mr Norris, DC Faruque's response was that it would be set out in his statement. He said Mr Norris was facing their direction and engaging with them to some degree but he then turned around to swipe the powder away from the countertop and so it was unlikely his actions were accidental. DC Faruque stated that no 'hands' were on Mr Norris at the time but he was then subsequently restrained and repeatedly said "please stop hurting me". DC Faruque could not hear or recall the other occupants of the property, on the video saying that 'he was being compliant'. In collecting the evidence from the scene DC Faruque recounted that he did not have his folder with him, which contained the evidence collection bags. He indicated that he did not remember using a credit card to collect the powder, he was adamant he did not recall it happening or whose credit card was used. DC Faruque said that if there were pictures of the scene prior to the evidence gathering then it would form part of his evidence.
19. The panel turned its mind to Exhibit NF02 and sought confirmation from DC Faruque as to when he first turned on his body camera and what prompted him to do so. He responded again that as it was 5 years ago, he could not comment but that his practice was such that he always turned it on when he felt something untoward was happening. DC Faruque indicated that due to the nature of the call it was unlikely that professionally a body camera would be deployed at all stages. When asked to describe how Mr Norris was resisting, he explained that he thought it was general resistance by the tensing of the body. Additionally, he stated that he was unclear if his recollection

was from memory or from viewing the footage but he recalls there was a level of resistance. DC Faruque was reminded of his witness statement and clarified that he could not remember how long the transport journey to the police station was nor Mr Norris's demeanour on the journey. He only recalled that Mr Norris made no reply to the caution.

20. In response to questions from Ms Ramage, DC Faruque confirmed that body camera's being switched on was a variable practice that depended on the type of call. He said that the incident in question was not his first experience of a breach of covid restriction callout.
21. DC Faruque confirmed in response to questions from Ms Kennedy that once they got to the station the handover was to the custody sergeant who would have then asked any further questions that were necessary.

PC Beardsworth

22. PC Beardsworth adopted her witness and exhibits in chief and gave supplementary evidence. She explained that the white powder could be seen on the worktop, she could see it had been scraped across the worktop and that some was on the floor. She confirmed that she could see it once Mr Norris was 'on the floor'. PC Beardsworth stated that although her view was obstructed, she believes there would have been a reason officers "put hands on him" as initially there was no physical contact with Mr Norris, it was simply verbal. PC Beardsworth could be heard on her footage asking DC Faruque to put his camera on and it was because she was prompting him as although he is a DC now, at the time 5 years ago he was an officer in training. She explained that although switching on a body camera is at an officer's discretion nowadays they are routinely used as it protects officers, she stated that she puts her camera on for every call and has always done so.
23. In cross examination PC Beardsworth confirmed there were 3 people in the house, she could not remember if there was loud music or disarray. Mr Norris was in the kitchen and standing against the worktop obscuring the white powder. Upon entering she was met with shouting from another officer, which was directed at Mr Norris, who it was confirmed had said he was scared. In the footage the other officer appears to shout at Mr Norris telling him that he should not be scared. PC Beardsworth explained that this was his natural manner as he has a hearing impairment. She stated she did not hear the other officer calling Mr Norris a dick.
24. PC Beardsworth could not recall if when she entered Mr Norris's details into the system, she looked to see if he was known to the police as a victim of crime. It is unlikely she did this as tempers were flared and she needed her wits about her. After checking the system, she responded to the shouting of her two other colleagues and Mr Norris was by this time on the floor as they were putting handcuffs on him. She believed they put the handcuffs on him as he was trying to brush away the powder. PC Beardsworth did not see Mr Norris resisting, shouting or being abusive. She remembers

the other occupants of the house saying the drugs were not Mr Norris's and that one said they were joint drugs.

25. PC Beardsworth could not explain why from the footage it appeared apparent that the focus was on Mr Norris, she said it may have been because he had sunglasses on, and he was in the kitchen. Although, she confirmed that she stated that she did not focus on him. PC Beardsworth said that whilst Mr Norris apologised and said he was scared throughout the video, he was a little obstructive at first but did then provide his details when asked.

DC Keefe

26. DC Keefe adopted his witness statement and accompanying exhibits in chief. He confirmed that the quality of the footage before the panel is not as good as the usual standard used. DC Keefe stated that Mr Norris was booked in during the evening and he was unfit to be interviewed due to intoxication. As a result, the questions about Mr Norris being employed took place the following morning when he was deemed fit for further investigation/interview. He said that in reviewing the footage he was only concerned with the caution and its lawfulness. DC Keefe stated that although there is a custody record in which it was recorded that Mr Norris stated he was unemployed, it is not printable and could not be produced for the panel. He was of the view that the entry in the police records was consistent with the custody footage.
27. Footage of Exhibit SK02 Part 2 at 1 minute and 20 seconds was played, and it was acknowledged that the sound quality was bad, although DC Keefe felt that an address to the effect of "although that doesn't apply to you" could be in response to Mr Norris stating he was unemployed.
28. In cross examination DC Keefe confirmed that Mr Norris was intoxicated when arrested. When asked if Mr Norris understood the process, he reiterated that he was intoxicated and so he did not understand but he would not be able to comment any further than to say Mr Norris was 'bedded for the night' and interviewed next morning.

Ms Ryan

29. Finally, Ms Ryan gave evidence she adopted her witness statement and accompanying exhibits in chief. In supplementary evidence she confirmed Mr Norris carried out in person safeguarding visits to service users during the lockdown. This expectation remained due to the nature and role of the team of which he was part. She confirmed that prior to the safeguarding concerns being raised against Mr Norris, he had resigned 16 February 2020. Ms Ryan confirmed the date of his suspension letter and that at the time of the incident Mr Norris was working his notice period. [PRIVATE]
30. In cross examination Ms Ryan stated that Mr Norris had voluntarily resigned and had no previous disciplinary matters whilst in employment. She confirmed the contents of her email dated 29 April 2020 and explained that whilst she wanted a Skype interview that did not happen. She confirmed that Mr Norris had wanted to bring along a representative but this was not workable and so it was decided to proceed with written

submissions in place of a formal interview, an option Mr Norris took up. She however maintained that Mr Norris initially refused a Skype interview.

31. Ms Ryan confirmed that Mr Norris told her he accepted the caution because he was embarrassed and upset so wanted to leave the station as soon as possible. Line management of Mr Norris fell to Vicky Haigh who had day to day responsibility. Ms Ryan was the line manager of Ms Haigh who came to her with low level issues around Mr Norris's conduct, nothing that needed any formal intervention. Ms Ryan was adamant that in supervision records there would be records of 'level concerns' raised about Mr Norris. Ms Ryan expressed the view that Mr Norris had the potential to progress to become a very good social worker. At the time of the incident, he was 10 years post qualification with no issues on his record. She said he had the potential to be exceptional but the conduct and immaturity he displayed let him down.

32.[PRIVATE]

33. Finally in cross examination Ms Ryan confirmed that she regularly talked to Ms Haigh in supervision about Mr Norris and her communication with him verbally and in written form was always positive. At the time she made the statement for Social Work England, she was not aware the caution had been revoked and had heard this for the first time today. Ms Ryan confirmed that during covid social workers were expected to wear PPI and equipment and safety planning was provided for each visit to a service user. She added that although checks were done to see if covid was present in a household, they would still have to be attended upon regardless.

34. Although the panel had no further questions of Ms Ryan, during the break she had found the risk assessment dated 7 December 2019 prepared for Mr Norris as contained in the social workers response bundle.

ii) Social worker

Mr Norris

35.[PRIVATE]

36.[PRIVATE]

37.[PRIVATE]

38.[PRIVATE]

39.[PRIVATE]

40.[PRIVATE]

41.[PRIVATE]

42.[PRIVATE]

43.[PRIVATE]

44.[PRIVATE]

45.[PRIVATE]

46.[PRIVATE]

47.[PRIVATE]

Ms Haigh

48.[PRIVATE]

49.[PRIVATE]

50.[PRIVATE]

51.[PRIVATE]

52.[PRIVATE]

Ms Welch

53.[PRIVATE]

54.[PRIVATE]

55. Ms Kennedy made closing submissions in which she recapped the case on behalf of Social Work England. She opened by correcting the record to reflect that Mr Norris had in fact self-referred on 9 April 2019 and not 20 April 2019 as previously indicated. Ms Kennedy reiterated the burden of proof and indicated that this case was supported by good video and oral evidence. In addition, she noted that Mr Norris's witnesses were not able to comment directly on the events in question. She stated it was a matter for the panel to decide if Mr Norris had fallen foul of the allegations as set out.

56.[PRIVATE]

57. Ms Ramage outlined that the issues in the video footage and the aggressive manner with which he was dealt with by the male officers who she stated were unprofessional in manner. She stated that the evidence of DC Faruque was vague and lacked credibility. The lack of evidence bags, use of a sandwich bag to collect the evidence, use of a credit card to gather the white powder and lack of photographic evidence of the scene are of concern and raise questions. Ms Ramage stated that Mr Norris took responsibility for not correcting the officer who stated that he was unemployed, but that this happened after he had told the officer that he was employed as a social worker.

Finding and reasons on facts:

58. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser, who reminded it where facts have been admitted they are to be found proven. Where facts are in dispute the panel is required to go on to decide those facts. The burden to prove each allegation rests with Social Work England and the panel must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities.

59. The legal adviser reminded the panel about the two-limb test in dishonesty allegations. This is derived from the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (2017) UKSC 67*.
60. The panel found the evidence of DC Faruque credible and that he recalled the facts as best he could given the passage of time. This was the same in respect of PC Beardsworth who had her camera on during the entire time, the panel noted that she recounted what she saw systematically. The panel also acknowledged that DC Keefe was credible and able to assist clearly given the limited scope of his evidence. In considering the evidence of Ms Ryan the panel noted there were some discrepancies in her evidence, it also bore in mind the evidence given by both her, Mr Norris and Ms Haigh. However, it found her an overall credible witness.
61. In considering the evidence of Mr Norris the panel noted that whilst it had been challenging, he gave credible evidence. It noted that he was open and honest and the level of emotional trauma he had suffered was apparent. Mr Norris had demonstrated professionalism at all times during the proceedings.
62. The panel found the evidence of both Ms Welch and Ms Haigh credible and supported by the numerous testimonials. It noted the positive content of the testimonials, and concluded they were written by individuals that had known Mr Norris in various capacities for long periods of time. They were both personal and professional in nature and outstanding reflections of Mr Norris.
63. When considering the overall video evidence, the panel noted that it was not conclusive as the sound was poor and almost inaudible at times, as well as sometimes offering distorted views as the incident unfolded. However, it noted the transcripts were of assistance.
64. In reaching its decision the panel considered all of the evidence before it and were of the view that it had heard good and reliable evidence from the live witnesses. It also considered the responses contained in the social worker's response bundle.

Particular 1a

Between on or around 5 and 6 April 2020, and whilst employed as a social worker, you: breached coronavirus regulations.

65. The panel closely considered this allegation and decided that Mr Norris's actions in physically attending his friend's house could be construed as a breach of the coronavirus regulations.
- 66.[PRIVATE]
- 67.[PRIVATE]
- 68.[PRIVATE]
69. The panel concluded that Mr Norris's actions fell within a lawful exception under Section 6 (2)(m) 'to avoid injury or illness or to escape a risk of harm' of The Health

Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) Regulations 2020 and as such the allegation was not found proved.

Particular 1b

Between on or around 5 and 6 April 2020, and whilst employed as a social worker, you: were in possession of a controlled drug, namely amphetamine.

70. The panel looked to the Oxford dictionary for the ordinary meaning of the word ‘possession’, it decided that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Norris was found using, holding, or storing a drug it noted that drugs were behind him and not on his person, as confirmed by the search undertaken by DC Faruque. The panel concluded Mr Norris was not in possession or control and so this allegation was not found proven.

Particular 1c

Between on or around 5 and 6 April 2020, and whilst employed as a social worker, you: attempted to conceal the presence of a controlled drug, namely amphetamine, from the police.

71. The panel was satisfied that Mr Norris attempted to conceal the presence of a controlled drug from the police. Whilst the panel noted the evidence given by Mr Norris, it gave great weight to the evidence of DC Faruque which was also supported by the body camera evidence of PC Beardsworth, this footage captured the aftermath of Mr Norris being restrained and showed the white powder had been scattered. The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

Particular 1d

Between on or around 5 and 6 April 2020, and whilst employed as a social worker, you: told the police, when asked what you did for employment that you were unemployed.

72. The panel decided that although that the video evidence to support this allegation was poor, the transcript and evidence of DC Keefe indicated that Mr Norris had stated that he was unemployed. The panel took note of Mr Norris’s evidence that he informed the officer that he was a social worker. However, it noted the fact that Mr Norris himself had stated that he ‘regretted not correcting the officer’ when it was later posed to him that he was unemployed and so additionally by his own admission this allegation was found proven.

Particular 2

Your actions at 1c and/or 1d were dishonest.

73. The panel concluded that Mr Norris knew that the powder was there, and he sought to scatter it. It was satisfied that an ordinary person would agree that in these actions Mr Norris’s conduct was dishonest in relation to allegation 1c.
74. The panel found that Mr Norris was dishonest in relation to allegation 1d. It noted that his failure to correct the officer was reactive due to the trauma he explained in evidence

he had suffered during the arrest. However, he was also fully aware that he was a registered social worker (a notifiable occupation) and should have corrected the officer's mistake. The panel also reminded itself that Mr Norris admitted he failed to correct the police custody officer and accepted that he ought to have corrected him.

Finding and reasons on grounds:

75. Having announced its decision on the facts, the panel then turned to consider the statutory ground of misconduct. Ms Kennedy made submissions and stated that Mr Norris had breached 2.1 and 5.2 of Social Work England standards 2019 and that his misconduct was serious in nature.
76. Ms Ramage submitted that in terms of misconduct Mr Norris never set out to deceive the public or his employer. She highlighted that he was further traumatised by the arrest ordeal and motivated to leave the police station after the incident and so failed to correct the officer and she also reminded the panel that Mr Norris notified his employer and self-referred to Social Work England. Ms Ramage reiterated that Mr Norris in response to the concealing of the drugs wholeheartedly wishes he had not gone to the property on the evening in question.
77. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel was reminded that the question of misconduct was a matter for its judgement and 'that 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' as per *Roylance*. In line with *Roylance* the panel was advised to decide for itself the professional standards it believed Mr Norris had breached.
78. The panel was unequivocal that Mr Norris's actions as set out in allegations 1c, 1d, and 2 all of which it found proven, amounted to misconduct. It was wholly satisfied that the conduct derived from Mr Norris departing from the professional standards expected and was serious in nature.
79. The panel decided that Mr Norris had breached the following sections of Social Work England's professional standards 2019,
- As a social worker I will:*
2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair
- 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.
80. The panel took note of paragraphs 179 to 181 relating to Dishonesty in a social worker's private life of Social Work England's Impairment and Sanctions guidance 2022 in its reasoning and findings.

Finding and reasons on current impairment:

81. On the question of impairment Ms Kennedy referred to Social Work England's Impairment and Sanctions guidance as well as the cases of Council for Healthcare and Regulatory Excellence v NMC and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) and Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) and asked the panel to find that Mr Norris was currently impaired.
82. Ms Ramage submitted that Mr Norris is not impaired and has never been. The incident was an isolated event that took place during a time of extreme difficulty when his mindset was altered. Mr Norris has apologised repeatedly for the errors he has made, he was defeated and traumatised by the arrest and wanted to leave the station. Mr Norris has continued to work as a social worker since the incident and has excellent references that show he has been honest and professional since the incident.
83. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser, who referenced Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) and in that it should consider if the conduct is easily remediable, has already been remediated, and that it is highly unlikely to be repeated. Further, following the case of Council for Healthcare and Regulatory Excellence v NMC and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) the panel was reminded to consider the following questions; a) If Mr Norris has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or b) has Mr Norris in the past and/or is he liable in the future to bring the profession into disrepute; and/or c) has he in the past breached and/or is he liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the profession. Finally, the panel was also reminded of Social Work England's Impairment and sanctions guidance.
84. The panel when considering the question of Mr Norris's current fitness to practise first considered the personal element of impairment. The panel when considering if Mr Norris is fit to practice today and, in the future, highlighted that the incident in question was isolated in nature and took place outside of work. It covered a 24-hour period when Mr Norris was essentially unfit due to the rather extreme personal circumstances he was going through. It noted there was no harm to service users and no risk of repetition given that his personal circumstances have changed, and he is no longer at risk personally. [PRIVATE]
85. Furthermore, the passage of time and how Mr Norris has used this period has been clearly demonstrated in the outstanding testimonials. The panel recognised that those who penned them had close personal and professional knowledge of Mr Norris and an awareness of the incident in question. The panel paid particular attention to the testimonials at pages 22, 24, 25 and 27 of the social worker's supplementary response bundle. Overall, the evidence was from various sources all of whom attested to Mr Norris's professionalism, honesty and integrity. The panel concluded that Mr Norris had an exemplary record prior to the incident, has maintained this since and shown remorse. It found that Mr Norris was not personally impaired.

86. In settling the question of the public element of impairment, the panel was clear that whilst Mr Norris's attempt to scatter the drugs and failing to correct the officer about his employment status, could have been reactionary as he was intoxicated and distressed at the time, they still should not have occurred. The panel was satisfied a reasonable member of the public would be concerned if there were no finding of impairment. Any such finding would substantially reduce the public's confidence in the social work profession. The panel concluded that the finding of public impairment was necessary to uphold the public's confidence.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

87. Ms Kennedy made submissions on sanction and asked the panel to refer to the Impairment and sanctions guidance when coming to its decision. She recognised Mr Norris's apology, that he had been working since the incident and had outstanding testimonials. Mr Norris was in a distressed state and going through difficulties at the time and had no previous regulatory concerns. Ms Kennedy stated that there were no aggravating factors, and she invited the panel to find that an appropriate sanction may be a one-year warning.

88. [PRIVATE]

89. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser who reminded it that the purpose of a sanction was not to punish Mr Norris but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The panel were reminded of the sanctions available and of the need to consider any aggravating and mitigating factors it sees fit. The panel was also asked to ensure that when considering sanctions, it begins with the lowest sanction and moves through all the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness, before identifying the sanction it agrees is sufficient to protect the public and maintain confidence in the profession and uphold professional standards.

90. The panel had regard to paragraphs 81 and 82 of the Impairment and Sanctions guidance. The panel said that Mr Norris was an experienced social worker who had not previously come to the attention of Social Work England. [PRIVATE] The panel noted the evidence that he had provided in support of this, and the vast evidence of his progress since. Mr Norris has continued to work within the profession without issue and there was no evidence to suggest that he posed a risk of harm to the public or service users. Mr Norris had notified his employer, self-referred and completely engaged with the process culminating in his attendance and participation at the final hearing.

91. The panel agreed with the submission of Social Work England and decided that there were no aggravating factors.

No action and Advice

92. The panel decided that neither no action or advice were appropriate as it had found Mr Norris had breached professional standards and this gave rise to public interest considerations.

Warning

93. The panel decided a one-year warning is the appropriate sanction given Mr Norris's breach of professional standards. It was satisfied that this accurately reflected the failings in Mr Norris's conduct given his personal circumstances that prevailed at the time and ensured the wider public interest considerations were met.

Conditions of practice

94. The panel concluded that a conditions of practice order would be disproportionate in these circumstances. Mr Norris's conduct was isolated in nature as extensively ventilated above, and he has continued to practise without issue. It took the view Mr Norris did not need any restriction on his ability to practise.

Right of appeal:

95. 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.

96. 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.

97. 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.

98. 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:

99. 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

100. 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:

101. 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>.