

Social worker: Robert Guyton

Registration number: SW122547

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review hearing

Date of hearing: 16 May 2025

Hearing venue: Remote hearing (registrant attended via phone)

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 09 June 2025)

Hearing outcome:
Replace the suspension order with a conditions of practice order for 12 months 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 2 years by a panel of adjudicators on 12 May 2023.
2. Mr Guyton attended by telephone and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Adjei-Ntow case presenter instructed by Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Eileen Carr	Chair
Susan Williams	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Paige Swallow	Hearings officer
Chiugo Eze	Hearings support officer
Abimbola Johnson	Legal adviser

Review of the current order:

4. 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).
5. The current order is due to expire at the end of 9 June 2025

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

6. *Whilst registered as a Social Worker:*
 1. *You failed to maintain a professional relationship with a service user in that you:*
 - a) *Talked about sex related matters with a service user;*
 - b) *Made inappropriate comments about the service user's personal appearance;*
 - c) *Sent inappropriate text messages to a service user;*
 - d) *Made contact with the service user without professional reason to do so;*
 - e) *Asked the service user for a 'rollie' when the service user was smoking, saying words to the effect of he would "have the one out of her mouth".*

2. *Your actions at regulatory concerns 1(a–e) were sexually motivated.*

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns (1 a–e) and (2) amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

The final hearing panel on 12 May 2023 determined the following with regard to impairment:

7. In their decision at paragraphs 143 – 155:

Insight

143. *The panel was concerned with Mr Guyton’s reflective piece as it appeared to minimise the allegations. In particular, the panel considered that Mr Guyton’s reflective piece sought to share the cause of the allegations with DA (due to misunderstands) as well as himself, and it downplayed the power imbalance between himself and DA. Consequently, the panel does not consider that Mr Guyton’s reflective piece demonstrates much insight.*

144. *The panel considers that Mr Guyton has provided limited insight in that he has set out how he would prevent himself from getting involved in similar allegations in the future. However, Mr Guyton lacks insight in relation to the effect of his actions on service user DA. He has not considered how his interactions with DA impacted upon her, especially given her vulnerable nature and his sexually motivated conduct, of which she was aware, as stated in her text messages and her complaint to the Council. Further, the panel considers that Mr Guyton’s reflective piece does not demonstrate insight in relation to the effect of his actions upon the social work profession and the public.*

Whether conduct is remediable and whether it has been remediated

145. *Mr Guyton’s reflective piece sets out what he has done in order to protect himself, such as the logging of text messages. However, the panel is of the view that these are safeguards that he should have had in place from the start of his practice. Further, the panel considers that Mr Guyton has focused upon protecting himself in the future, rather than fully considering the position of DA (and service users in general), and the effect of his actions on the profession and the public. The panel considered that Mr Guyton has disconnected his actions from the harm caused to the service user.*

146. *Due to the lack of insight from Mr Guyton, the panel cannot form a view whether his conduct is remediable. The panel considers that Mr Guyton has provided steps he would take to prevent himself from getting involved in similar allegations in the future, however, this does not address the cause of the conduct. Consequently, the panel considered that there has only been remediation to the extent of some preventative steps from Mr Guyton with regard to his social work practice, rather than the core issues being addressed in relation to his behaviour.*

Has Mr Guyton acted in the past and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm?

147. The panel considers that Mr Guyton placed DA at unwarranted risk of harm, and actually caused DA emotional harm and distress. DA was vulnerable and was made very upset by the communications with Mr Guyton. For example, DA implies that she considered that the text messages to be sexually motivated from the outset when she messaged Mr Guyton: “from the first time I met you trying get me in bed just u wait” and “I got all the messages you r a creep don’t message me!!! Or I will go the press”. DA felt that she was not informed of the plans Mr Guyton has concerning her child which added to the harm and distress that she was feeling.

148. Given the lack of insight and remediation from Mr Guyton, the panel considers that there is a risk of repetition in that Mr Guyton is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm. Despite Mr Guyton enacting some preventive steps, he has not addressed the root cause of the allegations which places service users at risk and taken steps to align his practice with the required social work standards.

Has Mr Guyton in the past and/or is liable in the future to bring the social work profession into disrepute?

149. The panel considers that Mr Guyton has brought the social work profession into disrepute through his proven conduct. This undermines public confidence.

150. The panel considered the following paragraphs of the Sanctions Guidance to be particularly pertinent:

“Some concerns are so serious that if proven, a finding of impairment is likely. This is because in these cases, a failure to make a finding of impairment may (do one or more of the following):

- undermine public confidence in the profession
- fail to maintain the professional standards expected of social workers

Examples of cases that are likely to be viewed as serious include (all of the following):

sexual misconduct

- violence
- dishonesty
- abuses of trust
- discrimination involving a protected characteristic”

151. The panel found that Mr Guyton’s conduct involved sexual misconduct and abuse of trust. The panel finds Mr Guyton’s misconduct, from the outset of his interaction with DA, to be so serious that the standards breached necessitate a regulatory finding of impairment in order to maintain public confidence in social workers and the professional standards expected of social workers.

152. Given the lack of insight and remediation from Mr Guyton, the panel considers that there is a risk of repetition in that Mr Guyton is liable in the future to act so as to put the social work

profession into disrepute. Despite Mr Guyton enacting some preventive steps, he has not addressed the root cause of the allegations which places the profession at risk of reputational damage.

Has Mr Guyton in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the social work profession?

153. Professional integrity, maintaining professional boundaries, transparency (with line managers), and an assessment of risk to himself and service users are all fundamental tenets of the social work profession. The panel consider that these have been breached.

154. Given the lack of insight and remediation from Mr Guyton, the panel considers that there is a risk of repetition in that Mr Guyton is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the social work profession.

155. Consequently, the panel finds Mr Guyton to be impaired”

The final hearing panel on 12 May 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

8. In their decision at paragraphs 159 – 171:

159. The panel reminded itself that it had concluded that Mr Guyton’s fitness to practise was impaired and of its duty to protect the public, to satisfy the wider public interest, namely to promote and maintain public confidence, and proper professional standards.

160. In relation to mitigating factors, the panel found that Mr Guyton was of previous good character and had no previous fitness to practice history; and that he has taken some actions to avoid repetition. However, the panel considered that there has only been remediation to the extent of some preventative steps from Mr Guyton with regard to his social work practice, rather than the core issues being addressed in relation to his behaviour. Although the panel notes Mr Guyton’s satisfactory performance appraisals, it was of the view that performance appraisals are of limited relevance to the proven conduct demonstrated by Mr Guyton in the allegations. Although the panel notes that Mr Guyton only had fifteen months’ experience prior to the date of the allegations, it considered that the conduct proven in the allegations are not dependent upon the level of experience of a social worker; it should be inherent with any social worker that such conduct is unacceptable.

161. In relation to aggravating factors, the panel finds that Mr Guyton’s misconduct caused actual emotion[al harm to service user DA, and breached the trust of DA. Further, the panel found that Mr Guyton has demonstrated only limited insight or remediation in that he has set out how he would prevent himself from getting involved in similar allegations in the future. However, he has not considered how his interactions with DA impacted upon a vulnerable service user [PRIVATE] (including the effect of the power imbalance between himself and DA), or the effect of his actions upon the social work profession and the public.

162. The panel finds that taking no action, issuing advice, or issuing a warning would not adequately protect the public, and be in the wider public interest of upholding professional standards and maintaining public confidence.

163. The panel then considered whether a conditions of practice order would be proportionate and appropriate in the circumstances. The panel was conscious of its previous finding that it cannot form a view whether his conduct is remediable. Further, the misconduct stemmed from behavioural concerns which are difficult to measure. The panel had particular regard to ... the Sanctions Guidance...In light of this, the panel found that it could not formulate conditions which were proportionate or workable, or which were not so restrictive that they would be tantamount to suspension.

164. The panel then considered whether a suspension order would be proportionate and appropriate in the circumstances. The panel was conscious that Mr Guyton has demonstrated some, even if limited, insight. It was further of the view that, given its previous finding that it cannot form a view whether his conduct is remediable, an opportunity is provided to Mr Guyton to demonstrate that his conduct is remediable and that he can remedy it. The panel consider that the public will be protected with a suspension order whilst Mr Guyton attempts to achieve insight and remedy his conduct. The panel consider that Mr Guyton knows how to behave to service users given his change of attitude towards DA from 27 May 2020, and therefore considers there is the possibility that Mr Guyton could remedy his behaviour so as not to pose a risk to the public.

165. The panel has the power to impose a suspension order for up to three years. The panel considered the proportionality of a suspension order, namely time for Mr Guyton to demonstrate remediation and gain insight, balanced against the need to protect the public and the wider public interest of upholding professional standards and maintaining public confidence, which also includes the risk of Mr Guyton deskilling.

166. Having balanced the factors outlined above, and upon considering all of the circumstances of the case, the panel found that a 2-year suspension would be a sufficient period for Mr Guyton to develop and demonstrate insight and remediation. The panel is satisfied, for all of the reasons outlined above, that this is a sufficient period of time to protect the public and to maintain public confidence and proper professional standards.

167. The panel had regard to ... the Sanctions Guidance...

168. The panel was borderline whether to impose a removal order, but found it was marginally disproportionate when taking into account the mitigating and aggravating features set out above. In particular, the panel was conscious of providing Mr Guyton the opportunity to demonstrate that his conduct is remediable and that he can remedy it.

169. The panel is conscious of the Sanctions Guidance in relation to abuse of trust and sexual misconduct. In relation to abuse of trust, the Sanctions Guidance sets out that: "most cases of serious abuses of trust are likely to require suspension or removal from the register. If a decision maker decides on a lesser sanction, they must provide detailed reasoning." The panel has imposed suspension in this matter.

170. ...Although the panel considers that Mr Guyton abused his professional position towards DA, who was vulnerable, the panel took into account that:

- a. the misconduct did not involve any physical interaction and was limited to inappropriate remarks, albeit consistently for over a month;

- b. *it did not consider Mr Guyton deliberately abused his power in a calculating or premeditated manner, but rather his conduct was opportunistic and unprofessional; and*
- c. *Mr Guyton should be afforded the opportunity to demonstrate that his conduct is remediable and that he can remedy it in a meaningful and sustainable manner.*

172. The suspension order will be subject to review before expiry, during which a separate panel of adjudicators will consider whether Mr Guyton's fitness to practise remains impaired and, if so, what, if any, sanction should be imposed. Mr Guyton will only be permitted to practice, under restrictions or otherwise, if he demonstrates insight and remediation and if the review panel is satisfied that there no longer remains a real risk of repetition of his behaviour. The reviewing panel would benefit from Mr Guyton's attendance at the hearing and a reflective piece from Mr Guyton demonstrating insight and remediation in relation to his behaviour.

Social Work England submissions:

9. The panel heard submissions from Ms Adjei-Ntow as to the background of the case and the previous panel's findings in relation to impairment and sanction. Ms Adjei-Ntow submitted that Mr Guyton remained currently impaired. However, as his reflective piece demonstrated some insight and remorse, Social Work England adopted a neutral stance on sanction.
10. Ms Adjei-Ntow explained that since the point of drafting the notice of hearing, Social Work England had received submissions from Mr Guyton in which he responded to each of the regulatory concerns. Ms Adjei-Ntow accepted that Mr Guyton had demonstrated some insight. His submissions acknowledged that some of his language had been inappropriate and may have had sexual connotations. She accepted that he acknowledged the power imbalances between social workers and service users. She highlighted that he admitted that his approach to communication damaged the professional relationship with a parent. Further, that he also acknowledged the impact on the parent's trust in the social work profession.
11. Ms Adjei-Ntow submitted, however, that the tone of some of Mr Guyton's representations was defensive due to him maintaining his denial of some of the allegations, for example, asking the service user for a 'rollie' cigarette. She asserted that his submissions reframed issues as 'misinterpretation' by the parent rather than accepting professional responsibility for his misconduct. She asserted that his reference to matters such as his smoking habit shifted focus away from his requirement to maintaining professional boundaries.
12. She accepted that he appeared to show a genuine acknowledgement of professional failings but submitted that Mr Guyton continued to fall short of fully accepting responsibility for his misconduct. She submitted therefore that he remained currently impaired and a sanction remained necessary.

Social worker submissions:

13. Mr Guyton provided written submissions addressing each of the allegations considered at the substantive hearing. He accepted that some of his actions, particularly in relation to his communication with a parent, were unprofessional and demonstrated poor judgement. He sought to show insight into the impact of his behaviour on the parent, the professional relationship, and the wider confidence in the social work profession.
14. Mr Guyton clarified that the assessment in question was a Section 17 Child in Need assessment, later progressing to a Section 47 enquiry, focused on the welfare of a young child. He stated that some of the intrusive enquiries were appropriate in that context. However, he accepted that the tone and content of his communication, particularly via text messages, fell short of professional expectations.
15. He acknowledged that the informal, sarcastic, and at times inappropriate tone of his messages may have caused distress or confusion and contributed to a breakdown in trust. He accepted full responsibility for the language used and recognised that this could be misinterpreted by the parent and others. He further accepted that such communication may have damaged public confidence in the profession.
16. Mr Guyton strongly denied that any of his actions were sexually motivated. He described this allegation as particularly distressing, given that the parent was aware of his sexuality and he had no history of inappropriate behaviour of this kind. While he did not accept the alleged motivation, he acknowledged that his conduct gave rise to misinterpretation and that this was a result of his own failings in maintaining appropriate professional boundaries.
17. He also denied asking the parent for a cigarette, describing the allegation as implausible and inconsistent with his views and practice. He accepted, however, that had such conduct occurred, it would have been wholly inappropriate and harmful to the parent-professional dynamic.
18. Regarding an alleged visit to the parent's home without justification, Mr Guyton stated that the visit was part of a Section 47 enquiry following a lack of response and was compliant with statutory guidance. He accepted that unannounced visits can be distressing, and that clearer professional communication was necessary.
19. Mr Guyton described several remediative steps, he had taken when he had been able to return to practice after the misconduct had occurred and prior to his suspension. This had included reflective practice, participation in workshops, and discussing, with managers, professional boundaries and communication. He expressed deep regret and remorse for his conduct and its impact. He stated that he had not repeated such conduct since, though acknowledged his ability to evidence ongoing development had been limited due to his unemployment since July 2023.
20. He expressed a strong desire to return to practice and demonstrate that he had learned from the experience.

21. In oral submissions, Mr Guyton specifically acknowledged the power imbalance of his relationship to service users. He explained that although he continued to dispute some of the allegations, he understood how those categories of behaviour undermined the profession and damaged relationships with service users. In this particular case, he emphasised the fact that his own misconduct had let himself down through damaging the profession and the service user's trust in social workers.
22. In response to questions from the panel, he explained that although he denied a subjective sexual motivation to his behaviour, he understood how the messages could be read as flirtatious and that it was reasonable for the service user and panel to have interpreted them that way. He explained that since being suspended, he had volunteered for a charity working with people who had suffered head injuries, and had worked in an administrative role for the Department for Education. He had not provided references for either role as he had believed that as they did not involve working directly with service users or families, they would not have been relevant to these proceedings.
23. In response to questions from the panel, Mr Guyton accepted that he had become deskilled during the period of his suspension. Although he had maintained some current awareness through keeping up to date with news stories touching upon social work and related legislation and conversations with friends in the profession, he had not undertaken CPD or other courses.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

24. 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'*.
25. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel, Mr Guyton's reflective statement, and the written submissions from both parties. It also considered the oral submissions it had heard in today's hearing.
26. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintaining public confidence in the profession.
27. The panel first considered whether Mr Guyton's fitness to practise remains impaired.
28. The panel noted that the previous panel found that Mr Guyton had limited insight and had demonstrated insufficient remediation. This was particularly in relation to the effect of his actions on service user DA. That panel found that he had not considered how his interactions with DA impacted upon her, especially given her vulnerable nature

and his sexually motivated conduct. Further, the previous panel considered that Mr Guyton's reflective piece did not demonstrate insight in relation to the effect of his actions upon the social work profession and the public.

29. The panel concluded that Mr Guyton's insight had significantly improved and that he had demonstrated remorse for his actions. The culmination of his oral and written submissions was such that each of the areas highlighted by the previous panel had been addressed by him. Further, he had followed the two recommendations of the previous panel, by attending today's hearing and providing a comprehensive reflective statement.
30. The panel noted that Mr Guyton continued to dispute some of the allegations but acknowledged that this was his right. The panel was satisfied that he had shown through his submissions that he accepted, objectively, how his behaviour could reasonably be interpreted to have been sexually motivated and flirtatious. Further, he accepted full responsibility for the impact of his behaviour. This included showing insight into how his misconduct affected both service users and the wider profession.
31. The panel noted that Mr Guyton had returned to work, for a further two years, for the local authority that had employed him at the time of his misconduct. It concluded, therefore, that there was some evidence to demonstrate that he could work safely in the profession. It noted, however, that it did not have evidence before it to show how that work had been structured, the level to which Mr Guyton may have been supervised or the specifics of the work he had undertaken.
32. The panel noted further that, since then, Mr Guyton had not maintained his skillset or knowledge. For example, he had not undertaken further CPD or training nor had he engaged in roles with elements that aligned with social work. Mr Guyton had not provided any testimonials or references from the roles he had undertaken and referenced in oral submissions. Such testimonials or references would have assisted the panel to consider his implementation of appropriate professional boundaries and communication with service users.
33. In light of the above, the panel found that on balance, there were still areas for Mr Guyton to remediate and therefore the risk of repetition continued (although the risk had reduced). Furthermore, Mr Guyton's skills and knowledge were such that there remained a risk of harm to the public.
34. Given the nature and seriousness of the underlying allegations which created the risk in the first place alongside the continued risk of repetition, there remained a necessity to find that Mr Guyton is currently impaired in the interests of the wider public.

Decision and reasons:

35. Having found Mr Guyton's fitness to practise to be currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to

the submissions made along with all the information and 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 Guyton, 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 Guyton's interests with the public interest.

Impose a new order namely conditions of practice for 12 months with effect from the expiry of the current order:

Taking No Action / Revoking the Suspension. Issuing a Warning:

37. The panel noted that these sanctions would not restrict Mr Guyton's ability to practise and were therefore not appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety. In any event, the deficiencies identified with Mr Guyton's practice had the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences and therefore some restriction on his practice is required. Therefore, the panel concluded that these options would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.

Conditions of practice order

38. The panel took the view that the deficiencies identified with Mr Guyton's practice are potentially capable of being remedied and was satisfied that appropriate, workable conditions could be formulated given the significant progress he had demonstrated in developing his insight and remorse.
39. The panel took into account that Mr Guyton had responded positively to the previous panel's suggestions to attend this hearing and to provide his reflections. The panel was of the view that as Mr Guyton has been out of social work practice for two years, the following conditions would protect the public and the wider public interest. This would allow Mr Guyton to return to social work in a supported environment where he could work towards further remediation and remove the identified risk of repetition.
40. The panel considered that a period of 12 months should be sufficient time for Mr Guyton to demonstrate that he can practice safely.

41. Conditions of Practice:

Condition 1

You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact

details of your employer or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.

Condition 2

You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.

Condition 3

You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.

Condition 4

You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.

Condition 5

You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment / self-employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.

Condition 6

You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant authority within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect.

Condition 7

You must keep your professional commitments under review and limit your social work practice in accordance with your workplace supervisor's advice.

Condition 8

You must not supervise the work of any other social worker or student social worker.

Condition 9

You must not work as an independent social worker and must only work as a social worker at premises where other social workers are employed.

Condition 10

You must not be responsible for the administration/management of any independent social work practice/establishment.

Condition 11

You must not undertake any agency or locum work.

Condition 12

Workplace supervision:

- a. At any time you are employed, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England; you must place yourself and remain under the supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by your workplace, and agreed by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register.**
- b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.**

Note: Social Work England can approve workplace supervisors in one business day if a full CV is sent at the time of the request.

Condition 13

You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 3 months and at least 7 days prior to any review, and Social Work England will make these reports available to any reporter referred to in these conditions on request.

Condition 14

You must work with your workplace supervisor, to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:

- **Communication with service users**
- **Maintaining professional boundaries**
- **Return to practice including:**
 - **Refreshing knowledge on the statutory framework relating to social work; and**
 - **Developments in the profession since your last period of practice.**

Condition 15

You must provide a copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England within 6 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 4 weeks prior to any review.

Condition 16

You must provide a written copy of your conditions, within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect, to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at (1) to (15), above:

- Any organisation or person employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary.
- Any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any organisation, agency, employer where you are using your social work qualification/knowledge/skills in a non-qualified social work role, whether paid or voluntary.

You must forward written evidence of your compliance with this condition to Social Work England within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect

Condition 17

You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, (1) to (16), to any person requesting information about your registration status.

Right of appeal:

42. 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.
43. 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.
44. 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.
45. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

46. 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).

47. 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

48. 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>