

Social worker: Noor M Yusuf

Registration number: SW118547

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review hearing

Date of meeting: 19 August 2025

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 03 October 2025)

Hearing outcome:

Extend the current suspension order for a further 9 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 18 months by a panel of adjudicators on 6 March 2024.
2. Mr Noor Yusuf attended and was represented by Mr Ibrahim Patel.
3. Social Work England was represented by Mr Micheal Brooks case presenter instructed by Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Eileen Carr	Chair
Julie Brown	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Tom Stoker	Hearings officer
Chiugo Eze	Hearings support officer
Esther Oladipo	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. Service of notice was not specifically addressed during the hearing. However, as Mr Yusuf attended the hearing and was represented by Mr Ibrahim Patel, the Panel was satisfied that notice of the hearing had been properly effected in accordance with the relevant Rules.

Preliminary matters:

5. At the outset of the hearing, Mr Patel invited the Panel to permit him to represent Mr Yusuf, the Social Worker subject to these proceedings. The Panel heard that Mr Patel had represented Mr Yusuf in previous hearings during this regulatory process and wished to do so again at this review hearing. Mr Patel confirmed that he is a practising social worker and currently manages an adult social work team. Mr Brooks, presenting the case on behalf of Social Work England, raised no objection to this course of action.
6. The Panel received and accepted general legal advice that, under the relevant framework, it is within the discretion of the adjudicators to permit a suitable person who is not legally qualified to represent a registrant. The advice further confirmed that the Panel may conduct the hearing in any manner it considers appropriate, provided it complies with the Fitness to Practise Rules and ensures fairness to both Social Work England and the registrant. Having considered the submissions, the advice, and in the interests of fairness, the Panel permitted Mr Patel to represent Mr Yusuf in this hearing

Review of the current order:

7. 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).
8. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 3 October 2025. The order subject to review is a suspension order.

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

Allegations:

Whilst registered as a Social Worker:

1. You were convicted of the following offences:

- a. Dangerous driving contrary to section 2 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 on or around 22 October 2021 at Manchester Crown Court and/or;*
- b. Using a motor vehicle without insurance contrary to section 143 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 on or around 18 October 2021 at Manchester Crown Court and/or;*
- c. Driving without due care and attention, contrary to section 3 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 on or around 2 May 2018 at Greater Manchester Magistrates' Court.*

2. You failed to inform the regulator that you had:

- a. Been arrested and/ or charged with the following offences:*
 - i. Causing death by dangerous driving contrary to section 1 of the Road Traffic Act 1988, following an incident on 28 February 2019 and/ or;*
 - ii. Causing death by dangerous driving whilst unlicensed, disqualified or uninsured contrary to section 3ZB of the Road Traffic Act 1988 following an incident on 28 February 2019.*

The matters outlined at paragraph 1 above amount to the statutory ground of a conviction in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence

The matters outlined at paragraph 2 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your convictions and/ or misconduct.

The final hearing panel on 4-6 March 2024 determined the following with regard to impairment:

9. *“The panel first considered the level of Mr Yusuf’s insight and his reflection on what had occurred in relation to his driving convictions and failures in his duty to report serious issues affecting his work as a social worker to his regulator.*
10. *The panel was not satisfied that Mr Yusuf had demonstrated full insight into his past failings or had taken sufficient measures to remedy them. It accepted that he had reflected upon them but was not persuaded that he fully understood them and considered that there was a risk of repetition in relation to both his driving and his failures to report matters to his regulator. The panel took fully into account what Mr Yusuf had told it, but was left with an impression that Mr Yusuf had told the panel what he thought it would wish to hear, without a full understanding of what his words meant. It was unconvinced that Mr Yusuf would not repeat his actions, which it found to be breaches of fundamental tenets of social work, which include the need to be honest, open and trustworthy.*
11. *The panel took into account the problems faced by a suspended social worker in remedying deficiencies but noted that Social Work England does provide advice and help to suspended social workers and that there were other sources of training and Continuing Professional Development which Mr Yusuf could have pursued. It noted that Mr Yusuf had not worked as a social worker for about five years and that he had not been qualified for long before he ceased social work. It considered that he will need considerable training and assistance if he is to return to social work.*
12. *The panel concluded that Mr Yusuf’s fitness to practise is currently impaired in relation to public protection.*
13. *The panel considered the effects of Mr Yusuf’s actions on public confidence in the profession. It concluded that informed members of the public, knowing the facts of Mr Yusuf’s case, would be shocked if there was no finding of impairment in this case and would not understand how a social worker who had breached fundamental requirements of social workers was allowed to work as a social worker without restriction.*
14. *The panel therefore concluded that Mr Yusuf’s fitness to practise is currently impaired for reasons of both public protection and public interest.”*

The final hearing panel on 4-6 March 2024 determined the following with regard to sanction:

15. *“The panel began by considering what mitigating and aggravating factors it should take into account.*

- The panel identified the following as mitigation:*
- Mr Yusuf was newly qualified at the relevant time;*
- He had no previous regulatory findings against him;*
- He did not attempt to conceal his arrest from his employers;*
- He now understands the need to inform his regulator of significant events affecting him as a social worker;*
- He has undergone personal and financial hardship as a result of his conduct;*
- He made an early admission of the facts and has engaged with his regulator in the investigation.*
- The panel identified the following aggravating factors:*
- There were two criminal convictions for driving offences;*
- The length of time which elapsed before both regulators were informed of the relevant events;*
- The report was made by his then employer, not Mr Yusuf;*
- There was a repetition of Mr Yusuf failing to inform his regulator;*
- Mr Yusuf has not undertaken the extended driving test;*
- Mr Yusuf has not undertaken any CPD, training or education during the time he has not been working as a social worker;*
- Mr Yusuf has only partial insight into his failings.*

16. *The panel first considered whether taking no action against Mr Yusuf’s registration was an appropriate sanction. Having identified that Mr Yusuf posed a continuing risk to the public, the panel determined that a disposal which did not restrict Mr Yusuf’s ability to practise was not appropriate and not in the public interest. The panel reached a similar conclusion in relation to issuing Mr Yusuf with advice or a warning.*

17. *The panel then considered whether a conditions of practice order was an appropriate sanction. It noted that the events leading to this hearing occurred in Mr Yusuf’s private life, not in his professional activities. It took into account that Mr Yusuf has not undertaken any training or education in the interim. It also took into account the wider*

public interest. The panel concluded that it was not possible to devise conditions that were workable and sufficient to protect the public and the public interest. It considered that any conditions which might be devised would be so limiting upon Mr Yusuf's ability to practise as to amount to suspension.

18. The panel then considered the sanction of a suspension order. In doing so it also considered whether removal of Mr Yusuf from the register of social workers was appropriate. The panel noted the Social Work England guidance on suspension:

19. Suspension is appropriate where (both of the following apply):

- the decision makers cannot formulate workable conditions to protect the public or the wider public interest*
- the case falls short of requiring removal from the register (or where removal is not an option)*

20. The panel considered that Mr Yusuf's case satisfied both limbs of the test. It concluded that removal from the register was not appropriate in this case as it was not the only means of protecting the public and the public interest, and would be disproportionate.

21. The panel took into account Mr Yusuf's evidence that he hoped to work towards returning to social work and considered that a period of suspension would give him time and an incentive to undertake what was necessary to enable him to do so. It was satisfied that suspension was a sufficient sanction to protect the public and the public interest and was proportionate.

22. The panel considered what was the appropriate period for a suspension order. It concluded that the appropriate length of suspension was 18 months. It considered that this was the minimum time Mr Yusuf would need to achieve his aim of preparing himself for a return to social work.

23. The panel, without binding a future reviewing panel, considered that that panel would be assisted by the following:

- Evidence that Mr Yusuf had engaged in appropriate education and training, in particular an update to his social work skills and also ethics and professional governance;*
- A written reflective piece setting out what Mr Yusuf had learned from the events leading to this hearing;*
- Testimonials or references from those of good standing which indicated Mr Yusuf's suitability to return to social work;*
- Evidence of steps taken by Mr Yusuf to take the extended driving test.*

24. The panel therefore concluded that a suspension order of 18 months was the appropriate sanction in Mr Yusuf's case."

Social Work England submissions:

25. This panel heard submissions from Mr Brooks, case presenter on behalf of Social Work England as to the background and the previous panel's findings in relation to impairment and sanction. Mr Brooks submitted that Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise remains impaired and invited the Panel to extend the existing Suspension Order for a further period of 9 months. He emphasised that this extension was sought for the same reasons as those given by the previous Panel, namely the seriousness of the underlying criminal convictions, the failure to report those convictions to the regulator, the associated risk of repetition, and the need to maintain public confidence in the profession.
26. Mr Brooks referred to the recommendations made by the previous panel, which identified four areas of evidence that would assist at this review: (i) engagement in appropriate education and training, including social work skills, ethics, and professional governance; (ii) a written reflective piece; (iii) testimonials or references from those of good standing; and (iv) evidence of having taken the extended driving test.
27. The Panel was informed by Mr Brooks that some steps had been taken by Mr Yusuf. A reflective piece had been submitted in July 2025, and he must have completed the extended driving test, as his driving licence had been returned. Mr Brooks drew the Panel's attention to correspondence showing that Mr Yusuf had enrolled on a return-to-practice course with confirmation from Mr Yusuf that he had completed the academic element, with his placement due to commence imminently. However, Mr Brooks noted that there was, as yet, no evidence of the outcome of that academic training, nor any feedback or assessment from the course provider. Likewise, Mr Yusuf had provided no testimonials or references from those of good standing as suggested by the previous panel.
28. Mr Brooks submitted that the reflective piece was limited in scope, concentrating largely on Mr Yusuf's failure to notify the regulator of traffic offences and the personal impact of proceedings, rather than addressing the gravity of the underlying criminal offending, the wider impact on public confidence, or the reputation of the profession. He highlighted that the previous panel had expressed concerns that Mr Yusuf risked telling the panel what he thought it wished to hear without demonstrating genuine insight, and that this remained a concern in the absence of deeper reflection.
29. In light of the limited evidence of remediation, and in the absence of corroborative material such as testimonials or demonstrable outcomes from the return-to-practice course, Mr Brooks submitted that Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise remained impaired. He invited the Panel to extend the Suspension Order for a further period of 9 months, to allow Mr Yusuf additional time to complete his remediation, evidence genuine insight, and demonstrate that the risk of repetition had been addressed.

Social worker submissions:

30. Mr Patel on behalf of Mr Yusuf submitted that Mr Yusuf was in agreement with Social Work England's proposal to extend the Suspension Order for a further period of 9 months. He explained that such an extension would provide Mr Yusuf with the opportunity to complete his return to practice training and obtain appropriate testimonials from social work practitioners regarding his supervised practice, which could then be presented to Social Work England.
31. Mr Patel acknowledged the concerns raised by Social Work England in relation to Mr Yusuf's reflective piece. He informed the Panel that Mr Yusuf understood this feedback, accepted the constructive criticism, and was willing to revisit and strengthen his reflection so as to demonstrate genuine insight and rehabilitation.
32. In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Patel and Mr Yusuf provided details of Mr Yusuf's forthcoming placement, arranged through Manchester University as part of a Return to Social Work course. The Panel was told that the placement, initially scheduled at Bury Council but now confirmed with Salford City Council, would be conducted under close supervision. Mr Yusuf explained that he would be attending two days per week until he had completed 35 placement days, which was expected to conclude in November 2025. The placement would involve shadowing a registered social worker and carrying out supervised tasks only.
33. Mr Patel confirmed his understanding that Social Work England had raised no objection to Mr Yusuf undertaking this placement on the basis that he was participating in a return to practice programme in the capacity of a supervised student. He submitted that this arrangement was consistent with the conditions of the current Suspension Order and provided a structured and appropriate opportunity for the Mr Yusuf to demonstrate progress towards remediation.
34. In closing, Mr Patel reiterated that Mr Yusuf remained committed to addressing the concerns identified by the previous panel and welcomed the proposed 9-month extension as a constructive period in which he could complete his placement, strengthen his reflection, and provide evidence of his remediation and suitability to return to unrestricted practice.

Legal Advice:

35. The Panel received and accepted legal advice from the Legal Adviser. The Panel was reminded that its role was to conduct a mandatory review of the existing final order, as required at the expiry of the order under paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 to the Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Rule 16 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended). This was not a rehearing of the original facts, which remain binding on the Panel, but an assessment of whether the Social Worker's fitness to practise remains impaired and, if so, what sanction, if any, is necessary and proportionate.

36. The Panel was advised of the powers available to it under the Regulations, namely to: confirm the current order; extend, reduce, substitute, revoke or vary it, subject to the relevant statutory limits. Any order made would take effect immediately, even if subject to appeal.
37. The Legal Adviser reminded the Panel to apply Social Work England's overarching objective, namely the protection of the public. This required consideration of: (i) the protection, promotion, and maintenance of the health, safety, and well-being of the public; (ii) the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and (iii) the maintenance of proper professional standards. The burden lay with the Social Worker to demonstrate that his fitness to practise was no longer impaired, with reference to evidence of insight, remediation, and sustained improvement.
38. The Panel was further advised that it must undertake its own risk assessment, considering both the risks identified by the original panel and any new evidence presented at this review. In doing so, the Panel was referred to Social Work England's *Impairment and Sanctions Guidance*, ensuring that any outcome was fair, proportionate, and addressed both the protection of the public and the wider public interest.
39. Finally, the Legal Adviser reminded the Panel of the need to provide clear, reasoned, and evidence-based findings, demonstrating how the statutory framework and guidance had been applied to the facts of the case.

Panel's decision and reasons on current impairment:

40. The Panel carefully considered the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England by Mr Brooks, together with those made by Mr Patel on behalf of Mr Yusuf. The Panel also took into account the information provided by Mr Yusuf during the hearing. In reaching its decision, the Panel had regard to the Social Workers Regulations 2018, the Social Work England Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), and the *Impairment and Sanctions Guidance* published by Social Work England. The Panel reminded itself that its task was to undertake a risk assessment, considering both the risks previously identified by the final hearing panel and any new information before it today.
41. The Panel noted that the original findings of fact and the determination of impairment remain binding. The Panel recognised that Mr Yusuf was convicted of a number of criminal offences, including dangerous driving and driving without insurance, which were of a serious nature and carried with them both personal and public elements of impairment. The original panel determined that his fitness to practise was impaired on the basis of these convictions, his failure to notify the regulator, and concerns regarding risk of repetition and the wider impact on public confidence in the profession.
42. In reviewing the current evidence, the Panel considered the areas of remediation that had been identified as necessary by the previous panel. These included: (i) evidence of engagement in appropriate education and training, particularly in relation to social work skills, ethics, and governance; (ii) a reflective piece demonstrating insight into the

seriousness of the misconduct, the impact on the public and on the reputation of the profession; (iii) references or testimonials from those of good standing addressing his suitability to return to practice; and (iv) evidence of completion of the extended driving test.

43. The Panel accepted that Mr Yusuf has now successfully completed the extended driving test, as evidenced by the return of his driving licence. This demonstrates some progress in addressing the risks associated with his convictions and provides evidence of developing insight. The Panel also acknowledged the submission of a reflective piece in July 2025. However, the Panel agreed with Social Work England that this reflection focussed primarily on the personal impact of events on Mr Yusuf, and his failure to report his convictions to his regulator. The Panel considered that there was insufficient analysis of the seriousness of the underlying criminal conduct and its effect on public confidence in the social work profession. However, the Panel was encouraged by Mr Yusuf's stated willingness to revisit and strengthen this reflection, but it considered that the current document did not evidence full insight.
44. The Panel further noted that although Mr Yusuf has completed the academic component of a return to social work course and is due to commence a supervised placement, there was no independent evidence before the Panel of his progress or performance. The Panel accepted that an email between Social Work England and Manchester University confirmed that he may undertake this placement as a "*return to social work student*." However, there was no formal feedback or corroborative evidence from the university in relation to the academic part of the course. In addition, no testimonials or references from those of good standing were provided.
45. Taking all of the evidence into account, the Panel concluded that whilst there are signs of developing insight and some early steps towards remediation, the process is incomplete and unsupported by independent corroboration. The absence of robust evidence in relation to insight, remediation, and sustained engagement means that the concerns identified by the original panel remain.
46. Accordingly, the Panel found that Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise remains impaired. On the personal component, the Panel determined that there continues to be a risk of repetition in light of the incomplete remediation and insufficient demonstration of full insight. On the public component, the Panel considered that confidence in the profession and the need to uphold proper standards would be undermined if a social worker with such serious convictions, and with limited evidence of remediation, were permitted to return to unrestricted practice at this stage.
47. For these reasons, the Panel determined that Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise remains currently impaired on both personal and public components.

Panel's Decision and Reasons on Sanction:

48. Having determined that Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise remains currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what, if any, sanction should be imposed in this case. The panel was mindful that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish Mr Yusuf but to protect the public and to uphold the wider public interest. The wider public interest includes the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and in Social Work England as its regulator, and the promotion of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
49. The panel had regard to the 'Impairment and Sanctions Guidance' published by Social Work England and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel also considered the submissions made by Mr Brooks on behalf of Social Work England and the submissions provided by Mr Patel on behalf of Mr Yusuf. In reaching its decision, the panel applied the principle of proportionality, balancing Mr Yusuf's own interests against the need to protect the public and the wider public interest.
50. The panel first considered whether to take no further action, issue advice, or impose a warning order. The panel concluded that these outcomes would not be sufficient to address the seriousness of the regulatory concerns, nor would they adequately protect the public nor to uphold public confidence in the profession.
51. The panel next considered whether to impose a Conditions of Practice Order. The panel recognised that Mr Yusuf has shown some engagement and a degree of remediation, including passing the extended driving test, producing a reflective piece, and commencing a return to social work practice course with Salford City Council. These steps demonstrate a willingness to re-engage with the profession and indicates developing insight. However, the panel concluded that his insight remains limited, that the reflective piece does not fully address the impact of Mr Yusuf's behaviour on public confidence, and he has not yet completed the practical component of the course or produced any supporting testimonials or references. The panel was not satisfied that conditions of practice could be formulated at this stage to adequately address the seriousness of the risks identified.
52. The panel therefore determined that a Suspension Order remains the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case. The Panel considered that a Suspension Order will provide Mr Yusuf with further time to complete the practical component of his return to practice course, consolidate his learning through reflection, and provide testimonials and references to demonstrate his readiness to return safely to practice.
53. Without binding a future reviewing panel, the panel agreed with the previous panel that any future reviewing panel would be assisted by evidence of:
- Completion of appropriate education and training, including an update to social work skills, ethics and professional governance;

- A written reflective piece addressing what Mr Yusuf has learned from the events leading to this hearing and their impact on public confidence; and
- Testimonials or references from individuals of good standing supporting his suitability to return to social work practice.

54. The panel considered the appropriate length of suspension. It determined that a period of 9 months was proportionate. This period provides Mr Yusuf with sufficient time to complete the 35-day practice placement of his course, develop further insight and reflection, and gather the necessary supporting evidence including testimonials and references. The panel noted that under the Fitness to Practise Rules and the Early Review Guidance, Mr Yusuf may request an early review of the Suspension Order should he be able to provide new evidence of compliance, remediation, and insight before the expiry of the order.

55. Accordingly, the panel decided to confirm and continue the Suspension Order for a further period of 9 months. This order is necessary and proportionate to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

Right of appeal:

56. 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:

57. the decision of adjudicators:

58. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),

59. not to revoke or vary such an order,

60. to make a final order,

61. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.

62. 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.

63. 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.

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

Review of final orders:

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

66. 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.

67. 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.

68. 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).

69. 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

70. 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>