



Social Worker: James Lynch

Registration Number: SW33220

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Meeting

Meeting Venue: Remote meeting

Date of meeting: 8 September 2025

Final Order being reviewed:
Suspension order – expires 19 October 2025

Hearing Outcome:
Removal Order upon expiry of the suspension order

Introduction and attendees

1. This was the second review of an order originally imposed by a panel of adjudicators of Social Work England on 22 March 2023. The panel imposed a suspension order of 18 months.
2. Mr Lynch did not attend the review and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Catherine Boyd	Lay Chair
Charlotte Scott	Social Work Adjudicator

Hearings Team/Legal Adviser	Role
Titlee Pandey	Hearings Officer
Kathryn Tinsley	Hearing Support Officer
Nathan Moxon	Legal Adviser

Service of Notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) had careful regard to the documents contained in the substantive order review hearing service bundle as follows:
 - i. A copy of the notice of substantive order review hearing dated 7 August 2025 and addressed to Mr Lynch at his email address as it appears on the Social Work England Register;
 - ii. An extract from the Social Work England Register detailing Mr Lynch’s registered email address;
 - iii. A copy of a signed Statement of Service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 7 August 2025 the writer caused the notice of hearing to be sent by email Mr Lynch’s registered address;
 - iv. A copy of the email; and

- v. An email from Mr Lynch, dated 12 August 2025, in which he states that he no longer wishes to remain on the register of social workers and requests that his name be removed.
5. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
6. Having had regard to rule 16 and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Lynch in accordance with rules 44 and 45 of Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules (updated 9 April 2020) ('the Rules').

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

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

*"If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention **by no later than 4pm on 22 August 2025. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you do not want to attend a hearing and Social Work England may decide to deal with the review as a meeting.** If Social Work England do hold a meeting, the adjudicators will be provided with a copy of this letter setting out Social Work England's submissions and a copy of any written submissions you provide."*

9. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to rule 16(d) of the Rules which provides:

"Where the registered social worker makes written submissions and states that they do not intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may direct that the question of whether an order should be made is determined by means of a meeting."

10. The panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(d). The panel was satisfied that Mr Lynch had intentionally absented himself. He had not attended the final hearing in March 2023 and he has now stated that he no longer wishes to be named upon the Social Work England register. It concluded that adjourning the review would not secure his participation on a future occasion in light of the comments within his 12 August 2025 email to Social Work England.

Review of the current order:

11. The final order review was determined in accordance with Part 5 of the Regulations, Schedule 2 paragraph 15 of the Regulations and Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules.

The allegations:

12. The regulatory concerns that were subject to the final order, are as follows:

“That you, a Registered Social Worker:

(1) Whilst working at Rutland County Council:

(a) Failed to produce reports following Looked After Children Reviews which took place on the following dates:

- i. 24 April 2018;*
- ii. 25 April 2018;*
- iii. 26 April 2018;*
- iv. 27 April 2018.*

(b) Failed to handle information appropriately by sending emails containing confidential information relating to Child A:

i. On 19 April 2018:

- a. unencrypted,*
- b. to your personal email account.*

ii. On 14 May 2018:

- a. Unencrypted*
- b. To your personal email account*

(c) Used ... inappropriate language in an email on or around 23 May 2018 to Person B in that you referred to Person C as a ‘bright person of colour’

(d) Did not use social media appropriately and / or responsibly when you posted on Facebook on or around 10 May 2018 as set out in Schedule 1.

(e) Behaved in an inappropriate and/ or threatening manner towards colleagues by sending one or more of the emails identified in Schedule 2.

(2) Following your employment with Rutland County Council, did not use social media in a professional manner when you posted on Facebook on or around 18 March 2020 as set out in Schedule 3.

(3) During your employment at Bury County Council, whilst chairing a Child Protection Conference relating to Family G on 19 November 2020, behaved in an inappropriate / unprofessional manner towards other professionals present in that you:

- a. Said to Person H twice ‘You ought to be ashamed of yourself.’*

- b. Said to Person H 'I am going to make a complaint against you to your inspector.'*
- c. Threatened to remove Person H from the remote conference.*
- d.*
- e. Told those present 'you can express an opinion and I'm happy to hear it but it doesn't count for anything.'*

(4) Following your employment at Bury County Council:

- a. Did not use social media in a professional manner when you posted on Twitter on 21 November 2020 as set out in Schedule 4.*
- b. Behaved in an inappropriate and/ or threatening manner towards Person J by sending a message to Person J on 12 September 2021 as identified in Schedule 5.*

(5) Following your employment at Luton Borough Council:

- (a) Behaved in an inappropriate and/or threatening manner towards Person K by sending one or more emails to Person K as identified in Schedule 6.*
- (b) Breached professional boundaries in that you made contact with Service User L and / or Service User M as set out in Schedule 7.*
- (c) Failed to return work equipment to Luton Borough Council after your contract had been terminated.*

Your actions as set out above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Schedule 1 – referred to in Allegation 1(d)

(1) Posted on Facebook on or around 10 May 2018, 'I may be a bit different but that does not mean bullying and implied threat of failing three mon[th] probationary is acceptable because I'm taking longer to get up to speed than you wanted me to. I call this at least insensitivity and at worst bullying behaviour. It is also ageist to expect a 58 year old to work at the pace of a 30 year old ..bodies and capacity change .. older staff .. have skills knowledge and experience .. deserve dignity and respect.'

Schedule 2 – referred to in Allegation 1(e)

(1) Email to Person D on 10 May 2018 at 11.27 including the following text:

'Hi

Not happy with this response. Please alert your manager to this. I have been on the road constantly for Rutland's children. You do not seem to share this

corporate ethic which legally you are obliged to do. Please come back with a creative solution – what you are asking me to do is be out of position on a Friday evening with me far from home Leicester. I have had late nights for the last two weeks. We need a solution or I escalate straight to Directors – yours and mine in the spirit of IRO regulations. Corporately we need to facilitate me to do my job – please see IRO regs.'

(2) Email to Person B on 21 May 2018 at 08.23 including the following text:

'If you agree this then ...

- I shall stand down my silks – (my employment barrister is a circuit judge – she was so horrified by what I described by Rutland's constructive behaviour, and its injustice that she was prepared to wear silk again to prosecute you),*
- I shall sign a non disclosure agreement and destroy our prepared press release case material in respect of child T, not refer your staff to HCPC*
- Desist and will speak in neutral terms regarding working for Rutland CC*
- Go forward in recovery with positive conscience,*
- Destroy case info I have, which threatens the future career of Person E, Person F and director...,*
- Not damage your career, or future prospects,*

If not, I want my permanent job endorsing at an early employment review, (within 1/12) with a raise of £45k

These are my quite generous terms.

Failure to respond by COP Wednesday will result in,

- Press release to east midlands news and consequent ongoing franchises internationally,*
- Social media campaign,*
- Legal action filed, based on employment law, judicial review, DDA and article 8 violation.*

This is not a threat but merely notice of action for your Lawyers/advisors.

This is my not unreasonable compromise. I am angry with Rutland and I shall resolve this matter now.

On this basis and this basis alone we shall meet, without prejudice, to any eventual outcome. I shall bring a supporter Rutland. On neutral territory tomorrow, please respond with where, when, those in attendance

Schedule 3 – referred to in Allegation 2

(1) Posted on Facebook on 18 March 2020, 'For a while I thought I would walk away from bullying Rutland Ain't gonna happen Ofsted saw exactly what I saw as an IRO.'

(2) Posted on Facebook on 18 March 2020, 'I have never seen such poor practices in child protection than that I witnessed at Rutland County Council. Shocking and unsafe So they sacked me for calling them out.'

(3) Posted on Facebook on or around 18 March 2020, 'They systematically neglect their looked after children ...'

(4) Posted on Facebook on or around 18 March 2020, 'Rutland County Council tried to destroy me and my friend because I discovered appalling professional practice ... this has been validated by OFSTED who found their child safeguarding in an appalling state.. I can't wait to tell social work England what I saw and I have the evidence ... their head of HR will go because she complied with the malpractice.'

Schedule 4 – referred to in Allegation 4(a)

(1) Posted on Twitter on 21 November 2020 using the name 'Kafka Wilde'; 'Yesterday I was sacked from a rubbish local authority for refusing to place a child on a child protection plan because greater Manchester police saw a 13 year old smoking in the street .. sorry ... been a social worker since 1990 ... that's not child protection ... poor Ofsted deserve.'

(3) Posted on Twitter on 21 November 2020 using the name 'Kafka Wilde'; 'Bury child safeguarding is a bad joke. No wonder Ofsted berated them for leaving children in neglect for 2 years. Poor decisions.'

Schedule 5 – referred to in Allegation 4(b)

(1) Message sent to Person J on 12 September 2021 at 06:35 including the text, 'Hi just to let u know in terms of advance disclosure ... got lots of evidence which shall end your career. It didn't need to come to this. Sadly Bury is a basketcase. You treated me badly. Be ashamed of yourself. Jx'

Schedule 6 – referred to in Allegation 5(a)

(1) Email sent to Person K on 23 April 2021 at 20.08 including the text: 'Hello Person K,

Just in terms of advanced disclosure. I wanted to let you know that I have referred you to Social Work England because your behaviour falls below the standards acceptable for a practising social worker. I will pursue this until you are deregistered and will ensure you shall never practise again. I have a number of independent witnesses who shall give evidence regarding your Racist behaviour...'

(2) Email sent to Person K on 27 April 2021 at 21.07 including the text:

'Hello Person K,

To give you full disclosure, Given your behaviour and Lutons treatment of me as an expert in child safeguarding, and Lutons vulnerable children and families; last Friday as indicated, your iPhone was sold for parts for 45 pounds. I shall return or destroy the Luton id card.

Send me a self-addressed paid envelope and it shall be returned within one week.

With regards to the laptop if you do not pay me, for my work by the end of next week this will be reformatted and sold.

Finally [PRIVATE], today I contacted Ofsted and will be briefing the inspection team on my observations, your conduct, and comments made by Luton staff to me. I am sorry that your lack of judgement included included underestimating my resolve.

The next stage should you continue, is media briefings of friends at BBC, and further social media disclosure,... consult your lawyers as my team are briefed and ready,'

Schedule 7 – referred to in allegation 5(b)

Service User L

(i) On 15 April 2021 at 04.07 sent a text message saying 'Hi (Service User L) Luton have terminated my contract so you will get an inexperienced social worker soz best wishes Jc.'

(ii) On 15 April 2021 at 06.54 sent a text message saying 'If you wish to complain about your treatment (and I would) contact [Person K's email address] and let him know we are working together well as a team jx.'

(iii) On 18 April 2021 at 09:43 sent a text message saying 'Hi can you let [Person K] know that we were working well as a team and that I should remain as a worker for you?'

(iv) On 18 April 2021 at 11:15 sent a text message saying 'I shall advise you as an independent social worker ring me whenever you want'

(v) On 18 April 2021 at 11:17 sent a text message saying 'Your new Luton social worker has no experience and is newly qualified.'

Service User M

(vi) On or about 15 April 2021 at 03.42 and 04.46 hours sent music videos via WhatsApp.

(vii) On or about 15 May 2021 sent a WhatsApp message at 02:26 saying 'Hello[Service User M], you are right I do not work for Luton. I work for...as an

independent social worker which is entirely proper. Just to clarify, if you do not want further contact from me that's fine. However it might be in your interests to keep communication open. Jamesx'

(viii) On or about 16 April 2021 at 04.15 sent a whats app message saying 'Hello Luton have terminated my contract you will be allocated a newly qualified social worker best wishes for the future jx.'

(ix) On or about 30 April 2021 sent a text message at 21.22 saying 'I have offered to appear as an expert witness in both court cases Swindon and Luton. Just thought I would let you know.'

(x) On or about 2 May 2021 sent a text message at 18.01 saying 'Glad contact has been re set up....wishing you well j.'"

Final hearing panel's determinations:

13. In concluding that Mr Lynch's fitness to practise was impaired at the date of decision, the final hearing panel noted that the proved facts amounted to serious misconduct and serious departures from the standards expected. It noted that his conduct towards colleagues amounted to a misuse of authority and an abuse of power. The adverse findings related to behaviour over a three-year period when Mr Lynch had engaged with three different local authorities.
14. The final hearing panel concluded that Mr Lynch had demonstrated no real insight; had failed to provide evidence of attempts to remedy the misconduct; and had failed to engage with proceedings in any significant way. It concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to protect the public and wider public interest.
15. The final hearing panel concluded that taking no action or issuing a warning was not sufficient. It concluded that conditions of practice would not properly reflect the seriousness of the misconduct and would otherwise be unworkable as Mr Lynch had not engaged with Social Work England since 2021. It determined that the misconduct was remediable and that Mr Lynch should be given a final opportunity to show remediation.
16. The final hearing panel concluded that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction was a suspension order for a period of 18 months. It stated that the reviewing panel would be assisted by evidence of "...reflection by Mr Lynch leading to insight and positive steps by him to undertake relevant training".
17. In concluding that Mr Lynch's fitness to practise was impaired at the date of decision, the final hearing panel noted that the proved facts amounted to serious misconduct and serious departures from the standards

First review panel's determination:

18. Following the determination of the final hearing panel, Mr Lynch re-engaged with proceedings and submitted evidence of insight and remediation. He detailed that he had obtained alternative employment but would wish to be reinstated to the Social Work England register upon completion of his suspension. **[PRIVATE]**
19. Mr Lynch provided a reflective statement, dated 27 June 2024. **[PRIVATE]** Mr Lynch provided positive testimonials and certificates of learning from The Samaritans.
20. The first review panel concluded that Mr Lynch's fitness to practise remains impaired:

"29. The panel ... observed that Mr Lynch has had twelve months, whilst suspended, to provide evidence of full insight and remediation and he has not done so. The panel considered that it could not yet be confident that Mr Lynch has the required level of insight and that he has remedied his failings and therefore in turn it could not be confident that his behaviour would not be repeated in the future.

30. The panel also noted the substantive hearing panel's determination in respect of the public component of impairment and endorsed its expressed view. This panel was also of the view that Mr Lynch remains impaired in respect of the public component. His misconduct occurred a number of years ago and he has not provided any evidence of further training, which would satisfy the panel that he has addressed his conduct, nor has he provided evidence to demonstrate that he has not become de-skilled during this time. Consequently, the panel was of the view that there remained a risk to the public in these circumstances and that a finding of current impairment was required to maintain public confidence in the profession, which would be undermined should Mr Lynch be permitted to return to unrestricted practice.

31. Accordingly, taking all of the aforementioned into account, the panel concluded that, with the personal and public components in mind, Mr Lynch's fitness to practise remains impaired."

21. The first review panel determined that a further period of 12 months suspension would be appropriate for him to demonstrate full insight into his actions.

Submissions:

22. Within the notice of hearing, dated 7 August 2025, Social Work England submitted that the panel should impose a removal order:

"Subject to any further evidence or submissions received from the Social Worker prior to, or at the review hearing, Social Work England will invite the Panel to consider making a Removal Order. The Panel will be aware that the Social

Worker has not engaged with these proceedings consistently. He has during the currency of these proceedings engaged meaningfully only from April 2023 to December 2024.

The Social Worker's remediation, reflections and insight remain live issues and at the previous review the Panel determined that the Social Worker had not demonstrated sufficient remediation or insight. It is submitted that there has been little change in circumstances since then and, therefore, concerns remain about the Social Worker's remediation. The risk of repetition remains high and accordingly it is submitted that it is in the interests of public protection and wider public interest that the Social Worker's practice remains restricted.

In February 2025 it became apparent that the Social Worker had attempted to remove himself from the register. That application was not submitted through the correct channels. He indicated at that time that he no longer wished to remain on the register and regarded his relationship with Social Work England as being at an end. He has disengaged since then.

While a Removal Order is an order of last resort it is submitted that the circumstances of this case render it proportionate and appropriate in that there is on the part of the Social Worker an unwillingness and/or inability to remediate.

In the event that the Panel consider that a Removal Order is not proportionate or appropriate Social Work England will invite the Panel to extend the Suspension Order by a further 6 months. This will afford the Social Worker a further opportunity to evidence remediation and insight."

23. Mr Lynch provided the following response in a statement attached to his 12 August 2025 email:

"I wish to inform the Panel that I no longer seek to remain on the register of social workers.

I accept that, for a period, I was not acting in a professional, measured, and thoughtful way. [PRIVATE]

In that time, I have been employed in a senior management capacity within the private sector as a Service Manager and Policy Advisor to the CEO, and subsequently for a national care provider advising on the safeguarding and the welfare of children.

I have maintained my safeguarding knowledge and skills, including completing Stockport Local Authority's annual Designated Safeguarding Lead update training and undertaking additional learning in Prevent, Safeguarding, and Online Safety -completing a nationally recognised qualification.

I have reflected deeply on the events and circumstances that led to my professional difficulties. I fully recognise that my conduct during that period fell short of Social Work England's professional standards and expectations. I

remain both mortified and regretful about my actions and their consequences, including the impact on the social work profession and its reputation.

I do not agree with the characterisation that there is a “high risk of repetition”. I have worked hard to [PRIVATE] ensure that I have learned from the serious errors of judgment that compromised my reputation and integrity.

I have decided, after careful consideration, that I no longer wish to be registered as a social worker. This decision reflects my wish to focus my future career outside of the statutory social work profession, while continuing to contribute positively in safeguarding and care roles in other capacities. I therefore respectfully request that my name be removed from the register.”

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 final hearing and review panels. However, it exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment.
25. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the final hearing and review panels. The panel also took account of the written submissions.
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 maintain public confidence in the profession.
27. The burden is upon Mr Lynch to provide evidence and information to show that he no longer poses a risk of harm to the public.
28. The panel noted that Mr Lynch has demonstrated, within his March /June 2024 communications and recent statement, developing insight about the appropriateness of the actions that led to the finding of misconduct. In his correspondence dated 12 September 2025 he expressed that he was mortified and regretful about his actions. However, he has failed to adequately detail how he should have acted or how his actions would have affected service users; colleagues; and the wider public confidence in the social work profession. Whilst he has disclosed undertaking courses to maintain his skills and knowledge, he has not shown that he has undertaken any training to address his behaviour towards others. [PRIVATE].
29. The panel therefore concluded that Mr Lynch had not shown adequate insight or remediation. In light of that, and the failure of Mr Lynch to adequately engage with these continuing regulatory proceedings, the panel found that there remains a real

risk of repetition of the regulatory concerns and that a finding that his fitness to practise was impaired remained necessary to protect the public.

30. Further, in light of the lack of insight and remediation, together with Mr Lynch's lack of adequate engagement in these proceedings and requests to be removed from the Social Work England register, the panel concluded that members of the public would be concerned if his fitness to practise was not found to be impaired and that such a finding would undermine public confidence in the profession. Such a finding would similarly fail to uphold professional standards.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

31. Having found Mr Lynch's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case.
32. The panel considered the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England. The panel also took into account the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance published by Social Work England. It also considered that Mr Lynch has consistently demonstrated a clear intention not to return to social work.
33. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction was not to punish Mr Lynch, 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 upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
34. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Mr Lynch's interests with the public interest and by considering each available sanction in ascending order of severity.
35. The panel considered that taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not adequately reflect the serious nature of the regulatory concerns. They would not adequately protect the public as they would not restrict his practice. The panel had assessed there to be a real and present risk of repetition, and so considered that the public cannot currently be adequately protected unless Mr Lynch's practice is restricted.
36. The panel took into account paragraph 76 of the Guidance, which states:
- "In some cases, the decision makers may determine that the social worker's impairment poses a current risk to public safety. If so, it may be reasonable to move beyond the lower sanctions (no action, advice or a warning) on this basis alone. This is because these outcomes will not address the risk to the public as they do not restrict the social worker's practice."*
37. Further, taking no action, or issuing advice or a warning, would not maintain public confidence in the profession.

38. The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be sufficient to protect the public and wider public interest. It considered that while conditions could be formulated, they remain unworkable and would not protect the public or wider public interest. This was particularly the case given the lack of adequate insight and remediation and the fact that Mr Lynch has stated that he has no intention of returning to social work practice.
39. The panel concluded that suspension would not be appropriate or proportionate in all of the circumstances. Mr Lynch has been subject to a final order over two years and has failed, in that time, to demonstrate adequate insight and remediation. The panel therefore concluded that, having failed to utilise the opportunities given by the final hearing panel, and having instead said that he no longer intends to work in social work, there was little prospect of him utilising any subsequent opportunities. The panel also considered that extending the suspension would not be in Mr Lynch's best interests given that he does not wish to return to social work and has asked for his registration to be removed.
40. Further, the panel concluded that it would not maintain public confidence in the profession or professional standards to impose a period of suspension upon a social worker who had failed to utilise the previous period of suspension to demonstrate sufficiently reduced risk of repetition and who has repeatedly stated that they do not wish to return to social work practice.
41. The panel noted that a removal order was a sanction of last resort where there was no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest. The panel took the view that, regrettably, a removal order was necessary, appropriate and proportionate in this matter in all of the circumstances, including the seriousness of the misconduct; the lack of adequate insight or remediation during over two years of suspension; and Mr Lynch's obtaining of alternative employment and assertions that he no longer wishes to work as a social worker.

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:
- i. the decision of adjudicators:
 - a. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - b. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - c. to make a final order,
 - ii. 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>