

Social worker: Hussain Ahmed
Tanweer
Registration number: SW36534
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of hearing: 03 October 2025

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed: Suspension order (expiring 14 November 2025)

Hearing outcome: Extend the current suspension order for a further six
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 two years by the case examiners, by way of accepted disposal on 10 November 2023.
2. The panel understood that, under paragraphs 7 and 9 of Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, for a case to be concluded through accepted disposal, the social worker must consent to the proposed disposal.
3. Mr Tanweer agreed to the accepted disposal proposal in an email dated 3 November 2023.
4. The panel understood that Mr Tanweer had thus accepted the case examiners' observations in relation to the key facts, including the factual limbs of the concerns giving rise to the suspension order, and accepted that his fitness to practise was, at that time, impaired by reason of those facts.
5. Mr Tanweer attended and was not represented.
6. Social Work England was represented by Ms Aslam, case presenter instructed by Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Jill Crawford	Chair
Charlotte Scott	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Poppy Muffet	Hearings officer
Chiugo Eze	Hearings support officer
Diarmuid Bunting	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

7. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) understood that the notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Tanweer by email to an address provided by Mr Tanweer.
8. Having had regard to Rules 16, 44 and 45 of Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (the “FTP Rules 2019”) 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 Tanweer in accordance with the Rules.

Preliminary matters:

9. Pursuant to rule 38 of and Social Work England’s FTP Rules 2019 (as amended), some parts of the hearing were held in private. This followed an unopposed application by Ms Aslam. The panel held that some of the hearing should be held in private only when the

physical or mental health of the registered social worker was being discussed, pursuant to rule 38(a)(ii).

Review of the current order:

10. The purpose of the review hearing was to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 14 November 2023. The order subject to review was a suspension order.
11. The panel received advice upon the outcomes upon to it under paragraphs 15(1) of Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018.

The allegations found likely to be proved which resulted in the imposition of the final order by consent were as follows:

12. In relation to the facts:

Whilst registered as a social worker you:

1. Failed to adhere to Covid-19 Guidelines in that you:

1.1. Did not wear PPE effectively.

8. On the 20/07/2022 you were convicted at Minshull Magistrates Court for the criminal offence of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm.

9. Did not inform Social Work England that you were subject to a police investigation.

10. You may have health conditions as set out in Schedule 1 which affect your practice.

Schedule 1

[PRIVATE]

13. In relation to the statutory grounds:

The actions outlined at regulatory concerns 1.1 and 9 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

The actions outlined at regulatory concern 8 amount to the statutory ground of a criminal conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence.

The actions outlined at regulatory concern 10 amount to adverse physical or mental health.

The case examiners on 10 November 2023 determined the following with regard to impairment:

Assessment of impairment consists of 2 elements:

- 1. The personal element, established via an assessment of the risk of repetition.*
- 2. The public element, established through consideration of whether a finding of impairment might be required to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.*

Personal element

With regards to the concerns before the regulator, the case examiners have given thought to their guidance, and they note that they should consider whether the matters before the regulator are easily remediable, and whether the social worker has demonstrated insight and/or conducted remediation to the effect that the risk of repetition is highly unlikely.

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied

In this instance, the case examiners are satisfied that the conduct can be remedied. For example, in respect of regulatory concern 1.1, the social worker could reflect upon the importance of wearing PPE effectively. In respect of regulatory concerns 8 and 9, the social worker could reflect upon their conduct (including their duty to report and the potential impact of not doing so), as well as considering what they would do differently in the future, and how they can prevent a recurrence. In respect of regulatory concern 10, the social worker could continue to access appropriate treatment and support.

Insight and remediation

In respect of regulatory concern 10, the social worker has accessed appropriate treatment to address their adverse health conditions, which evidences both insight and remediation.

However, it is noted that the latest health evidence suggests that the social worker remains to be unfit to practise.

The case examiners have not been provided with any evidence of insight and remediation in respect of regulatory concerns 1.1 and 9.

In respect of regulatory concern 8, the case examiners acknowledge that the social worker has stated they were subject to prolonged and significant provocation in the form of unacceptable, racially motivated abuse.

Consequently, the social worker is likely to have been upset, distressed, and offended, and the case examiners acknowledge that as such, there is some mitigation. Nevertheless, social workers are expected to act with integrity both inside and outside work, and the case examiners consider the social worker's

conduct to be wholly inappropriate. Furthermore, in their submissions, the social worker does not demonstrate any insight or remediation in respect of their conduct, for example, in respect of how else they could have addressed the matter.

Risk of repetition

Given the lack of insight and remediation demonstrated in respect of regulatory concern 1.1, 8 and 9, the case examiners must conclude that there is a risk of repetition.

In respect of regulatory concern 10, the case examiners note that since 2021, medical professionals have consistently stated that the social worker is not fit to practise, and that this opinion was reiterated most recently in June 2023. The case examiners have therefore concluded that the social worker's health will remain to be unmanaged until such a time when it is no longer assessed to be impacting upon their fitness to practise.

Public element

The case examiners have next considered whether the social worker's actions have the potential to undermine public confidence in the social work profession, or the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

In this instance, the case examiners have concluded that the alleged conduct in respect of the regulatory concerns, if found proven, would amount to a significant departure from the professional standards and have the potential to undermine trust and confidence in the social work profession, because it is vital that social workers are medically fit to practice and behave in a way that would not bring into question their suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.

Accordingly, the case examiners have concluded that there is a realistic prospect that a finding of current impairment would be made by adjudicators, should the regulatory concerns be found proven.

The case examiners on 10 November 2023 determined the following with regard to sanction:

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of the concerns being found proven by adjudicators. Furthermore, they found a realistic prospect that the concerns, if proven, would amount to the statutory grounds of criminal conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence (in respect of regulatory 8); adverse physical or mental health (in respect of regulatory concern 10); and misconduct (in respect of regulatory concerns 1.1 and 9). The case examiners have also found a realistic prospect that

adjudicators would find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners had regard to Social Work England's Impairment and Sanctions Guidance (2022) and reminded themselves that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker but to protect the public and the wider public interest.

The guidance requires that decision makers select the least severe sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest. In determining the most appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case, the case examiners considered the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness.

The case examiners considered taking no further action but considered that this would not be appropriate in this instance because the case examiners have concluded there is a continuing risk to the public of the social worker breaching the identified professional standards again, and in respect of the social worker's health.

The case examiners next considered whether offering advice or a warning would be sufficient. An advice order will normally set out the steps a social worker should take to address the behaviour that led to the regulatory proceedings. The case examiners believe that issuing advice is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which they view the alleged misconduct, and again it would not adequately protect the public in light of the social worker's health.

A warning order implies a clearer expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct than an advice order. However, the case examiners are not satisfied that a warning order would send a strong enough message to the social worker, and particularly, the wider social work profession. Furthermore, a warning order is not likely to be appropriate where there is a lack of insight and a risk of repetition, and again it would not adequately protect the public in light of the social worker's health.

The case examiners then considered a conditions of practice order. The case examiners have concluded that a conditions of practice order is not suitable for this case, because the social worker is not currently practising and therefore there are unlikely to be workable conditions that could be formulated.

The case examiners have gone on to consider a suspension order and have noted the sanctions guidance which indicates that such an order may be appropriate in cases where there has been a serious breach of the professional standards, the social worker has demonstrated some insight and there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate. The case examiners are of the view that this case meets these requirements, and that in light of the social worker's health, a suspension order

would also give the social worker time to undertake further treatment and then return to practice when it is felt they are able to do so safely.

In considering the duration of the suspension order, the case examiners were mindful of the sanction's guidance, which indicates that whilst an order can be made up to 3 years in duration, case examiners need to be mindful of the risk of deskilling a social worker. In this instance, it is unlikely that the social worker will be able to return to practise in the short-term given the ongoing nature of their adverse health conditions, and the case examiners note that their guidance suggests that in such cases, it may be "in the interests of the social worker to impose a longer period of suspension...to avoid the stress of a review hearing before they have recovered to full health".

The case examiners are therefore of the view that a 2-year suspension order provides an opportunity for the social worker to continue their recovery and undertake professional development to assist with their return to practice. This sanction will mark the seriousness of the regulatory concerns, as well as considering the social worker's adverse health. If the social worker's health improves prior to the end of this order, the social worker is able to request an early review hearing where adjudicators could be consider the option of supporting the social worker's return to practice through a conditions of practice order.

The case examiners are aware that removal orders are not an available sanction in cases where the primary concern relates to adverse physical and/or mental health. The case examiners acknowledge that in this instance there are other serious concerns; however, they are of the view that the social worker's adverse health may have contributed to those concerns and the associated conduct, and that the concern relating to adverse health is therefore one of the primary concerns.

The case examiners have therefore decided to propose to the social worker a suspension order of 2 years duration. They will now notify the social worker of their intention and seek the social worker's agreement to dispose of the matter accordingly. The social worker will be offered 28 days to respond. If the social worker does not agree, or if the case examiners revise their decision regarding the public interest in this case, the matter will proceed to a final hearing.

14. The case examiners did not seek to fetter the discretion of a future reviewing panel, who will look at whether the social worker is ready to resume work as a social worker, but they did consider, and recorded in their decision on accepted disposal on 10 November 2023, that a future panel may be assisted as follows:

Prior to attending a review panel, the case examiners recommend the social worker:

- *Continues to access relevant medical support and provides up-to-date evidence in this respect.*
- *Provides a reflective piece demonstrating insight and remediation into their misconduct and conviction. If they are able to do so, the social worker may benefit from reflecting on these matters with a peer, who would be welcome to provide a witness statement for adjudicators.*

Social Work England submissions:

15. It was confirmed at the outset that all attendees had the 47-page bundle and the 18-page service and supplementary bundle.
16. The panel heard opening submissions from Ms Aslam as to the background and the case examiners' findings in relation to impairment and sanction.
17. Capsticks had provided a written submission, which was sent to Mr Tanweer within the Notice of Hearing dated 27 August 2025. It proposed, on behalf of Social Work England, a six-month continuation of the suspension order, saying:

Subject to any submissions or information provided by the social worker ahead of the hearing, Social Work England invites the Panel to consider that the fitness to practice of the social worker remains impaired for the same reasons as identified by the Case Examiners.

The social worker has not provided any evidence of reflection, remediation or insight since the suspension order was imposed.

Furthermore, there is no updating information as to the social worker's health and the steps that have been taken to address it.

As such, there is no information to suggest there had been a material change in circumstances since the making of the suspension order and the risk of repetition remains high.

The Panel will be invited to continue the suspension order for a further six months so as to afford the social worker an opportunity to demonstrate insight, reflection and remediation as well as updating information regarding their health.

The social worker has not engaged with Social Work England and has not provided any evidence pursuant to the recommendations made by the Case Examiners at the time of their decision.

Social Work England does not consider it appropriate to invite the Panel to consider a Removal Order at this stage. However, this may be a more appropriate sanction at the next review if the Social Worker continues to disengage.

18. Ms Aslam confirmed, in her opening submissions, that Social Work England's position remained as set out in that document. She explained that there was no evidence of remediation or reflection and submitted that it was proportionate and appropriate to continue the current suspension order.
19. She submitted that the risk to the public and to the profession remained in place and a six-month extension would protect the public and the wider public interest. She suggested this period would also enable Mr Tanweer to gather evidence in relation to remediation in relation to the relevant conduct and/or health issues.
20. In her closing submissions, after Mr Tanweer's oral evidence, Ms Aslam maintained Social Work England's position that a six month extension to the current suspension order would be appropriate and proportionate.
21. She said there remained a risk of repetition, including in relation to the matters which led to the conviction for assault, and therefore that course of action was in the public interest. She also suggested it was in the wider public interest to maintain the suspension order.
22. She suggested that Mr Tanweer had not sufficiently engaged with the regulatory process. She pointed to a lack of supporting evidence for Mr Tanweer's assertions during his oral evidence. There was no documentary or independent evidence to suggest that Mr Tanweer's mental health was no longer such that it might impair his fitness to practise.

Social worker submissions:

23. Mr Tanweer did not provide any written evidence to Social Work England in advance of the final order review on 3 October 2025.
24. The panel observed that Social Work England appeared to have emailed Mr Tanweer to the email address recorded on his Social Work England record to remind him of the case examiners' suggestion about how he might demonstrate remediation. Social Work England suggested that certain steps may help in the social worker's preparation for the final order review hearing before the two year suspension order.
25. The suggestion Mr Tanweer received in relation to evidence for this panel was:

Prior to attending a review panel, the case examiners recommend the social worker:

- *Continues to access relevant medical support and provides up-to-date evidence in this respect.*
- *Provides a reflective piece demonstrating insight and remediation into their misconduct and conviction. If they are able to do so, the social worker may*

benefit from reflecting on these matters with a peer, who would be welcome to provide a witness statement for adjudicators

26. Such emails were sent on 22 November 2023, 16 July 2024 and 22 July 2025 to the email address recorded on Mr Tanweer's Social Work England record.
27. Despite this, the panel did not have the benefit of any documentary evidence (including medical evidence), any witness statement(s) or any written reflective piece from Mr Tanweer.
28. The panel was aware that Mr Tanweer had provided some potentially relevant comments to Social Work England in August 2023 (prior to the consensual disposal in November 2023) and the panel took that material, which is set out below, into consideration.
29. On 16 August 2023, Mr Tanweer corresponded with Social Work England as follows:

...

The stuff with my neighbour I am a victim in all this too. The chap was verbally abusing me calling me a wog, coon, thick Paki, impotent. He was throwing empty Viagra boxes, banana skins, gravel stones by the dozen in [m]y front and back garden. As well eaten apple cores, orange peel, tree branches, beer cans, videoing me whilst I was exercising. Putting bacon and lard on a couple of lampposts outside my house to stop me doing warm up exercises before I went for a jog, spitting at my door, his adult sons threatening to beat me up. The police were informed but because I had no witnesses, it was his word against mine. My bathroom window was put through and someone claimed in and ripped off the alarm which cost me good money to replace. This situation had gone on for years. In that time I lost 2 marriages. This affected my mood and mental health not sleeping. The offence took place in this context. I bet the 2 uncle Tom's did not mention this from Oldham Council.

I have worked 30 years for 3 statutory Local Authorities helped lots of people often selfless work. I am done I am looking for employment elsewhere. I just wanted you to know my side of the story. If you want any clarification please contact me.

30. On 17 August 2023, Mr Tanweer corresponded with Social Work England as follows:

Hi Kirsty, if you share this email with the rest of the panel.

In my defence, I have worked in statutory Local Authority Social Services Mental Health for over 30 years. In my opinion I shouldn't be barred for life for making a mistake. There were mitigating circumstances re the offence I assaulted a racist neighbour who I had the misfortune to live next door to me. For example, he would frequently make chicken noises making fun of my Punjabi language, throwing beer cans and bottles, lots of gravel stones, tree branches, planks of broken fencing, banana skins, eaten apple cores and orange peel, black pudding

into my front and back garden. Name calling calling me a wog, coon and a Paki did not help the situation. These behaviours of my neighbour were happening since 2012. The police were made aware but they/we had no proof.

I exercise, jogging daily, he put lard and bacon on a lamppost between my house and his house, more mine, preventing me to do leg exercises. He put an article headline on the lamppost from the Metro newspaper 2022 "save our bacon" which shocked me and upset me. My bathroom window was smashed and my alarm system was damaged. [PRIVATE].

...

I hope you can deal with my case in the maxim "let who has not sinned cast the first stone". I put my life into this career, 30 plus years is a long time to work in Adult Mental Health care. I have moved out of this house and relocated away from the aforementioned nightmare. [PRIVATE]. I have no other skills or trade to fall back on. I have acquired a number of skills over the years and I am trilingual it would be a pity if these skills are lost in that I cannot practice. I am unemployed, I hope you take these mitigating circumstances into account before you make your decision.

31. The panel considered its power to regulate its own procedures under rule 32 of the FTP Rules 2019 and it thus admitted such evidence as it was fair to admit. This included Mr Tanweer giving oral evidence.

32. In his evidence in chief, Mr Tanweer submitted:

- a. He does not intend to return to statutory social work but may consider social work in a non-statutory setting.
- b. He may wish to pursue a career in support work in the future.
- c. A return to statutory social work would not do his health any good.
- d. He has reflected over the last couple of years.
- e. He thought that a six-month continuation of the present suspension order would be a good idea to enable him to reflect further and produce evidence of his reflection, as well as medical evidence to support his oral evidence about his health.

33. Under cross-examination:

- a. Ms Aslam asked Mr Tanweer if he had reflected on the first allegation, which related to him having failed to adhere to Covid-19 Guidelines regarding wearing PPE. Mr Tanweer accepted that he was instructed by his employer to wear the PPE, but that he sometimes he forgot. He said he was going through [PRIVATE] at the time and that may have impaired his judgment.

- b. Ms Aslam asked Mr Tanweer about his reflections on his criminal offence. He said he regretted the incident. He explained that he was racially taunted before the incident. He explained that the individual he assaulted (his neighbour at the time) was persistently antagonising him. He reflected that his neighbour was wilfully putting pork products and alcohol into his property, in the knowledge that he was a practising Muslim, and that his neighbour engaging in other upsetting, racist behaviour.
- c. He explained that [PRIVATE] and he was afraid. He explained that when he asked his neighbour why they were antagonising him, his neighbour said it was because Mr Tanweer was a 'Paki'. Mr Tanweer explained that, despite this, he was ashamed of the incident.
- d. [PRIVATE]. He confirmed that he had now moved to a new part of town. He said he was a lot better now, [PRIVATE].
- e. [PRIVATE].
- f. [PRIVATE].
- g. Ms Aslam asked Mr Tanweer about whether there was any reason that Mr Tanweer had not provided any written evidence or reflections to Social Work England. Mr Tanweer suggested that he was able to provide reflection in his oral evidence.

34. Mr Tanweer also answered questions from the Panel:

- a. He explained that his motivation for attending today was not to waste the panel's time. He explained that he does not want to go back to statutory social work. He initially said would like to be free from dealing with future panels.
- b. He explained that he was not aware, up to now, of the concept of voluntary removal.
- c. He explained that he wanted to leave the social work profession and wanted to draw a line under things, rather than to necessarily seek to 'clear his name', so to speak, in relation to the present proceedings.
- d. However, when asked, he indicated he would welcome further time to engage with Social Work England, to demonstrate insight and/or remediation, with a view to enabling him to work in the social care sphere, possibly in a social work role outside frontline statutory services.
- e. [PRIVATE].
- f. [PRIVATE].

- g. Regarding the impact of Mr Tanweer's conviction on public confidence in social workers, he confirmed that social workers need to be perceived to be in control of situations and to avoid confrontational situations.
- h. He explained that if he found himself in a similar situation (regarding the assault), he would try to take time out, rather than reacting as he did. He said he would ask for support if he felt trapped and was not thinking straight. He also confirmed that [PRIVATE].
- i. Regarding his failure to report to Social Work England that he was subject to a police investigation, he explained that, at the time, he assumed that Social Work England would have known about the investigation.
- j. He said that, if he found himself under similar investigation again, he would report to and work alongside Social Work England.
- k. When invited to comment generally regarding the potential risk of repetition of any of the relevant conduct [PRIVATE], Mr Tanweer said that, where he was now, he had moved on. He said that was a negative period of his life. He had since moved house and has nothing to do with the neighbour with whom he had the altercation.
- l. To broadly paraphrase, he suggested he was in a better place now, both literally and metaphorically.

35. In his closing submissions, Mr Tanweer confirmed as follows:

- a. He had listened to the panel.
- b. He would set about gaining evidence, [PRIVATE].
- c. He would also seek to provide a written reflective piece.
- d. He did not oppose Social Work England's suggestion of a continuation of the suspension.
- e. Regarding the duration of any order continuing the suspension, he submitted that he considered six months to be a necessary and realistic timeframe for him to provide a reflective piece and other evidence.
- f. He suggested that the panel's guidance in relation to what to include in a future reflective piece would be helpful.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

36. 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 case examiners. 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'.

37. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the case examiners and the oral evidence of Mr Tanweer.
38. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Ms Aslam on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mr Tanweer.
39. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.
40. 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.
41. The panel first considered whether Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remains impaired.
42. The panel noted that the case examiners decision on accepted disposal noted that Mr Tanweer had limited insight, other than in relation to [PRIVATE]. This panel noted the extent to which Mr Tanweer has acted upon the recommendations of the previous of panel as to what might assist a future reviewing panel. Mr Tanweer had attended and engaged in the hearing, but he had not engaged with Social Work England's previous recommendations in relation to gathering and presenting evidence which might assist this review panel.
43. The panel considered whether Mr Tanweer had demonstrated remediation, insight and/or remorse.
44. Regarding his conviction, he had developed some insight in relation to his own conduct, including the fact that he was ashamed of his conduct. In relation to the public elements of impairment, he showed some but only very limited insight in relation to the potential effect on the reputation of the profession.
45. Regarding the failure to report the police investigation, the panel observed that this may have been partially due to [PRIVATE], but more detailed information on insight was required.
46. Regarding his health issues *per se*, Mr Tanweer appeared to understand how managing his health was important, and he seemed to understand at least some of the steps he needed to take to ensure this was maintained. However, there was no independent or documentary evidence to assist the panel in relation to assessing his fitness to practice in relation to health.
47. Regarding the PPE issue, Mr Tanweer's insight was somewhat limited, but the panel took the view that this was the least serious of the issues under consideration.

48. Overall, the panel considered that Mr Tanweer had not yet demonstrated he was now safe to practise and/or there is no longer a risk to the public.
49. Regarding the conviction, the risk of repetition appeared to be low, but the panel lacked corroborative evidence of Mr Tanweer managing matters better now.
50. Regarding failure to report police investigation, further information was required from Mr Tanweer to enable a panel to understand if this issue was fully understood and unlikely to recur.
51. Regarding Mr Tanweer's health, additional, independent evidence was needed.
52. Thus, he had not sufficiently addressed the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment.
53. The panel also noted that there was no evidence before it that Mr Tanweer had taken steps to maintain his skills and knowledge.
54. To summarise, the panel determined that Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remains impaired, due to the seriousness of the allegations, his still developing insight and lack of written evidence to substantiate his oral evidence about his insight and the steps he has taken to remediate the concerns and to reduce the risk of repetition.
55. The panel concluded that Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of both the private and public elements of fitness to practise.
56. However, the panel considered that these issues were potentially remediable.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

57. Having found Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise is 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.
58. The panel considered the submissions made by Ms Aslam, on behalf of Social Work England, during which they invited the panel to consider imposing a six-month continuation of the suspension order.
59. Mr Tanweer did not oppose that course of action.
60. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England and the advice of the legal adviser.
61. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Tanweer, 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 Tanweer's interests with the public interest.

62. Given the nature of the allegations, the lack of documentary evidence and the lack of full insight, the panel did not consider that a warning or any outcome less than conditions of practice would be appropriate.
63. However, conditions were not deemed to be appropriate to mitigate the relevant risks. Appropriate conditions which could mitigate the risks could not be formulated. The panel was also conscious of the fact that the issues did not relate solely to Mr Tanweer's health, so even if health-related conditions could be formulated, these would not address the fitness to practise issues overall.
64. A suspension order would prevent Mr Tanweer from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest.
65. The Panel was aware it had to independently assess the issues of impairment and sanction, notwithstanding the fact that both parties agreed that a continuation of the suspension order for six months was appropriate.
66. Having undertaken that assessment, the panel reached the view that a continuation of the suspension order was appropriate.

Extend the current suspension order for a further six months with effect from the expiry of the current order:

67. The panel considered whether the current suspension should be extended for a further period of six months, or for some other period.
68. The panel determined that the suspension order should be extended for a period of six months. The panel was satisfied that this period was appropriate because it would protect the public, including the wider public interest and it would enable Mr Tanweer to obtain evidence of insight and remediation before the next review.
69. This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, a future reviewing panel would expect Mr Tanweer to attend the review hearing, and it would be of assistance to that panel if they were able to provide evidence that they had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. This may include:
 - a. In relation to each of the four matters which gave rise to these proceedings (conviction, not disclosing police investigation, health and PPE):
 - i. whether Mr Tanweer understands what led to the events which are the subject of the concern

- ii. whether he recognises what went wrong
 - iii. whether he accepts his role and responsibilities in relation to the events
 - iv. whether he appreciates what could (and should) have been done differently
 - v. whether he has addressed how he might act or react differently if the same circumstances were to happen again (to avoid reoccurrence of similar concerns)
- b. Evidence that he has kept his social work skills and knowledge up to date, such as any relevant reading and/or training courses (online or otherwise).
 - c. Evidence that he continues to access relevant medical support and provides up-to-date evidence in this respect. He may also wish to provide information about [PRIVATE].

70. The panel reminds Mr Tanweer that he may put any information he deems to be relevant before the next reviewing panel, which may include references and testimonials, should he wish to do so.

Right of appeal:

71. 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.

72. 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.

73. 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.

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

Review of final orders:

75. 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).

76. 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

77. 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>