



Social worker: Chipo Dhinda

Registration number: SW89485

Fitness to Practise

Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 31 March 2025 to 11 April 2025, 4 November 2025 to 7 November 2025

Hearing venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome: Fitness to practise impaired, suspension order (12 months)

Interim order: Interim suspension order (18 months)

Introduction and attendees:

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

Adjudicators	Role
Bryan Hume	Chair
Joanna Bowes	Social worker adjudicator
Catherine Beckett	Lay adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Poppy Muffett	Hearings officer
Molly-Rose Brown	Hearings support officer
Jeanette Bloor	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

4. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter “the panel”) was aware that a notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Dhinda and her nominated representative by email on 25 February 2025 and that Ms Dhinda requested that a hard copy be sent to her, which was duly sent on 27 February 2025 by next day delivery service to an address provided by the social worker (namely their registered address as it appears on the Social Work England register).
5. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final hearing service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final hearing dated 25 February 2025 and addressed to Ms Dhinda at their email address which they provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 25 February 2025 detailing Ms Dhinda’s registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 25 February 2025 the writer sent to Ms Dhinda and her legal representatives by email notice of hearing and related documents and that the writer sent to Ms Dhinda on 27 February 2025 by next day delivery service at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
 - A copy of the Royal Mail Track and Trace Document indicating “signed for” delivery to Ms Dhinda’s address at 12.14/pm on 28 February 2025.
6. Having had regard to Rule 14 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (the rules) 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 Ms Dhinda in accordance with Rule 44.

Documents before the panel:

7. The panel had the following:
 - a) Statements Bundle (83 pages)
 - b) Exhibits Bundle (2159 pages)
 - c) Social Worker's Response Bundle (61 pages)
 - d) Service and Supplementary Bundle (40 pages)
 - e) Supplementary Defence Bundle (89 pages)
 - f) Statement of Case (34 pages)

Preliminary matters:

8. The panel was asked to consider that certain evidence be heard in private that related to the Registrant's health.
9. The panel accepted legal advice that there is a presumption that the hearing should be heard in public subject to Rule 37, however in respect of Rule 38 that the health and private life of Ms Dhinda can be heard in private.
10. The panel agreed that those parts of the evidence relating to Ms Dhinda's health would be heard in private.

Matters arising:

11. On day 3, the panel heard submissions from Social Work England that the statement of PA is not a document which is relied upon in these proceedings. The document itself speaks to its lack of reliability in strict evidential terms, as such it is inherently unreliable and should not have been included in the bundle of documents made available to the panel shortly before the hearing. There is no specific application from either party before the panel for recusal due to bias with regards to the panel having had sight of PA's statement.
12. The panel invited the reply of Mr McCaffrey and he supported the views of Social Work England in that he was not seeking the panel's recusal, but felt it was proper that the panel considered the matter of bias, before making its own decision.
13. The panel accepted the advice of the legal advisor and in doing so considered subject to Rule 32 the need to regulate its own procedures and the need to conduct the hearing in a manner that is considered to be fair. It therefore went on to consider whether it believes there is any issue of actual or perceived bias in proceeding with the case having had sight of PA's statement.

14. In particular the panel fully considered the test in Porter -v- McGill (2002) 2AC 357 “whether a fair minded and informed observer having considered the facts concludes that there is a real possibility the Judge is biased.” The panel also considered the potential of perceived bias as set out in the case of R v Sussex Justices ex p McCarthy (1924) 1KB 256 “it is not merely of some importance but is of fundamental importance that justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done.”
15. In doing so the panel determined that;
 - i. The submission from Social Work England and supported by the Registrant’s Counsel is that the statement of PA is an unreliable document and
 - ii. It agrees with that submission and
 - iii. The document was never intended to be relied upon as evidence and
 - iv. The adjudicators feel able to discount it from their minds and
 - v. The document will not be considered and
 - vi. It will have no impact on its decision making
16. The panel decided that the test for recusal is not met and a fair minded and informed observer having considered the facts would not conclude there is a real possibility of bias, whether actual or perceived and the case will proceed.
17. On day 6 an application was made by Social Work England to recall the witness AA on the basis that Ms Dhinda had made statements in her evidence that needed to be put to AA as these issues had not previously been addressed in any evidence before the panel. The social worker’s counsel did not object to the application.
18. The panel considered the application and in particular noted their powers subject to rule 32:
 - (a) that they can regulate their own procedures and must conduct the hearing in the manner they consider fair,
 - (b) in particular and without prejudice to any other provision in the regulations, schedules or rules, the adjudicators may...
 - (vii) admit evidence where they consider it fair to do so, whether or not such evidence would be admissible before the courts
19. The case of R v Frost and 11 others (1839) 9 C. & P. 129, Tindall CJ. Tindall CJ said “if any matter arises ex proviso (unannounced or otherwise unknown) which the Crown could not foresee, supposing it to be entirely new matter, which they may be able to answer only by contradictory evidence they may give evidence in reply.”
20. The panel determined that it was fair to all parties that AA be recalled to give evidence.

Allegations:

- 1. Whilst working as a social worker, between 1 March 2020 and 11 June 2020:*
 - a. You represented that a Core Group Meeting took place on 9 March 2020 for Children A, B and C when no such meeting took place.*
 - b. You represented that a Core Group Meeting took place on 11 May 2020 for Children A, B and C when no such meeting took place.*
- 2. Your actions in relation to paragraph 1 (a) and/ or paragraph 1 (b) were dishonest in that you knew that no such meeting had taken place and that your representations would give the impression that a meeting did take place.*
- 3. Alternatively to paragraph 1(a) and/ or 1(b) and/ or 2, whilst working as a social worker between 1 March 2020 and 11 June 2020 you failed to maintain accurate and/ or up to date adequate records in that:*
 - a. You recorded a Core Group Meeting of 9 March 2020 for Children A, B and C that had not taken place and you failed to upload the minutes of that meeting until 9 June 2020; and/ or*
 - b. You recorded a Core Group Meeting of 11 May 2020 for Children A, B and C that had not taken place and you failed to upload the minutes of that meeting until 11 June 2020.*
- 4. Between 1 March 2019 and 11 November 2020, you did not make timely and/ or accurate recordings on your allocated cases and/ or failed to carry out actions in a timely manner or at all as set out in Schedule 1*

Schedule 1

(a) Case of Child D

A Child Protection case, in which you recorded a visit as a Child in Need visit and not a Child Protection visit.

(b) Case of Child O

A Child in Need case, in which:

- (i) you failed to record, in a timely manner or at all, whether a Child in Need review occurred; and/ or*
- (ii) you failed to carry out a Child in Need review between 23 March 2020 and 1 July 2020.*

(c) *Case of Child L*

A Child in Need case, in which:

- (i) *you failed to record the Child in Need reviews on 20 November 2019, and 27 January 2020 until 22 June 2020 and/ or;*
- (ii) *you failed to record, in Child L's case notes, that Child L was seen in person on 16 June 2020 (along with Child M).*

(d) *Case of Child M*

A Child in Need case, in which you failed to record the Child in Need reviews on 20 November 2019 and 27 January 2020 until 22 June 2020.

(e) *Case of Child J, a Child in Need case, in which:*

- (i) *you failed to record Child in Need reviews between 24 February 2020 and 19 July 2020; and/or*
- (ii) *you failed to carry out Child in Need reviews between 24 February 2020 and 19 July 2020.*

(f) *Case of Child H*

A Child in Need case, in which:

- (i) *you failed to carry out a Child in Need review between 12 February 2020 and 30 June 2020 and/ or;*
- (ii) *you failed to record that a Child in Need review had taken place between 12 February 2020 and 30 June 2020.*

(g) *Case of Child G*

A Child in Need case, in which:

- (i) *you failed to carry out a Child in Need review between 12 February 2020 and 30 June 2020 and/ or;*
- (ii) *you failed to record that a Child in Need review had taken place between 12 February 2020 and 30 June 2020.*

(h) *Case of Child C*

A Child Protection case, in which:

- (i) *you failed to carry out Core Group meetings between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or*
- (ii) *you failed to record that Core Group meetings had occurred between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or;*
- (iii) *you failed to carry out a Child Protection visit between 16 May 2020 and 3 June 2020; and/or*
- (iv) *you failed to complete a record for a Child Protection visit, which took place on 4 June 2020, until the 10 June 2020.*

(i) *Case of Child A*

A Child Protection case, in which:

- (i) *you failed to carry out Core Group meetings between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or*
- (ii) *you failed to record that Core Group meetings had occurred between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or*
- (iii) *you failed to carry out a Child Protection visit between 16 May 2020 and 3 June 2020; and/or*
- (iv) *you failed to complete a record for a Child Protection visit, which took place on 4 June 2020, until the 10 June 2020.*

(j) *Case of Child B*

A Child Protection case, in which:

- (i) *you failed to carry out Core Group meetings between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or*
- (ii) *you failed to record that Core Group meetings had occurred between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or*
- (iii) *you failed to carry out a Child Protection visit between 16 May 2020 and 3 June 2020 and/or*
- (iv) *you failed to complete a record for a Child Protection visit, which took place on 4 June 2020, until the 10 June 2020.*

(k) *Case of Child I*

In which you failed to make a recording of the Core Group Meeting, which took place on or around 8 October 2019 to 23 October 2019, until 9 and/or 10 June 2020.

(l) *Case of Child E*

A Child in Need case, in which you failed to carry out and/or record any Child in Need reviews between 27 January 2020 and 7 September 2020.

(m) *Case of Child F*

A Child in Need case, in which you failed to carry out and/or record any Child in Need reviews between 27 January 2020 and 7 September 2020.

(n) *Case of Child N*

A Child Protection case, in which you, between 1 November 2019 and 27 February 2020:

- (i) *did not hold any Core Group Meetings; and/or*
- (ii) *failed to record that any Core Group meetings took place.*

(o) *Case of Child K*

A Child Protection case, in which you, between 1 November 2019 and 27 February 2020:

- (i) *did not hold any Core Group Meetings and/or;*
- (ii) *failed to record that any Core Group meetings took place.*

The matters at paragraphs 1-4 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Admissions:

21. Rule 32c(i)(aa) Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (the ‘Rules’) states:
‘Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved.’
22. Following the reading of the allegations the panel Chair asked Ms Dhinda whether they admit any of the allegations and whether they admit that their fitness to practise is currently impaired.
23. Ms Dhinda informed the panel that they admitted allegations;
1 (a) and (b)

3 (a) and (b)

4 (a)

4 (b) (i)

4 (c) (i)

4 (c) (ii)

4 (d)

4 (e) (i)

4 (f) (ii)

4 (g) (ii)

4 (h) (i)

4 (h) (iv)

4 (i) (i)

4 (i) (iv)

4 (j) (i)

4 (j) (iv).

4 (k)

4 (l) -admits no recording of the Child In Need Reviews but denies the Reviews did not take place

4 (m) - admits no recording of the Child In Need Reviews but denies the Reviews did not take place

4 (n) (ii)

4 o (ii)

24. The panel therefore found these allegations proved by way of Ms Dhinda's admissions.

25. The panel noted that Ms Dhinda denied allegations;

2.

4 (b) (ii)

4 (e) (ii)

4 (f) (i)

4 (g) (i)

4 (h) (ii) - **dismissed**

4 (h) (iii)

4 (i) (ii) -**dismissed**

4 (i) (iii)

4 (j) (ii) - **dismissed**

4 (j) (iii)

4 (l) partial denial, see above at paragraph 23

4 (m) partial denial, see above at paragraph 23

4 (n) (i)

4 (o) (i)

26. The panel noted that Mr Wilson has confirmed the charges 4 (h) (ii), 4 (i) (ii), 4 (j) (ii) should be disregarded as records cannot be completed when a meeting does not take place. The panel therefore dismissed these allegations.
27. In line with Rule 32c(i)(a) of the Rules, the panel then went on to determine the disputed facts.

Background

28. On 21 January 2021, Social Work England received a referral from London Borough of Merton regarding the Respondent social worker, Chipo Dhinda (“the social worker”).
29. The social worker qualified as a social worker in 2012 and worked for a range of local authorities in children’s services between 2013 and 2019. The social worker was employed by Merton Council (“the Council”) as a senior social worker from 29 July 2019 to 21 December 2020. The social worker had a mixed caseload involving children on Child Protection plans and Child in Needs plans. Child Protection plans often involved court work, and there was always a need to manage the cases within statutory timeframes, progress plans, undertake visits, arrange and attend Core Group Meetings. In relation to Child in Need cases, the social worker was required to hold Review Meetings and update the Plan. The social worker was required to keep adequate, accurate and timely records of all actions and interactions concerning service users within their records.

Summary of evidence:

Social Work England

SK evidence – Independent Reviewing Officer

30. SK gave evidence that she became aware that no core group meeting had occurred on 9 March 2020 for children A, B, and C during a conversation with Ms Dhinda on 26 May 2020 this was during part of a Midway Review Meeting held between child protection conferences. However, SK went on to say that Ms Dhinda was not 'crystal clear' about this and SK thought she may have initially told SK that the meeting had taken place. The record of the Midway Review Meeting states that the Core Group meeting in March was cancelled due to the social worker not being available – not rescheduled, social worker advised Core Group held on 11 May 2020 – not evidenced on file. Ms Dhinda had told her that there had been a core group meeting on 11 May 2020 which had not yet been written up. SK told Ms Dhinda to write up the meeting of 11 May 2020 by 5 June 2020 and this is recorded in the actions of the Midway Review Meeting. SK confirmed in evidence that she requested that Ms Dhinda send it out to the members of the core group. SK confirmed she had a brief conversation with the social worker over the phone as part of her pre-conference preparation on 9 June 2020. The social worker told SK that there was some improvement that she would reflect in the report, but other than this there was no change needed to the plan. When SK spoke to the children's mother on the 10 June 2020, SK was informed that the family had not seen Ms Dhinda since January 2020 and that no Core Group Meetings had taken place in this period. SK had no reason to disbelieve the mother of the children.
31. In her evidence SK expressed concern that there had been no core group meeting from January to May 2020.
32. SK explained when giving evidence that a core group meeting could potentially take place without a physical meeting and on information only, but this would need to be accurate and disseminated to the members of the core group. It would need to be agreed with the manager and there be a clear recording that the review had taken place in this manner. SK confirmed that in her 20 year career she had never seen a core group meeting that had been undertaken in this way, nor has she seen this done during the covid period. Ms Dhinda had not explained to SK that she had undertaken the meeting from the basis of updates and gave her the clear understanding that either a face to face or a live stream virtual core group meeting had taken place on 11 May 2020.

RO evidence – Investigating Manager

33. RO confirmed in her evidence that during her investigation Ms Dhinda had told her that there had been no core group meeting on 9 March 2020 because she had been out of the country. Ms Dhinda told her that she had been instructed by her manager at the time HW to record the core group meeting on the children's records and had been told to 'get it on the system'.

34. In the investigation meeting on the 6 November 2020 Ms Dhinda is recorded to confirm in relation to the core group meeting of 9 March 2020 “I made the record sometime in June. We had a new manager then, not my current manager, and she was talking about if meetings are cancelled, or people can’t attend, we can use updates from them to fill in the episode. I had talked to my previous manager about this as well, I thought. So I thought that I would use updates to fill in the meeting record.” Ms Dhinda goes on to say in the same record “I am not sure if it was miscommunication or not from my previous manager, but when new manager said that we can use updates, she emailed the whole team about this, saying about CIN meeting updates using written or shared information from professionals. I hadn’t yet written the March core group up but when my new manager said this about using updates, I thought I remembered talking about this with my previous manager.” In the same record Ms Dhinda informs RO “When I came back from leave and there was discussion about the meeting (9 March 2020) not being done, it was then I thought HW had said that we could use updates. I hadn’t written it up yet and when AA emailed the team about using written updates, this reminded me of what I thought I was told in March by HW.”
35. RO asked Ms Dhinda to share the email from AA of which she referred dated the 12 June 2020.
36. In relation to the core group meeting of 11 May 2020, Ms Dhinda had told RO that she had gathered information from other sources and that she thought this constituted a core group meeting. During the investigation meeting, Ms Dhinda referred to an email from her manager AA dated 12 June 2020 this stated “Please note that during lockdown CIN reviews should be taking place virtually. If for whatever reason the network/family can’t get on a virtual meeting you can get written updates from professionals within the timescales of the meeting to use as updates for the episode.” RO confirmed she did not give this email correspondence much weight as it was sent after 11 May 2020 and so this was a discrepancy by Ms Dhinda. RO confirmed that there is significant difference between Child In Need (CIN) reviews and core group meetings in that CIN reviews are about support which the family could choose not to engage with whereas core group meetings are part of a statutory child protection plan.
37. Ms Dhinda admitted to RO that she was behind with her recordings and that was not acceptable.
38. When RO spoke with AA on 3 November 2020, AA confirmed that Ms Dhinda had also told her that HW had instructed her to get everything onto the system. RO asked AA about issues in the team as Ms Dhinda had raised the lack of recording as a general problem. AA confirmed to RO that there was an issue about the team not recording visits in a timely way, but this did not extend to working plans.
39. RO did not get the impression that the core group meeting of 11 May 2020 had taken place virtually, but that Ms Dhinda had pulled the information together into a meeting as Ms Dhinda had confirmed this.

40. When RO spoke with HW, Ms Dhinda's initial manager she confirmed that Ms Dhinda had work outstanding, but that she had no concerns about her falsifying information.

AA – Manager in May/June 2020

41. AA confirmed in her evidence that her email to the team of 12 June 2020 that CIN reviews could take place virtually and could also include core group meetings and child protection visits as they needed to be recorded in a timely manner. She confirmed that if someone could not attend a core group meeting then their update would need to be provided at the meeting, but if no one could attend then the meeting should be rescheduled. AA explained that the whole purpose of the meeting would be to get updates and progress the plan and if no one is there then they cannot do that. AA explained there is a need to have quality discussions to review the plan effectively.

42. AA confirmed that she may have instigated concerns to her manager (LG) about backlogs in the team for CIN visits. Two members of the team were complaining about problems with the system. This was resolved by IT and was not an issue raised by Ms Dhinda.

43. AA confirmed she reviewed KPI's for Ms Dhinda's files and was raising the issue of drift with Ms Dhinda in her work in the period she was managing Ms Dhinda. Ms Dhinda did not inform AA that she was struggling, but did indicate the team as a whole were struggling, but this was not AA's impression, nor what the team were telling her. Ms Dhinda did tell AA that she felt emotionally overwhelmed, but not because of workload but because she had had covid.

44. SK raised with AA that the core group meeting of 9 March 2020 had not taken place. When AA looked at the record she could tell that Ms Dhinda had cut and pasted case notes from elsewhere into the recording of the core group meeting, but that anyone just looking at the record would think that the meeting had taken place. Ms Dhinda had told AA that HW had told her she could do this.

45. In the meeting between Ms Dhinda, AA and LG on 11 June 2020 Ms Dhinda initially confirmed that there had been a core group meeting on 9 March 2020, then she said there had not been an actual meeting. AA confirmed that Ms Dhinda was contradictory and did not give any clear explanations.

46. AA confirmed that a telephone call did not constitute a child protection visit to a family as that was dangerous, the children had to be seen and Skype or WhatsApp would be the expected minimum. AA confirmed she did not tell the team that they could gather information from different sources in place of a meeting, in order for a meeting to occur it had to be in person or virtual.

47. AA expressed her view that gross misconduct and suspension were extreme as she felt that issues needed to be dealt with in performance management as the issues had not previously been raised with Ms Dhinda. However, she confirmed that there were a lot of inconsistencies in Ms Dhinda's accounts and she was concerned about her wellbeing but did not think she was calculatedly going out and fabricating CIN reviews and visits.

AA was mindful how dangerous these issues were as the cases were dealing with vulnerable families. In relation to children A, B, and C that there had been no core group meeting in 5 months, that was very serious and not meeting statutory duties.

AA recalled evidence

48. It was put to AA that Ms Dhinda told her that the meeting of the 9 March 2020 did not take place and further it is suggested that after being told that the meeting did not take place on the 9 March 2020 AA told Ms Dhinda "to fill in the gaps" and whether she specifically directed or insinuated to Ms Dhinda that she should write the minutes of the core group of 9 March 2020 knowing that that meeting did not take place.
49. AA confirmed she did not know that the meeting on 9 March 2020 had not taken place. She confirmed that she had not told Ms Dhinda to "fill in the gaps."
50. AA confirmed it was not possible that she knew about the missing meeting because the KPI report would not flag that the meeting had not taken place. AA acknowledged that she may have had a general conversation with Ms Dhinda about her case recordings being 'messy' but reiterated that nothing specific had been said about 9 March 2020.

HW – previous manager in Sept 2019 - March 2020

51. HW confirmed the council's policy was to carry out child protection visits every 10 working days in their home and record those visits within 5 working days. HW stated 5 working days was a generous amount of time to complete the record and she would encourage her team of social workers to do it as quickly as possible.
52. [PRIVATE].
53. HW accepted that she had received the text message from Ms Dhinda to her on 6 March 2020 confirming there was a core group meeting scheduled for 9 March 2020. HW accepted she could not recall that communication nor what she did about it, but her intention at the time of writing the text would have been to delegate it as a Duty task.
54. HW explained that it was not acceptable to pull information together for a core group meeting, that it had to be an actual, quorate meeting. HW was shocked to learn that Ms Dhinda had inaccurately recorded a core group meeting on the system which gave the appearance a meeting had taken place, and that people had given verbal updates in the moment. If the record had been taken from reports, then this should have been made clear, but 9 March 2020 was written as a core group meeting.
55. HW received a call from a school raising concerns about a CIN meeting in February 2020 where it had been decided to close the case and the school were raising concerns about not receiving a copy of the initial CIN plan or any of the CIN meetings and that the case was planned for closure when there were outstanding actions. Ms Dhinda's explanation in supervision with HW on 6 February 2020 was that it was difficult to work a case with a student and it led to confusion. The student had been allocated to Ms Dhinda as part of her role as a senior social worker, which was an expectation of the

role. HW was not involved in this decision nor in Ms Dhinda's appointment as a senior social worker.

56. HW was shocked when she learned Ms Dhinda had confirmed during the investigation meeting with RO that HW had told her to 'just get it done'. HW confirmed she had not said this and would never tell any worker to fabricate something or record something falsely.
57. HW said in her written statement that she was 'really shocked' to learn of the concerns arising from the social worker's practise and said that it was 'out of character'. She said that it was common for social workers within the team to be late with their recordings and the social worker was no worse than any other team member in this respect. In live evidence, she spoke about meetings with her fellow managers in which the ongoing problems with poor record keeping across the teams was discussed. When asked how she addressed this with Ms Dhinda, HW said that this was addressed in supervision and was a standing agenda item in team meetings. The service as a whole was encouraged to take an administration day where they would try and plan no meetings and have a desk day.

DE – Principal social worker and single point of contact for Social Work England

58. DE was not called to give live evidence. The panel had regard to the documents she exhibited as part of her role.

Social worker

59. Ms Dhinda accepted that the core group meeting of 9 March 2020 did not take place and accepted that someone reading that record would think it had taken place. She accepted that certain people had to be at the meeting and accepted that as of 9 March 2020 virtual meetings were not taking place and that as no one is sat around the table virtually or otherwise then it cannot be a core group meeting. She accepted that 9 March 2020 core group meeting was not uploaded until 9 June 2020 and was not shared with the right people (the core group members).
60. She accepted that the core group meeting record of 11 May 2020 was not uploaded until 11 June 2020.
61. Ms Dhinda denied being dishonest when writing up the core group meetings of 9 March 2020 and 11 May 2020.
62. Ms Dhinda accepted that when she was writing up the record of the 9 March 2020 that she knew it had not taken place. She accepted that upon her return to work she did not check whether HW had organised cover for the 9 March meeting and that was a big mistake. She accepted that she had a huge backlog of work and her weakness was recording. She accepted that it was her responsibility to ensure the records were up to date and that not doing so was not in the interests of the children she was working with. She confirmed that she had poor oversight but had been through a lot and was not thinking straight. [PRIVATE]. It was a bad chapter in her life, and it made her embarrassed as a practitioner.

63. [PRIVATE].
64. Ms Dhinda confirmed that she thought that the core group meeting of the 11 May 2020 had taken place, in that it was acceptable to use updates to constitute a virtual meeting. Ms Dhinda told SK that the meeting had taken place and SK instructed her to write up the record and send it out to the core group members. In her evidence in chief she accepted that on reflection no meeting had taken place on the 11 May 2020. She had spoken with the health visitor who could not attend and had sent Ms Dhinda an update by email. Ms Dhinda confirmed she did not send the minutes out and that it stayed on file. She accepted that it needed to be shared with the core group members. Ms Dhinda explained that she had thought at the time that it constituted a core group meeting under the covid directives, which were frequently changing.
65. Ms Dhinda explained that she was not sure whether the new Mosaic system used for recording cases prepopulated information into records. There were a lot of IT issues with migrating over to Mosaic from another system. She explained that she used a report of the review of a children's plan of 31 March 2020 as the basis for the updates within the record of the 9 March 2020 core group meeting. She also confirmed she was speaking with the family and professionals a lot during this period.
66. Ms Dhinda recalled covering a colleague's case on duty and going into a log of a meeting, which a professional said to be present at the meeting then told her it had not taken place. She therefore made the assumption that the duty social worker had recorded the meeting using updates rather than holding an actual meeting, and that this was acceptable practise.
67. Ms Dhinda disputed she told RO during the investigation that HW had told her to use updates to record meetings and that she had said "just get it done." Ms Dhinda stated that if HW had told her this then she would have done so earlier.
68. In cross examination Ms Dhinda accepted that she represented both the 9 March and 11 May core group meetings had taken place and that someone reading them would think this. She accepted SK was right about core group meetings being important and she knew the purpose of such meetings. She accepted that the record of the meetings was not uploaded until later. She accepted that she had known the 9 March meeting had not taken place. She stated that after coming back from leave she had ample time up to June and if she was trying to trick anyone by fabricating the meeting record then she would have done so earlier. Ms Dhinda was asked why she had not checked on her return if the core group meeting had taken place or not on 9 March 2020 and in answer to his question, she confirmed it had slipped through her net and she felt bad and ashamed about that.
69. Ms Dhinda accepted that SK had not directed her to write up the missed core group meeting 9 March 2020 when they spoke at the midway meeting on 26 May 2020. Ms Dhinda said that the decision to write up 9 March 2020 core group meeting had been triggered by a conversation with AA. Ms Dhinda acknowledged that she could have misinterpreted the instructions of AA, but she thought she was doing as she had been

told and filling in the gaps in her work. Ms Dhinda stated that AA informed her that she was under pressure from LG, her manager at the time, as there were gaps on files throughout the team. Ms Dhinda's understanding was that AA had been brought in to 'clean up' the team's recording before LG returned to her post as team manager.

70. As evidenced in her witness statement, SK emailed Ms Dhinda on 5 June 2020 to remind that her the report needed to be sent to the family. In cross examination Ms Dhinda confirmed this could have referred to the 11 May 2020 core group meeting as she had given the impression it had taken place.
71. It was put to Ms Dhinda that she knew she could get into trouble for missing the core group meeting in March 2020. Her response was AA was pressing her to do updates on the files and to fill in the gaps and she was busy with another piece of work and was not thinking straight. Ms Dhinda stated that while not wishing to be critical of AA, when she tells you what to do, you do it. At this point Ms Dhinda's evidence was that AA was not asking her to create fake notes of meetings, AA was instructing her to find updates and put them in.
72. In relation to children A, B and C Ms Dhinda confirmed that the child protection visit that took place on the 15 May 2020 was over the phone and 29 May (or 1 June allowing for the bank holiday) should have been the next meeting as it occurs every 10 working days. The next recorded visit is the 4 June 2020, and it was put to her that she would not have needed to do this visit unless it was the missed visit from the 29 May 2020/1 June 2020. Ms Dhinda added that she had been informed that she was not allowed to undertake child protection visits over the phone and was to cancel and reschedule them. She could not recall why she had not phoned on 29 May 2020, but she did say sometimes you phone the family, and they are not available, and you let your manager know. She acknowledged in these circumstances a manager should be informed but it was possible she had not done so. She confirmed the visit was late.
73. Concerning child D, Ms Dhinda confirmed that the record should have been a child protection and not a CIN record.
74. Ms Dhinda could not recall a meeting with Child O.
75. Ms Dhinda confirmed that for child N and K who were subject to child protection plans that these were statutory visits, and she cannot recall if she or the duty social worker had carried out these visits.
76. In re-examination, Ms Dhinda confirmed it was AA who had triggered her to write up the core group meeting of 9 March 2020, and she could have misinterpreted her instructions. She agreed she had made a big mistake in relation to the 9 March 2020 meeting and that she was under so much pressure at that time. She confirmed she felt uncomfortable but that she thought she was doing the right thing and accepted she needed to fill in the gaps.
77. Ms Dhinda stated that HW had not told her that she could pull information from elsewhere in order to create records of meetings. Ms Dhinda expressed surprise that AA

had said this and stated that if HW had told her to do this she would have done so earlier. Ms Dhinda stated it was AA who told her that the records needed to be completed.

78. In respect to questions put to Ms Dhinda by the panel she confirmed that AA knew the core group meeting of the 9 March 2020 had not taken place and had told her to go and fill in the gaps. She said that this had specifically been discussed during a Skype call in late May or early June 2020. Ms Dhinda then completed a record for a Core Group Meeting on 9 March 2020 using updates and sent it to AA, who signed the record off knowing the meeting had not taken place. Therefore, Ms Dhinda thought this was acceptable. Ms Dhinda said that AA was badgering her to fill in the gaps in her record keeping at this time.
79. Ms Dhinda explained she had had 5 different managers from March to June and it was a confusing time. Ms Dhinda was clear in answer to a question from the panel that AA knew the 9 March 2020 core group meeting had not taken place and specifically told her to use the updates and fill in the gaps.

Finding and reasons on facts:

80. The panel heard and carefully considered the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England and the social worker. Mr Wilson for Social Work England's closing submissions were made in writing totalling 12 pages, and these have been considered by the panel. Mr McCaffrey for the social worker gave oral closing submissions that were considered.
81. The panel took account of the advice of the legal advisor. The burden of proof rests with Social Work England, it is Social Work England who have brought this case and it is for them to satisfy the panel that the facts in the allegations have been proved. There is no burden on Ms Dhinda to prove or disprove anything. The standard of proof required is the civil standard, which is often expressed as 'on the balance of probabilities' and this simply means Social Work England have to satisfy the panel that it is more likely than not that what is alleged to have occurred, did occur.

The panel went on to consider the relevant two stage test of dishonesty as set out in the case of *Ivey V Genting Casinos (2017) UKSC 67* namely -

"First ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of [her] belief may evidence whether [she] held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that [her] belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held."

And [Second,] "whether [her] conduct was dishonest by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people. It is not necessary for the individual to appreciate that what [she] has done is, by those standards, dishonest."

82. The panel considered the case of *Uddin v GMC [2012] EWHC 2669 (Admin)*, where the panel asked themselves whether there is an alternative explanation for the Registrant's

conduct that demonstrates likely innocent, negligent or careless acts /motivation rather than likely dishonest conduct or motivation.

83. The panel considered Williams V SRA (2017) EWHC 1478 (Admin) Lord Justice Leveson said that with regards to “professional standards, it is right to impose on those that aspire to them a higher obligation to demonstrate integrity in their work.”
84. The panel carefully considered SK, AA, HW and the social worker’s evidence. The panel considered that SK, AA and HW gave carefully considered and credible evidence having remained consistent in their accounts throughout the period of time from 2020 until today. The panel considered Social Work England’s witnesses gave balanced evidence in the sense that it was recognised it was a pressured time and none of them suggested they believed the social worker had been deliberately dishonest at the time. The panel noted that HW did not remember receiving a text message from the social worker about 9 March 2020 meeting, but she readily accepted she would have received it once she saw the evidence from the social worker’s phone. The panel felt that this omission did not lessen the credibility of her later evidence as she was so quick to admit having forgotten about receiving the text message and this could be understood in the context of HW being extremely busy, concerned about the approaching pandemic, and about to leave her post. The panel further considered that HW would have no motivation for denying the existence of the text message during the council or Social Work England’s investigations.
85. The panel noted that HW and AA did not consider Ms Dhinda to be dishonest at the time. However, the panel identified the fact that neither AA or HW had been aware that meetings had not taken place when they saw completed records and so had no reason to think that the Ms Dhinda was deliberately falsifying records. They believed she had simply created the records late.
86. Ms Dhinda’s evidence changed as the hearing progressed. In particular there were two key changes to the evidence she had consistently provided throughout the council and Social Work England’s investigations and earlier in these proceedings. Firstly, she initially said in oral evidence that AA had not known the 9 March 2020 meeting had not taken place – and this was consistent with her previous evidence. However, she later stated in her oral evidence that AA had known about the meeting not taking place, and in the full knowledge of this fact, instructed the social worker to complete the record. The panel found this to be a surprising assertion as this was the first time it had been mentioned, and completely contradictory to the social worker’s previous accounts. In effect the social worker was accusing AA at this late stage of the same allegation of dishonesty that she is facing.
87. Secondly, the Ms Dhinda mentioned for the first time during her oral evidence that when she was covering a case as duty social worker, she saw that a colleague had completed a record of a meeting which she was then later told by a professional had not taken place. She then made the assumption that the colleague had completed the record using case updates and that this was acceptable. Again, the panel observed that Ms Dhinda had not relied on this point up until partway through the hearing.

88. When Ms Dhinda was asked direct questions, she at times tried to deflect the question, and started to blame others for her actions.

In respect to allegation 1;

1. Whilst working as a social worker, between 1 March 2020 and 11 June 2020:

(a) You represented that a Core Group Meeting took place on 9 March 2020 for Children A, B and C when no such meeting took place.

and in respect of allegation 2;

Your actions in relation to paragraph 1 (a) was dishonest in that you knew that no such meeting had taken place and that your representations would give the impression that a meeting did take place.

89. The panel finds the allegation of dishonesty proved in that Ms Dhinda knew that no such meeting had taken place and that her representations would give the impression that a meeting did take place.

90. The panel found that when Ms Dhinda came to write up the record on the 9 June 2020 for the meeting of 9 March 2020, she knew that the meeting had not taken place as she had been out of the country. Ms Dhinda had messaged her manager HW informing her of the core group meeting on the 9 March 2020 and believed it would be dealt with. The panel found on the balance of probabilities the phone call on 9 June 2020 with SK triggered Ms Dhinda to write up the notes despite knowing the meeting had not taken place.

91. There is a clear recording of the date, time and venue of the meeting for 9 March 2020, giving the clear impression to anyone reading the record that the meeting had actually taken place. The panel found this was evidence that the intention was to deliberately deceive or mislead the reader.

92. Ms Dhinda gave conflicting oral evidence about AA's knowledge of the meeting, and therefore both versions could not possibly be true. Therefore, the panel concluded that Ms Dhinda had lied under oath. In the panel's view, this meant that they could provide less reliance on Miss Dhinda's evidence, than the other witnesses.

93. The panel noted upon submissions on behalf of Ms Dhinda, it was stated that 'no self-respecting professional could say, I did something wrong because my boss told me to do it. That would not be acceptable'. The panel agrees with that submission. The panel also accepts the evidence of AA who was recalled to give rebuttal evidence to Ms Dhinda's evidence on this issue. AA was clear that she did not know that the meeting on 9 March 2020 had not taken place. She confirmed that she had not told Ms Dhinda to "fill in the gaps."

94. The panel found that Ms Dhinda was using the 12 June 2020 email from AA as evidenced in her defence and has extrapolated, working backwards, her account with the intention to divert from the fact that she had intentionally and dishonestly made the record of the core group meeting of the 9 March 2020. Ms Dhinda was coming under

pressure from various sources, her manager and the IRO and the panel considers it was her intention to retrospectively make the note in the hope she would not get into trouble. It is likely that she panicked, but that does not make her actions acceptable nor honest.

95. Ms Dhinda did not send the records to the core group members because to do so would alert them to the fact that she had created a record of a meeting which had not taken place.
96. The panel considers that an ordinary decent person would believe that such conduct was dishonest. The record of the 9 March 2020 was completed as minutes of the core group meeting, anyone reading it would think that it had occurred. It contained the date, time and even the venue of the meeting.

In respect of allegation 1

1. *Whilst working as a social worker, between 1 March 2020 and 11 June 2020:*

(b) You represented that a Core Group Meeting took place on 11 May 2020 for Children A, B and C when no such meeting took place

And in respect of allegation 2

Your actions in relation to paragraph 1 (b) was dishonest in that you knew that no such meeting had taken place and that your representations would give the impression that a meeting did take place

97. The panel finds the allegation of dishonesty proved in that no meeting took place on 11 May 2020 and Ms Dhinda knew no meeting took place when writing up the minutes and she was dishonest in that she knew the minutes would give the impression that a meeting did take place.
98. The panel found that Ms Dhinda told SK, the Independent Reviewing Officer on 26 May 2020 that the core group meeting on the 11 May 2020 had taken place. The panel found that as this was only 15 days after the 11 May 2020 it was unlikely under the balance of probabilities that Ms Dhinda could have forgotten that the meeting had not taken place. The panel found it implausible that Ms Dhinda believed that the updates she had received from professionals had constituted a core group meeting. The panel heard evidence from Social Work England's witnesses that updates on a case should be recorded in case notes. The panel accepts that case notes are different from core group minutes and it is unfathomable why Ms Dhinda would not expressly state they were case notes and make this abundantly clear, rather than write them up in a manner that anyone looking at the record would believe them to be core group meeting minutes, and therefore believing an actual meeting had taken place either virtually or in person.
99. It is accepted that this was during the covid period and it is accepted that practise was adapting to difficult circumstances. It is accepted that Ms Dhinda was under pressure and [PRIVATE] at that time. However, the panel notes that there is nothing in the record

to suggest that the information was gathered from updates, again it is presented in such a way that anyone reading it would believe that an actual meeting had taken place. The members of the core group could not attend and as such the meeting should have been rescheduled. The panel found there cannot be a meeting if no one is present.

100. The panel understood from SK's evidence that "anything can be allowed if it is essential" but the panel determined that everything on a service user's file needs to be recorded openly and honestly and any deviation from normal practice would require the knowledge and permission of a manager. However, the panel found the two managers, HW and AA did not give Ms Dhinda instruction to retrospectively create a record of a meeting that did not take place.
101. The panel finds that Ms Dhinda as a senior social worker would know precisely that she was making the record look like a meeting had taken place on the 11 May 2020. The panel rejects the assertion that she misunderstood how a virtual meeting took place. Ms Dhinda failed to send the record out to the core group despite being told to do so by SK, whom she had told the meeting had occurred. The panel find that Ms Dhinda did not send the record to the core group members because to do so would alert them to the fact that she had created a record of a meeting which had not taken place. The panel does not accept Ms Dhinda's account that she thought making the record in this manner was acceptable practise at this time.
102. The panel consider that Ms Dhinda was dishonestly making the record to look like the meeting had taken place. The panel considers that an ordinary decent person would believe such conduct was dishonest.
103. Concerning allegation 2 in relation to allegations 1(a) and 1(b) where dishonesty was found, the panel considered Ms Dhinda's previous good character. However, the weight of the evidence and the fact Ms Dhinda is found to have lied under oath is such that the panel finds the dishonesty allegation proved.

In relation to allegation 3

Alternatively, to paragraph 1(a) and/ or 1(b) and/ or 2, whilst working as a social worker between 1 March 2020 and 11 June 2020 you failed to maintain accurate and/ or up to date adequate records in that:

- a) *You recorded a Core Group Meeting of 9 March 2020 for Children A, B and C that had not taken place and you failed to upload the minutes of that meeting until 9 June 2020; and/ or*
- b) *You recorded a Core Group Meeting of 11 May 2020 for Children A, B and C that had not taken place and you failed to upload the minutes of that meeting until 11 June 2020.*

104. The panel dismisses this allegation as it is in the alternative to 1 and 2, which the panel has found proved.
105. In relation to allegations;

4 (b) (ii)

you failed to carry out a Child In Need review between 23 March 2020 and 1 July 2020 in the case of Child O

106. Ms Dhinda accepts that there is no record of a CIN review occurring between these dates. In her statement she confirms that she cannot recall whether she carried out a CIN review between these dates for Child O. She states in her statement that if these reviews do not take place on time, it may result in a child being harmed because additional risks may not be detected early, and this may have a negative impact on the child's welfare.
107. The panel found the case of Child O was allocated to Ms Dhinda between 23 March to 3 November 2020 and there are no CIN reviews on the file from 4 January to 2 July 2020. There should be a CIN review every 6 weeks. It was raised in supervision on the 8 June 2020 that a CIN review was now due, however despite this no CIN review took place until the 2 July 2020.
108. In the absence of any records for this period of a CIN review then the panel finds that on the balance of probabilities, no review took place between the 23 March and the 1 July 2020, this is a period of 68 working days, or just over 13 weeks in which period at least two CIN reviews should have occurred.
109. The panel had regard to the exhibits of AA and DE (production witness only, not called), in that there were no meetings and visits as there are no records demonstrating the same took place. At no time has Ms Dhinda challenged the validity of Social Work England's evidence on this point.
110. The panel therefore finds this allegation proved.

4(b) (i) Case of Child O

A Child in Need case, in which:

you failed to record, in a timely manner or at all, whether a Child in Need review occurred.

111. Ms Dhinda has accepted this allegation, however in light of the panel's finding at 4 (b) (ii) then a recording cannot occur of a CIN meeting between this period as there cannot be a recording of a meeting that did not take place. The panel therefore dismisses this allegation.

4 (e) (ii)

You failed to carry out Child In Need reviews between 24 February 2020 and 19 July 2020 in relation to Child J

112. Ms Dhinda was allocated this case between 3 August 2019 and 10 September 2020. Child J's Child Protection Plan ended on 24 February 2020 and the child was then made subject to a CIN Plan, which should be reviewed every 6 weeks. Between this period there should have been three CIN reviews. A record was produced for the 2 June 2020

but this is blank. In all the CIN visit records for this period there is no confirmation of a review having taken place.

113. In the absence of any CIN review records for this period and the record of the 2 June 2020 being blank and there being no reference of a CIN review in the recordings of the CIN visits then the panel finds that on the balance of probabilities that no CIN reviews took place during this period.
114. The panel had regard to the exhibits of AA and DE (production witness only, not called), in that there were no meetings and visits as there are no records demonstrating the same took place. At no time has Ms Dhinda challenged the validity of Social Work England's evidence on this point.
115. The panel therefore finds this allegation proved.

4(e) Case of Child J, a Child in Need case, in which:

(i) you failed to record Child in Need reviews between 24 February 2020 and 19 July 2020

116. Ms Dhinda has accepted this allegation, however in light of the panel's finding at 4 (e) (ii) then a recording cannot occur of a CIN review between this period as there cannot be a recording of a meeting that did not take place. The panel therefore dismisses this allegation.

4 (f) (i) and 4 (g) (i) are allegations for Child H and Child G who are siblings;

You failed to carry out a Child In Need review between 12 February 2020 and 30 June 2020

117. The panel found Ms Dhinda was allocated this case between 3 September 2019 and 10 November 2020. A CIN review took place on the 11 February 2020 and the next review was due 6 weeks thereafter should have been on the 24 March 2020, there is no record of a CIN review having taken place on this date, or indeed during the period between 12 February and 30 June 2020. This is a 14 week period when two CIN reviews should have occurred. The fact that there are no records of any CIN reviews during this period leads the panel to find that on the balance of probabilities that no CIN reviews took place.
118. The panel had regard to the exhibits of AA and DE (production witness only, not called), in that there were no meetings and visits as there are no records demonstrating the same took place. At no time has Ms Dhinda challenged the validity of Social Work England's evidence on this point.
119. The panel therefore finds these allegations proved.

4 (f) and (g) (ii) Case of Child H and G who are siblings

You failed to record that a Child in Need review had taken place between 12 February 2020 and 30 June 2020

120. Ms Dhinda has accepted these allegations, however in light of the panel's finding at 4 (f) and (g) (i) then a recording cannot occur of a CIN review between this period as there cannot be a recording of a meeting that did not take place. The panel therefore dismisses these allegations.

4 (h) (iii) 4 (l) (iii) and 4 j (iii) are allegations in respect of children A, B and C who are siblings

You failed to carry out a Child Protection visit between 16 May 2020 and 3 June 2020

121. The panel found Ms Dhinda was allocated this case between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020. Noting Ms Dhinda's oral evidence where she accepted if a meeting had occurred between 16 May 2020 and 3 June 2020 there would not have been a requirement for a meeting on 4 June 2020, the panel found that on the balance of probabilities there was no CP visit between the 16 May and 3 June 2020.
122. The panel had regard to the exhibits of AA and DE (production witness only, not called), in that there were no meetings and visits as there are no records demonstrating the same took place. At no time has Ms Dhinda challenged the validity of Social Work England's evidence on this point.
123. The panel therefore finds these allegations proved.

4 (l) and (m) Child E and F who are siblings

You failed to carry out and/or record any Child In Need reviews between 27 January and 7 September 2020

124. Ms Dhinda was allocated this case between 27 January 2020 and 10 November 2020. There is no record of any CIN reviews having taken place during this period and the panel finds that on the balance of probabilities that no CIN reviews took place between the 27 January and 7 September 2020. As there is a finding that no reviews took place then it is accepted there would be no recording and therefore this part of the allegation is dismissed.
125. The panel had regard to the exhibits of AA and DE (production witness only, not called), in that there were no meetings and visits as there are no records demonstrating the same took place. At no time has Ms Dhinda challenged the validity of Social Work England's evidence on this point.
126. The panel therefore finds these allegations proved.

4 (n) (i) and 4 (o) (i) are allegations concerning Child N and K who are siblings

A child protection case, in which you between 1 November 2019 and 27 February 2020 did not hold any core group meetings

127. The panel found that Ms Dhinda was allocated this case between 31 July 2019 and 2 October 2020. There are no records of any core group meetings during this period, which should occur every 6 weeks. This is a 16 week period. The panel finds that on the balance of probabilities that no core group meetings were held between this period.

128. The panel had regard to the exhibits of AA and DE (production witness only, not called), in that there were no meetings and visits as there are no records demonstrating the same took place. At no time has Ms Dhinda challenged the validity of Social Work England's evidence on this point.

129. The panel therefore finds these allegations proved.

4 (n) and 4 (o) (ii) Case of Child N and K

A Child Protection case, in which you, between 1 November 2019 and 27 February 2020:

(ii) failed to record that any Core Group meetings took place.

130. Ms Dhinda has accepted this allegation, however in light of the panel's finding at 4 (n) and 4(o) (i) then a recording cannot occur of Core Group meetings between this period as there cannot be a recording of a meeting that did not take place. The panel therefore dismisses these allegations.

Grounds – misconduct

131. The panel heard the first part of these proceedings in April 2025 and made findings on the facts. The case was part heard and listed to deal with misconduct, impairment and sanctions from 4 November 2025.

132. Ms Dhinda conceded that misconduct was established save for allegations 4 (a) (c) (d) and (k). She produced an additional Bundle of 20 pages that contained the following;

- a) Reflection document
- b) Information of courses she has undertaken
- c) Updates on practise from Tanya Shirley her current manager dated 8 July 2025 and 8 October 2025.

This was considered by the panel along with all evidence provided at the previous stage.

133. Ms Dhinda also relied on a statement from her manager TS and her oral evidence.

Summary of Evidence – misconduct and impairment

Ms Dhinda

134. Ms Dhinda confirmed that she had done a lot of thinking, reflection and training and also discussed and reflected upon her previous failings in supervision. She stated that she understood why the panel had found her to be dishonest in that she had represented core group meetings had taken place for children A, B, and C on 9 March 2020 and 11 May 2020 when in fact these did not take place. She explained it was the way they had been written up; no-one had been present and she had used updates from the files and using these did not accurately reflect the circumstances of the families at that time and anyone looking at the records would see this as dishonest. However, Ms

Dhinda stated that whilst her actions may appear to be dishonest to anyone reading her records, she herself was not dishonest as it had not been her intention to mislead. She confirmed it was a difficult time, so many instructions were being given and she recognised that she should have sought clarification from managers, which is what she does now if she has any doubts.

135. Her delayed flight from Zimbabwe meant she was not in the UK on the 9 March 2020, she assumed the meeting had been dealt with by the Duty Team. [PRIVATE]. She accepted that anyone looking at the records would think that the meetings had occurred and they had not. They did not give an accurate account as she had taken information from other sources and no meeting had in fact occurred. If another social worker had picked up the records, it could have been potentially harmful to the children. Events could have happened of which they were unaware, but that they would assume everything was fine.
136. Ms Dhinda confirmed the importance of actual physical meetings with the core group members in order to gain an accurate and updated picture of circumstances for the family. She confirmed that she felt “bad” and that she had “let the families down”. She apologised. She explained that the children would become “invisible” by not being seen and supported by the processes she was responsible to undertake.
137. Ms Dhinda explained that if service users have negative experiences with social workers then this can lead to mistrust. She explained that the “spotlight” is on the profession due to child deaths and the perception that social workers do not do enough to prevent these.
138. Ms Dhinda has undertaken a number of courses prior to the first stage hearing in April 2025 and since this time. She stated she had been approached by her current employer to become a permanent member of staff as opposed to an agency worker. She confirmed that her employer knew all the allegations and she had told them to wait until after the hearing in April 2025, after which they had come back to her still wanting her to apply for the permanent role. She had secured this position which commenced from September 2025. These proceedings have been a powerful process for her and served her well in terms of learning. It has given her motivation to do better and she stated she has received commendations from judges and received positive letters from families about her practise.
139. Ms Dhinda reflected that she now tells her managers and colleagues if she has any problems and that she is open about her circumstances and any impact. She confirmed she now asks for clarification if she is unsure of instructions.
140. Ms Dhinda accepted that the minutes of the meetings of the 9 March 2020 and 11 May 2020 were dishonest as she had used updates. However, she stated that the whole team were using updates and she should have clarified her instructions with managers and this was her fault, but she had assumed from emails that it was acceptable practice. She had come back from leave and was trying to make everything OK. She stated there was no premeditation, otherwise she would have written up the 9 March

2020 meeting log sooner. It was a difficult time with covid lockdown and personal issues.

141. When challenged by Mr Wilson as to whether she accepted if she herself was dishonest, Ms Dhinda said it was not her intention to be dishonest. She accepted that her actions were dishonest but not intentional in making the false records. It was a lapse of judgement.
142. Ms Dhinda stated that AA had sat down with her and went through a spreadsheet of all the things Ms Dhinda had not done and told her to “fill in the gaps” and therefore she assumed that AA knew that the core group meeting on the 9 March 2020 had not taken place. Ms Dhinda confirmed she had sent the record to AA and she had approved it, that she was the manager and knew everything and she signed it off. When asked about accusing AA of dishonesty, Ms Dhinda denied saying AA was dishonest. She said maybe it was her misremembering what she was told and misunderstanding the email she was reading. She stated it was not her intention to risk AA’s reputation by giving dishonest evidence about another professional witness.
143. Ms Dhinda accepted that when meetings had not taken place for children subject to child protection processes then their plan does not get reviewed and the risks are therefore not assessed. She confirmed that she had taken steps to check on the families upon her return to work. She now takes steps to ensure meetings are not missed by diarising them earlier than the statutory requirement.
144. When questioned by the panel Ms Dhinda confirmed her understanding of the misconduct she had accepted, in that she did not do her work in timescales, had not undertaken meetings and this put children at risk of harm. That other agencies are relied on for information and the monitoring was not there and so this created risk. Ms Dhinda accepted that social work is a public office and the reputation of the profession could have been brought into disrepute by her failings. Service users could lose trust and become resistant to working with social workers.
145. Ms Dhinda confirmed that she had told her current employer that the hearing in April 2025 had gone part heard and findings had been made around misconduct but that issues of dishonesty were going to be explored further when the hearing resumed in November. She stated her manager has the list of allegations sent by Ms Dhinda’s solicitor and they went through everything in supervision. Her manager also has the interim conditions of practice. She confirmed she had not sent her employer the determination that she had received from the April 2025 hearing as she was not sure she should do so. She did not seek clarity from anyone and was not sure if she could send the determination to anyone, so she did not. She stated she did not know if her solicitor sent the document to her manager.
146. Ms Dhinda was asked whether she understood the relevance of the finding by the panel that she had lied under oath. In particular, how this might relate to a key part of her role which is to give evidence in court. It was put to Ms Dhinda that a judge may have difficulty accepting her evidence if they were aware that she had a history of lying under

oath. Ms Dhinda responded that judges do not always accept evidence given under oath by social workers during family proceedings and that she collects information to prove her case when undertaking court work.

147. Ms Dhinda asked the panel for forgiveness and apologised to the panel, the families, and everyone affected by her actions. She stated that everyone deserves a second chance when they have done something wrong. Ms Dhinda stated that if she felt unwell now, she feels confident to talk to her manager. She gave an example of consulting with the clinical team when she had a really difficult case. She also talks to colleagues that she trusts to give her advice. Ms Dhinda also stated that she has taken time to consider the broader impact of her actions on colleagues, social work professionals, public confidence, and the reputation of the profession.

TS Evidence

148. TS confirmed she is Ms Dhinda's current manager and knew about the fitness to practise proceedings. She was aware that the case had gone part heard from the hearing in April 2025 and knew the general nature of the allegations against Ms Dhinda. She did not know the specific details of the allegations or exactly what Ms Dhinda had accepted or denied, but they had spoken about the importance of recordings needing to be done on time and talked about how upset Ms Dhinda had been about the adjournment. This conversation took place around the beginning of May 2025.
149. It was not until 18 June 2025, when she was asked to submit a report by Social Work England for Ms Dhinda's interim review hearing, that TS had confirmed she had become fully aware that the findings of dishonesty were proved. She understood that final decisions were not being made until the hearing in November 2025. TS stated that she did not have an awareness of exactly how the fitness to practise process works, so would not have been aware at that time that the remaining matters to be considered were misconduct, impairment, and sanction.
150. TS confirmed that Ms Dhinda's application for the permanent position was successful on the 16 April 2025. Ms Dhinda had submitted an expression of interest form outlining why she felt she met the job description. The Head of Service accepted her application without the need for an interview as Ms Dhinda had been an agency worker with her now employer for over a year. TS had spoken with the Head of Service and liaised with the HR department upon receipt of the proven allegations of the 18 June 2025. There had been no evidence of poor practice whilst Ms Dhinda had been engaged as an agency worker and so a decision was made not to withdraw the job offer.
151. TS had spoken with Ms Dhinda about the findings and they talked about the impact it was having on her and about what constitutes good practice in terms of case recording and completing essential tasks within timescales. TS confirmed she was not aware of the specifics of the findings in that two core group meetings had not taken place, but were later written up by Ms Dhinda as if they had occurred. She confirmed that Ms Dhinda had not shared with her the finding that she had lied under oath. She further confirmed that she was not aware of Ms Dhinda accusing AA, her previous manager, of

dishonesty. TS confirmed knowing this would not make her look at Ms Dhinda's practice differently as she had undertaken some outstanding work whilst under TS's management. However, she accepted that such behaviour does not reflect well on the service nor on the worker. TS shared the view that if children are not seen especially during the Covid lockdown period, then it could result in children being locked in houses with their abusers.

152. She expressed that social workers have an important role in people's lives, but they are not perfect, and they make mistakes, and it is the reflection of those mistakes and how someone moves forward that is important. TS stated that she supports Ms Dhinda "absolutely" in terms of maintaining her position within the profession and that it would be a "great loss" if she were no longer able to practise.

Finding and reasons on grounds:

Social Work England's submissions on grounds

153. Mr Wilson on behalf of Social Work England in his oral submissions in which he relied upon the statement of case dated 21 March 2025 reminded the panel that whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct is a matter of judgement for the adjudicators, rather than a matter of proof. Misconduct was defined by Lord Clyde in the case of *Roylance v General Medical Council (No 2)* as "a word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances." Lord Clyde went on to say that "{t}he standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a {. . .} practitioner in the particular circumstances."
154. The majority of the alleged conduct of the social worker would amount to a departure from the following professional standards of Social Work England:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.

3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.

3.11 Maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records, documenting how I arrive at my decisions.

As a social worker, I will not:

5.3 Falsify records or condone this by others.

152. For conduct alleged to have taken place prior to 2 December 2019, the following HCPC Standards for Performance, Conduct and Ethics (2016) are relevant:

3.4 You must keep up to date with and follow the law, our guidance and other requirements relevant to your practice.

6.1 You must take all reasonable steps to reduce the risk of harm to service users, carers and colleagues as far as possible.

9.1 You must make sure that your conduct justifies the public's trust and confidence in you and your profession.

10.1 You must keep full, clear, and accurate records for everyone you care for, treat, or provide other services to.

10.2 You must complete all records promptly and as soon as possible after providing care, treatment or other services.

153. Similarly, the following HCPC Standards of Proficiency (2017) are relevant:

2.2 understand the need to promote the best interests of service users and carers at all times.

3.1 understand the need to maintain high standards of personal and professional conduct

9.7 be able to contribute effectively to work undertaken as part of a multi-disciplinary team

10.1 be able to keep accurate, comprehensive and comprehensible records in accordance with applicable legislation, protocols and guidelines.

155. Mr Wilson confirmed that breaches of the professional standards provide *prima facie* evidence of misconduct. The extent of the social worker's departure is a key feature in this case. Allegation 4 provides an overview of the poor record keeping and failure to complete actions at all within the required timescales. Accurate record keeping is a fundamental tenet of social work, especially in a multi-disciplinary setting; other professionals and agencies must be able to rely upon the records.

156. The social worker has admitted a large number of the allegations including representing that Core Group Meetings had taken place when this was not the case (Allegations 1 and 3) and that she failed to carry out Core Group Meetings (e.g. 4h(i), 4i(i) and 4j(i)). She has also admitted a large number of failures to keep records. Mr Wilson submitted that Allegation 4a if it stood alone may not have constituted misconduct, but it is not to be taken in isolation, and the panel is entitled to look at overall conduct in assessing misconduct. Mr Wilson submitted that Allegations 4c, 4d and 4k were more significant. He submitted that these are failures to record CIN reviews and the Ms Dhinda herself accepts that failing to do so is serious.

157. Mr Wilson submitted that in addition to the overarching deficiencies in record keeping, there is the dishonesty as alleged in paragraph 2. The social worker gave the distinct impression that Core Group Meetings had occurred when they had not. The meetings themselves are a crucial part of Child Protection but even more serious than missing the meetings is the dishonesty in terms of representing they had taken place when they had not. The social worker was covering up her professional failures. That is a very

serious departure from the standards and undermines the confidence in the social work system as a whole.

Submissions on behalf of Ms Dhinda on grounds

158. Mr McCaffrey on behalf of Ms Dhinda provided written submissions and reminded the panel that conduct must be serious rather than mere misconduct as per *Cheatle v GMC* (2009) EWHC 645 (Admin) at (19). The decision in every case as to whether the misconduct is serious has to be made by the panel in the exercise of its own skilled judgement on the facts and circumstances and in the light of the evidence.
159. Mr McCaffrey submitted on behalf of Ms Dhinda that the allegations of dishonesty must amount to serious misconduct, and this is conceded. It is also accepted the following allegations amount to serious misconduct: 4(b), 4(e), 4(h), 4(g), 4(h) (i) and (j) [subject to duplication in allegations 1-3], 4(l), 4(m), 4(n) and 4(o).
160. Mr McCaffrey submitted on behalf of Ms Dhinda that the following allegations do not amount to serious misconduct: 4(a), 4(c), 4(d) and 4(k). This is on the basis that these were honest mistakes and/or were reflective of practice and circumstances in the team at the time.

Legal advice on grounds

161. The panel heard and accepted legal advice from the legal adviser that it is for the panel, applying its own independent judgment, to determine whether the proven facts amount to misconduct (*Council for the Regulation of Health Care Professionals v GMC and Biswas* [2006] EWHC 464). Misconduct has no statutory definition, but in *Roylance v GMC* (No.2) [2001] 1 AC 311 it was described as conduct falling short of what would be proper in the circumstances. The panel was reminded that not every breach of professional rules amounts to misconduct; only conduct that is serious, culpable, and regarded by responsible practitioners as reprehensible will suffice (*Solicitors Regulation Authority v Day & Others* [2018] EWHC 2726 (Admin); *Khan v Bar Standards Board* [2018] EWHC 2184 (Admin)).
162. The panel was referred to *R (on the application of Remedy UK Limited) v GMC* [2010] EWHC 1245 (Admin) and that misconduct is of two principal kinds. First it may involve sufficiently serious misconduct in the exercise of professional practice such that it can properly be described as misconduct going to fitness to practise. Secondly, it can involve conduct of a morally culpable or otherwise disgraceful kind, which may, and often will occur, out-with the course of professional practice itself, but which brings disgrace upon the registrant and thereby prejudices the reputation of the profession.
163. The panel was reminded of the overriding objective of Social Work England, which includes its duty to protect the public, promote and maintain public confidence in social workers in England and to promote and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.

The panel's decision on grounds

164. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser.
165. The panel considered the submissions made on behalf of both parties and in particular the submissions made for Ms Dhinda that allegations 4 (a), (c), (d) and (k) did not amount to misconduct.
166. The panel evaluated each allegation individually and collectively, assessing the nature, gravity, frequency, and impact of the conduct, as well as the duties and expectations of a registered social worker.
167. The panel accepted that taken alone allegation 4 (a), (c), (d) and (k) would not amount to serious misconduct however the panel was concerned that (c) and (d) involved a lack of recording over a significant period of time. It was the collective nature of the allegations, the frequency, gravity and impact of the conduct that led the panel to view the allegations as a whole and as such it determined these were serious departures from the standards.
168. The panel also had regard to the regulatory frameworks in place during the material period. The panel was satisfied that factual allegations admitted and found proved involved repeated and egregious breaches of the following:

Professional standards of Social Work England:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.

3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.

3.11 Maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records, documenting how I arrive at my decisions.

As a social worker, I will not:

5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.

5.3 Falsify records or condone this by others.

For the conduct alleged to have taken place prior to 2 December 2019, the following

HCPC Standards for Performance, Conduct and Ethics (2016) were breached:

3.4 You must keep up to date with and follow the law, our guidance and other requirements relevant to your practice.

6.1 You must take all reasonable steps to reduce the risk of harm to service users, carers and colleagues as far as possible.

9.1 You must make sure that your conduct justifies the public's trust and confidence in you and your profession.

10.1 You must keep full, clear, and accurate records for everyone you care for, treat, or provide other services to.

10.2 You must complete all records promptly and as soon as possible after providing care, treatment or other services.

HCPC Standards of Proficiency (2017) were breached:

2.2 understand the need to promote the best interests of service users and carers at all times.

3.1 understand the need to maintain high standards of personal and professional conduct

9.7 be able to contribute effectively to work undertaken as part of a multi-disciplinary team

10.1 be able to keep accurate, comprehensive and comprehensible records in accordance with applicable legislation, protocols and guidelines.

169. The panel found that the misconduct of dishonesty was ongoing, and the breaches of the professional standards taken together were serious as in the case of *Nandi v DMC (2004) EWHC 2317*.

170. The panel therefore found that the matters found proved amounted to misconduct in their entirety.

Submissions on impairment

Social Work England's Submissions

171. Mr Wilson also submitted that whether the facts found proved result in impaired fitness to practise is a matter of judgement for the adjudicators.

172. Mr Wilson submitted that there is no direct evidence of harm. He submitted the assessment of risk is not solely about whether harm actually occurs. It was submitted that Ms Dhinda's failure to record Core Group and Child in Need meetings were not administrative lapses, but they suspended the mechanism for assessing risks to children for months at a time and Ms Dhinda has accepted the risks around this as did her manager TS when giving evidence.

173. Mr Wilson noted that Ms Dhinda admits to not making timely recordings of visits, meetings, emails, phone calls and plans and expresses her regret at this. Ms Dhinda denies the dishonesty allegations. In terms of remediation, Ms Dhinda has produced a number of certificates that evidence continued professional development, such as Introduction to Safeguarding Children (Level 1), Advanced Safeguarding Children (Level

2), and Past Reviews of Policy and Practice for Social Work with Children and Families. None of the certificates, Mr Wilson submitted is evidence of remediation as to dishonesty.

174. Mr Wilson submitted that impairment should be found in relation to public protection, as a result of the risk to the public, and otherwise in the wider public interest.
175. Mr Wilson submitted the missed meetings which were later recorded as having taken place was deliberately dishonest. It has been found that Ms Dhinda had given dishonest evidence under oath about what her manager knew. It was submitted that she was not only dishonest in practise, but in attempting to cover it up and dishonest to the panel in her evidence, as such Ms Dhinda had attempted to allege that another professional had been dishonest and that is a key issue for public safety. It is integral to be able to trust a social worker and for them to own up when they have done something wrong. Owing up to mistakes is the foundation to professional practise because that is how mistakes are rectified. In Mr Wilson's submissions if the public cannot trust the social worker, then they cannot trust her to protect children and this is a public safety issue.
176. Mr Wilson submitted public confidence in the profession is undermined by: a. the social worker's dishonesty; and b. the social worker's failure to act in the best interests of service users in relation to making accurate and up to date case records and progressing identified actions in her cases.
177. Mr Wilson submitted that the public are entitled to expect that social workers will create accurate records of cases involving the safety and future of children, will abide by statutory requirements, will act in the best interests of service users and will maintain professional standards as to honesty.
178. In relation to insight and remediation, Mr Wilson confirmed that Ms Dhinda has produced one certificate on the introduction to social work course containing some material on ethics, but the other courses are on record keeping, with nothing targeted on dishonesty. In his submissions this is due to the fact that Ms Dhinda has not come to terms with the findings. Mr Wilson submitted that not to find impairment would seriously undermine confidence in the regulator and profession and until the conduct is demonstrated to have been fully remediated, there remains a risk of repetition in the future. Dishonesty is a particularly difficult trait to remediate.

Submissions on impairment on behalf of Ms Dhinda

179. Mr McCaffrey provided the panel with written submissions and reminded the panel that the purpose of fitness to practise proceedings is not to punish the practitioner for past misdoings but to protect the public against acts and omissions of those who are not fit to practise. Panels should therefore look forward and not back.

180. It was submitted by Mr McCaffrey that findings have been made contrary to Ms Dhinda's evidence and whilst she does not accept the full extent of the dishonesty findings, she does accept that her actions could be regarded as dishonest, but that she did not set out with an intent to mislead.

181. Mr McCaffrey asked the panel to carefully consider all the evidence they heard. In that he submitted;

- There is clear and unchallenged evidence of department confusion and changeover of managers.
- [PRIVATE]
- [PRIVATE]
- There is clear and unchallenged evidence that at the relevant time in 2020 Ms Dhinda was involved in a complex adoption court case with final hearing evidence due.
- There are clear admissions from Ms Dhinda that she was overwhelmed and evidence from others who noticed a change in her appearance including anxiety and disorganisation.
- The nation was in the lead up to lockdown in February and March 2020.

182. It was submitted on behalf of Ms Dhinda that the dishonesty allegations relate to one case and should be regarded in the context of the findings in Stage 1 which take account of her personal circumstances, health and covid and the time lapse since the misconduct is relevant.

183. The submission on behalf of Ms Dhinda was that she spoke in evidence about the potential for her actions to have caused harm. It was submitted that in becoming visibly upset when speaking of her own personal experiences of failed care and absent visits, she was able to explain reference to the “invisible child” which was highly personal and lead to words such as shame being used multiple times. “I let them down – they did not deserve that”. Ms Dhinda could “empathise” with their position [PRIVATE].

184. Mr McCaffrey submitted there is no evidence of repetition of any of the allegations since 2020 and Ms Dhinda's managers are supportive, they are more than complimentary, and they demonstrate good practice with no concerns at all. Ms Dhinda is now employed by them on a permanent basis which it is submitted was done in the full knowledge of this case and the allegations.

185. He further submitted that Ms Dhinda had practiced for many years without issue or incident until the end of 2019 into the first half of 2020. He submitted that she was, until this case, a social worker with an impeccable career and has since proved herself a valuable social worker.

186. Mr McCaffrey submitted that Ms Dhinda does have insight, and her original statement also addresses insight and reflection.
187. Mr McCaffrey submitted that Ms Dhinda does recognise both the gravity of her actions/inactions and the seriousness of the misconduct she has admitted, in stark contrast to her evidence at Stage 1 in that, although she still sought to outline her position, she did not blame anyone but herself for what occurred. He submitted she recognised that it was always her responsibility to confirm what needed to be done and her responsibility to uphold her professional standards.
188. Mr McCaffrey submitted on the basis that Ms Dhinda did not contest misconduct and did not seek to argue her actions are less than what they are, he submitted that this is a key indication of insight. She clearly recognised in all her statements and evidence the potential harm to the children and families in question and was able to do so through deeply personal experience. She was able to speak about the impact of negative social work experiences on families and the knock-on effect with respect to their engagement. She spoke of her own experiences trying to get engagement where previous social workers had caused alienation and recognised the damage this does, publicly, to the profession. She spoke of previous apologies and apologised in evidence to all those affected. She, on more than one occasion, spoke about the shame she feels about that period in her career and the remorse she feels for her failings.
189. Mr McCaffrey submitted that efforts made by a social worker to remediate can always be open to criticism. Ms Dhinda's remediation started long before the April hearing started and continued after the hearing up to last month. Her courses are varied, for example, her return to the basics through introductory courses was designed, to return to the basic principles she learned when she first started studying social work at Kingston University. He submitted that this humility should be applauded, not criticised.
190. Mr McCaffrey submitted that it was accepted that while there is always more work to be done, the breadth of Ms Dhinda's courses and training, culminate in individual reflections and a final reflection which draws the principles together to explain what she learned. He further submitted remediation is not attained and proved by attending one course for each failing – it is attained by remembering the purpose of the profession and the standards expected. He submitted her reflection does exactly this and it is worth a second consideration and it demonstrates a clear capacity to remediate even if it is considered to be incomplete as yet.
191. Mr McCaffrey submitted that it is the ability to put this learning into practice which matters. The panel have 5 years of evidence of that, which included supervision, and numerous reports confirming compliance with conditions of practice and glowing reports from management in a new local authority. This he submitted, demonstrates

consistent good practice which is irrefutable evidence of no repetition and clear remedial action.

192. The panel heard from TS, who was the author of the more recent reports. Mr McCaffrey submitted it was unclear as to TS' level of knowledge of the findings of the hearing in April 2025. He submitted that to view this as entirely the fault of Ms Dhinda would be unfair in circumstances where Ms Dhinda showed TS the letter which confirmed misconduct and impairment was the next step. There could equally be a mistaken level of assumed knowledge of Social Work England processes that TS admitted she did not have.
193. Mr McCaffrey submitted that TS was aware prior to 8 May 2025, that the allegations involved dishonesty. She was firm that while she did not know specifics until June, she did know the general nature of the allegations. She was aware they were very serious however she was determined to judge Ms Dhinda on her practice at the local authority.
194. Mr McCaffrey submitted that by 18 June 2025, TS was fully aware of the findings. At this point the previous successful application to move Ms Dhinda into a permanent role was reviewed but maintained. This involved the operations manager and HR. This is significant because, as confirmed by TS, by the time of the commencement of the role (1 September 2025) and her reports in July and October 2025 she was fully aware. Further, that decision was based on "her demonstrated reflection, professional growth, and consistently strong performance during her period of employment with the local authority."
195. Mr McCaffrey submitted that TS was steadfast in her support for Ms Dhinda, and in her view that she would be "a real loss."
196. Mr McCaffrey submitted that Ms Dhinda spoke of how she does things differently since. She spoke of openness about her own health and failings, developing an ability to be vulnerable, to seek help when needed and to always put the interest of the families first. She was even able to speak to smaller management changes she has made to her practice which included booking in CGM's or CIN's well in advance of their actual completion date to allow time to rearrange should circumstances change. She was, he submitted, able to speak to practical and principled changes.
197. Mr McCaffrey submitted that Ms Dhinda spoke of "Wellness Wednesdays" and of the weekly Monday data and statistics meetings which check all meetings have taken place and all reports have been written. She described this experience as being "painful and powerful" in that it had "deepened her practice" and had "motivated me more to do more to make sure children are protected and the profession is protected."
198. Mr McCaffrey accepted on behalf of Ms Dhinda that a finding of impairment on this limb is likely in matters of dishonesty. Ms Dhinda was at pains to assure the panel she recognised the seriousness of the misconduct.

199. Mr McCaffrey submitted that a properly informed member of the public would not seek a finding of impairment in their name. He submitted that the panel have evidence from her employers who have granted Ms Dhinda a second chance, along with their support and understanding. He submitted that the public would do the same in all the circumstances of this case. He further submitted that the public interest wanes with time, if genuine learning and insight exists.

200. Mr McCaffrey referred the panel to *Bijl v General Medical Council* [2001] UKPC 42; [2002] Lloyd's Rep Med 60, in which Lord Hoffmann said (at [13]) that proper concern with public confidence in the profession and its procedures for dealing with "doctors who lapse from professional standards" should "not be carried to the extent of feeling it necessary to sacrifice the career of an otherwise competent and useful doctor who presents no danger to the public in order to satisfy a demand for blame and punishment". While this is technically a reference to sanction, he submitted it is relevant to the proper and considered weight to be attributed to the public view of impairment.

Legal Advice on impairment

201. The panel was referred to the personal and public elements of impairment and the cases of *Cohen v GMC* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) and *Yeong v GMC* [2009] EWHC 1923(Admin) and *CHRE v NMC & Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin). The panel was referred to the impairment section of Social Work England's published Guidance on Impairment and Sanction (the guidance) and the principles from the case law authorities relating to impairment.

202. With regard to the "personal element" and the principles referred to in *Cohen v GMC* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) the panel should consider if the conduct is remediable, has the conduct been remediated and is there a likelihood of repetition?

203. With regard to the "public interest element" the panel must take into account that even where the misconduct is easily remediable, has been remedied and there is no risk of repetition a registrant's fitness to practise may still be impaired, *Yeong v GMC* [2009] EWHC 1923 (Admin) & *CHRE v NMC & Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin).

204. The panel was reminded that a social worker's fitness to practise is impaired if they pose a risk to public safety, or if their conduct or performance undermines the confidence the public is entitled to place in all social workers in England. A social worker's fitness to practise may also be impaired if their actions make it necessary to send a public message about the standards expected of social workers.

205. The panel should consider the limbs of public interest, which includes the protection of service users, colleagues and the wider public from the risk of harm, maintaining public confidence in the social work profession, protecting the reputation of the social work

profession and declaring and upholding appropriate standards of conduct and competence among social workers.

206. The panel was referred to the four tests identified by Dame Janet Smith in her 5th Shipman Report and cited in CHRE v (1) NMC and (2) Grant. The panel was advised to consider whether:
 - a. The social worker has in the past and/or is liable in the future to place service users at unwarranted risk of harm.
 - b. The social worker has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the profession into disrepute.
 - c. The social worker has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the profession.
 - d. Has the social worker in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.
207. The panel was also advised that when considering the question of impairment, it should take account of Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.

Findings and reasons on current impairment:

208. After finding that the facts proved amounted to serious misconduct, the panel went on to consider whether Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise was currently impaired. In doing so, it reminded itself of the need to assess both the personal component, which addresses the risk of repetition and protection of the public, and the wider public component, which concerns the maintenance of confidence in the profession and the upholding of proper standards.
209. In relation to the personal component, the panel determined that the misconduct was not restricted to isolated mistakes but included serious and intentional failings. The dishonesty in official documentation, specifically to mislead professionals into believing actual meetings had taken place was an act of deliberate concealment. The panel is satisfied that Ms Dhinda's actions when creating records of the meetings on 9 March 2020 and 11 May 2020 were taken in a deliberate attempt to conceal gaps in her practice; she was coming under increased pressure and her behaviour placed her personal needs above professional duty.
210. The panel found there was clearly a significant risk of harm as meetings did not happen within the required timescales and minutes of meetings were falsified. Ms Dhinda should have anticipated the risk of harm by not having the meetings and then falsifying paperwork. Ms Dhinda acknowledged that children could have been at significant risk, stating that Children A, B and C were part of a family where domestic abuse was a concern.

211. The panel also noted that Ms Dhinda had sought to shift responsibility for her actions onto others. She stated that AA had known that the meeting of the 9 March 2020 had not taken place and specifically instructed her to make the recording. In her evidence for impairment, Ms Dhinda was again clear that AA knew the meeting on the 9 March 2020 had not taken place and had signed off the record in that knowledge, despite the panel having made findings that Ms Dhinda lied under oath on this matter. The panel considered that such attempts to deflect blame were inconsistent with genuine acceptance of responsibility and further demonstrated a lack of meaningful insight.

212. The panel also placed particular weight on the element of dishonesty that ran through Ms Dhinda's misconduct. Dishonesty is regarded as especially serious because it undermines the trust placed in social workers by service users, colleagues, courts, and the public. In this case, her dishonest production of minutes of core group and CIN meetings demonstrated a willingness to mislead in order to protect her own position. Such behaviour not only placed service users at risk but also threatened the integrity of multi-agency safeguarding processes. The panel considered that this sustained dishonesty compounded the gravity of the case and was itself a significant factor in its finding on impairment.

213. In addition, the panel found there was incomplete reflection. Ms Dhinda has accepted the findings in relation to her poor record keeping and failure to carry out critical meetings and visits and was able to articulate how this could have placed children and families at risk, impacted their willingness to engage with social work services and damaged the reputation of the profession. However, when it came to findings on dishonesty the panel determined that there was little to no genuine reflection. Ms Dhinda stated on more than one occasion that whilst she accepted her actions appeared dishonest; she was not being intentionally dishonest. The panel rejects her assertion that she can accept her actions were dishonest without having the intention behind those actions. It is the panel's view that she knew exactly what she was doing in falsifying the records of the 9 March 2020 and the 11 May 2020 and that there was no substantial reflection on the impact of dishonesty upon how either her own practice or the profession as a whole may be viewed.

214. In explaining to this panel her understanding of the findings, Ms Dhinda did not once acknowledge the findings of dishonesty. She stated in her evidence that she had learned and is now open and honest with managers and seeks clarification when she is uncertain about any issues. However, she failed to inform TS of the finding of dishonesty or that there was a finding she had lied under oath. TS only found out about the dishonesty findings on 18 June 2025; despite confirming she had spoken to Ms Dhinda about the allegations around the beginning of May 2025 after this panel had made the findings. Ms Dhinda had every opportunity of explaining the findings to TS as her manager and her failure to do so leads the panel to consider she has not been reflective, nor has she been open and honest with her employer. There is no evidence

before the panel to suggest that Ms Dhinda accepts the findings made in relation to dishonesty. The panel finds there cannot be full remediation until there is a genuine acceptance of the findings.

215. In evidence from TS, it became clear that Ms Dhinda was encouraged to submit an expression of interest for a permanent position. Ms Dhinda submitted the application, and the Head of Service offered her the post on 16 April 2025. This is 6 days after the adjournment of the hearing of 10 April 2025 where the panel found that Ms Dhinda had been dishonest and lied under oath. The panel finds Ms Dhinda failed to inform her employer of the extent of those findings in the recruitment process, nor did she provide them with a copy of the determination that she had received from the April 2025 hearing as she was not sure she should do so. The panel does not find this to be an example of her being open and honest with her current managers, and therefore does not accept her assertion that she has learned to do so.
216. The panel finds that Ms Dhinda minimised responsibility and did not engage with the seriousness of the misconduct. The panel acknowledges her apology, and considers that she has expressed genuine remorse in terms of her failure to complete records and carry out her duties in a timely manner. However, this apology did not extend to an acknowledgement of her dishonest conduct and needs to be considered in the light of the overall minimisation and blame-shifting demonstrated throughout her evidence. Furthermore, Ms Dhinda did not demonstrate meaningful insight or mitigate the seriousness. Taken together, these factors led the Panel to conclude that the risk of repetition remained significant.
217. The panel acknowledged Ms Dhinda's previously unblemished record and noted that since the allegations were made, she has practised successfully under interim conditions of practice. However, without any acknowledgement from Ms Dhinda that her actions were fundamentally dishonest, the panel cannot accept that full remediation has occurred.
218. The panel found that Ms Dhinda still had some work to do to recognise what went wrong and accept her role and responsibilities in relation to the events. Whilst the panel accepts the time period which covered these events was difficult, it cannot be an excuse for the entirety of the matters that happened. Whilst Ms Dhinda told the panel that she now works closely with her manager and team to raise issues when she feels she has a problem, and allows herself to be more vulnerable, and checks when she is unsure of instructions, she proved this did not happen when asked about sharing the determination or findings with her employer. She was unsure as to whether she could share these, but appeared to take no steps to confirm or deny this belief and simply did not share the document and indeed shared incorrect information, such as stating that misconduct had been found, when it had not.

219. The panel found that Ms Dhinda has not accepted the panel's finding of her intention to be dishonest. When asked to describe the misconduct she was accepting that she had committed, Ms Dhinda did not mention dishonesty at all, until prompted later. Despite facts being found that she was dishonest, and lied under oath, Ms Dhinda seemed unable to accept that she herself was dishonest.

220. Dishonesty is generally recognised as one of the most serious forms of misconduct. Panels are directed to consider dishonesty on a scale of seriousness. The panel found that the dishonesty initially occurred during an isolated period of Ms Dhinda's career, namely March to June 2020. However, when put in arguably similar circumstances of pressure, during the hearing, Ms Dhinda was dishonest and was found to have lied under oath. This led the panel to determine that Ms Dhinda's dishonesty is part of a larger problem or pattern of behaviour.

221. The panel accept this was a difficult time, and Ms Dhinda was experiencing [PRIVATE] which could have contributed to her difficulties at the time. However, the panel found there is no mitigation which could excuse Ms Dhinda's behaviour at the time, and her dishonesty during the hearing.

222. Ms Dhinda had multiple testimonials which gave positive accounts of her work. Ms Dhinda's manager gave evidence under oath and was very supportive of Ms Dhinda's practice and included the fact that she had been commended by judges on complex Family Court cases.

223. Given the panel's concerns about the adequacy of Ms Dhinda's insight or remediation the panel concluded there remained a risk of repetition of the past misconduct. The panel concluded that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is impaired in relation to the personal element of current impairment.

224. Turning to the public component, the panel considered that some concerns are so serious, that if proven, a finding of impairment is likely. This is because a failure to make a finding of impairment may:

- Undermine public confidence in the profession
- Fail to maintain the professional standards expected of social workers

225. Social workers hold a position of significant trust, particularly when working with vulnerable service users. Misconduct of this nature undermines that trust and damages the reputation of the profession. The panel also noted that by authoring and submitting flawed and misleading records, Ms Dhinda placed children at potential risk of harm. Child protection processes rely on the accuracy of such reports in making critical decisions affecting children and families, and any dishonesty in this context threatens the integrity of that process.

226. The panel considered that Ms Dhinda's actions had the potential to affect not only the service users and the children involved, but also the wider system of multi-agency safeguarding, since inaccurate information distorts the work of professionals across agencies who depend on reliable records to make informed decisions. The panel determined that public confidence would be seriously compromised if such conduct were not marked by a finding of impairment. It concluded that it was essential to declare and uphold the standards of professional practice, including maintaining appropriate boundaries, protecting service users from harm, being open and honest, and keeping clear and accurate records.

227. The panel concurred with the submissions of GMC counsel in the case of *Yeong v GMC* General Medical Council [2009] EWHC 1923 (Admin), where the court upheld that:

“Where a (Fitness To Practise Panel) considers that the case is one where the misconduct consists of violating such a fundamental rule of the professional relationship between medical profession and patient and thereby undermining public confidence in the medical profession, a finding of impairment of fitness to practise may be justified on the grounds that it is necessary to reaffirm clear standards of professional conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the practitioner and in the profession.”

228. In light of the above, the panel finds that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is impaired in relation to the public element of current impairment. The protection of the public is the panel's paramount concern.

229. Having regard to both the personal and public elements, the panel concluded that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise was currently impaired. The seriousness and persistence of the misconduct, the central role of dishonesty, the absence of genuine insight, thus remediation and the importance of maintaining confidence in the profession made a finding of impairment both necessary and proportionate.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

230. The panel considered the written submissions provided by Mr Wilson. He submitted that the findings against Ms Dhinda were so serious that removal would be the only appropriate sanction to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England

231. He referred the panel to Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' which described when a removal order may be appropriate.

232. Mr Wilson submitted that no action, warning or advice would address Ms Dhinda's misconduct and impairment.

233. Mr Wilson submitted that conditions of practice would also not be appropriate due to the finding of serious dishonesty.

234. Mr Wilson submitted that Ms Dhinda's misconduct was so serious that suspension would not be appropriate.
235. Mr Wilson submitted that Ms Dhinda's dishonesty was so serious that it required her to be removed from the register.

Submissions on behalf of Ms Dhinda

236. The panel considered the written submissions provided by Mr McCaffrey. He submitted that sanctions imposed should be the minimum necessary to protect the public, starting with the lowest and considering them in ascending order.
237. Mr McCaffrey submitted that conditions of practice would be appropriate. He listed a number of mitigating factors and submitted that these should be carefully considered alongside the core issue of proportionality and asked the panel to consider the guidance. He submitted that any conditions imposed would be reviewed meaning a future panel could exercise all options available to them.
238. Mr McCaffrey further submitted that if the panel were not minded to impose a conditions of practice order, a suspension order would be sufficient to send a clear and unambiguous message to Ms Dhinda, the profession, and the public.
239. Mr McCaffrey submitted that a removal order would be disproportionate and Ms Dhinda should be given an opportunity to put matters right, rather than being removed from the profession permanently.

Legal advice:

240. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The legal adviser reminded the panel that its overarching objective when determining sanction is to protect the health, safety and well-being of the public, to maintain public confidence in the profession, and to uphold proper professional standards. The legal adviser advised that sanctions are not intended to be punitive, though they may have that effect, and must be directed to protecting the public and the wider public interest. The panel was further advised that it must apply the principle of proportionality, weighing the interests of the social worker against the public interest, and that any sanction imposed must be the minimum necessary to achieve the regulatory objectives and consistent with the panel's earlier findings on impairment.
241. In addition, the panel was advised that it should identify aggravating and mitigating factors at each stage of the process and consider each available sanction in ascending order of seriousness, having regard to the guidance. The legal Adviser explained the range of outcomes available under the Social Workers Regulations 2018, including advice, warnings, conditions of practice, suspension, and removal. It was further advised that conditions of practice are generally suitable for cases involving competence or health, but are unlikely to be appropriate where the concerns relate to attitudinal, behavioural, or serious public interest issues. The panel was also advised that suspension may only be appropriate where there is evidence of insight and a willingness to remediate, and that where no lesser sanction would suffice to protect the

public or to maintain public confidence and standards, it should consider imposing a removal order.

Finding and reasons on sanction:

242. The panel considered the written submissions from Mr Wilson on behalf of Social Work England, and Mr McCaffrey on behalf of Ms Dhinda. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser who reminded it that the purpose of a sanction was not to punish Ms Dhinda but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The panel was reminded of the sanctions available and of the need to consider any aggravating and mitigating factors it sees fit. The panel was also asked to ensure that when considering sanctions, it begins with the lowest sanction and moves through all the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness, before identifying the sanction it agrees is sufficient to protect the public and maintain confidence in the profession and uphold professional standards.

243. The panel had regard to the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'. In reaching its decision on sanction, the panel took into account its previous findings, in particular at the misconduct and impairment stage which included Ms Dhinda's limited insight and remediation at this stage.

244. The panel identified the following mitigating factors;

- Early admission of the majority of the allegations from the outset of investigations and engagement with the fitness to practise process.
- [PRIVATE].
- Evidence of wider issues in Ms Dhinda's workplace.
- Ms Dhinda had no previous fitness to practise history.
- There have been no issues of concern raised about her practice since the allegations and whilst she has been working under interim conditions of practice.
- Full support from Ms Dhinda's current manager.
- Positive testimonials from multiple sources.
- Ms Dhinda apologised to the panel and to all affected by her actions.
- Ms Dhinda has continued to attend training courses in an attempt to remediate.

245. The panel identified the following aggravating factors;

- Repeated dishonesty including during this hearing.

- Ms Dhinda's continued failure to accept the findings of dishonesty which has resulted in limited insight and remediation.
- The risk of harm to vulnerable service users.
- Ms Dhinda's failure to inform her current employer of the outcome of the findings hearing in terms of the specific detail of the findings and in particular the finding she had lied under oath.

No action, warning or advice

246. The panel decided that none of these options were appropriate noting the seriousness of Ms Dhinda's misconduct and the requirement to protect the public, which would not be achieved by taking no action or giving Ms Dhinda a warning or advice. It would be manifestly insufficient in light of the gravity and attitudinal nature of the misconduct and would fail to address the ongoing risk and the strong public interest in marking the seriousness of the behaviour.

Conditions of practice

247. The panel considered whether conditions of practice would address the misconduct and impairment found. The panel noted the guidance in that conditions of practice are unlikely to be appropriate where dishonesty is found.

248. The panel could not formulate any workable conditions of practice in light of Ms Dhinda's dishonesty and still developing insight and remediation.

249. The panel accepts that Ms Dhinda has been subject to an interim conditions of practice order throughout this process and that she has had the fullest support from her current employer. However, the panel finds that this cannot mitigate the risk posed by her dishonest actions should these be repeated.

250. These concerns were not discrete competence or health issues amenable to supervision or retraining, but arose from fundamental breaches of professional standards and dishonesty. The panel could not frame conditions that would be effective, measurable, or sufficient to protect the public and maintain confidence in the profession.

Suspension order

251. The panel then considered whether a suspension order would be appropriate.

252. The panel considered that suspension is appropriate when it is not possible to formulate workable conditions of practice and the case falls short of requiring removal from the register. The panel considered that suspension may be appropriate when the concerns represent 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 and remediate their failings.

253. The panel considered suspension is likely to be unsuitable where the social worker has not demonstrated any insight and remediation and there is limited evidence to suggest they are willing or able to resolve or remediate their failings.

254. The panel has found that Ms Dhinda has limited insight and the panel has seen evidence she has successfully remediated most of the concerns against her. The panel therefore found that there was a willingness and ability to remediate.

255. In this case, the misconduct involved dishonesty, including lying under oath. The panel finds that dishonesty is a serious breach of the professional standards and can be difficult to remediate. However, the panel found that Ms Dhinda has successfully developed insight into the majority of her failings and if given the chance following the completion of the hearing, she could do so regarding the finding of dishonesty.

256. The panel decided that a suspension order was appropriate in this case and that it should be for a period of 12 months to allow Ms Dhinda to reflect on her behaviour and demonstrate to any future panel that she had developed insight and attempted to remedy her conduct.

257. The panel decided that any future panel, when this order is reviewed, would be assisted by Ms Dhinda:

- Providing a written reflective piece addressing her dishonest behaviour and its impact on others, in particular the impact of her dishonesty on service users and colleagues including managers. This should also include reflection on the impact of her behaviour on the social work profession, upholding professional standards, and public confidence in the regulator. The piece should also demonstrate how Ms Dhinda can prevent recurrence of the behaviour if she finds herself in similar circumstances.
- Undertaking training on ethics, probity and transparency in practise.
- Provision of up to date character testimonials and employment references whether from paid or unpaid work.
- Continued engagement with the regulatory process and attendance at any future hearings.

258. The panel made a suspension order for a period of 12 months.

[**Removal order**](#)

259. The panel also noted that a removal order may be appropriate in cases involving dishonesty, a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of a social worker's actions or consequences and "social workers who are unwilling and/or unable to remediate (for example, where there is clear evidence that they do not wish to practise as a social worker in the future)." The panel considered that a removal order is a sanction of last

resort and should be reserved for those categories of cases where there is no other means of protecting the public and the wider public interest.

260. The panel gave careful consideration to the fact that Ms Dhinda's current employer is fully supportive of her, has found her practice exemplary and that she has no record of concerns since the allegations were made. In light of this, and considering proportionality, the panel considered that to prevent Ms Dhinda from practising again would constitute a loss to the profession and to the public of an experienced social worker.
261. On balance the panel considered that a removal order would be a disproportionate sanction.

Interim order:

262. In light of its findings on sanction, the panel next considered an application by Mr Wilson for an interim suspension order under Schedule 2 para 11(b) of the 2018 Regulations to protect the public and maintain confidence during any appeal.
263. An interim order would be necessary in accordance with Schedule 2 para 11(b) of the 2018 Regulations the appeal period before the final order becomes effective.
264. An interim order would be necessary in accordance with Schedule 2, paragraph 11 (b) of the Social Work Regulations 2018 to cover the appeal period. Mr Wilson submitted that an interim order was necessary to protect the public in light of the findings made by the panel.
265. Mr McCaffrey submitted that an interim suspension order does not necessarily follow the panel's findings. He asked the panel to consider that Ms Dhinda has a current caseload and a supportive manager and could be given 28 days to handover in light of the fact she has complied with conditions for 5 years.
266. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to the imposition of an interim order. The test is that it is necessary for the protection of the public and/or in the best interests of the social worker.
267. The panel next considered whether to impose an interim order. It was mindful of Mr McCaffrey's submissions, however in light of its earlier findings, it decided that it would be wholly incompatible to impose an interim conditions of practice order. The panel had found Ms Dhinda's misconduct to be serious misconduct with an ongoing risk of repetition and decided it would be wholly incompatible with those earlier findings to permit Ms Dhinda to practice during the appeal period.
268. Accordingly, the panel concluded that an 18 month interim suspension order is necessary for the protection of the public. When the appeal period expires, this interim order will come to an end unless an appeal has been filed with the High Court. If there is no appeal, the final order of suspension shall take effect when the appeal period expires.

269. The panel went on to revoke the existing interim conditions of practice order. Mr McCaffrey confirmed that Ms Dhinda waived notice.

Right of appeal:

270. Under Paragraph 16(1)(a) of Schedule 2 of the regulations, the social worker may appeal to the High Court against the decision of adjudicators:

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

271. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of the regulations an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.

272. Under Regulation 9(4) of the regulations this order may not be recorded until the expiry of the period within which an appeal against the order could be made, or where an appeal against the order has been made, before the appeal is withdrawn or otherwise finally disposed of.

273. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

274. Under Paragraph 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of the regulations:

- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry
- 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker
- 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5), and a final order does not have effect until after the expiry of that period

275. Under Rule 16(aa) of the rules a social worker requesting a review of a final order under Paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

The Professional Standards Authority:

276. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a final decision made by Social Work England's panel of adjudicators can be referred by the Professional Standards Authority ("the PSA") to the High Court. The PSA can refer this decision to the High Court if it considers that the decision is not sufficient for the protection of the public. Further information about PSA appeals can be found on their website at:

<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work-with-regulators/decisions-about-practitioners>.