

Social worker: Allan Hall

Registration number: SW26089

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Hearing

Date of Hearing: 25 November 2025

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 09 January 2026)

Hearing outcome:
Extend the current suspension order for a further 6 months with effect from the expiry of the current order

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the second review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a panel of adjudicators on 12 June 2024.
2. Mr Hall attended and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Sophie Sharpe (“Ms Sharpe”), case presenter instructed by Capsticks LLP.

Adjudicators	Role
Catherine Audcent	Chair
Natalie Williams	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Paige Swallow	Hearings officer
Heather Hibbins	Hearings support officer
Candice Manifold	Legal adviser

Documentation

4. The panel considered the following documentation ahead of the hearing:
 - Final Order Review Hearing Bundle comprising 275 pages.
 - Service and Supplementary Bundle comprising 15 pages.
 - Supplementary Bundle (“Reflections Bundle”) comprising of 150 pages.
 - Second Supplementary Bundle (“CPD Bundle”) comprising of 18 pages.

Preliminary matters:

Privacy

5. The panel noted the exceptions set out in Rule 38(a) and (b) in relation to the hearing of medical information within private session and Mr Hall was advised to inform the panel if he was intending to make reference to a personal health matter.

Review of the current order:

6. This final order review hearing is taking place under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).
7. In 2024 a panel of adjudicators found Mr Hall’s fitness to practise to be impaired and it imposed a final order of suspension for 12 months. This was reviewed in June 2025 when a panel of adjudicators determined that Mr Hall’s practise remains impaired at that time and it extended the suspension order by 6 months.

8. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 09 January 2026. The order subject to review is a suspension order.

The allegations found proved, by the June 2024 panel, that amounted to misconduct and upon which impairment was found, are as follows:

(5) Whilst working as a registered social worker and Operational Lead for your team for Coventry City Council December 2017 – April 2019 you failed to make and/or record decisions in a timely manner in that you,

(e) On or around 29 November 2018 failed to arrive at a timely decision as to what you thought should happen to Service User 5.

(f) On or about the 31 January 2019 and thereafter, failed to make a timely decision to report Child 2 as missing and/or escalate the case of Child 2 as a missing child to your line manager.

(6) On 16 March 2020 whilst working as an Independent Reviewing Officer for Gloucestershire County Council you used discriminatory and inappropriate language in relation to a young person's gender identity before, and/or during and/or after a looked after child review meeting, in that you,

(c) Made reference to your own church condemning transgender people as 'sinful.'

(7) Failed to provide Social Work England with your current and former employer details as requested on 15 June 2020.

(8) Between 3 March 2020 and 3 April 2020 your record keeping was inadequate in that you;

(a) Failed to record the minutes and decisions taken during three child review meetings that you chaired during the week of 3 – 10 March 2020 within the statutory timescale or at all.

(b) Failed to record the decisions taken for six out of seven child review meetings that you chaired during the week of 19 – 26 March 2020 within the statutory timescale.

(c) Failed to record the decisions taken for five child review meetings that you chaired during the week 27 March – 3 April 2020 within the statutory timescale.

9. The 2024 panel concluded that Mr Hall was a social worker with significant experience, who held a senior managerial position. He failed to conduct himself in a manner that would justify the public's trust and confidence and in doing so breached a number of the fundamental tenets of the social work profession.
10. This panel noted that the 2024 final hearing panel also found some other allegations proved at the facts stage (stage one), however later determined that these facts did not amount to misconduct and therefore did not go on to consider impairment in relation to these facts.

Social Work England submissions:

11. This panel heard submissions from Ms Sharpe as to the background and the 2024 and June 2025 panels' findings in relation to impairment and sanction. Ms Sharpe relied on the written submissions prepared for the hearing, and further submitted that:
 - a. Not all of the allegations were found proved, and of the allegations found proved, not all of them amounted to misconduct.
 - b. The June 2025 panel suggested that a future panel may be assisted by:
 - (i) Evidence that Mr Hall had taken steps with the Disclosure and Barring Service ("DBS") to address his inclusion in the barred list in relation to working with children and adults. This could include sending a copy of the full decision relating to the finding made and this review to the DBS and seeking confirmation from them as to how to appeal or review his inclusion in the barred list.
 - (ii) Seeking testimonials from colleagues who were fully apprised of the initial findings would also be of assistance to future panels in providing evidence in relation to impairment.
 - (iii) Evidence that they have kept their social work skills and knowledge up to date, such as:
 - Training courses (online or otherwise);
 - Training specifically related to Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion in order to offer assurance to a future panel that the risk of inappropriate comments being made was diminished.
 - c. In advance of this hearing, that Mr Hall had been asked to provide written submissions by no later than 31 October 2025, however only provided this evidence yesterday on 24 November 2025. The email from Mr Hall to Capsticks attaching the Reflections Bundle and CPD Bundle, includes a copy of the correspondence sent to the DBS on 24 November 2025, some evidence of CPD, two reflective statements

and two testimonials (one from his sister and one from a friend he attended university with).

- d. Social Work England became aware that the DBS had determined that it was (in its view) appropriate to place Mr Hall on the barred list during the course of the fitness to practise proceedings, and the 2024 panel was made aware of this at stage 2 (misconduct and impairment). Whilst there is some overlap between the allegations, Social Work England notes that the DBS based their decision on some allegations that were later not found proved in the fitness to practise proceedings brought by Social Work England, and therefore the decision of the DBS is wider than the findings made by the fitness to practise final hearing panel. Further, that it is Social Work England's understanding that the DBS makes its decisions without hearing live evidence and that Mr Hall has a right to request a review of the DBS decision.
- e. Mr Hall informed the June 2025 Panel that he had not appealed the decision of the DBS and had not asked for it to be reviewed. He stated he was awaiting the outcome of the review before doing so. Mr Hall has only taken very recent steps to contact the DBS, writing to them yesterday (24 November 2025), and consequently, there is no updating information before this panel relating to this issue, and it is unclear whether the DBS will review its decision and if so when.
- f. Social Work England is not bound by the DBS decision to place Mr Hall on the barred list, and nor is the DBS decision contingent upon what this panel does today in reviewing the final order. However, it is unclear why Mr Hall has delayed in contacting the DBS to update that organisation in relation to the findings made in the fitness to practise proceedings and exercise his right to review.
- g. There is no evidence of Mr Hall undertaking training relevant to social work practice or in respect of the concerns set out in the facts upon which his practice was found to be impaired.
- h. Neither of the testimonials provided by Mr Hall are from colleagues (former or current) and whilst it is acknowledged that both provide a positive account of his character in the personal capacity that they each know him, neither individual has knowledge of his social work practice, and the testimonials do not comment on Mr Hall's insight or remediation. It is acknowledged that Mr Hall is not presently working in a social work role, however testimonials could be provided from former or current colleagues with regards to his ability to meet deadlines, insight, remediation and a commitment to equality and diversity. Consequently, Social Work England submit that little weight can be given to the testimonials provided by Mr Hall for the purpose of today's review hearing.
- i. The two reflective statements prepared by Mr Hall are not supported by any objective evidence of his learning and lack, in Social Work England's opinion, evidence of Mr Hall's full insight, targeted remediation and professional development.

- j. Social Work England invites this Panel to find that the Social Worker remains impaired according to the personal impairment test. He has not demonstrated that he has developed sufficient insight and remediated sufficiently to reduce the risk of repetition. He remains, it is submitted, a risk to the public.
- k. Insofar as the wider public interest is concerned, it is submitted that the Social Worker remains impaired on the basis that an informed member of the public would, in the circumstances, be surprised to learn there was no restriction to his practice. It is submitted that it is necessary and proportionate to extend the suspension order for a further 6 months in the wider public interest in promoting and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers in England and maintaining public confidence in the profession.
- l. In the event that the Suspension order is continued and the Social Worker continues not to engage with the previous panels' recommendations, Social Work England may invite this Panel at the next review to give consideration to making a Removal order.

Social worker submissions:

12. Mr Hall chose not to give evidence, but they made the following submissions:

- a. That the concerns arose from isolated errors within his practice, and within the context of **[PRIVATE]** concerns about management style and lots of other issues. That it was uncharacteristic of his behaviour and that he had practiced as a social worker for several years in different capacities, including as a senior manager, and that past behaviour is indicative of future behaviour;
- b. Mr Hall maintained that it is evident that he has learnt from this experience, a stating that this is personal – it involves remorse, suffering, and shame. Describing the experience as salutary, Mr Hall explained that he has had to work 12 hours a day, 6 days a week in a minimum wage job as a driver to make ends meet, that he has struggled financially and that the whole process has had a significant emotional impact upon him;
- c. In Mr Hall's view, it is unlikely that the DBS will review its decision whilst he remains subject to a suspension order, and that his inaction in terms of contacting the DBS had been due to dismay and frustration from what he considers to be an unfair process, with Social Work England's refusing to accept any of the evidence that he puts forward;
- d. Mr Hall disagreed that he continued to pose a risk and asserted that he is no longer impaired, stating that he considered there to be sufficient information before the panel today and that he is therefore opposed to the application made by Social Work England for the suspension order to be extended by a further 6 months;

- e. Mr Hall submitted that if the panel found there to be impairment today, that it give consideration to the making of a conditions of practice order instead, explaining that this would provide him with the opportunity to explore working as a project manager or similar role, where there is no direct work with service users, and also opportunity to demonstrate that the concerns that there were regarding his practise no longer remain;
- f. In closing, Mr Hall acknowledged that the panel at today's final order review hearing had been fair and tried to understand the 'chicken and egg' dynamic that he has found himself in with the DBS and Social Work England, and that if the panel goes on to make recommendations relating to documents/evidence that would assist a future panel, that he would adhere to this.

Legal advice

- 13. The legal advisor reminded the panel that the review process should not undermine the original decision made by the previous panel and the purpose of the review was to review evidence in relation to what had occurred since the making of the original order, and drew the panel's attention to the leading case law and Social Work England's sanction and impairment guidance.
- 14. The purpose of a review is to consider whether (all of the following):
 - the social worker has demonstrated remediation, insight and/or remorse
 - the social worker has demonstrated they are now safe to practise and/or there is no longer a risk to the public
 - the social worker has taken steps to maintain their skills and knowledge
 - the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired (and if so, whether the existing order or another order needs to be in place)
 - the adjudicators should consider whether the social worker has sufficiently addressed the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment
- 15. The outcome of a review could be to (any of the following):
 - extend the period for which the previous order is in place (provided that any extension does not exceed 3 years at a time)
 - replace a suspension order with a conditions of practice order
 - make an order that case examiners or adjudicators could have made at the time (provided that the order does not exceed 3 years at a time)
 - revoke the order in place from the date of the review.

16. The panel should consider the purpose and nature of misconduct proceedings in reaching their decision and that in determining sanction the least restrictive option should be considered first.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

17. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances, and noted that findings of impairment had only been made in respect of the allegations 5 e) and 5 f), 6 c), 7, and 8 a) – 8 c). It took into account the decision of the previous panels. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
18. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel and previous review panel, and in addition to the new documentation provided by Mr Hall in the Reflections Bundle and CPD Bundle, which included two reflective statements, two references/testimonials. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Ms Sharpe on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mr Hall.
19. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession.
20. The panel first considered whether Mr Hall's fitness to practise remains impaired.
21. The panel noted that the original panel found Mr Hall's insight to be embryonic and that he had demonstrated insufficient remediation in particular in relation to record keeping. This panel noted the extent to which Mr Hall has acted upon the recommendations of the previous of panel as to what might assist a future reviewing panel.
22. The panel noted the steps that Mr Hall has taken to address the concerns, however remained concerned about the quality of the reflection, timeliness and insight. The evidence produced by Mr Hall is brief and fails to examine, in any detail, the findings made and not provide sufficient focus of the impact of his actions on service users. This panel accepted Mr Hall's submissions with regards to the significant impact that the suspension has had on him emotionally, financially and him having to work long hours across a 6 day working week. This panel noted the consequences Mr Hall said have caused him to learn from this experience and consider what he might say or do differently, and/or how things that he says might be interpreted. However, this panel took the view that Mr Hall's main focus appears to be on the impact on himself rather than service users, and this does not demonstrate full insight. This panel therefore concluded that Mr Hall's insight and remediation, whilst emerging, remains in its

infancy. This panel also noted the lack of objective evidence, such as certificates of training completed.

23. With regards to the DBS issue, the panel makes clear that its decision today is wholly independent of the action taking by the DBS and is not bound by its decision. The panel was disappointed that it had not had the opportunity to review any DBS response to Mr Hall's request for a review (noting that the review request was only sent yesterday). However, it acknowledges the difficulty in that Mr Hall remains barred by the DBS, noting that the 2024 panel acknowledged that the information the DBS considered as part of their decision making included allegations that had been found not proved.
24. Neither of the testimonials are from colleagues and therefore neither can attest to anything that Mr Hall has done at work. Again, this panel acknowledged the difficulty Mr Hall faces in obtaining contemporaneous evidence regarding his social work skills, due to his current suspension. However, it concluded that former colleagues, aware of the allegations, could provide useful testimony, as could current work colleagues who could speak to Mr Hall's personal qualities at work and his ability to work with members of the public.

Decision and reasons:

25. Having found Mr Hall's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to the submissions made along with all the information and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.
26. The panel considered the submissions made by Ms Sharpe, on behalf of Social Work England, during which they invited the panel to consider imposing a Suspension Order for a further 6 months. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
27. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Hall, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Mr Hall's interests with the public interest.

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

28. The panel noted that these sanctions would not restrict Mr Hall's ability to practise and were therefore not appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety. In any event, the deficiencies identified with Mr Hall's practice had the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences and therefore some restriction on his practice is

required. Therefore, the panel concluded that these options would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.

Conditions of practice order

29. The panel consider that the deficiencies identified with Mr Hall's practice are potentially capable of being remedied but were not satisfied that appropriate, workable conditions could be formulated at this stage or that this would be the appropriate decision for a panel to make today as there continues to be concerns about Mr Hall's ability to demonstrate full insight and evidence remediation.

Suspension order

30. This panel considered whether the current suspension order should be extended for a further period of time, and considered that it would be appropriate to do so as there remains ongoing concerns relating to insight, evidence of remediation and engagement in relevant training.
31. A suspension order would prevent Mr Hall from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest. Having determined that a suspension order ought to be imposed, the panel went on to consider the length of such an order. The panel concluded that a further 6 month order ought to be imposed.
32. This panel noted that a further 6 months would provide Mr Hall with sufficient time to continue the remediation process and further develop his insight. It would also provide Mr Hall to, if he chooses, exercise his right to appeal the decision taken by the DBS.
33. This panel recognised the impact a further 6- month suspension order would have on Mr Hall and took this into account. However, it considered the public interest outweighed Mr Hall's interests. This panel therefore concluded that the only sanction which achieved the aim of public protection in all three limbs was a further 6- month suspension order, to take effect on 9th January 2026, with no lesser sanction being sufficient.
34. This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, felt that a future reviewing panel would find it helpful for Mr Hall to attend the review hearing and it would be of assistance to a future panel if Mr Hall were able to provide evidence that he had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. This may include:
- a. Seeking testimonials from colleagues (previous social work colleagues and/or colleagues/managers from his current employment) who have been fully appraised of and had sight of the findings made in respect of allegations 5e) and 5f), 6 c), 7, and 8 a) – c), and speak to the issues identified such as conduct, professionalism, record keeping, engagement with the public and/or equality and diversity;

- b. Evidence that Mr Hall had taken steps with the Disclosure and Barring Service (“DBS”) to address his inclusion the barred list in relation to working with children and adults. This could include sending a copy of the full decision relating to the finding made and this review to the DBS and seeking confirmation from them as to how to appeal or review his inclusion in the barred list. Further, it notes that the 2024 panel (in the fitness to practise proceedings) did not agree with the full conclusion of the DBS, which Mr Hall may find assists him with any application for review of the DBS decision.
- c. Noting that the evidence submitted by Mr Hall for the purpose of today’s review hearing related to steps that he had taken very recently, and on the days leading up to the hearing, continual evidence of;
 - i. Remediation;
 - ii. Training courses (online or otherwise) to keep his social work practice, skills and knowledge up to date;
 - iii. Training specifically related to Equalities , Diversity and Inclusion in order to offer assurance to a future panel that the risk of inappropriate comments being made was diminished.

Removal order

- 35. This panel was satisfied that it could consider a removal order as Mr Hall’s fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of one or more grounds as set out in regulation 25(2)(a), (c), (d), (f) or (g).
- 36. This panel noted that a removal order is a sanction of last resort where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest. This panel took the view that a removal order would not be appropriate because Mr Hall has demonstrated developing insight and has demonstrated to the panel a willingness to reflect upon his practice.

Right of appeal:

- 37. Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the social worker may appeal to the High Court against:
 - a. the decision of adjudicators:
 - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - iii. to make a final order,

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

- 38. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
- 39. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.
- 40. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

- 41. Under regulation 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended):
 - 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.
 - 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker.
 - 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5).
- 42. Under Rule 16(aa) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), a social worker requesting a review of a final order under paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

The Professional Standards Authority

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

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