



# Social worker: Abbie Meyrick

## Registration number: SW121404

### Fitness to Practise

### Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 16 February 2026 to 19 February 2026

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 (the Regulations) and in accordance with the Social Work England (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2019 (the Rules).
2. Ms Abbie Meyrick (Ms Meyrick) did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Mr Fred Batstone (Mr Batstone), case presenter instructed by Capsticks LLP.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this hearing (the panel) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

<b>Adjudicators</b>	<b>Role</b>
Miriam Karp	Chair
Stella Elliott	Social worker adjudicator
Judith Webb	Lay adjudicator

<b>Hearings team/Legal adviser</b>	<b>Role</b>
Amy Langton-Robinson	Hearings officer
Liam Dixon	Hearings support officer
Jane Kilgannon	Legal adviser

5. The panel had been provided and read in advance the following documents:
  - a. Hearing Timetable (4 pages);
  - b. Social Work England's Statement of Case (17 pages);
  - c. Witness Statement Hearing Bundle (15 pages);
  - d. Exhibits Hearing Bundle (148 pages);
  - e. Social Worker Responses Bundle (78 pages);
  - f. Final Hearing Service & Supplementary Bundle (35 pages).

## Service of notice:

6. The panel was informed by Mr Batstone that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Meyrick on 8 January 2026 by email to an email address that she had provided to Social Work England (namely, her registered email address) and by special delivery post to an address that she had provided to Social Work England (namely, her registered postal address). Mr Batstone submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
7. The panel had careful regard to the documents contained in the final hearing service bundle as follows:
  - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 8 January 2026 detailing Ms Meyrick's registered email and postal addresses;

- A copy of the notice of the final hearing dated 8 January 2026 and addressed to Ms Meyrick at her registered email and postal addresses;
  - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 8 January 2026 the writer sent by email and special delivery to Ms Meyrick at her registered email and postal addresses: the notice of hearing and related documents; and
  - A copy of a ‘Track your Item’ proof of delivery notice showing that the notice of hearing that was sent by special delivery post was signed for and delivered at 10:32 on 9 January 2026.
8. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
  9. Having had regard to Rules 44 and 45 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 Meyrick in accordance with Rule 16. The panel also noted that Ms Meyrick had acknowledged receipt of the notice of hearing sent by email, in that she had sent an email in direct response to it on 17 January 2026.

### Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

10. Mr Batstone made an application that the hearing proceed in the absence of Ms Meyrick. He submitted that the notice of hearing had been sent to Ms Meyrick by both email and special delivery, her email response showed that she had actually received the notice of hearing and therefore it was clear that she was aware of the hearing and of her right to attend the hearing should she wish to. Mr Batstone also drew the panel’s attention to follow-up correspondence between Ms Meyrick and Social Work England in which it was explained to Ms Meyrick that she could make an application to postpone the hearing to another date, but that Ms Meyrick had decided not to make such an application. On the basis of that correspondence, Mr Batstone invited the panel to conclude that Ms Meyrick had voluntarily waived her right to attend the hearing.
11. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the factors it should take into account when considering this application. This included reference to Rule 43 of the Rules and principles drawn from the cases of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5* and *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. The panel also took into account Social Work England guidance ‘Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker’.
12. The panel noted the correspondence between Ms Meyrick and Social Work England following Ms Meyrick’s receipt of the notice of hearing dated 8 January 2026. On 17 January 2026 Ms Meyrick had explained that she had recently had a baby and that she was not sure if she would be able to attend the hearing because she had “*no childcare options*” and was unsure if the presence of a young child would be too much of a “*distraction*” during the hearing. Then on 19 January 2026, following further information having been given to Ms Meyrick by Social Work England, she had provided a response

form indicating that she would not be attending the hearing and a written statement setting out her position in relation to the Social Work England allegations. Ms Meyrick had also stated in an email that she was unsure whether a postponement would be suitable in her circumstances because she did not have an alternative five days in which she could offer her attendance at a hearing. Ms Meyrick concluded her email dated 19 January 2026 with the comment *“I’m positioning that it may just be better for those involved if I do not attend, so that they can just make the decision, as I’m sure of what the outcome will be”*.

13. Given that context, the panel was satisfied that Ms Meyrick had voluntarily absented herself from the hearing and waived her right to attend. It was clear that Ms Meyrick was aware of the hearing, understood that she had a right to attend the hearing and understood that she could make an application for the hearing to be postponed to a later date. It was also clear from the evidence available that Ms Meyrick had decided not to attend and not to apply for a postponement of the hearing. That appeared to be because she had a young child to look after and no possibility to ask someone else to look after the child whilst she attended the hearing – either on the dates scheduled or at any later date. Ms Meyrick had instead decided to rely on her written statements provided to Social Work England.
14. The panel acknowledged that proceeding in Ms Meyrick’s absence might cause her some disadvantage in that she would not be able to put forward her version of events directly to the panel, and to ask questions of the Social Work England witnesses. However, the panel noted that Ms Meyrick had, in fact, indicated that she agreed the evidence provided in the witness statements of the Social Work England witnesses (in that she had not required them to give oral evidence at the hearing) and that the panel could mitigate any such disadvantage by carefully scrutinising the available evidence and asking questions of any witnesses in attendance and of the Social Work England case presenter. The panel also had Ms Meyrick’s written statements so had a good understanding of her account of events and her position in relation to the Social Work England allegations.
15. The panel had regard to the public interest in there being an efficient and expeditious disposal by the regulator of these concerns. It noted that the concerns related to alleged conduct in 2020 – approximately six years ago – and that any further delay in hearing the concerns could result in the memories of the relevant witnesses fading and could cause inconvenience and cost to the parties.
16. Taking all of these matters into account, the panel was satisfied that it was appropriate, fair and in the public interest to exercise its discretion to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Meyrick.

### Allegations:

17. The allegations referred by the Case Examiners on 15 February 2022 were as follows:

*Whilst registered as a social worker, and working for Wiltshire Council, you,*

(1) *Did not handle confidential information appropriately in that you accessed the records of service users with no professional reason to do so as set out in Schedule 1.*

Schedule 1

(a) *On 15 April 2020 at 09.53 the records of Person A.*

(b) *On 12 May 2020 at 17.09 the records of Person A.*

(c) *On 23 March 2020 at 08.53 the records of Person B.*

(d) *On 15 April 2020 at 09.57 the records of Person B.*

(e) *On 15 April 2020 at 09.54 the records of Person C.*

(2) *Failed to declare a conflict of interest to your employer in 2020 regarding Person A.*

*Your actions at paragraph (1) and (2) amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.*

*Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.*

### Admissions:

18. Rule 32(c)(i)(aa) of the Rules states: ‘*Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved*’.
19. Following the reading of the allegations, Mr Batstone informed the panel that Ms Meyrick had indicated in her response to Social Work England dated 17 November 2021 that she admitted allegation 2.
20. The panel therefore found allegation 2 proved by way of admission.
21. The panel noted that Ms Meyrick denied allegation 1 in its entirety. In line with Rule 32(c)(i)(a) of the Rules, the panel then went on to determine the disputed facts.

### Summary of evidence:

#### Mr Graham – Team Manager for Support and Safeguarding Service, the Council

22. Mr Michael Graham (Mr Graham) provided a witness statement dated 1 March 2023 and gave oral evidence at the hearing. Mr Graham is a registered social worker and is currently the Team Manager for the Support and Safeguarding Service at Wiltshire Council (the Council).
23. On 6 August 2020 the Council received two complaints from Person A against Ms Meyrick. Following a triage process, Mr Graham was tasked with undertaking an internal investigation into the matters raised in the complaints.
24. As part of his investigation, Mr Graham gathered documentary evidence including the following:

- a. Screenshots from the Council’s ‘Liquid Logic’ database recording that Ms Meyrick’s ‘Staff ID’ against viewing of:
    - i. Person A’s records at 09:53 on 15 April 2020 and at 17:09 on 12 May 2020;
    - ii. Person B’s records at 08:53 on 23 March 2020 and at 09:57 on 15 April 2020; and
    - iii. Person C’ records at 09:54 on 15 April 2020.
  - b. Screenshot of Ms Meyrick’s online calendar for 15 April 2020 recording the following:
    - i. “*Abbie Meyrick – Working hours 8:45-5:20*”;
    - ii. “*WFH – COVID 19*”; and
    - iii. An appointment from 9am-12noon “*CICT(S) TEAM MEETING [...]*”.
25. Mr Graham interviewed Ms Meyrick’s Team Manager, Mr Neil Adlam (Mr Adlam) on 17 September 2020 and provided the panel with a copy of his note of the interview. In the interview, Mr Adlam stated that:
- a. he was not aware of any reason that Ms Meyrick would have had to look at the records of Person B and Person C;
  - b. he would expect a social worker to raise any conflict of interest with their supervisor or the Duty Manager and that Ms Meyrick had not raised any such matters; and
  - c. Ms Meyrick’s “*home set up*” appeared to be in her kitchen/diner room, and that on one occasion a male was seen to walk in and through the room.
26. Mr Graham interview Ms Meyrick on 24 September 2020 and provided the panel with a copy of his note of the interview. In the interview, Ms Meyrick stated that:
- a. she had no recollection of accessing Person A’s records on 15 April 2020 and 12 May 2020, Person B’s records on 23 March 2020 and 15 April 2020 and Person C’s records on 15 April 2020;
  - b. Person A was someone that she was “*dating*” for a few months around January to April 2020, and Person B is Person A’s daughter;
  - c. at the relevant times she was living in a house shared with six other people, including Person A;
  - d. her home working arrangements were that she had her computer set up in the lounge area, that others could access the lounge area when she was working but that she would ask them to leave when holding confidential meetings; and

- e. her practice was to lock her computer, but that *“I feel that I always lock my computer, but could I say that this was ever not the case? I don’t know”*.
27. Mr Graham commented that Ms Meyrick had no professional reason to access the records of Person A, Person B and Person C, and that Ms Meyrick should have disclosed her conflict of interest arising from her relationship with Person A at the outset of the relationship.
28. Mr Graham provided copies of a number of the Council’s relevant policies, including the Code of Conduct Policy and Procedure, Behaviour Principles, Information Security Policy, Data Protection and Subject Access Policy, Information Governance and Acceptable Usage Policy, Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.
29. In his oral evidence to the panel, Mr Graham confirmed that ‘Liquid Logic’ was the software used by the Council to hold records in relation to Children’s Services. He explained that to access the system, a person needs a ‘User ID’, a password and to undergo two sets of training (an initial online training course and then some teacher-led training). Mr Graham added that you also need to sign a declaration that you will use the system in accordance with agreed rules because the system holds personal and sensitive information in relation to children, young people and their families. Mr Graham described the ‘Liquid Logic’ system as *“not the most user friendly software”*.
30. Once logged onto the ‘Liquid Logic’ system, Mr Graham explained that to access a particular service user’s record, a person would need to click on the search bar which would bring up a search engine, type in the service user’s first name or surname and click search. That would bring up a list of service users, and the person would then need to select a service user from that list by clicking on their name. That would then take the person to the service user’s file. Alternatively, he explained that a connected person’s file could be accessed by clicking on a ‘relationships’ tab within a service user’s file. Mr Graham’s view was that the process of accessing a record on ‘Liquid Logic’ could take about 5-10 minutes and that the system would not be easy to navigate for someone unfamiliar with the software and without the necessary training.
31. In response to a question from the panel, Mr Graham confirmed that he was not aware of the ‘Liquid Logic’ system or the Council’s computers at the relevant times having an automatic timing-out function after a certain period of inactivity. He said that would very much depend upon the individual computer settings.
32. In response to another question from the panel, Mr Graham confirmed that as far as he was aware, the Council did not explore Ms Meyrick’s assertion that Person A worked in IT for an organisation called EDS at the relevant times, and so would have had a knowledge of and familiarity with the ‘Liquid Logic’ software.

#### Mr Adlam – Team Manager for Support and Safeguarding Service, the Council

33. Mr Adlam provided a witness statement dated 24 January 2023 and gave oral evidence at the hearing. Mr Graham is a registered social worker and, at the relevant times, was

Team Manager for Looked After Children at the Council. Ms Meyrick worked within Mr Adlam's team and was supervised on a day-to-day basis by another social worker.

34. Following the Council's receipt of the complaints from Person A, on 7 August 2020 Mr Adlam conducted an informal meeting with Ms Meyrick. He provided the panel with a copy of his note of that meeting. It records that when asked whether she viewed confidential personal information on the Council's database without authorised access, Ms Meyrick denied it, saying "*That's not true*". The meeting note also records that Ms Meyrick stated that she was dating someone a while ago, who she later discovered was a perpetrator of domestic abuse. She stated that he has since been threatening her, saying that he would "*report data breaches and stuff on Social Media*". Ms Meyrick added that Person A and a friend were staying with her at the beginning of the first Covid-19 lockdown, and that Person A would occasionally walk by but that she did not encourage or allow him to look at anything.
35. In his oral evidence to the panel, Mr Adlam confirmed that he does not recall the team meeting held via MS Teams on 15 April 2020, that the average attendance at those meetings was approximately 20 people, and that he would expect team members to attend unless on annual leave. Mr Adlam explained that he would expect people to have their cameras on during meetings, but it was not a hard and fast rule. He confirmed that there would be nothing to stop a team member from accessing the 'Liquid Logic' system from their computer whilst taking part in a team meeting via MS Teams. Mr Adlam stated that if a team member walked away from their computer whilst it was logged onto 'Liquid Logic', for example to go to the toilet or to make a cup of tea, it was "*entirely feasible*" that another person could use their computer to access a service user record.
36. In response to a question from the panel, Mr Adlam stated that he did not routinely ask team members to confirm at the beginning of team meetings that they were in a private place where they could not be overheard. He added that some team members were not so fortunate as to have separate working spaces at home. Indeed, some team members had to join the team meetings from their bedroom.
37. In response to another question from the panel, Mr Adlam stated that he was not aware of the Council exploring Ms Meyrick's assertion that that Person A worked in IT for an organisation called EDS at the relevant times, and so would have had a knowledge of and familiarity with the 'Liquid Logic' software. He said that he would understand EDS to mean the Council's Emergency Duty Service but he was not aware of the Council looking into whether Person A worked for that service at the relevant time.

#### Ms Meyrick

38. Ms Meyrick returned a response form to Social Work England dated 10 May 2021. In that form she denied using the Council's database to view confidential information and she denied that she failed to declare a conflict of interest to her employer.
39. Ms Meyrick added the following:

- a. *“I have [...] acknowledged that I made some crucial errors of judgement which I feel has allowed an individual to have the opportunity to access my computer”;*
- b. *“I had a “relationship” with the individual that has made the accusations. At the time lockdown began to happen he was in my home, as he worked with my housemate. At the time of the accusations there were 6 people within my home. This made it difficult to have secluded space in order to work. However, I would ask anyone in the room to leave if I was on confidential phone calls etc... I ensured my notes were out of the view of anyone’s eye sight and ensured my laptop never faced anyone else”;*
- c. *“Since this time, allegations were made by Person A, and I feel this is in retaliation due to me ending the relationship. I have received small information through mutual friends that Person A has joked about gathering information to ensure he has the upper hand at all times and being able to “get revenge” on past partners if they ever left”; and*
- d. *“It is my belief that Person A accessed my computer and made attempts to hear information whilst he was in my home. I had no reason to anticipate that he would do this, however recognise that I have been negligent that he has been able to do this”.*

- 40. Ms Meyrick returned a further response form to Social Work England dated 17 November 2021.
- 41. In that form Ms Meyrick denied accessing or allowing others to access the records of three service users with no professional reason to do so, stating *“I have and will take ownership that I feel he may have got some information by having access to my laptop, although I did not allow him to do this [...] Due to my home circumstances I believe Person A may have actively listened to some conversations without my knowledge, as some information he was aware of I know I had telephone conversations about”.*
- 42. Ms Meyrick changed her position, however, in relation to the alleged failure to declare a conflict of interest. Ms Meyrick admitted the matter, stating *“I acknowledge now how my relationship with Person A would be deemed as a conflict of interest. At the time I did not recognise how this would be. I had a short “relationship” with Person A and when I had been told a small amount of information about some of his history by him, we were not in a relationship. Therefore when it came to the point where I should have raised this with my manager, I had did not draw the connections about what I knew about him and how this would be a conflict of interest. I have since reflected and am able to recognise the actions I should have taken”.*
- 43. Ms Meyrick provided a copy of the record of the Council’s internal disciplinary hearing held on 3 December 2020. In that hearing, Ms Meyrick is recorded as having stated that the last time Person A was in her house was 12 May 2020. She confirmed that she had not accessed the records in question but concluded that someone else must have

accessed the records when she got up from her computer to go to the toilet or to make a cup of tea. Ms Meyrick stated that she has never given her password to anyone, adding that *“Even in my own head it doesn’t make sense and that’s coming from me who knows I didn’t access the information myself [...] Person A knows about computers, online systems. Person A’s character needs to be acknowledged in this situation. Things have happened since. Lengths he will go to. I think now it was premeditated. Stood outside a door, listening without me knowing”*.

44. Ms Meyrick provided a copy of the record of the Council’s internal appeal hearing held on 1 February 2021. The note records that Ms Meyrick stated that Person A had mentioned to her that he had previously worked for the Council for the “EDS Service”, and that Ms Meyrick wondered whether this could have given Person A some understanding of the Council’s systems.
45. Ms Meyrick returned a further response form to Social Work England dated 19 January 2026. In that form she denied allegation 1, but stated *“Accept fault for someone to have gained access to view information”*, and she admitted allegation 2. Ms Meyrick also indicated that she agreed with the content of the witness statements of Mr Graham and Mr Adlam.

### Submissions:

46. Mr Batstone, on behalf of Social Work England, invited the panel to find allegation 1 proved. He submitted that the social workers various accounts of what happened do not stand up to scrutiny. He stated that he would have had questions of the social worker about her account of events if she had attended the hearing and given evidence. However, he had not had that opportunity as she had not attended. He invited the panel to draw an adverse inference from Ms Meyrick’s failure to attend the hearing.
47. Mr Batstone invited the panel to consider Mr Graham’s evidence that the ‘Liquid Logic’ system was clunky, difficult to use, required thorough training to use and would take about 5-10 minutes to access a particular record. Mr Batstone submitted that it would therefore be unlikely that another person, untrained on use of ‘Liquid Logic’ would be able to access Ms Meyrick’s laptop whilst she was momentarily away from it to go to the toilet or make a cup of tea, and access the service user records in question. He submitted that Ms Meyrick’s account of what must have happened is entirely implausible.
48. Mr Batstone submitted that, given that the panel knows that on 15 April 2020 Ms Meyrick was at her laptop, logged into an MS Teams meeting, was trained in how to use the ‘Liquid Logic’ system, and was in a relationship with Person A, it is more likely that Ms Meyrick accessed the records of her partner and his children on that occasion than that someone else accessed the records while she stepped away from the computer.
49. In response to a question of clarification from the panel, Ms Batstone added that Ms Meyrick appears to have stated that she was in a relationship with Person A between January and April 2020. Therefore, it may be notable that on one of the occasions when

Person A's records were accessed – on 12 May 2020 – Ms Meyrick was no longer in a relationship with Person A and therefore no longer living together.

50. The panel had regard to the written statements provided by Ms Meyrick, noting that she denied allegation 1 in its entirety.

### Finding and reasons on facts:

51. The panel noted that Ms Meyrick denied allegation 1 in its entirety, that the burden of proving the allegation 1 rested on Social Work England, and that the standard of proof was the civil standard – the balance of probabilities.
52. The panel rejected the invitation to draw an adverse inference from Ms Meyrick's failure to attend the hearing today. The panel was satisfied that the social worker had given a reasonable explanation for not attending the hearing, namely her difficulties arranging childcare. Therefore, with reference to the relevant part of the guidance in the Social Work England guidance document 'Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker', the panel did not consider that it would be fair to draw an adverse inference from the social worker's absence at the hearing.
53. The panel noted that the content of Mr Graham and Mr Adlam's witness statements had been agreed by Ms Meyrick. The panel found that the evidence provided by Mr Graham and Mr Adlam – both in their written witness statements and in oral evidence at the hearing – was clear, consistent and relevant. Given the passage of time since the events in question, it was understandable that some details were not recalled and the panel found that both witnesses were sensible in making clear whenever this was the case. Overall, the panel considered the evidence of Mr Graham and Mr Adlam to be reliable and placed substantial weight upon it.
54. The panel noted that Ms Meyrick had cooperated with the internal investigation of the Council and the Social Work England regulatory investigation. She had also provided detailed written responses to Social Work England. Unfortunately, however, the panel noted that Ms Meyrick had not attended the hearing and so had not provided oral evidence that could be tested under cross-examination questions. That meant that the weight that the panel felt it appropriate to give to her evidence was reduced somewhat.
55. The panel accepted Mr Graham's explanation that the 'Liquid Logic' system was not user-friendly, required training to use, and that it could take approximately 5-10 minutes to navigate the required 'pathways' through the system to arrive at a particular service user record, but only if the user was familiar with that system.
56. Given that the dates referenced in Schedule 1 to allegation 1 are all in March to May 2020, the panel was cognisant of the fact that this was during the initial period of the Covid-19 pandemic in the United Kingdom and a period of 'lockdown' when most people were required to stay at home. Within that context, the panel accepted Ms Meyrick's account that she had to work from home during that period and, because she lived with six other people, there were sometimes other people with her in the room where she was working at home. The panel also accepted Ms Meyrick's account that

one of the people living with her at the relevant times was Person A, with whom she was in a relationship.

57. The panel did not, however, accept Ms Meyrick's contention that she did not access the service user records in question. It was clear from the screenshots gathered by Mr Graham for the Council's internal investigation, that the records in question were accessed at the times alleged by someone using Ms Meyrick's log on ID. It was also clear from the screenshot of Ms Meyrick's online diary from 15 April 2020, when three service user files were accessed within a short period of time, that Ms Meyrick was likely to have been in attendance at a remote team meeting and therefore logged into her work computer from home. Given the panel's finding that accessing a service user's file via 'Liquid Logic' could take 5-10 minutes, the panel found that it was highly unlikely that three such files could have been accessed between 09:53 and 09:57 on 15 April 2020 (a period of only 4 minutes in total) without Ms Meyrick being aware. Even if Ms Meyrick had walked away from her computer to go to the toilet or make a cup of tea, and left her computer logged into 'Liquid Logic' and 'unlocked' (which she originally said she never did), the panel considered that she was unlikely to have been away from the computer for long enough for another person to undertake such an operation on Ms Meyrick's computer without her knowledge. The panel also had regard to the evidence of Mr Graham and Mr Adlam that the 'Liquid Logic' software was not easy to use and required specialist training. The panel considered that made it even less likely that another person could have accessed the three service user files on 15 April 2020 without Ms Meyrick noticing.
58. The panel considered what Ms Meyrick had said about Person A's background. First, that he may have had a motive to access the records in question using her computer because she had heard from mutual friends that Person A liked to gather information that he could later use to get "*revenge*" on her. Second, that she recalled Person A saying that he had worked for the Council's EDS Service and so could have been familiar with the Council's IT systems. The panel was not persuaded by these arguments. Ms Meyrick had not provided any documentary or witness evidence to support these specific assertions, and neither had the investigations undertaken by the Council and by Social Work England unearthed anything that appeared to support them. Having said that, the panel considered that, even if Person A had wanted to gain access to the service user records in question, and had been familiar with the 'Liquid Logic' system, it was still unlikely that Person A could have accessed one service user record on 23 March 2020, three service user records on 15 April 2020 and one service user record on 12 May 2020 – so on five occasions on three separate days, all when Ms Meyrick had momentarily stepped away from her computer leaving it unlocked, without her noticing.
59. Taking all of these matters into account, the panel concluded that it was more likely than not that Ms Meyrick had herself accessed the service user records at the times and dates set out in Schedule 1 to allegation 1. She was the only person with knowledge of her computer and 'Liquid Logic' log on details, she was likely to have had her laptop

turned on and logged into on 15 April 2020 (due to the team meeting) and she had a personal connection to the service users in question in that she was in a relationship with Person A, and Person B and Person C are Person A's children. The alternative, innocent explanation put forward by Ms Meyrick was not persuasive because of the time the panel found it would take for someone else (especially someone without the relevant training in the use of 'Liquid Logic') to access the service user records and Ms Meyrick having only ever been away from her computer momentarily (to go to the toilet or make a cup of tea).

60. The panel was satisfied, and it was not disputed by Ms Meyrick, that accessing the records of service users without a professional reason to do so amounted to a failure to handle confidential information appropriately. Mr Graham and Mr Adlam were both categorical in their evidence that such action would be in breach of a number of the Council's policies and procedures and in breach of a social worker's professional obligation to handle confidential information appropriately.
61. The panel accordingly found allegation 1 proved.

#### Finding and reasons on grounds:

62. On behalf of Social Work England, Mr Batstone submitted that the conduct found proved in respect of allegations 1 and 2 breached standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 2.7 and 5.2 of the Social Work England Professional Standards (2019) and that the seriousness of those breaches was aggravated by the following matters:
  - a. Ms Meyrick knew or ought to have known about her responsibilities in relation to handling confidential information given her access to the Council's relevant policies and relevant training that she had undertaken;
  - b. Ms Meyrick's conduct in relation to allegation 1 was not an isolated incident. She accessed the case files of Person A, Person B and Person C across three different days, spanning the time period 23 March 2020 to 12 May 2020;
  - c. Ms Meyrick accessed the confidential information for her own gain, connected with being in a relationship with Person A;
  - d. The confidential information Ms Meyrick accessed was not purely administrative but contained highly sensitive information; and
  - e. Ms Meyrick's failure to declare the conflict of interest was deliberate and continued over a period of time, because it will have been obvious to her as soon as she accessed the records of Person A, Person B and Person C (March to May 2020), and yet she failed to declare it until it was brought to her attention following Person A's complaint in August 2020.
63. Mr Batstone submitted, therefore, that Ms Meyrick's conduct was so serious that it amounted to professional misconduct.

64. Ms Meyrick had provided written representations relevant to this stage of the hearing. In her statement provided on 17 January 2026, Ms Meyrick stated:

*“My actions represented a serious breach of the fundamental values and ethical principles of social work, including respect for confidentiality, accountability, professional integrity, and the maintenance of appropriate boundaries”.*

65. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that:

- a. misconduct is an act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances; and
- b. not every breach of professional standards will amount to the statutory ground of misconduct, it must be a sufficiently serious breach.

66. The panel was satisfied that the conduct found proved at allegations 1 and 2 amounted to conduct that fell short of what was expected of a registered social worker. Ms Meyrick’s conduct breached the following Social Work England Professional Standards (2019):

As a social worker, I will:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair;

2.2. Respect and maintain people’s dignity and privacy;

2.6 Treat information about people with sensitivity and handle confidential information in line with the law;

2.7 Consider where conflicts of interest may arise, declare conflicts as early as possible and agree a course of action.

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.

67. The panel noted that the nature of the conduct was serious in and of itself – a social worker deliberately accessing confidential service user information without a professional reason to do so and failing to declare a conflict of interest with a service user. The panel considered that the conduct was made more serious by the fact that it continued over an extended period of time and was not brought to the attention of her employer and regulator until one of the service users in question made a complaint. Given that context, the panel was satisfied that the conduct found proved was so serious as to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

### Finding and reasons on current impairment:

68. On behalf of Social Work England, Mr Batstone submitted that Ms Meyrick’s fitness to practise is currently impaired. In relation to the personal element of impairment, he submitted that Ms Meyrick had provided some evidence of insight, reflection and

remediation, but that it was limited. He submitted that Ms Meyrick had not yet provided evidence of insight into the potential impact of accessing or allowing others to view confidential sensitive information – on the service users themselves, but also on public confidence in the profession of social work. In relation to the public element of impairment, he submitted that a reasonable member of the public would be highly concerned about the misconduct in this case and would expect the regulator to acknowledge it with disapproval.

69. Ms Meyrick had provided written representations relevant to this stage of the hearing.

70. In her response form dated 10 May 2021, Ms Meyrick stated:

*“Having acknowledged my failings, I have taken this time to further educate myself on data protection policies alongside social work expectations and competencies. I feel revisiting this and increasing my understanding, has helped me reflect on the situation which has led to this, and help me acknowledge my mistake and understand how to improve moving forward. [...] I have deep regret of some of the mistakes I have made, and am willing to learn from these and move forward in the future”.*

71. In her response form dated 17 November 2021, Ms Meyrick stated:

*“Through-out this process I have reflected on my actions [...] acknowledged the mistakes I have made. [...] I have taken ownership of these mistakes and reflected on the serious ramifications these could have. I felt at the time that the actions I was taking to uphold confidentiality were sufficient and I can see now how my improvement could have been made, and I should have been more vocal with my manager/supervisor about my concerns.*

*I have chosen not to take another social work post during this as I have wanted to ensure that I can take all the learning I can from this to ensure I am never in a position that could have such dire consequences again. I have continually reflected after every meeting on what each professional has inputted and used this as a stepping stone to look at myself, actions and need for further development.*

*[...] I believe my naivety allowed a situation to escalate, and put my ability to practice at risk. I can acknowledge that the actions I failed to take put not only myself at risk but those who put trust in me to do the job I am trained to do, and ensure their safety and confidentiality is upheld”.*

72. In her most recent statement provided on 17 January 2026, Ms Meyrick stated:

*“I now understand that professional practice requires the ability to recognise when personal history and emotional responses may impair judgement. At the time, I failed to pause, seek appropriate support, and reflect critically on my actions. Instead, my fear of loss and rejection influenced my responses in a way*

*that was not aligned with professional values. This insight has been an important part of my reflection and personal growth.*

*I did experience guilt and remorse at the time of the incident; however, my overwhelming fear of losing the profession that defined my sense of purpose led me to focus on defending my practice rather than fully acknowledging my failings. I now understand that this approach did not demonstrate genuine accountability, which should have been paramount. [...]*

*This process has spanned many years, and I am no longer the individual I was when it began. I fully accept my responsibility for what occurred. I acknowledge the impact my actions had on those directly involved, the wider community, and the profession as a whole. I accept that my practice was impaired and remains impaired.*

*It was my responsibility to protect confidentiality, trust, and professional integrity, and I failed to do so. Although my actions were not intentional, I accept that intent does not mitigate responsibility. I should have exercised appropriate judgement, recognised conflicts of interest, and ensured that confidential documents were not accessible. My failure to do so was inexcusable. [...]*

*I recognise that the impact of my actions extends beyond myself. Individuals were placed at risk of harm and loss of trust, colleagues and services were affected, and the reputation of the profession was compromised. I now fully understand that social work practice demands constant vigilance, sound judgement, and the prioritisation of professional responsibilities above personal emotion or fear. My inability to do so at that time demonstrated impaired practice and a failure to uphold the values I once sought to represent.*

*I offer my sincere apologies to all those affected by my poor judgement and the consequences of my actions. My decisions altered the course of my life, and I have spent significant time reflecting on the gravity of that.”*

73. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that:
- a. a social worker is fit to practise when they have the skills, knowledge, character and health to practise their profession safely and effectively without restriction;
  - b. the panel must assess the current risk of repetition of the misconduct, based on the social worker’s past conduct and any steps they have taken to demonstrate insight and remediation; and
  - c. the panel must consider both the personal and public elements of impairment.
74. The panel took into account Social Work England’s ‘Impairment and sanctions guidance’.

75. The panel noted the submissions of both Social Work England and Ms Meyrick, and that both had submitted that Ms Meyrick’s fitness to practise remains impaired.
76. With reference to the test formulated by Dame Janet Smith in her Fifth Shipman Report, and approved by Cox J in *Council for Healthcare and Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927, the panel found that the nature and seriousness of the misconduct in this case meant that the first three limbs of that test were engaged:
- a. Has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user or service users at unwarranted risk of harm;
  - b. Has in the past brought and/or is liable to in the future to bring the social work profession into disrepute; and
  - c. Has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the social work profession.
77. Ms Meyrick’s misconduct in accessing confidential service user information without a professional reason to do so put service users at risk of harm in that Ms Meyrick was able to access personal and sensitive information about service users that they were entitled to expect was kept private. Ms Meyrick’s misconduct in accessing confidential service user information without a professional reason to do so and failing to declare a conflict of interest brought the social work profession into disrepute because it amounted to breaches of fundamental tenets of the social work profession, including – as Ms Meyrick herself acknowledged – “*respect of confidentiality, accountability, professional integrity, and the maintenance of appropriate boundaries*”.
78. The panel found that the misconduct was attitudinal in nature, and reflected serious errors of judgement on the part of Ms Meyrick. As such, the panel considered that the misconduct would not be easy to remediate. However, the panel found that, in her response forms and statement to the panel, Ms Meyrick had demonstrated genuine remorse and made considerable efforts to reflect and develop her insight into the relevant matters. Ms Meyrick had recognised and acknowledged what she had done wrong and had started to explore and articulate the impact that her misconduct will have had on the service users involved, as well as her social work colleagues, the wider social work profession and members of the public.
79. The panel found that the level of insight demonstrated by Ms Meyrick was positive and had clearly improved since the outset of the Social Work England investigation, but that it remained incomplete at this stage because Ms Meyrick has not yet had the opportunity to reflect on the panel’s finding in relation to allegation 1. The panel has now determined that Ms Meyrick had deliberately and repeatedly accessed confidential service user information without a professional reason to do so. The panel consider that Ms Meyrick needs to now reflect on this finding and to further develop her insight in the light of the facts found proved.

80. Further, the panel noted that Ms Meyrick's steps towards remedying her misconduct appeared to have been limited to personal reflection. Ms Meyrick had not provided any evidence that she had undertaken targeted reading, study, and/or training courses. In addition, Ms Meyrick had not provided any employment references or character testimonials. Acknowledging that Ms Meyrick is not currently working as a social worker, the panel nevertheless considered that it was open to Ms Meyrick to seek to demonstrate improved awareness, attitude, judgement and behaviours in roles outside of paid work as a social worker – for example, paid work in another field, or voluntary work. However, no such evidence had been provided.
81. Taking into account the nature and gravity of the misconduct, which was serious, together with the evidence indicating that insight is still developing and the lack of evidence demonstrating practical steps towards remediation, the panel decided that there remained a risk of repetition of the misconduct.
82. In relation to the personal element, the panel therefore concluded that Ms Meyrick's fitness to practise is currently impaired.
83. The panel also considered that a finding of impairment was required in relation to the public element of impairment. Given the nature and seriousness of the misconduct in this case (deliberately and repeatedly accessing confidential service user information without a professional reason to do so and failing to declare a related conflict of interest) and the risk of repetition of the misconduct, the panel found that a reasonable member of the public would expect the regulator to take action to mark its disapproval of this misconduct in order to uphold proper professional standards and maintain public confidence in the social work profession.

### Decision and reasons on sanction:

84. On behalf of Social Work England, Mr Batstone submitted that the imposition of a final order of suspension would be appropriate in this case. He did not refer to any specific length of suspension. He submitted that anything less than a period of suspension would not be appropriate because the misconduct in this case was serious – it was deliberate, repeated, and involved an abuse of trust that put service users, including child service users, at risk of harm.
85. Ms Meyrick had not provided written representations specifically for this stage of the hearing.
86. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that:
  - a. The panel's powers at this stage are set out in paragraphs 12 and 13 of Schedule 2 to the Regulations. It may take no further action, give advice, give a warning, impose conditions of practice, impose a period of suspension, or remove the social worker from the social work register;
  - b. The purpose of any sanction is to protect the public. This includes direct protection from the risk of harm, and it also includes upholding proper

professional standards and maintaining public confidence in the social work profession;

- c. The reputation of the social work profession is more important than the fortunes of any individual social worker;
- d. Any sanction imposed must be appropriate, taking into account the seriousness of the misconduct and any mitigating and aggravating factors; and
- e. Any sanction imposed must be proportionate, balancing the interests of the social worker with the interests of the social work profession and the public interest.

87. The panel took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
88. The panel noted the submissions of Mr Batstone and had regard to the written representations provided by Ms Meyrick by way of her response forms and statement to the panel on 17 January 2026.
89. The panel identified a number of mitigating factors. The panel noted that Ms Meyrick does not have any previous fitness to practise history and that she had engaged with the Social Work England investigation process. The panel reminded itself of its earlier finding that Ms Meyrick had shown genuine remorse and it noted that she had apologised for her misconduct (*"I offer my sincere apologies to all those affected by my poor judgement and the consequences of my actions"*). The panel noted that Ms Meyrick had made partial admissions relatively early in the Social Work England process, admitting to allegation 2 in her response form dated 17 November 2021. The panel reminded itself of its earlier finding that Ms Meyrick had demonstrated insight which, although incomplete, was positive and appeared to be progressing. The panel found that significant time – approximately 5 to 6 years – had passed since the conduct in question and Ms Meyrick's response forms and recent statement to the panel showed that she had undertaken thoughtful reflection over that period. She had recognised her previous *"naivety"* and *"poor judgement"*, accepted responsibility for her wrongdoing, and demonstrated a willingness to learn from and remediate her misconduct.
90. The panel identified a number of aggravating factors. The panel reminded itself of its earlier finding that Ms Meyrick's misconduct had been deliberate and that it had continued over an extended period of time. The panel noted that the misconduct all related to one family – Ms Meyrick had been in a relationship with Person A between approximately January to April/May 2020, she had accessed the confidential files of Person A and his two children Person B and Person C on three dates between March and May 2020, and she did not inform the Council of the conflict of interest in relation to Person A until August 2020 when he made his complaint. The misconduct was therefore not an isolated incident. Furthermore, the panel found that the misconduct

amounted to an abuse of position and trust, putting the service users in question at risk of harm.

91. The panel noted paragraphs 154 and 155 of the Social Work England guidance document, which stated that:

*“154. Social workers hold privileged positions of trust. Their role often requires them to engage with vulnerable people. It is essential to the effective delivery of social work that the public can trust social workers. Any abuse of trust by a social worker is a serious and unacceptable risk in terms of public protection and confidence in the profession.*

*155. A social worker may abuse their professional position in a number of ways, for example (by doing any of the following):*

- [...]
- [...]
- *inappropriately accessing confidential information without professional reason”.*

92. The panel assessed the misconduct in this case to be serious. Although a number of mitigating factors had been identified, the panel was mindful that the misconduct involved serious breaches of fundamental tenets of social work practice and that there were a number of aggravating factors including that the conduct had been deliberate, continued over an extended period of time, amounted to an abuse of trust and had put service users at risk of harm.
93. Given its finding that the misconduct was serious, and with reference to paragraphs 93 to 112 of the Social Work England guidance document, the panel decided that this was not a case in which imposing no restriction on the social worker’s registration would be appropriate. There were no exceptional circumstances that would justify taking ‘no further action’ in this case. Furthermore, in its assessment of impairment, the panel had found a risk of repetition, indicating that service users and the public could be put at risk of harm if the social worker were permitted to practise without restriction. Therefore, giving advice or giving a warning would be insufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest in this case.
94. The panel next considered whether conditions of practice might be an appropriate and proportionate sanction. With reference to paragraph 118 of the Social Work England guidance document, the panel noted that conditions of practice are unlikely to be appropriate in cases involving an abuse of trust. Furthermore, with reference to paragraphs 114 to 117 of the Social Work England guidance document, the panel noted that Ms Meyrick had demonstrated some insight and it had found that the misconduct was capable of being remedied. However, the panel had also found that the misconduct was attitudinal in nature, demonstrating serious errors of judgement. As such, the panel decided that it was not possible to formulate workable conditions. To be effective in addressing the identified risk of harm to service users and the public, any

conditions would need to be so stringent as to be tantamount to suspension. That would not be fair or practical. The panel also had in mind that it had no details of Ms Meyrick’s current employment situation, other than that she was not currently working in a social work role. That context also made conditions of practice unlikely to be effective or workable in the circumstances of this case.

95. The panel next considered whether a period of suspension might be an appropriate and proportionate sanction.

96. The panel noted paragraphs 136 to 138 of the Social Work England guidance document, as follows:

*“136. Suspension is appropriate where (both of the following apply):*

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

*137. Suspension may be appropriate where (all of the following):*

- *the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards;*
- *the social worker has demonstrated some insight;*
- *there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate their failings.*

*138. Suspension is likely to be unsuitable in circumstances where (both of the following):*

- *the social worker has not demonstrated any insight and remediation;*
- *there is limited evidence to suggest they are willing (or able) to resolve or remediate their failings”.*

97. The panel was satisfied that this case fell within the circumstances set out at paragraph 136 of the guidance. The panel could not formulate workable conditions to protect the public or the wider public interest, but the case did not require removal from the social work register. Referring to its earlier findings that the misconduct amounted to a serious breach of professional standards, that Ms Meyrick had demonstrated some insight and that she had indicated a willingness to take steps to remediate her failings, the panel concluded that a period of suspension was an appropriate action to take to address the risks identified in this case.

98. To check its reasoning in relation to the imposition of a period of suspension, the panel also considered whether removal from the register might be appropriate and proportionate. The panel noted that paragraph 149 of the Social Work England guidance

document indicated that a removal order may be appropriate in a case involving an abuse of position or trust, and that paragraph 148 stated that a removal order must be made where no other outcome would be enough to protect the public and the wider public interest. Although this was a case involving an abuse of position and trust, the panel did not consider that the circumstances of this case meant that no sanction other than a removal order would be sufficient to protect the public and the public interest. Given that the misconduct was remediable, and that Ms Meyrick had demonstrated some insight and a willingness to remediate, the panel considered that a period of suspension was the most appropriate sanction and that a removal order would be disproportionate.

99. In deciding upon the length of the period of suspension, the panel had reference to paragraphs 140 to 144 of the Social Work England guidance document.
100. The panel noted paragraph 142, which stated that “Suspension up to one year may be appropriate if the suspension’s primary aim is (one or both of the following): maintaining confidence in the profession; ensuring the professional standards are observed”. That was not the case here. The panel had decided that Ms Meyrick’s fitness to practise was currently impaired on grounds of public protection, as well as in the wider public interest. Therefore, any period less than 12 months was unlikely to be appropriate.
101. The panel also considered the guidance at paragraphs 143 and 144, but noted that this was not a case involving chronic ill health, an outstanding criminal sentence, or any other circumstance that obviously pointed to the need for a longer period of suspension.
102. With reference to paragraph 141 of the guidance document, the panel had in mind the public interest in supporting a trained and skilled social worker to return to social work practice where that can be achieved safely, and balancing that with giving the social worker in this case sufficient time to fully develop her insight into the misconduct and take practical steps to demonstrate that insight and remediation. In that regard, the panel noted the recent statement from Ms Meyrick in which she explained her initial decision to pursue a career in social work, demonstrating her commitment to the profession and a genuine desire to support the most vulnerable in society.
103. The panel concluded that a period of suspension of 12 months would be an appropriate and proportionate length of time. That would mark the fact that there was a risk to public protection that needed to be addressed, and it would also allow sufficient time for Ms Meyrick to be able to take meaningful steps to fully develop her insight into the misconduct and take practical action to remediate in order to address that risk. The panel was satisfied that this length of suspension properly balanced the interests of the social worker in returning to social work practice and the benefits to society in having a trained social worker return to social work practice, with the public interest in properly marking the seriousness of the misconduct in order to uphold proper professional standards and maintain public confidence in the social work profession.

104. There will be an automatic review before the expiry of the 12-month period of suspension and the reviewing panel will expect to see an improvement at the review. In order to demonstrate that improvement, the panel recommends that the reviewing panel would be assisted by Ms Meyrick providing the following:
- a. An updated reflective statement, showing that she has accepted the findings of the panel in relation to allegation 1, accepts responsibility for that misconduct, and understands the impact that the misconduct will have had on Person A, Person B, Person C, her social work colleagues, the wider social work profession, and public confidence in the social work profession;
  - b. Evidence of targeted reading, study and training courses focused on the professional standards breached. For example, in relation to: handling confidential information, abuse of trust/position, maintaining proper professional boundaries, and conflicts of interest;
  - c. References from employment or voluntary work undertaken and/or character testimonials, commenting on Ms Meyrick's awareness, attitude, behaviour and judgement; and
  - d. Evidence that social work knowledge and skills have been kept up to date. For example, evidence of continued professional development (CPD).

#### Interim order:

105. Mr Batstone made an application for an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months, to cover the appeal period. He submitted that this was necessary for the protection of the public, in light of the panel's findings at the impairment and sanctions stages.
106. Ms Meyrick had not provided written representations specifically for this stage of the hearing.
107. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that:
- a. the final order of suspension imposed by the panel will not come into effect until the expiry of the period for making an appeal, that is 28 days;
  - b. where a panel has made a final order, it may make an interim order under paragraph 11(1)(b) of Schedule 2 to the Regulations to cover the appeal period where it considers that doing so is necessary for the protection of the public or in the best interests of the social worker;
  - c. the panel should take into account its findings at the impairment and sanction stages, and any risks identified; and
  - d. the panel must apply the principle of proportionality, imposing only the least severe restriction necessary to address the risks identified.

108. The panel had regard to paragraphs 203 to 204 and 206 to 208 of the Social Work England 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' document.
109. The panel bore in mind that it had found a risk of repetition of misconduct, impaired fitness to practise, and that a final order of suspension was the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case. Since the panel's final order of suspension would not come into effect until the expiry of the 28-day appeal period, or until any appeal is dealt with, it considered that an interim order was necessary to protect the public.
110. The panel reminded itself that appropriate and workable conditions could not be formulated to address the risks in this case. Therefore, an interim order of conditions would be insufficient to protect the public. It therefore decided that the appropriate and proportionate type of interim order to impose at this stage was an interim suspension order.
111. The panel decided that the interim suspension order should be imposed for a period of 18 months in order to allow sufficient time for any appeal that might be lodged to be dealt with.

### Right of appeal:

112. 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.
113. 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.
114. 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.
115. 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:

116. 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

117. 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:

118. 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>.