



Social worker: James Reilly
Registration number: SW142236
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review hearing

Date of hearing: 24 February 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Conditions of practice order (expiring 6 April 2026)

Hearing outcome:
Revoke the conditions of practice order with immediate effect

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is a review of a conditions of practice order made in respect of Mr James Reilly (Mr Reilly).
2. The review is taking place under paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 to the Social Workers Regulations 2018 (the Regulations) and in accordance with Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (the Rules).
3. On 7 October 2024 Mr Reilly accepted the Case Examiners proposal for the imposition of a conditions of practice order for a period of 18 months. The conditions of practice order is currently due to expire on 6 April 2026.
4. Mr James Reilly (Mr Reilly) attended the hearing.
5. Social Work England was represented at the hearing by Ms Verity Barnes, instructed by Capsticks LLP.
6. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (the panel) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Lesley White	Chair
Christine Anne Rice	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Hannah McKendrick	Hearings officer
Andrew Brown	Hearings support officer
Jane Kilgannon	Legal adviser

7. The panel was provided with the following documents in advance of the hearing:
 - a. Final order review hearing bundle (122 pages); and
 - b. Service and supplementary bundle (20 pages).

Review of the current order:

8. This is a final order review hearing, taking place under paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 to the Regulations. The purpose of the hearing is to review the current conditions of practice order, which is due to expire at the end of 6 April 2026.

Procedural history of current order (conditions of practice, 18 months):

9. A complaint was received from South Tyneside Council (the Council) on 19 September 2022. Social Work England investigated the matter.
10. On 19 August 2024 the Case Examiners found a realistic prospect of the following regulatory concerns being found proven against Mr Reilly:

1. *You made inappropriate comments and/or used inappropriate language, including:*
 - a. *Swearing at a child at a family contact session on 21/07/2022*
 - b. *Swearing at a vulnerable parent at a visit on the 02/09/22*
 - c. *Described a child as ‘arrogant’*
 - d. *Saying to a child that if they failed to clean up the mess in your car you would ‘rub their face in it’*
2. *While supervising family contact on 13/07/22, you took a photo of a child without the parents’ consent and/or threatened to share the photo.*

11. The Case Examiners also found that there was a realistic prospect that:

- a. those regulatory concerns, taken together, could amount to the statutory ground of misconduct; and
- b. Mr Reilly’s fitness to practise could be found impaired.

12. The Case Examiners proposed an accepted disposal of conditions of practice for a period of 18 months.

13. Mr Reilly accepted the proposal. In his response received on 7 October 2024, he confirmed

“I have read the case examiners’ decision and the accepted disposal guide. I admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, and that my fitness to practise is impaired. I understand the terms of the proposed disposal of my fitness to practise case and accept them in full.”

14. Therefore, on 7 October 2024, a final order of conditions of practice was imposed on Mr Reilly for a period of 18 months. It is currently due to expire on 6 April 2026.

15. The current conditions of practice in place are as follows:

1. You must notify Social Work England within 7 days of any professional appointment you accept or are currently undertaking and provide the contact details of your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work services, whether paid or voluntary.

2. You must allow Social Work England to exchange information with your employer, agency or any organisation with which you have a contract or arrangement to provide social work or educational services, and any reporter or workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions.

3. a. At any time you are providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England, you must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by you and approved by Social Work England. The reporter must be on Social Work England's register.

3. b. You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.

4. You must provide reports from your reporter to Social Work England every 6 months and at least 14 days prior to any review and Social Work England will make these reports available to any workplace supervisor referred to in these conditions on request.

5. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against you from the date these conditions take effect.

6. You must inform Social Work England within 7 days of receiving notice of any investigations or complaints made against you from the date these conditions take effect.

7. You must inform Social Work England if you apply for social work employment / self-employment (paid or voluntary) outside England within 7 days of the date of application.

8. You must inform Social Work England if you are registered or subsequently apply for registration with any other UK regulator, overseas regulator or relevant authority within 7 days of the date of application [for future registration] or 7 days from the date these conditions take effect [for existing registration].

9. a. At any time you are employed, or providing social work services, which require you to be registered with Social Work England; you must place yourself and remain under the direct supervision of a workplace supervisor nominated by you, and agreed by Social Work England. The workplace supervisor must be on Social Work England's register.

9. b. *You must not start or continue to work until these arrangements have been approved by Social Work England.*

10. *You must provide reports from your workplace supervisor to Social Work England every 6 months and at least 14 days prior to any review, and Social Work England will make these reports available to any reporter referred to in these conditions on request.*

11. *You must work with your workplace supervisor, to formulate a personal development plan, specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:*

- *Communication with and about children and their families*
- *Respecting the privacy of service users*

12. *You must provide a copy of your personal development plan to Social Work England within 6 weeks from the date these conditions take effect and an updated copy 2 weeks prior to any review.*

13. *You must read Social Work England's 'Professional Standards' (July 2019), and provide a written reflection 6 months after these conditions take effect, focusing on how your conduct, for matters relating to this case (communication with and about children and families, and respecting the privacy of service users), was allegedly below the accepted standard of a social worker, outlining what you should have done differently.*

14. *You must provide a written copy of your conditions, within 7 days from the date these conditions take effect, to the following parties confirming that your registration is subject to the conditions listed at 1 to 13, above:*

- *Any organisation or person employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary.*
- *Any locum, agency or out-of-hours service you are registered with or apply to be registered with in order to secure employment or contracts to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).*

- Any prospective employer who would be employing or contracting with you to undertake social work services whether paid or voluntary (at the time of application).
- Any organisation, agency or employer where you are using your social work qualification/knowledge/skills in a non-qualified social work role, whether paid or voluntary.

You must forward written evidence of your compliance with this condition to Social Work England within 14 days from the date these conditions take effect.

15. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1 to 14, to any person requesting information about your registration status.

The Case Examiners determined the following with regard to impairment:

“Whether the conduct can be easily remedied

The case examiners are mindful of their decision-making guidance, which explains that where concerns may relate to a social worker’s character, it can be more difficult to evidence remediation. The case examiners recognise, however, that the conduct in this case arose at the very start of the social worker’s career. All social workers require support in the early stages of their career to develop their knowledge, skills and understanding of how social workers should conduct themselves.

The case examiners consider that, in this case, the social worker could remedy the concerns by reflecting on how they interact with children and their families, and how the way in which they communicate might be experienced. Evidence of reflection with peers would be particularly beneficial.

The case examiners would also expect to see evidence, for example by way of a written observation of their practice, of the social worker having been seen to conduct themselves more professionally with children and families, evidencing a change in their behaviour. The case examiners recognise, however, that this could be a challenge for the social worker given they left employment relatively soon after starting, as a result of the concerns now before the regulator.

Insight and remediation

[...] the case examiners were encouraged to see that [...] the social worker [... has] started the process of reflecting on how they conduct themselves with children and families.

In particular, the case examiners noted that the social worker has outlined their understanding of how the language they use is subjective, and it is important that they form appropriate boundaries and relationships with the people they support. The social worker has explained that they recognise that there is a time and a place for them to joke around.

With reference to regulatory concern 2 specifically, the social worker has reflected on how the child might have felt, and explained that they understand that their conduct could have affected the child emotionally, and impacted upon the child's relationship with social services and their own sibling.

More broadly, the social worker has accepted that they demonstrated poor judgement, and that their conduct did not reflect the way in which social workers should behave. However, although the case examiners were greatly encouraged by the work undertaken by the social worker to date, they consider that adjudicators might expect further evidence of a depth of reflection for each of the concerns.

The case examiners are also mindful that the social worker has not practised since the concerns arose. They consider that in order for there to be sufficient evidence of remediation, it would be necessary for the regulator to receive evidence of the social worker having demonstrated their learning.

Risk of repetition

The case examiners have outlined their view that there is some encouraging evidence of reflection within the social worker's submissions, and it is apparent that they have already taken steps to develop their insight. However, they consider that there is still some further work for the social worker to undertake, and they would have benefitted from some evidence of the social worker's conduct in practice. Accordingly, although the risk of repetition has been reduced, there is not yet sufficient evidence to suggest that it is low.

Public element

[...] the case examiners [...] consider the conduct in this case to be linked, and that it might raise concern about the social worker's character and judgement. The case examiners are satisfied that the social worker has begun to address the issues of concern, but insight and remediation is not yet complete. In the case examiners' view, public confidence could therefore be undermined if a finding of impairment were not to be made".

The Case Examiners determined the following with regard to sanction:

"[...] conditions of practice may be appropriate in cases where (all of the following):

- the social worker has demonstrated insight*
- the failure or deficiency in practice is capable of being remedied*
- appropriate, proportionate, and workable conditions can be put in place*

- *decision makers are confident the social worker can and will comply with the conditions*
- *the social worker does not pose a risk of harm to the public by being in restricted practice*

In the case examiners' view, all five of the above criteria apply in this case. The social worker has already demonstrated some insight, and the case examiners have [...] their view that the conduct can be remedied. The case examiners [...] would have benefitted (in assessing impairment) from evidence of the social worker's practice since the concerns in this case arose. A conditions of practice order would therefore provide fair opportunity to obtain relevant evidence, and to demonstrate a change in the way they conduct themselves around children and families. [...] a conditions of practice order would be sufficient to protect the public, and [...] would represent the minimum necessary outcome to safeguard public confidence in the social work profession, and the maintenance of proper professional standards for social workers. In order to test their thinking, the case examiners considered whether a suspension order might be necessary. However, the case examiners were firmly of the view that the suspension order would be punitive, and would represent a significant risk of deskilling a social worker who is in the early stages of their career."

Social Work England submissions:

16. Social Work England provided written submissions in its notice of hearing dated 26 January 2026 as follows:

"Social Work England will invite the Panel to consider the Social Worker's written reflection and any further evidence submitted before or at the review and to consider if the Social Worker has satisfied them that his fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

The Social Worker has provided evidence of developing insight and remediation within a written reflection piece. However, he has not obtained a new social work role since the order was imposed and, for that reason, has not been able to demonstrate any change in the way he conducts himself around children and families. For this reason, on the basis of the information available at the point of drafting the notice of hearing, the Panel are invited to find that the Social Worker's fitness to practice remains impaired.

If the Panel conclude that the risk of repetition remains and the concerns have not been fully remediated, then they are invited to extend the COPO for a further 9 months with some variation.

Social Work England submit that the intention of the Case Examiners was to protect the public and also give the Social Worker an opportunity to demonstrate safe and effective practice. In particular, they felt it necessary for the Social Worker to provide evidence of how he conducts his practice after the accepted regulatory concerns. To date the Social Worker has not been successful in securing a further social work role.

If the existing order is allowed to lapse or is revoked, the Social Worker would be able to return to unrestricted practice without the aim of the order being met. It is submitted that the risk of repetition has reduced but still remains.

The Panel are therefore invited to impose a further conditions of practice order for 9 months. Social Work England submit that this is necessary and proportionate, both for public protection and to afford the Social Worker a continued opportunity to demonstrate that they have addressed the regulatory concerns about their communication with service users and their ability to respect their privacy, should they return to a social work role.

It is submitted that the following variations may be appropriate:

- *Removal of condition 13 (reflective piece) as this has been met.*
- *Addition of a CPD condition requiring the Social Worker to undertake targeted CPD relevant to the conduct concerns. This will also assist in demonstrating he has kept his skills and knowledge up to date.*
- *Variation of condition 9a to require “supervision” rather than “direct supervision” (to assist the Social Worker in securing employment).*

The Panel are also invited to consider making recommendations that may assist a future panel, were the Social Worker unable to secure social work employment, such as provision of testimonials that speak to the Social Worker’s ability to interact with families and children and evidence of wider learning / practice akin to social work”.

17. Ms Barnes confirmed those submissions at the hearing.

18. Ms Barnes also submitted that:

- a. Mr Reilly has demonstrated some evidence of insight and remediation. In particular, by providing his reflective statement dated 12 February 2025;
- b. Mr Reilly has complied with the conditions, except for a technical breach of condition 14 when he missed a deadline in informing Social Work England about a job he had applied for and failed to provide a prospective employer with a copy of his conditions of practice (although he did tell the prospective employer about the conditions);
- c. Mr Reilly has provided evidence that he has made efforts to obtain employment in a social work role but has not yet been successful in securing such a role. As such, he has not yet been able to demonstrate that he has changed the way that he conducts himself around children and families; and
- d. Although the risk of repetition has reduced, some risk of repetition remains.

Social worker evidence and submissions:

19. On 12 February 2025 Mr Reilly provided a reflective statement to Social Work England as follows:

“Reflection is a crucial part of my personal development. It allows me to learn from situations and events that are my personal lived experience. Today, I reflect for the first time in writing, something I've explored a million times in my head, the reasons that led to my fitness to practice review by SWE. I will use the Gibbs model for the reflection.

During my time with a LA, my practice became impaired, and I was too inexperienced to know it. I wanted to improve the experience of working with a social worker, but instead it took someone else to explain how I was hindering this. I was accused of swearing at a young service user and using language that was inappropriate for the role I was undertaking.

A social worker is a professional role and demands a professional attitude.

At the time, having just gone through my university training, I was left thinking that I was going to change lives. I had done a year of doing family time sessions and I felt I knew exactly what person I wanted to be. I wanted to be the person that anyone could come to, the person that would meet an adult with a handshake, and a child with a fist pump. Maybe my experience in schools during my teaching degree, or training during the pandemic and not getting the traditional experience, or my lived experience as a child being the subject of a family court battle, made me want to change the experience for someone else. I never thought for a second of the issues that would come with this approach, and reflecting on that now, it shows how naive I was. I should have asked myself to understand why things were the way they were before feeling I could rewrite the procedure book.

With specific reference to the reasons relating to my fitness to practice, I look back at my behaviours and what led to my practice being impaired.

I was accused of swearing at a young service user. [...] I have reflected on what I would do differently. I would have started my relationship with this family by setting firmer boundaries. [...] I have learnt that my communication skills, whilst I thought were good, were not and indeed impaired. I will forever keep this lesson in my thoughts, and I know that going forward, I would communicate differently, realising my role is not to be a friend, but a professional person, with the sole purpose of keeping them safe and being an advocate for them.

I have also had time to reflect on my decision to take a photograph of a service user, and the impact of this on their privacy. [...] Going back to my knowledge of working in schools and tactics that teachers use with younger children where they try to ask children to understand how the other person would feel, I wanted to achieve this, I just feel with hindsight that this was the wrong way of going about it. If I look back at my working life, this is the moment I am most unproud of. Whilst my intentions were honourable, my delivery was far from right. I look back at how that must have made that young person

feel. The invasion of privacy aside, this young person was going through what must be the most difficult point in her young life, and instead of being supportive and an advocate, I became a barrier to this person finding some sense of normality. I let this young person down and I have no excuse for that. I know better than trying to help one person at the detriment of another, this isn't my values or the professional standards I am expected to follow. [...]. I let myself down, I let the young person down and I let my profession down. [...] I have learnt from these situations, and they don't only affect my career going forward, but my character and the person I am today [...]."

20. Mr Reilly provided written submissions ahead of this review, on 2 February 2026, as follows:

"I am writing this letter to explain my life since the allegations against me, in the hopes that you will see that I have learnt from my mistakes and that extending my conditions of practice is not the right step going forward!

[...] the complaint was lodged in November 2022 and wasn't completed until September 2024. [...] I was open and honest throughout the investigation, working with [Social Work England] and answering any questions to the best of my ability.

Once the investigation was complete, the decision was to implement conditions of practice for 18 months. During this period, I have applied for several Social Work roles, only getting to interview once. I never got any feedback, but I can assume this was due to having to declare my conditions of practice before I'd built up any rapport with the recruitment team. This means I have been out of Social Work for over 3.5 years, and I only practiced for 6 weeks or so, and that was as a family worker, not a social worker as I hadn't even started my ASYE. [...]

When I got into Social Work, I did so to make a difference in the lives of other people. When I was growing up, I was part of a custody battle, and I was forever being removed by police. I know how that made me feel, and I wanted to be different. Where I was not the social worker for the child, I wanted to be more friend than formal, breaking barriers and making it easy to interact with. This is where I went wrong. I wanted to make service users laugh, to not worry 24/7 like I had as a child. Unfortunately, this meant I couldn't switch the role back when I became more involved with the family. In hindsight I should have got my feet firmly in the door before I tried to change the wheel, even though my intentions were honourable. I have had several nights of sleepless nights over the last 3 years to reflect on what I did good and what I did wrong as a family worker. I am my own worst critic.

I have been waiting for 3.5 years to show that I have learnt from my mistakes, but nobody is willing to take a chance on someone who is under conditions of practice before even starting their ASYE. My concern is that you extend the conditions of practice and I'm left in the same position, then what do you do when the extension is finished? Extend again? I believe that I have done well to keep my registration active, I have paid for years of registration whilst not being able to get a job in the industry, and I believe that I should now be left to do this.

Feedback from my last interview in which I got offered a role before it was rescinded was 'your time away from practice is something we considered but overall, we felt that your interview was good enough to give you a chance'. The offer was rescinded due to the LA reading my FTP report in full.

I am eager to start my career. I have 170 days in schools as a trainee teacher with no complaints, I have 170 days during covid as a social work trainee, no complaints. I feel I should have the right to prove I am not the person I was 4 years ago. The country is screaming for social workers, especially male social workers. Let me show that I am an asset and not a hinderance. I don't think I can take another setback in relation to this role.

Social work is about compassion, empathy and giving people the opportunity to transform their life. All I am asking is for you to show me these same characteristics and allow me to move on with my life."

21. At the hearing Mr Reilly gave oral evidence. He stated that:

- a. He qualified and registered as a social worker in 2022;
- b. At the relevant times he was not yet working as a social worker, but as a family support worker. This was front line work, including supervising contact time between parents and children, and looking after children in temporary accommodation (including overnight stays) who were waiting to be placed with foster carers. He was waiting for the rest of his cohort of newly qualified social workers to join the Council so that they would all start their Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (ASYE) year together. He had been given the option to work as a family support worker in the meantime and, although registered as a social worker, he was contracted as family support worker at that time;
- c. In the family support worker role, he was not provided with any induction or training, and had only two supervision meetings over a three-four month period in the role;
- d. He recognises now that his conduct in question came with good intentions but was mistaken. He believes that he was naïve and has since learned from his mistakes;
- e. In the four years that have since passed, he has remained committed to social work and made numerous applications for social work roles. However, he has found it difficult to secure a role due to the Social Work England conditions of practice which include a requirement of direct supervision;
- f. He has not yet started his ASYE year as a social worker;

- g. He wants to secure a social work role where he could undertake his ASYE year, as that would allow him to benefit from shadowing, coaching, training, regular feedback and monthly progress conversations. He believes that that level of support and a lower caseload would be in his best interest when returning to social work practice;
- h. Before the relevant times, he worked in primary education and, during his social work Masters degree programme, he undertook 70 days of placement in a 'looked after children' team and 100 days of placement in a child protection team. No concerns were raised about his conduct or performance in those roles; and
- i. He is now working in a role outside of social work.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

22. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the conditions of practice order in light of the current circumstances. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
23. The panel had regard to all of the evidence before it. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Ms Barnes on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mr Reilly.
24. 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 maintaining public confidence in the profession.
25. The panel considered whether Mr Reilly's fitness to practise remains impaired.
26. The panel noted that Mr Reilly had fully engaged with the Social Work England investigation, fitness to practice and review processes.
27. The panel acknowledged that Mr Reilly had breached one of the current conditions of practice, but noted that this was a very minor and technical breach. Good reasons had been provided to Social Work England for the late notification of the job application, and Mr Reilly had not sought to hide his conditions of practice from the prospective employer because he had expressly told them about the conditions. The breach was simply that he had not provided a copy of the conditions to the prospective employer immediately when making his job application.
28. With that one exception, the panel found that Mr Reilly had complied with the conditions of practice currently in place and there was no evidence of any repetition of the conduct of concern. The panel acknowledged that Mr Reilly was not currently working in a social work role, but was keen to return to social work practice as soon as he could secure such a role. Given what Mr Reilly had told the panel, it was confident

that Mr Reilly would be looking for a social work role that would allow him to undertake his ASYE year, supporting his professional learning and development as a newly qualified social worker.

29. The panel noted that, by way of his response to the case examiner's accepted disposal proposal, Mr Reilly had admitted the key factual allegations and that his fitness to practise was impaired as a result of his conduct at that time. The panel found that, within his response dated 23 March 2024 and written reflections dated 12 February 2025, Mr Reilly had expressed sincere remorse and regret for his conduct.
30. The panel considered that Mr Reilly's written reflections indicated that he had developed full insight into the seriousness of his conduct and the impact of his actions on the service users in question, his former employer, the profession as a whole, and public confidence in the profession. The panel took into account Mr Reilly's oral evidence, noting in particular that, at the relevant times, he had been working as a family support worker with very little support or supervision. The panel found that, in his written reflections and his oral evidence, Mr Reilly had demonstrated a clear understanding of what he had done wrong, of how he could and would act in the future so as to avoid making the same mistakes again, and a willingness to be self-critical and learn from others going forward. He demonstrated a mature outlook, making clear that he now appreciates the importance of ensuring a level of professional distance between the social worker and service users.
31. The panel considered the Social Work England submission that the Case Examiners had intended for Mr Reilly to find a social work role whilst subject to conditions of practice so that he could demonstrate the insight he had developed in a practical way whilst supervised, and that because this had not happened Mr Reilly's fitness to practise remained impaired.
32. The panel was mindful of the guidance provided by the High Court in the case of *Nursing and Midwifery Council v Persand* [2023] EWHC 3356 (Admin) in relation to interim orders but, in this regard, also relevant to assessment of risk when reviewing final orders:

“44. [...] in working out the level of any continuing risk, it seems to me to be deeply unfair for the Committee or for this court to rely on the fact that, despite doing remediation courses, Mr Persand cannot show that any risk has proved to have been reduced because he has not worked as a nurse since he completed the courses. Mr Persand was prevented from working as a nurse until June 2023 and, since that time, has been subject to such a set of extensive and tight conditions that it is hardly surprising that no employer has taken him on in a nursing role. That argument is thus wholly circular and cannot justify continuing sanctions against Mr Persand. He has been unable to work as a nurse because of the interim orders and so completion of the courses is the most he could do to demonstrate a reduction in risk”.

33. The panel considered Mr Reilly to be in an analogous position to the nurse in that case. The panel found that Mr Reilly had taken appropriately targeted action to fully develop his insight and remediate by properly reflecting and providing a written reflective statement. Despite persistent attempts, including attending job interviews, Mr Reilly had not been able to secure a social work role due to the extensive and tight conditions of practice in place on his social work registration, which included direct supervision. In the circumstances, the panel considered that Mr Reilly had done everything that he could do to demonstrate a reduction in risk.
34. The panel did not agree with Social Work England that the only way Mr Reilly could fully remediate the regulatory concerns in this case was by completing a satisfactory period of work in a social work role whilst subject to conditions of practice. The panel found that Mr Reilly's thoughtful and thorough reflection, demonstrated in his written reflective statement and in his oral evidence at this hearing, was sufficient to demonstrate fully developed insight and remediation of the concerns in question.
35. Taking all of the evidence into account, and in particular the new evidence since the last review (written reflection dated 12 February 2025, evidence of job applications indicating Mr Reilly's commitment to social work practice, and Mr Reilly's oral evidence at the hearing), the panel considered that Mr Reilly's insight was now fully developed and that he has demonstrated that the regulatory concern in question has been remediated. The panel considered that the risk of repetition was now very low. The panel therefore found that a finding of impairment was no longer required on the grounds of public protection.
36. The panel also considered the wider public interest. The panel noted that Mr Reilly had engaged fully throughout the regulatory process, had been subject to a final conditions of practice order for a total of 16 months, and had responded positively by taking appropriate steps to develop full insight and remediate the concerns. Given that background, and with the risk of repetition no more than very low, the panel considered that a finding of impairment was not required in order to uphold proper professional standards and to maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel also noted that there was a public interest in returning social workers to practice where it was safe to do so.
37. The panel therefore decided that Mr Reilly's fitness to practise was no longer impaired.

Revocation of the conditions of practice order with immediate effect:

38. As Mr Reilly's fitness to practise was no longer impaired, the panel concluded that the current conditions of practice order was no longer appropriate or proportionate, and so it decided to revoke the current order with immediate effect.

The Professional Standards Authority

39. 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>