



Social worker: Tanweer Hussain

Registration number: SW36534

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Hearing

Date of Hearing: 31 March 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 13 May 2026)

Hearing outcome:
Impose a new order namely a removal order with effect from the expiry of the current order

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the second review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of two years by case examiners, by way of accepted disposal on 10 November 2023.
2. The panel understood that, under paragraphs 7 and 9 of Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018, for a case to be concluded through accepted disposal, the social worker must consent to the proposed disposal.
3. Mr Tanweer agreed to the accepted disposal proposal in an email dated 3 November 2023.
4. The panel understood that Mr Tanweer had thus accepted the case examiners' observations in relation to the key facts, including the factual limbs of the concerns giving rise to the suspension order, and accepted that his fitness to practise was, at that time, impaired by reason of those facts.
5. The Final order was reviewed on 3 October 2025, and that panel extended the current suspension order for a further six months with effect from the expiry of the current order.
6. The current order is due to expire on 13 May 2026.
7. Mr Tanweer attended and was not represented.
8. Social Work England was represented by Ms Bonifai instructed by Capsticks LLP.
9. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter "the panel") and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Frank Appleyard	Chair
Christine Moody	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Andrew Brown	Hearings officer
Heather Hibbins	Hearings support officer
Charlotte Mitchell-Dunn	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

10. The panel of adjudicators (hereafter "the panel") understood that the notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Tanweer by email to an address provided by Mr Tanweer.
11. Having had regard to Rules 16, 44 and 45 of Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (the "FTP Rules 2019") and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Tanweer in accordance with the Rules.

Preliminary matters:

12. Both parties confirmed that they did not wish to make an application pursuant to rule 38 of Social Work England's FTP Rules 2019 (as amended) for any matters in this hearing to be dealt with in private. Therefore, the hearing proceeded entirely in public.

Review of the current order:

13. The purpose of the review hearing was to review the current order, which is due to expire on 13 May 2026. The order subject to review was a suspension order.
14. The panel received advice upon the outcomes available to it under paragraphs 15(1) of Schedule 2 of the Social Workers Regulations 2018.

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

15. In relation to the facts:

Whilst registered as a social worker you:

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

1.1. *Did not wear PPE effectively.*

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

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

[PRIVATE]

Schedule 1

[PRIVATE]

16. In relation to the statutory grounds:

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

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

[PRIVATE]

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

Assessment of impairment consists of 2 elements:

1. *The personal element, established via an assessment of the risk of repetition.*

2. *The public element, established through consideration of whether a finding of*

impairment might be required to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

Personal element

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

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied

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

Insight and remediation

[PRIVATE] The case examiners have not been provided with any evidence of insight and remediation in respect of regulatory concerns 1.1 and 9. In respect of regulatory concern 8, the case examiners acknowledge that the social worker has stated they were subject to prolonged and significant provocation in the form of unacceptable, racially motivated abuse. Consequently, the social worker is likely to have been upset, distressed, and offended, and the case examiners acknowledge that as such, there is some mitigation. Nevertheless, social workers are expected to act with integrity both inside and outside work, and the case examiners consider the social worker's conduct to be wholly inappropriate. Furthermore, in their submissions, the social worker does not demonstrate any insight or remediation in respect of their conduct, for example, in respect of how else they could have addressed the matter.

Risk of repetition

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

In respect of regulatory concern 10, the case examiners note that since 2021, medical professionals have consistently stated that the social worker is not fit to practise, and that this opinion was reiterated most recently in June 2023.

[PRIVATE]

Public element

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

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

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

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

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of the concerns being found proven by adjudicators. Furthermore, they found a realistic prospect that the concerns, if proven, would amount to the statutory grounds of criminal conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence (in respect of regulatory 8); [PRIVATE] and misconduct (in respect of regulatory concerns 1.1 and 9). The case examiners have also found a realistic prospect that adjudicators would find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

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

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

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

The case examiners next considered whether offering advice or a warning would be sufficient. An advice order will normally set out the steps a social worker should take to address the behaviour that led to the regulatory proceedings. The case examiners believe that issuing advice is not sufficient to mark the seriousness with which they view the alleged misconduct, [PRIVATE].

A warning order implies a clearer expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct than an advice order. However, the case examiners are not satisfied that a warning order would send a strong enough message to the social worker, and particularly, the wider social work profession. Furthermore, a

warning order is not likely to be appropriate where there is a lack of insight and a risk of repetition, [PRIVATE].

The case examiners then considered a conditions of practice order. The case examiners have concluded that a conditions of practice order is not suitable for this case, because the social worker is not currently practising and therefore there are unlikely to be workable conditions that could be formulated. The case examiners have gone on to consider a suspension order and have noted the sanctions guidance which indicates that such an order may be appropriate in cases where there has been a serious breach of the professional standards, the social worker has demonstrated some insight and there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate. [PRIVATE].

In considering the duration of the suspension order, the case examiners were mindful of the sanction's guidance, which indicates that whilst an order can be made up to 3 years in duration, case examiners need to be mindful of the risk of deskilling a social worker. [PRIVATE].

The case examiners are therefore of the view that a 2-year suspension order provides an opportunity for the social worker to [PRIVATE] undertake professional development to assist with their return to practice. This sanction will mark the seriousness of the regulatory concerns, [PRIVATE].

[PRIVATE].

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

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

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

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

The Final Order Review hearing panel on 03 October 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the case examiners. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.

The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the case examiners and the oral evidence of Mr Tanweer.

The panel also took account of the submissions made by Ms Aslam on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mr Tanweer.

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.

In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession.

The panel first considered whether Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the case examiners decision on accepted disposal noted that Mr. Tanweer had limited insight, other than in relation to [PRIVATE]. This panel noted the extent to which Mr Tanweer has acted upon the recommendations of the previous of panel as to what might assist a future reviewing panel. Mr Tanweer had attended and engaged in the hearing, but he had not engaged with Social Work England's previous recommendations in relation to gathering and presenting evidence which might assist this review panel.

The panel considered whether Mr Tanweer had demonstrated remediation, insight and/or remorse.

Regarding his conviction, he had developed some insight in relation to his own conduct, including the fact that he was ashamed of his conduct. In relation to the public elements of impairment, he showed some but only very limited insight in relation to the potential effect on the reputation of the profession.

Regarding the failure to report the police investigation, the panel observed that this may have been partially due to [PRIVATE], but more detailed information on insight was required.

[PRIVATE].

Regarding the PPE issue, Mr Tanweer's insight was somewhat limited, but the panel took the view that this was the least serious of the issues under consideration.

Overall, the panel considered that Mr Tanweer had not yet demonstrated he was now safe to practise and/or there is no longer a risk to the public.

Regarding the conviction, the risk of repetition appeared to be low, but the panel lacked corroborative evidence of Mr Tanweer managing matters better now.

Regarding failure to report police investigation, further information was required from Mr Tanweer to enable a panel to understand if this issue was fully understood and unlikely to recur.

[PRIVATE].

Thus, he had not sufficiently addressed the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment.

The panel also noted that there was no evidence before it that Mr Tanweer had taken steps to maintain his skills and knowledge.

To summarise, the panel determined that Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remains impaired, due to the seriousness of the allegations, his still developing insight and lack of written evidence to substantiate his oral evidence about his insight and the steps he has taken to remediate the concerns and to reduce the risk of repetition.

The panel concluded that Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of both the private and public elements of fitness to practise.

However, the panel considered that these issues were potentially remediable.

The Final Order Review hearing panel on 03 October 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

Having found Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to the submissions made along with all the information and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.

The panel considered the submissions made by Ms Aslam, on behalf of Social Work England, during which they invited the panel to consider imposing a six-month continuation of the suspension order.

Mr Tanweer did not oppose that course of action.

The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England and the advice of the legal adviser.

The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Tanweer, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public

interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Mr Tanweer's interests with the public interest.

Given the nature of the allegations, the lack of documentary evidence and the lack of full insight, the panel did not consider that a warning or any outcome less than conditions of practice would be appropriate.

However, conditions were not deemed to be appropriate to mitigate the relevant risks. Appropriate conditions which could mitigate the risks could not be formulated. [PRIVATE].

A suspension order would prevent Mr Tanweer from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest.

The Panel was aware it had to independently assess the issues of impairment and sanction, notwithstanding the fact that both parties agreed that a continuation of the suspension order for six months was appropriate.

Having undertaken that assessment, the panel reached the view that a continuation of the suspension order was appropriate.

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

The panel considered whether the current suspension should be extended for a further period of six months, or for some other period.

The panel determined that the suspension order should be extended for a period of six months. The panel was satisfied that this period was appropriate because it would protect the public, including the wider public interest and it would enable Mr Tanweer to obtain evidence of insight and remediation before the next review.

This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, a future reviewing panel would expect Mr Tanweer to attend the review hearing, and it would be of assistance to that panel if they were able to provide evidence that they had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. This may include:

a. In relation to each of the four matters which gave rise to these proceedings (conviction, not disclosing police investigation, [PRIVATE] and PPE):

- i. whether Mr Tanweer understands what led to the events which are the subject of the concern*
- ii. whether he recognises what went wrong*
- iii. whether he accepts his role and responsibilities in relation to the events*
- iv. whether he appreciates what could (and should) have been done differently*

- v. *whether he has addressed how he might act or react differently if the same circumstances were to happen again (to avoid reoccurrence of similar concerns)*
- b. *Evidence that he has kept his social work skills and knowledge up to date, such as any relevant reading and/or training courses (online or otherwise).*
- c. *Evidence that he continues to access relevant medical support and provides up-to-date evidence in this respect. He may also wish to provide information about any [PRIVATE] he has received.*

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

Social Work England submissions:

18. The panel heard submissions from Ms Bonifai as to the background and the previous panel's findings in relation to impairment and sanction. Ms Bonifai submitted that Social Work England invites the Panel to consider that the fitness to practise of Mr Tanweer remains impaired for the same reasons as identified by the Case Examiners and the Panel at the first Final Order Review hearing dated 3 October 2025.
19. Ms Bonifai submitted that Mr Tanweer has not provided any evidence of reflection, remediation or insight since the Suspension Order was imposed. [PRIVATE]. As such, Ms Bonifai submitted that there is no information to suggest there has been a material change in circumstances since the making of the suspension order and the risk of repetition remains high.
20. Ms Bonifai noted that Mr Tanweer has been subject to a Suspension Order since 15 November 2023 with the current extension due to expire on 13 May 2026 (i.e. 2 years and 6 months). She invited the Panel to make a Removal Order. Ms Bonifai submitted that Mr Tanweer was given further opportunity to demonstrate insight, reflection and remediation [PRIVATE] but has failed to do so.
21. Ms Bonifai submitted that Mr Tanweer has not engaged with his case review officer and has not provided any evidence pursuant to the recommendations made by the Case Examiners at the time of their decision nor following the Panel's suggestions made at the review hearing on 3 October 2025. Ms Bonifai submitted that Social Work England considers that in light of the above it is appropriate and proportionate to consider a Removal Order at this stage.

Social worker submissions:

22. Ms Tanweer addressed the Panel and stated that he would like to come off of the Register. He stated he did not want to go back to working as a social worker and he was the happiest he has been enjoying his free time. He stated he did not want to be part of the stressful working environment that Social Workers within and he no longer wished to be registered as a social worker.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

23. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the previous panel. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account of Social Work England's "Impairment and sanctions guidance (updated February 2026)" ("the sanctions guidance").
24. The panel had regard to all the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel and the review panel. The Panel also took account of the submissions made by Ms Bonifai on behalf of Social Work England and Mr Tanweer's submissions.
25. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel noted that there are 2 elements to impairment, the personal element and the public element and the panel should consider both elements.
26. In respect of the personal element the panel should consider whether the conduct is easily remediable, whether it has been remedied and whether it is highly unlikely to be repeated. The public element requires the panel to consider whether a finding of impairment is necessary to promote and maintain public confidence in social workers in England and in respect of proper professional standards for social workers.
27. The panel understood that if it found Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remained currently impaired it should go on to consider what sanction, if any, is appropriate. In considering the options the panel should consider any proposed sanction starting with the least restrictive and must select the least severe sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.
28. The panel first considered whether Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remained currently impaired. The panel noted and agreed with the reasoning and conclusions of the final order review panel regarding the seriousness of the proven allegations and the question of impairment. It noted that that the events had occurred a considerable time ago and were undoubtedly serious. Nonetheless, the panel agreed with the final hearing panel that the misconduct was remediable, and that Mr Tanweer should be capable of remediating if he chose to do so. However, the panel had received no information since the previous hearing to indicate that Mr Tanweer has taken any action to develop his insight or to address the deficiencies in his conduct. The Panel considered that the final order review panel provided very comprehensive guidance on the matters that would be of assistance to a future reviewing panel and the panel noted that Mr Tanweer has provided no evidence in this regard. Further, Mr Tanweer had made very clear that he no longer wished to remain registered as a social worker.

29. In these circumstances the panel considered that Mr Tanweer has shown no additional insight, his misconduct has not been remediated, and his conduct is likely to be repeated.
30. The panel therefore considered that public safety would be at risk if a finding of current impairment was not made in these circumstances. The panel further considered that public confidence in social workers in England and proper standards for social workers would be undermined if Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise was not practised was not considered currently impaired.
31. The panel therefore decided that Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both personal and public grounds and went on to consider the question of sanction.

Panel decision and reasons on sanction: Impose a new order namely removal order with effect from the expiry of the current order:

32. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Tanweer but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The Panel applied the principle of proportionality, weighing up the interest of Mr Tanweer against the public interest.
33. The panel first considered whether to take no further action or give a warning. Given the seriousness of the misconduct, the potential risk of repetition and the panel's finding that Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise remains currently impaired, it concluded neither outcome would adequately protect the public and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if such a sanction was imposed.
34. The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be sufficient and proportionate. The panel had regard to the "sanctions guidance" noting that conditions of practise may be appropriate where the social worker has demonstrated insight and the panel can be confident that the social worker can and will comply with the conditions. Mr Tanweer has clearly indicated that he wishes to be removed from the register, the panel therefore concluded that conditions of practice would not be workable or sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest.
35. The panel next considered whether a suspension order would be sufficient and proportionate. The panel had regard to paragraph 137 of the sanctions guidance which states that suspension may be appropriate where the social worker has demonstrated some insight and there is evidence to suggest that they are willing and able to resolve or remediate their failings. Paragraph 138 states that suspension is likely to be unsuitable where the social worker has not demonstrated insight and remediation and where there is limited evidence that they are willing to resolve or remediate their failings. In this case, Mr Tanweer has shown no evidence to demonstrate that he has taken any steps to remediate his failings or that he is willing to do so in the future. He has made

repeated assertions to Social Work England in the lead up to this hearing that he wishes to be removed from the register and has not engaged with his case review officer. As such, the panel concluded that suspension would serve no purpose, Mr Tanweer has indicated through his actions to date that he would not engage, and such sanction would therefore be inappropriate.

36. The panel was satisfied it could consider a removal order as Mr Tanweer's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of misconduct. The panel noted that a removal order is a sanction of last resort where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest.
37. The panel concluded that a removal order would be the appropriate and proportionate outcome. In reaching this decision the panel had regard to paragraph 149 of the sanctions guidance which sets out a number of situations when a removal order may be appropriate, including cases involving 'social workers who are unwilling and/or unable to remediate (for example, where there is clear evidence that they do not wish to practise as a social worker in the future)'.
38. The panel considered there was very clear evidence provided today in Mr Tanweer's submissions that he does not wish to practise as a social worker in the future and therefore is unwilling to remediate.
39. The panel therefore decided that the appropriate and proportionate order is a new order, namely a removal order with effect from the expiry of the current order:

Right of appeal:

40. Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the social worker may appeal to the High Court against:
 - a. the decision of adjudicators:
 - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - iii. to make a final order,
 - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
41. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
42. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-

paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.

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

Review of final orders:

44. Under regulation 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended):

- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.
- 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker.
- 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5).

45. Under Rule 16(aa) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), a social worker requesting a review of a final order under paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

The Professional Standards Authority

46. 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>