



Social worker: Catherine
Kinyanjui
Registration number: SW37329
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Early Review hearing

Date of hearing: 13 April 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:

Conditions of practice order (expiring 04 November 2027)

Hearing outcome:

Conditions of practice order revoked and replaced by a removal order (with immediate effect)

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is an early review of a final conditions of practice order under paragraph 15(2) of schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the regulations”) originally imposed by a panel of adjudicators on 7 October 2025 for a period of 2 years.
2. Ms Kinyanjui did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Mr Ed Carey, case presenter instructed by Capsticks LLP.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this hearing (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Miriam Karp	Chair
Louise Fox	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Molly-Rose Brown	Hearings officer
Raegan Kirkland	Hearings support officer
Ruksana Kosser	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 12 March 2026 and addressed to Ms Kinyanjui at their email address which they provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 12 March 2026 detailing Ms Kinyanjui’s registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 12 March 2026 the writer sent by email to Ms Kinyanjui at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
6. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
7. Having had regard to the Social Work England (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2019 (as amended) (hereafter “the Rules”) and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Kinyanjui in accordance with Rules 14,15,44 and 45.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

8. 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 the cases of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5*; *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’.
9. The panel considered all the information before it regarding notice, together with the submissions made by Mr Carey on behalf of Social Work England. The panel noted that Ms Kinyanjui had been sent notice of today’s hearing and the panel was satisfied that Ms Kinyanjui was or should be aware of today’s hearing.
10. The panel also considered the fact that Ms Kinyanjui had contacted Social Work England via email on the 30 March 2026 to express her intention to not attend the hearing. A further email was sent by Ms Kinyanjui on the 31 March 2026 and the 07 April 2026 confirming her non-attendance and expressing her wish for the matter to proceed in her absence.
11. The panel, therefore, concluded that Ms Kinyanjui had chosen to voluntarily absent herself. The panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in Ms Kinyanjui’s attendance. Having weighed the interests of Ms Kinyanjui in regard to her attendance at the hearing with those of Social Work England and the public interest in an expeditious disposal of this hearing, the panel determined to proceed in Ms Kinyanjui’s absence.
12. The panel noted all the documentation presented in support of the early final order review hearing including the final review bundle of 198 pages and a service and supplementary bundle of 28 pages.

Review of the current order:

13. This early final order review hearing is taking place under Paragraph 15(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England’s Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).
14. Under paragraphs 15(2)(a) to (f), the regulator may review a final order early 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, and may:
 - Confirm the order;
 - Extend, or further extend, the period for which the order has effect, provided that the extended period does not exceed in the case of conditions of practice order, three years;
 - Reduce the period for which the order has effect;

- Substitute any order which the adjudicators or the case examiners could have made on the date on which they made the order;
- Revoke the order, and in the case of a suspension order may make the revocation subject to the social worker satisfying such requirements as to additional education or training and experience as apply to them;
- Revoke or vary any condition imposed by the order.

15. The decision on a review under sub-paragraph (2) takes effect from the date on which the regulator completes the review notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.

16. The legal adviser highlighted that the meaning of ‘new evidence’ is not defined in the rules and regulations but Social Work England’s ‘Early Review Guidance’ does explore the meaning of the term stating that new evidence:

- “Must raise a realistic prospect that the order originally imposed is no longer appropriate or proportionate to address those concerns. It must be genuinely new evidence, which was not and could not have been made available to the decision makers when they imposed the order;”
- “New evidence almost certainly will be about events which have happened since the order was imposed;” and that
- “The new evidence must be verifiable.”

17. The purpose of this early review is to review the current order in light of the new information, which is due to expire at the end of 4 November 2027. The order subject to review is a conditions of practice order, the conditions of which 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.
 - 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. You must work with your workplace supervisor to formulate a Personal Development Plan (PDP), specifically designed to address the shortfalls in the following areas of your practice:
 - a) Honesty and integrity in recording and sign-off, including avoiding copying/pasting and ensuring independent, informed decision-making.
 - b) Accuracy, clarity and timeliness of assessment records, with a clear audit trail showing how decisions are reached.
 - c) Application of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 and DoLS legal/ethical frameworks (including the BIA role boundaries and safeguards).
 - d) Ensuring the service user's voice, wishes, feelings and rights are accurately obtained, considered and represented.
 - e) Risk assessment, analysis and professional judgement, including appropriate use of supervision and escalation.
 - f) Workload management, prioritisation and quality-assurance checks prior to submission/sign-off.

The PDP must be formulated within 6 weeks of these conditions taking effect, and thereafter updated as required. An updated PDP must be prepared and shared with your supervisor no later than 2 weeks prior to any review.

10. You must provide a copy of your PDP to Social Work England within 6 weeks from the date these conditions take effect, and an updated copy at least 2 weeks prior to any review. The PDP must be:
 - Accurate and reflective of your current circumstances, role and caseload;
 - Demonstrate how you will make independent and informed decisions, including the steps you will take to ensure the accuracy and integrity of your assessments and records.
11. a. At any time you are employed, or providing social work services that require registration with Social Work England, you must place yourself and remain under close 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.

b. You must not start or continue to work in a role requiring registration until these supervision arrangements have been approved in writing by Social Work England.
12. You must provide supervisor reports to Social Work England every 6 months and at least 14 days prior to any review. Reports must comment on your caseload, adherence to these conditions, progress against the PDP, the quality/accuracy of your assessments and records, your use of supervision, and any identified concerns or incidents.
13. You must not supervise the work of any other social worker or student social worker.
14. You must not be responsible for the work of any other social worker or student social worker (including line-management or sign-off responsibility).
15. You must not carry out Best Interests Assessor (BIA) assessments under DoLS and you must not present yourself as a BIA or sign off any BIA/DoLS assessment.
16. a. You must carry out an audit of your assessments and related case records completed under, or engaging, the Mental Capacity Act 2005. Each audit must review a minimum of five complete cases (or all cases if fewer than five in the period) and must evaluate: (i) accuracy and integrity of recording; (ii) the presence and quality of analysis and decision-making; (iii) how the service user's voice, wishes and rights have been obtained and represented; and (iv) legal/ethical compliance. The audit must be signed by your work place supervisor.

b. You must provide a copy of this audit to Social Work England every 6 months and at least 14 days prior to any review or, alternatively, confirm that there have been no such cases.

17. You must read Social Work England’s Professional Standards (July 2019) and provide a written reflective account within 6 months of these conditions taking effect. Your reflection must focus on how your conduct in this case fell below the accepted standards of a social worker and what you should have done differently, addressing in particular:
- Dishonest recording and signing-off assessments that contained information you knew (or ought to have known) was inaccurate.
 - Copying/pasting without verification and failure to undertake independent checks.
 - Failure to ensure the service user’s voice and rights were properly represented.
 - Deficits in applying MCA/DoLS legal and ethical frameworks and in evidencing decision-making.
 - Over-reliance on others to identify/correct errors rather than exercising personal accountability.
- Your reflection must explicitly reference relevant Professional Standards, including **1.7, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.11, 5.2 and 5.3**, and set out concrete changes you have made to prevent repetition.

18. 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 17, 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 7 days from the date these conditions take effect.

19. You must permit Social Work England to disclose the above conditions, 1 to 17, to any person requesting information about your registration status.

The allegations found proved which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

18. While registered as a social worker:

1. *Between 1 August and 31 December 2022, you produced inaccurate assessments in that you:*
 - a. *On 10 October 2022 you completed a Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Form 3 for Service User A and recorded one or more of the following statements, despite Service User A's mother having died on 27 January 2022:*
 - i. *Listed Service User A's mother as one of the people you had met and consulted with*
 - ii. *Recommended Service User A's mother as being the recommended representative for Service User A*
 - iii. *You wrote words "her mother in particular is very involved in (A's) assessment and understands (A's) past and what mattered to her then"*
 - iv. *You wrote that Service User A's mother "understands that she needs to monitor if her daughter makes any objections to her"*
 - v. *You wrote "the restrictions placed on [Service User] A by her care plan enable her to remain safe" and so not appear to be having "any sort of negative or adverse effect" and "this view is echoed by (A's) mother";*
 - vi. *Recorded one of the benefits for Service User A is that "it is easy for her mother to visit and for (A) to visit her mother"*
 - b. *In one or more of the cases in Schedule A for which you completed a DoLs Form 3, you copied and pasted from other documentation, which resulted in your DoLs Form 3s being inaccurate in that they were:*
 - i. *Copied from previous DoLs assessments which were carried out by a previous social worker / author; and/or*
 - ii. *Copied from previous DoLs assessments regarding a different service user; and/or*

iii. *Did not include reference to updated relevant medical and/or legal information.*

2. *Your actions in paragraph 1 (in whole or in part) were dishonest in that you recorded information that you knew was not correct.*

3. *Between 1 August and 31 December 2022, your Deprivation of Liberty Assessments as listed in Schedule B were of poor quality.*

The matters outlined in paragraphs 1-3 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

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

The final hearing panel on 07 October 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

19. “In considering the personal component the Panel accepted that aspects of the misconduct are, in principle, remediable and noted steps Ms Kinyanjui has taken since the events: completion of relevant courses, production of reflective pieces, and the provision of employer and colleague references. Those are forms of remediation and testimonials that decision-makers may take into account when assessing current risk. However, the guidance emphasises that insight and remediation must be sufficiently developed and demonstrated in practice to reduce the risk of repetition; decision-makers should assess their quality, not just their existence.
20. The Panel found Ms Kinyanjui’s insight remains limited. Her reflections did not adequately engage with the core failings identified at fact-finding: that she knowingly copied and pasted and submitted inaccurate assessments across a significant number of cases, and that this created obvious risks to people’s liberty and to the accuracy of statutory records. The Panel was particularly concerned that her reflective materials did not sufficiently address the absence of the service-user’s voice, the gravity of the BIA role, or the practical and ethical consequences for service users and their families of inaccurate records in DoLS decision-making. The guidance cautions that decision-makers should look for objective evidence of genuine understanding of what went wrong, why it was wrong, and how similar failings will be prevented; simple assertions or remorse that is focused on the social worker rather than on those affected carry limited weight.
21. The Panel also considered remediation and application in practice. Although courses had been undertaken, there was no objective, anonymised case-based evidence showing how learning has been embedded into contemporaneous assessments to ensure accuracy, service-user voice, and lawful DoLS analysis. Testimonials referenced continued oversight and “second checks” by supervisors, which suggested

ongoing reliance on external monitoring rather than robust personal assurance, and therefore did not persuasively demonstrate that the risk has been internalised and controlled by Ms Kinyanjui herself. The guidance recognises testimonials as potentially relevant but stresses that their weight depends on their currency, the author's knowledge of the concerns, and critically evidence that the social worker's practice now meets standards without undue support.

22. On risk of repetition, the Panel placed significant weight on: (i) the pattern and volume of inaccurate recording established at the facts stage; (ii) Ms Kinyanjui's late acceptance of the dishonesty finding and the absence of targeted reflection on dishonesty itself; and (iii) continuing dependence on supervisory cross-checks rather than demonstrable personal compliance with the standards. The guidance indicates that risk of repetition is higher where insight is incomplete and remediation has not been convincingly embedded in practice.
23. The Panel did consider the personal circumstances, including references to health and stressors around the time of the misconduct. However, in the absence of probative medical evidence linking those issues to the specific dishonest conduct and explaining how the risk has been addressed, these factors did not materially reduce current risk. The guidance recognises that context can be relevant, but it remains necessary to be satisfied that the causes have been understood and that the risk has been controlled by the social worker.
24. Taking these matters together, the Panel could not be confident that Ms Kinyanjui would practise safely without restriction at this time. The personal component of current impairment is therefore established.
25. The Panel considered whether a finding of impairment is required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards. The guidance explains that even where personal risk may be low, public impairment may still be required in cases that seriously undermine trust or standards, and it identifies dishonesty and falsification of records as examples. Here, the misconduct involved systematic false recording across numerous statutory assessments, each personally signed and dated, within a legal process that can authorise a person's deprivation of liberty. Such conduct strikes at the heart of professional integrity, record-keeping, and lawful safeguarding of rights, and would be regarded by a reasonable, well-informed member of the public as profoundly concerning.
26. The panel also considered the wider impact beyond individual service users to their families and representatives, and to partner agencies that rely on the accuracy and honesty of BIA assessments. In the panel's judgement, failing to mark this behaviour as currently impairing would undermine public confidence and send the wrong signal about the standards expected of social workers particularly those entrusted with the BIA function. The guidance underscores that maintaining confidence and proper standards may necessitate a finding of public impairment, especially where dishonesty is involved.

27. For the reasons above, the panel finds that Ms Kinyanjui's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal and the public components: personally, because insight and remediation are insufficiently developed and there remains a material risk of repetition; and publicly, because the established dishonesty and sustained inaccuracy in DoLS assessments require a clear regulatory response to uphold confidence and standards in the profession."

The final hearing panel on 07 October 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

28. "The Panel next considered whether a Conditions of Practice Order would be a sufficient and proportionate response. Conditions may be appropriate where the concerns identified are capable of being remedied, and where the social worker is willing and able to comply. The panel concluded this is the least restrictive sanction sufficient to protect the public and meet the wider public interest. The panel recognised that conditions are generally most apt where (i) the deficiencies are remediable, (ii) there is some insight, (iii) appropriate, proportionate and workable conditions can be crafted and monitored, and (iv) public protection can be achieved in restricted practice. Those criteria are satisfied in this case. The misconduct was serious and repeated, and included dishonest recording; however, it occurred within a specific context, is capable of remediation, and there is objective evidence of meaningful albeit incomplete remediation and developing insight. The panel also noted recent compliance with interim restrictions and positive supervisory engagement, which supports the conclusion that conditions will be effective and enforceable.
29. In selecting conditions rather than suspension, the panel placed weight on robust, targeted conditions (for example, enhanced supervision and audit of assessments/records; restrictions around undertaking or signing off Best Interests/DoLS work until competence is demonstrated; completion of further training on legal/ethical frameworks and record-keeping; submission of reflective work specifically addressing dishonesty, integrity in assessments, and the impact on service users and families) that can manage the identified risks while allowing remediation to continue in a controlled environment. Conditions facilitate real-time learning and demonstrable change in safe practice; suspension would risk a period without evidence of improvement and could contribute to deskilling. A stringent, well-structured conditions regime appropriately marks the seriousness of the misconduct, addresses the risk of repetition, and upholds standards without resorting to more restrictive sanctions than are necessary.
30. The Panel determined that a period of 2 years is necessary and proportionate. This is the least restrictive sanction that adequately protects the public, maintains public confidence in the profession, and upholds proper standards while enabling remediation to be demonstrated in practice. This duration allows sufficient time to complete any further training, to embed learning, to produce high-quality reflective work focusing on honesty/integrity and on the voice and rights of service users, and to evidence

sustained safe practice through supervision reports and audit outcomes. It also enables the regulator to monitor progress and review the order before expiry. The guidance permits conditions for up to three years and emphasises that length should be long enough to complete remediation; the Panel judged two years to strike the right balance in light of the work already commenced and the further development still required.

31. For completeness the Panel considered whether a suspension order or removal is required in this case. The Panel determined that while suspension can be appropriate for serious breaches where some insight is shown, this is more relevant for cases where workable conditions cannot adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. Here, the panel concluded that stringent conditions could protect the public and better promote remediation. Suspension would not easily permit supervised practice, reflective application, or ongoing audit all of which the panel considers essential to consolidating insight (particularly around dishonest recording and the integrity of assessments) and reducing the risk of repetition. Moreover, the guidance cautions that decision makers should balance public protection with the risk of de-skilling; in this case, conditions more effectively protect the public while supporting safe, structured rehabilitation in practice.
32. Finally, the Panel considered removal from the register, recognising that removal may be appropriate in cases of persistent or concealed dishonesty and/or persistent lack of insight. However, the panel determined that removal would be disproportionate and not the minimum necessary outcome in this case. Although the misconduct was serious, repeated and included dishonest recording, the panel found that: (i) the conduct is remediable; (ii) there is some insight and substantial, but incomplete remediation; (iii) there is a realistic prospect of safe practice under robust restrictions; and (iv) public confidence and professional standards can be maintained through a stringent conditions regime. The threshold for removal is that no lesser outcome being sufficient to protect the public or uphold confidence was not met.
33. The Panel expects future reviews to be informed by: (i) supervisor/line-manager reports evidencing compliance and audited improvements in assessment quality and record-keeping; (ii) anonymised work samples demonstrating accurate, service-user-centred, legally compliant assessments; (iii) targeted CPD completion (including legal/ethical frameworks and record-keeping); and (iv) reflective statements specifically addressing dishonest recording, integrity in assessment practice, and the impact of previous failings on service users and families. Absent satisfactory progress, more restrictive outcomes may be considered at review.”

Social Work England submissions:

34. The panel noted the written submissions from Social Work England as outlined in the notice of hearing dated 12 March 2026:

35. *“The Social Worker is subject to a Final Conditions of Practice Order, which came into effect on 5 November 2025. Between 7 October 2025 and 5 November 2025 she was subject to an Interim Condition of Practice Order in the same terms.*
36. *Social Work England have called an early review of this Final Order following a new referral received on 1 December 2025 from Wolverhampton City Council. The Social Worker was employed as a Best Interests Assessor (BIA)(via Adecco) on an ad hoc basis from 1 November 2021 to 1 December 2025. Wolverhampton City Council raised concerns that the Social Worker had continued in their role as an agency BIA after conditions were imposed on their practice by Social Work England.*
37. *This referral has identified the following breaches of the Social Worker’s Conditions of Practice:*

- *Condition 1: The Social Worker did not notify Social Work England of their employment with Wolverhampton City Council and did not provide the employer’s contact details, within 7 days. The Social Worker did not notify Social Work England of registration with Adecco and did not provide the agency’s contact details, within 7 days.*
- *Condition 3a, 3b, 11a and 11b: The Social Worker did not have an approved reporter and approved workplace supervisor in place at Wolverhampton City Council. She did not work under “close” supervision.*
- *Condition 15: The Social Worker completed three form 3 assessments on 18/11/25 (BIA assessments).*
- *Condition 18: Social Work England have not received any evidence which supports that that the Social Worker had provided a written copy of their conditions of practice to Wolverhampton City Council, within 7 days. Social Work England have not received any evidence which supports that the Social Worker had provided a written copy of their conditions of practice to Adecco within 7 days.*

It is submitted that these breaches were wilful and sustained. The conditions regarding notifying Social Worker England and notifying any organisation if employed or providing social work services are very clear. It is submitted that they cannot be incorrectly interpreted to only relate to one employer or to new employers.

It is submitted that the Social Worker was fully aware of the need for a reporter and supervisor to be in place before undertaking any role requiring Social Work England registration.

The Social Worker has provided an account regarding the breach of condition 15, to the effect that the Deprivation of Liberty Form 3 assessments (BIAs) were actually, undertaken by her in September 2025, when the restrictions on acting as a BIA assessor and completing DoLs assessments was lifted. Social Work England do not accept this account and consider it to be untrue. The evidence received from Wolverhampton suggests that the Social Worker sought BIA work in November 2025, whilst the restrictions were in place.

It is submitted that the content of the three assessments undermines the validity of the Social Worker's assertion:

- *The BIA for TT states:*

"I told Mr T that he was in a care home called H L and had been there 05/09/2025 therefore, he has been there for 2 months. I asked him if this was correct- He said, "Well that it how it is down here".

This suggests the assessment took place 2 months from 5 September 2025, which would be around 5 November 2025, when the COPO was in effect.

- *The BIA for AKD, at page 7, states:*

"[A2] is independently mobile with support from her walking frame and the supervision from 1 carer [A2] has been in the current care home since 30.10.25".

There is also reference on page 9 to a Mental Health assessment on 14.11.2025.

- *The BIA for AC, at page 7: makes reference to a Mental Health Assessment in 14.11.2025. Within the assessment it states:*

"[A] has the diagnosis of Dementia. She has been in the current placement since 15/10/2025"

These entries all support that the Social Worker completed the assessments in November 2025. In any event, the wording of condition 15 not only prohibits the carrying out of BiA, but also precludes the Social Worker from presenting herself as a BIA, or signing off any BIA or DoLs assessment.

".. you must not present yourself as a BIA or sign off any BIA/DoLS assessment".

All three BIA forms were signed off by the Social Worker on 18 November 2025, and within the form at page 1, she states her profession as “Best Interests Assessor”.

Social Work England submit that the Social Worker has blatantly worked in contravention of the conditions of practice, that she was fully aware were in place at the time. When the breach of her conditions was brought to the attention of the regulator, she has sought to further mislead them.

It is submitted that the conduct alleged undermines any assertion of insight into the previous dishonest conduct, or that the Social Worker is willing or able to remediate that conduct, or to work in accordance with the conditions put in place by the regulator to protect the public. As a result, Social Work England invite the Panel to find that her fitness to practise remains impaired and to impose a Removal Order.”

38. Mr Carey supplemented Social Work England’s written submissions with the following oral submissions:

- Mr Carey stated that Social Work England have called an early review in this case as it is considered that the final order of conditions of practice is no longer workable or sufficient to protect the public. Mr Carey informed the panel that new information had come to light that is relevant to the order, namely that Ms Kinyanjui has breached the conditions of the order as outlined in the above.
- Mr Carey submitted the breaches were not only serious but occurred almost immediately after the order was imposed. Mr Carey stated that these were not technical or accidental breaches, but blatant and deliberate and amount to possible further examples of dishonesty and if not, they can ‘at least be characterised as behaviour in the same vein as the attitudinal problem of dishonesty identified at the final hearing’.
- Mr Carey submitted that the panel at the final hearing had imposed the conditions of practice order having found that the social worker had demonstrated some insight and a willingness to comply with conditions, despite Social Work England’s submissions that a removal order was proportionate and appropriate given the findings regarding the dishonesty. Mr Carey stated that by breaching these conditions Ms Kinyanjui has shown a lack of transparency and willingness to engage constructively. Mr Carey further submitted that these are not conditions of practice that have partly succeeded or in need of tightening but essentially there was immediate noncompliance and the trust between Ms Kinyanjui and the regulator has been broken.
- Mr Carey invited the reviewing panel to revoke the existing conditions of practice order and replace it with a removal order. Mr Carey submitted that the Ms

Kinyanjui's fitness to practise remains impaired given her current lack of insight and remorse, her current and future lack of willingness to comply with conditions and/or to remediate. In conclusion Mr Carey submitted that only a removal order would be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest in this case.

Social worker submissions:

39. The panel had sight of an email from Ms Kinyanjui to Social Work England dated 21 January 2026, responding to the new information alleging she has breached the conditions of practice. Ms Kinyanjui *"in September 2025 I was allocated 3 assessments by Wolverhampton council which I assessed and wrote up their drafts. However, as I was busy and focused in [sic] my final hearing, which was coming up in October 2025, I did not manage to finalise and send them until 18 November 2025. I did not complete further assessments after this date as I had been informed at the hearing that the condition preventing me from completing BIAs had been reinstated in my full order. I did not declare working with Adecco to Social Work England as I knew I was no longer going to work with Adecco following reinstatement of the restrictions."*
40. The panel considered the contents of Ms Kinyanjui's emails dated 30 March, 31 March and the 7 April 2026 where she categorically stated her intention to no longer engage with Social Work England nor attend the review hearing.
41. The panel noted that Ms Kinyanjui stated in her email correspondence that she had had a lot of time to reflect, wanted to move forward with this case and did not want to go through with the process anymore. In her email Ms Kinyanjui apologised for her mistakes and errors that she had made stating that she never intended to put the service users and the families in any situation. Furthermore, that she believed that this process had not totally gone to waste because she felt she had learnt from it and that she was a better practitioner today. In conclusion Ms Kinyanjui expressed that she is no longer practicing as a social worker nor is interested in applying to become one in the future and therefore, will not be submitting any documents for this review. Ms Kinyanjui stated that she had shared her decision with her representative and her manager.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

42. 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 previous decision of the final hearing panel. However, the panel 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'.
43. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it and the submissions made by Social Work England. They also considered all the email correspondence from Ms Kinyanjui.

44. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser which it incorporated into the decision set out below.
45. The panel reminded itself of its powers under Paragraph 15 of schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Worker Regulations 2018.
46. The panel also reminded itself of the importance of a review hearing, and it followed the sequence of decision making set out by Blake J in *Abrahaem v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 183*:
- Address whether the fitness to practise is impaired before considering the appropriate sanction.
 - Whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction.
 - In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision, or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments.
47. The panel had regard to the over arching objective of Social Work England of protecting the public which involves the pursuit of the following objectives:
- To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and wellbeing of the public.
 - To promote and maintain public confidence in the profession.
 - To promote and maintain proper professional standards of conduct for members of the profession.
48. The panel first considered whether Ms Kinyanjui's fitness to practice remains impaired. It kept in mind that there had been a finding of impairment on the 07 October 2025 on the grounds of misconduct and considered whether Ms Kinyanjui had demonstrated that she had taken sufficient steps to allay the concerns of the previous panel.
49. The panel carefully considered all the information relating to the concerns raised by Wolverhampton City council in relation to breaches of conditions 1, 3a, 3b, 11a, 11b, 15 and 18. The panel noted that Ms Kinyanjui had partially accepted that she had not informed Wolverhampton council or the agency that she was subject to a conditions of practice order and that she had arranged a reporter or supervisor prior to her taking on employment. In relation to the BIA assessments and DoL's Ms Kinyanjui disputed that she undertook these assessments during the time the order was in place arguing that she has started them in September 2025 as the previous interim conditions had been relaxed. However, the panel found that on closer inspection of these assessments, there is information contained within them which clearly suggests that they were undertaken at a later date than claimed by her. In any event the DoLs assessment was

signed off by her on the 18 November 2025 which put her in breach of conditions which started on 5 November.

50. The panel was satisfied that the conditions that Ms Kinyanjui was subject to were straightforward and clearly outlined within the order. The panel was satisfied that Ms Kinyanjui had breached them. The panel agreed with Social Work England's submission that the breaches were deliberate.
51. The panel considered that these breaches of the conditions, clearly demonstrated that Ms Kinyanjui's insight remained limited because of the lack of compliance with the conditions and lack of respect for the regulatory process. Furthermore, the panel was concerned that when faced with the alleged breaches of her conditions, Ms Kinyanjui was not transparent in her responses to Social Work England. The panel considered that these breaches undermine any assertion of insight into previous dishonest conduct or that Ms Kinyanjui is willing or able to remediate that conduct. The current concerns arising out of the breaches of the conditions of practice order clearly shows that Ms Kinyanjui has not reflected on the misconduct found and raises further questions about her honesty. The panel therefore concluded that risk of repetition of the misconduct was high.
52. The panel also considered the contents of Ms Kinyanjui's emails from the 30 March, 31 March and the 7 April where she clearly states that she has no intention to practice as a social worker, does not wish to engage with her order and not attend the review hearing today.
53. The panel was not satisfied that Ms Kinyanjui had discharged the persuasive burden upon her that she had sufficiently addressed all of the outstanding concerns. The panel considered that all the concerns of the previous panel that led to the finding of impairment remain and have increased by the nature of the breaches of the conditions.
54. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Kinyanjui's fitness to practise remains impaired in respect of the personal component.
55. The panel also concluded that Ms Kinyanjui's fitness to practise remained impaired in respect of the public component. It determined that public confidence in the profession and in Social Work England as the regulator would be seriously undermined if a finding of impairment was not made.

Sanction:

56. Having found Ms Kinyanjui'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.
57. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Kinyanjui, 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 Ms Kinyanjui's interests with the public interest.

58. The panel considered the submissions made by Mr Carey, on behalf of Social Work England, where he invited the panel to impose a removal order. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.

Take no further action/advice/warning

59. The panel noted that none of these sanctions would restrict Ms Kinyanjui's ability to practise. As such they were not appropriate or sufficient to protect the public given the misconduct found at the final hearing and the serious breaches of the conditions found by this panel.

Continue, extend and/or vary the current conditions of practice order

60. The panel went on to consider continuing, extending and/or varying the conditions of practice order.

61. The panel noted that when the conditions of practise order was imposed, Ms Kinyanjui had agreed to comply with any conditions that would be imposed. She had shown some insight and was willing to engage with Social Work England. The panel considered that the conditions in place were robust and stringent however they proved to be insufficient to protect the public due to Ms Kinyanjui's almost immediate breaches.

62. Ms Kinyanjui has expressly stated that she no longer wishes to engage nor comply with the conditions of practice order. The panel have seen the emails sent to Social Work England on the 30 March, 31 March and 7 April 2026, in which Ms Kinyanjui expresses her frustration and intention to stop engaging with Social Work England. Furthermore, the recent concerns clearly demonstrate that Ms Kinyanjui is unable or unwilling to remediate. The panel concluded that the serious breaches of the conditions of practice now make any further conditions unworkable as Ms Kinyanjui can no longer be relied on to comply with any further conditions.

Suspension Order

63. The panel next considered a suspension order.

64. The panel carefully considered the guidance on when a suspension order may be appropriate noting particularly at paragraph 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'

The panel determined Ms Kinyanjui has not developed her insight or demonstrated any remediation or willingness to resolve her failings. The panel also took into account the serious breaches of the conditions found, the original serious misconduct found, Ms Kinyanjui's unwillingness to further engage with Social Work England. The panel therefore concluded that any period of suspension would be insufficient to meet the seriousness of the original misconduct and the serious breaches found today.

Removal Order

65. The panel was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Ms Kinyanjui's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of one or more grounds as set out in regulation 25(2)(a), (c), (d), (f) or (g), namely misconduct.
66. The panel considered the following features from the sanctions guidance which may indicate that a removal order is appropriate are engaged:
- dishonesty;
 - persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of their actions or consequences;
 - 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).
67. 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. However, the panel concluded that the findings of repeated misconduct including the deliberate and immediate breaches of the conditions and Ms Kinyanjui's lack of further insight, remediation or remorse, were incompatible with Ms Kinyanjui remaining on the register.
68. The panel therefore impose a removal order with immediate effect.

Right of appeal

69. 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:
- 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,
 - the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.

70. 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.
71. Under Paragraph 15(2A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the decision of a review under sub-paragraph (2) takes effect from the date on which the regulator completes the review notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.
72. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

The Professional Standards Authority

73. 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>.