

Social worker: Kolbrun
Arnadottir

Registration number: SW103264

Fitness to Practise

Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 1 June to 4 June 2026 and 3 August 2026

Hearing venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome: Fitness to practise impaired, warning order (1 year)

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is a hearing held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the regulations”).
2. Ms Arnadottir attended and was not represented on the initial hearing dates (1 June to 4 June 2026) and did not attend nor was represented on the resuming hearing date (3 August 2026).
3. Social Work England was represented by Ms Fatania 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
Fiona Abbott	Chair
Stella Elliott	Social worker adjudicator
Lee Longden	Lay adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Molly-Rose Brown	Hearings officer
Asma Ansar/Raegan Kirkland	Hearings support officer
Natasha Shotunde/Zill-e Huma	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. No issues were taken with service of the notice of hearing.

Preliminary matters:

6. The panel considered whether to hold part of the hearing in private, due to matters concerning the health of Ms Arnadottir and matters concerning her private life and that of her family.
7. The panel were directed to Rule 38 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) (“the Rules”), by the legal adviser, which include that a hearing, or part of a hearing, shall be heard in private where the proceedings are considering the physical or mental health of the social worker, and that the adjudicators may determine to hold part of all of proceedings in private where they consider that to do so would be appropriate having regard to the vulnerability, interests or welfare of any participant in the proceedings.
8. No objections were made on behalf of Social Work England in regards to holding the hearing partly in private however, it was submitted by Ms Fatania that the overall facts do not meet the test that the entirety of the proceedings need to be held in private.
9. The panel determined that, in the interests of Ms Arnadottir’s private and family life, the hearing shall be heard partly in private when dealing with matters concerning Ms Arnadottir’s health and matters concerning her private life and that of her family.

Allegations:

10. The allegations arising out of the regulatory concerns referred by the case examiners on 23 August 2022 are:

Whilst registered as a social worker:

1. *On 30 October 2020, you were convicted at Guernsey Magistrate's Court of offences with the following particulars:*
 - a. *On 29 March 2020 did permit [Person 1] to use motor vehicle 64286, on a road, namely Vale Road, St Sampson, such vehicle not being covered by Third-Party Insurance in relation to the use of the said vehicle by him, contrary to Article 2(1) of The Road Traffic (Compulsory Third-Party Insurance) (Guernsey) Law, 1936 as amended; and*
 - b. *Further that you, on 29 March 2020 at Vale Road, St Sampson did drive motor vehicle registration number 64286 on a public highway whilst not being the holder of a driving licence issued under the provisions of The Motor Taxation and Licensing (Guernsey) Law, 1987, as amended or a permit to drive motor vehicles for the time being in force granted by a competent Authority under and by virtue of an enactment relating to the International Circulation of Motor Vehicles authorising you so to do: contrary to Section 5(l) and punishable by virtue of Section 22 of the said Law.*
2. *On 18 March 2021 you were convicted at Guernsey Magistrate's Court of offences with the following particulars:*
 - a. *On 6 January 2021 at the Rohais, St Peter Port whilst subject of an Order of Court made on 30 October 2020 disqualifying you for a period of 12 months from holding or obtaining a driving licence authorising you to drive motor vehicles of any category did drive motor vehicle 28980 on a public highway, such vehicle falling within category B and subject to the said disqualification; contrary to Section 10(b) of The Motor Taxation and Licensing (Guernsey) Law, 1987, as amended and punishable by virtue of Section 22 of the said Law; and*
 - b. *Further that you, on 6 January 2021 did use motor vehicle number registration number 28980 on a road namely the Rohais, St Peter Port such vehicle not being covered by Third Party Insurance in relation to the use by you of the said vehicle; contrary to Article 2(1) of The Road Traffic (Compulsory Third Party Insurance) (Guernsey) Law, 1936 as amended.*

The matters outlined in paragraphs (1) and (2) amount to the statutory ground of a conviction for an offence which, if committed in England and Wales, would constitute a criminal offence.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of a conviction for an offence which, if committed in England and Wales, would constitute a criminal offence.

Admissions:

11. The panel were provided with a statement of agreed facts prior to the final hearing. This statement of agreed facts was signed by Ms Arnadottir and included that the facts of the conviction were admitted and that grounds and impairment were a matter of judgment for the panel.
12. The panel were reminded by the legal adviser of its power to regulate its own procedures in Rule 32(a).
13. The panel were reminded by the legal adviser that Rule 32 of the Rules, which includes:
 32. (a) Subject to Rule 32(c), the adjudicators or the regulator may regulate their own procedures and must conduct the hearing or meeting in the manner they consider or it considers fair.
 - (c) The adjudicators or regulator must apply the following procedures:
 - (i) (aa) Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved;
 - (a) The adjudicators or regulator must then determine any disputed facts;
 - (b) The adjudicators or regulator must then determine whether the registered social worker's fitness to practise is impaired on the basis of facts admitted and found proved;
14. Following the reading of the allegations the panel chair asked Ms Arnadottir whether she admits any of the allegations and whether she admits that their fitness to practise is currently impaired.
15. Ms Arnadottir informed the panel that she admitted Allegations 1(a)-(b) and Allegations 2(a)-(b). She did not admit that her fitness to practise is currently impaired.
16. The panel therefore found Allegations 1(a)-(b) and 2(a)-(b) proved by way of Ms Arnadottir's admissions.

Summary of evidence:

Background

17. Ms Arnadottir's date of registration with Social Work England is 16 September 2020 and the allegations stem from an incident that took place on 29 March 2020 but for which she was convicted of a criminal offence after the date of registration.

18. On 29 March 2020, Ms Arnadottir was working and residing in Guernsey. She worked in a social work role for the local authority. As part of her employment, she had the use of a vehicle owned by the local authority that she was authorised to use. On that day, police officers stopped that vehicle in which the social worker was a passenger due to the manner of the driving. It transpired that Person 1 was driving the vehicle. Person 1 was charged with road traffic offences as he did not have the correct insurance and there were no 'L' plates displayed to show he was a learner driver.
19. The police also found that the social worker had an Icelandic driving licence, which she should have exchanged for a Guernsey driving licence within one year but had not done so. Ms Arnadottir was charged with the relevant road traffic offences. She was convicted of permitting Person 1 to drive the motor vehicle and driving without a licence approved by the Guernsey authorities (Allegation 1 (a)-(b)).
20. On 6 January 2021, another road traffic incident occurred with the social worker. At this time, the social worker was still subject to the 12 month driving disqualification and as such, could not legally drive. On that day, the social worker was observed driving a vehicle to work by her manager who was aware of the driving disqualification. The manager reported the matter to the police. The social worker was arrested and charged later that day.
21. The social worker pleaded guilty at Guernsey Magistrate's Court on 18 March 2021 and was convicted of driving whilst disqualified and use of a vehicle without third-party insurance. She received a 3 year driving ban and two month's imprisonment suspended for 18 months for driving whilst disqualified. For the conviction which related to not having the appropriate insurance, the social worker received a sentence of one month's imprisonment suspended for 18 months.
22. The social worker self-referred to Social Work England on 30 April 2021. At the time, the social worker was a Deputy Manager at Guernsey Children and Family Community Services ('GCFCS'). The social worker resigned from GCFCS, but she still attended the disciplinary hearing on 16 April 2021.
23. Written evidence from Social Work England included the following:
 - Matthew Jones (Former Director of Operations, Health and Social Care, Guernsey)
 - Anthony Fairclough (Associate Solicitor Capsticks – Production Statement)
 - Mark Foster (Lead Investigator, Social Work England – Production Statement)
24. A summary of Mr Jones' written evidence included the following:

- a. He spoke positively of how the social worker presented during the disciplinary hearing.
- b. He stated he ‘saw a broader picture of the social worker and had a certain degree of respect for her as she maintained her professional competencies at work despite the criminal concerns against her’.
- c. He described Ms Arnadottir as being ‘honest.’
- d. He sympathised with her because ‘her professional feedback was extremely positive, which was really respected and appreciated’. Ms Arnadottir was considered to have provided good quality care work and brought value to her service users.
- e. He outlined that Ms Arnadottir’s ‘Competence as a professional and the circumstances that led to the hearing were two separate matters on this case from our perspective’.
- f. He acknowledged that Ms Arnadottir had accepted the driving incidents should not have occurred and that she appeared honest about the reasoning.
- g. He stated that Ms Arnadottir provided ‘a considerable amount of mitigation, which was objective, tangible and counted. She said that she should not have done it and knew that it was wrong. She was honest about it all. This demonstrated integrity and remorse...’.

25. Ms Arnadottir provided written evidence in the social worker response bundle, totalling 95 pages. Ms Arnadottir provided a reflective piece during the final hearing, totalling 4 pages. Ms Arnadottir also provided oral evidence in respect of the grounds and impairment. A summary of her written and oral evidence is below:

- a. She took full responsibility during both the internal investigation and these proceedings. She stated that she really regretted what had happened and that her conduct fell short of a social worker, professional and [PRIVATE].
- b. She had moved from London to Guernsey with her three children [PRIVATE].
- c. She had only been qualified for two years. She had been offered a deputy practice manager job that she was “*probably not ready for*”. She stated that she was “*quite naïve, quite gullible*”.
- d. She had immense work demands at the time, including a shortage of staff due to Covid-19 and staff shielding. She and her colleagues had been subjected to threats to kill and harassment by a service user. The support received from her employer was inadequate.
- e. She stated that the incident in Allegation 1 was in the context of having just gone into lockdown due to Covid-19 and there was “*so much going on*”. She admitted that she should have handled things very differently and could only

apologise for that. She stated that going to court and updating Social Work England was not something she had at the forefront of her mind. She was functioning in “*fight or flight mode*”.

- f. She stated she was “*truly sorry... as well as deeply embarrassed.*” She also expressed regret at not informing her supervisor of the matter immediately.
- g. [PRIVATE].
- h. [PRIVATE].
- i. [PRIVATE].
- j. She added that she knew “*full well that I should have changed my driving license[sic.] over ages ago and really there is no good reason why I haven’t done this.*”.
- k. Regarding Allegation 2, on the day of the incident, she stated that she had several statutory reports due, partly due to staff shortages. She also had a number of supervisions to undertake that she did not feel could be postponed due to the staff needing support. She went to work by bus but needed to return home due to a family emergency.
- l. [PRIVATE]
- m. She stated that she took [PRIVATE] car keys and drove back to the office due to the pressures of work. She stated that her manager could have handled things differently, and instead of calling the police, she could have handed herself in. Instead, she was arrested by officers who arrived with two police vans.
- n. She raised poor treatment at work, including racism.
- o. Ms Arnadottir stated that she is currently undertaking frontline social work without managerial responsibilities. She has been training and updating herself on her skills.
- p. [PRIVATE]
- q. [PRIVATE].
- r. [PRIVATE].
- s. [PRIVATE].
- t. [PRIVATE].
- u. [PRIVATE].
- v. [PRIVATE].
- w. [PRIVATE].

- x. [PRIVATE].
- y. [PRIVATE].
- z. [PRIVATE].
- aa. [PRIVATE].

- 26. Further information was provided about case examiner's decision by Ms Arnadottir, including in an email on 3 June 2026 at 12.47pm during panel deliberations. Social Work England were neutral on whether this information should be admitted, noting that it was not normally presented to the panel.
- 27. The panel was provided with legal advice regarding the panel's power to admit evidence where they consider it fair to do so under Rule 32(b)(vii) and that, following admission, it was for the panel to determine what weight, if any, to attach to it. The panel were also reminded that Ms Arnadottir is unrepresented and that, if the panel felt that the information was irrelevant to their decision, they, as a professional panel, will be able to disregard it in their decision making.
- 28. The panel decided to admit the evidence. That evidence included that the case examiners decided that it was not in the public interest to refer the matter to adjudicators, that they would agree to dispose of the case without a need for a hearing and that they offered Ms Arnadottir a 3 year warning which she did not accept as she felt that due process was not followed.

Submissions on grounds and impairment

- 29. Ms Fatania made submissions on the statutory ground and impairment. In relation to Allegation 1, she submitted that, although the incident occurred prior to Ms Arnadottir's registration, she was convicted and sentenced after she was registered. She submitted that it was in the public interest for such matters to be considered grounds for the purposes of Regulation 25(2) of the Social Worker Regulations 2018 because the conduct would undermine public confidence in the profession and Ms Arnadottir was convicted of all alleged offences after she was registered.
- 30. Ms Fatania submitted that Ms Arnadottir's conduct breached the following Social Work England Professional Standards:
 - a. As a social worker, I will not:
 - 5.2 Behave in any way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.
 - b. As a social worker, I will:
 - 6.6 Declare to the appropriate authority and Social Work England anything that might affect my ability to do my job competently or may affect my fitness to practise, or if I am subject to criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is made against me anywhere in the world.

31. Ms Arnadottir accepted that the statutory ground had been met and accepted that she had breached the above Social Work England Professional Standards.
32. On impairment, Ms Fatania submitted that this was a matter of judgment for the panel, but that Social Work England conceded that Ms Arnadottir's fitness to practise may not be impaired on personal grounds. Social Work England acknowledged that Ms Arnadottir had accepted her guilt and had engaged with all proceedings. She demonstrated a commitment to the profession, her health and how she would cope better moving forward. Social Work England acknowledged that it was an isolated period in Ms Arnadottir's life. Social Work England also acknowledged that Ms Arnadottir had provided positive references and had undertaken CPD. She submitted that there was a reduced risk of repetition.
33. Social Work England relied on public impairment. Ms Fatania submitted that Ms Arnadottir's convictions demonstrated a significant lapse of judgment and that the offending was so serious that it resulted in a custodial sentence, albeit not immediate. She also noted that Ms Arnadottir could see why public confidence would be undermined by her actions and the allegations she had admitted.
34. Ms Arnadottir submitted that she accepted that she did not uphold professional standards and broke the law. She submitted that she accepted full responsibility for it and has served her sentence. She submitted that the Probation Report completed in Guernsey in February 2021 concluded that she was at a very low risk of reoffending. She highlighted that this was a month after her conviction. She acknowledged she should have reported what happened to Social Work England when it happened. She stated that she had several matters going on including court hearings, lockdown and the internal investigation by the local authority. She stated that, as soon as the internal investigation process was concluded, she self-referred to the process. She submitted that almost 5 and a half years have passed since the convictions and that she has continued to practise in social work without any issues with her public and private conduct.
35. [PRIVATE]

Legal Advice

36. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser, which included that grounds and impairment were a matter of the panel's professional judgment. The panel were advised to consider Social Work England's Professional Standards carefully, and that the panel was not tied to the Professional Standards that Social Work England had submitted had been breached.
37. On impairment, the panel were reminded of *Meadow v GMC [2007] EWCA Civ 1390*, in particular, that the purpose of fitness to practise proceedings is not to punish the practitioner for past misdoings but to protect the public from acts and omissions for those who are not fit to practise. The legal adviser referred to *CHRE v Grant and NMC [2011] EWHC 927*.

38. The panel's attention was drawn to Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance', including the overarching objective to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and wellbeing of the public, public confidence in social workers in England and proper professional standards for social workers in England.
39. The panel were reminded that the question for the panel is whether the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.
40. The panel were advised on the personal and public elements of impairment. In respect of insight, the panel's attention was specifically drawn to paragraphs 31-33 of the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance', with particular reference to the fact that a person's culture or background may sometimes affect how insight is expressed.
41. The panel's attention was drawn to paragraphs 60-62 of the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
42. The panel were advised that the fact that Ms Arnadottir's convictions had appeared in the media should not be a factor in determining whether there is public impairment as that is something outside of Ms Arnadottir's control.
43. During deliberations, the panel received additional advice. The parties were provided with an opportunity to comment (either by email or in the hearing) and they had no comments. That advice included:
 - a. The panel's powers if a finding of no impairment was made (in contrast to the powers mentioned in *CHRE v Grant and NMC*).
 - b. That the panel should not place too much weight on the length of the sentence as that is not referred to in the Impairment and Sanctions Guidance. Reference to *R(Low) v General Osteopathic Council [2007] EWHC 2839* was made to remind the panel that this jurisdiction is separate from the criminal jurisdiction, and some criminal acts which would not result in custodial sentences in the criminal courts could be deemed extremely serious in this jurisdiction.

Finding and reasons on grounds:

44. For the avoidance of doubt, the panel independently considered the information provided in Social Work England's statement of case regarding the convictions in Allegations 1 and 2, including the fact that they were convictions of offences that would have been offences in England and Wales under the following legislative provisions:
 - a. Allegation 1(a) would constitute a criminal offence contrary to section 143(1)(b) and (2) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.
 - b. Allegation 1(b) would constitute a criminal offence contrary to section 87(1) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

- c. Allegation 2(a) would constitute a criminal offence in accordance with section 103(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.
- d. Allegation 2(b) would constitute a criminal offence in accordance with section 143(1)(a) and (2) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

- 45. The panel determined that the statutory ground had been met.
- 46. The panel considered the Allegations individually and collectively in the context of Social Work England's Professional Standards. The panel determined that both 5.2 and 6.6 had been breached both individually and collectively.

Finding and reasons on current impairment:

- 47. When considering the question of impairment, the panel took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance', the evidence, the submissions of the parties and the legal advice.
- 48. On the personal element, the panel determined that Ms Arnadottir was not currently impaired. It determined that her actions in Allegation 1 had constituted a risk to the public, however, the risk of repetition was extremely low and the panel were confident that she was highly unlikely to repeat her actions. This was demonstrated both by her evidence and assisted by the 2021 probation report.
- 49. The panel noted that Ms Arnadottir admitted the facts through the criminal proceedings, local investigation and these proceedings, which demonstrated her full engagement throughout the process and willingness to take accountability for her actions.
- 50. The panel noted that Ms Arnadottir had no previous history of concerns and there have been none since.
- 51. The panel acknowledged Ms Arnadottir's background and personal circumstances and how that might affect how her insight is expressed. The panel found that Ms Arnadottir had given very significant, sustained and in-depth insight. She demonstrated a real appreciation for the seriousness of what happened. The panel also noted that it had taken a considerable amount of time for the fitness to practise proceedings to get to this stage, [PRIVATE].
- 52. [PRIVATE].
- 53. The panel accepted the very difficult personal and professional circumstances that Ms Arnadottir was subjected to during the time that the offences were committed, including the death threats from a service user, her concern about a lack of support from her employers, the lack of staff and the difficulties with Covid-19. The panel were confident that, even if Ms Arnadottir were under similar pressures again, she would act differently.

54. The panel noted Ms Arnadottir's positive testimonials which provided a view that she could and had maintained social work standards in her practice.
55. The panel agreed with Ms Arnadottir's acknowledgement that, when working in Guernsey, she had too much responsibility too soon and was not coping under the weight of it all. The panel noted that Ms Arnadottir has decided not to undertake managerial responsibilities in her current role. The panel found that this also demonstrated a high degree of insight.
56. However, the panel found that Ms Arnadottir was currently impaired on the public element. The panel considered the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' carefully, including paragraphs 60-62. The panel noted that the facts behind the convictions did not meet the examples listed at paragraph 62 but also noted that it was not bound by the guidance. The panel was cognisant of the fact that the purpose of fitness to practise proceedings is not to punish the practitioner, as that was the role of the criminal courts, and that Ms Arnadottir had served her sentences.
57. Nevertheless, the panel determined that the convictions were for serious offences, in particular Allegation 2(a) which included a breach of a court order, which resulted in custodial sentences. The panel found that the offences were sufficiently serious to undermine public confidence in social workers in England.
58. The convictions took place when Ms Arnadottir was in a senior position at work where she was expected to make important decisions affecting other people's lives. She would also have had responsibility to say that she was not functioning properly during the time of the incidents. The panel found that the convictions demonstrated a severe lapse in judgement, with good judgement being fundamental to the role of social workers. She also breached professional standards on two separate occasions which would damage the public's confidence in the profession.
59. The panel also found that a finding of public impairment was necessary to uphold proper professional standards. Breaching a court order is a serious matter that is incompatible with the fundamental tenets of the social work profession. Therefore, a finding of public impairment was necessary to mark the importance of the standards and expectations of the profession, to the public, service users and colleagues.
60. Finally, the panel did not attach any weight to the case examiner's decision nor Ms Arnadottir's decision not to accept a 3 year warning.

Adjournment

61. After the panel handed down the decision on grounds and impairment, Ms Arnadottir made an application to adjourn the proceedings to enable her to reflect on the findings. Social Work England were neutral in response to the application.
62. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser regarding applications to adjourn.

63. The panel decided to adjourn the proceedings to allow Ms Arnadottir time to reflect on the findings, especially as it was late in the afternoon.

Directions

64. The final hearing will resume on 3 August 2026, time estimate one day.
65. Ms Fatania submitted that directions could be made to progress the case. Those directions were accepted by Ms Arnadottir. The panel made the following directions:
- a. If Ms Arnadottir wishes to appoint a legal representative or a McKenzie friend to accompany her at the adjourned hearing, that she provide a completed Notice of Representation Form to Social Work England by 30 June 2026.
 - b. If Ms Arnadottir wishes to provide written submissions on sanction, that she provide those to Social Work England by 20 July 2026.
66. The above directions are not intended to be restrictive towards Ms Arnadottir, in that she is not prevented from appointing a legal representative or McKenzie Friend or from providing written submissions after the dates listed above. The dates are intended to assist all parties in the preparation for the adjourned final hearing.

Reconvened final hearing:

67. The panel reconvened on Monday 3 August 2026, to resume the adjourned final hearing for the purpose of considering the appropriate sanction following its earlier findings on the statutory ground and current impairment.
68. The panel was informed that Ms Arnadottir attended the parties' meeting at 9.00am. However, she informed Ms Fatania and the legal adviser that, due to a prior court commitment, she would be unable to attend the hearing itself. Ms Arnadottir confirmed that she consented to the hearing proceeding in her absence and requested that the panel take into account her written submissions when reaching its decision.

Service and proceeding in absence:

69. On the issue of service, Ms Fatania submitted that this is an adjourned final hearing. She referred the panel to the relevant documents within the hearing bundle and acknowledged that the notice of the adjourned hearing had been served slightly short of the usual 28 day period required under the Rules.
70. However, she submitted that the position had been expressly accepted by Ms Arnadottir. She referred the panel to the email correspondence contained within the bundle, which demonstrated that Ms Arnadottir agreed to the shorter period of notice and was content to accept service on that basis. Ms Fatania further submitted that the hearing date itself had been identified and agreed at the conclusion of the previous hearing, and the subsequent email correspondence confirmed Ms Arnadottir's agreement to that arrangement.

71. Ms Fatania referred the panel to the service documentation within the bundle, including the notice of hearing sent by email, the service statement and the evidence confirming that the notice had been sent to Ms Arnadottir's registered email address in the usual manner. She submitted that, save for the shortened period of notice, service had otherwise been affected in accordance with the Rules.
72. In addition, Ms Fatania submitted that Ms Arnadottir had attended the parties' meeting on the morning of the hearing, thereby confirming that she had received the hearing documentation, was aware of the hearing and had had sufficient time to prepare. She submitted that Ms Arnadottir had confirmed that she was satisfied with the service of the notice and, in those circumstances, there could be no suggestion that she had suffered any prejudice as a result of the shorter period of notice.
73. Turning to the application to proceed in Ms Arnadottir's absence, Ms Fatania submitted that the panel would be familiar with the relevant legal principles governing applications to proceed in absence. She submitted, however, that the circumstances of the present case were somewhat unusual, as Ms Arnadottir had effectively consented to the hearing proceeding in her absence.
74. Ms Fatania reminded the panel that Ms Arnadottir had engaged throughout the regulatory proceedings, had attended the previous final hearing and had continued to engage constructively with the process. She referred the panel to Ms Arnadottir's email dated 28 July 2026 contained within the hearing bundle, in which she explained that she was due to attend a court hearing on the morning of today's hearing.
75. Ms Fatania submitted that, whilst the email may initially have suggested that Ms Arnadottir would prefer the hearing to take place during her lunch break between 1.00pm and 2.00pm, the position had subsequently been clarified during the parties' meeting held that morning. At that meeting, Ms Arnadottir confirmed that she wished the hearing to proceed at the listed time despite her absence. She explained that she wished the matter to be concluded, confirmed that she had already provided detailed written submissions for the panel's consideration and indicated that she would be available between 1.00pm and 2.00pm should the panel require her participation or wish to ask any questions.
76. Ms Fatania submitted that Ms Arnadottir had therefore taken every reasonable opportunity to engage with the proceedings. She had been aware of the case against her, had been informed at the previous hearing of Social Work England's likely submissions and had addressed those matters comprehensively within her written submissions. In those circumstances, the panel had before it all the evidence and submissions necessary to determine the case fairly.
77. Accordingly, Ms Fatania invited the panel to proceed with the hearing in Ms Arnadottir's absence.
78. She further submitted that, should the panel consider during the course of its deliberations that Ms Arnadottir's attendance became necessary, it remained open to

the panel to contact her so that she could join the hearing during the period between 1.00pm and 2.00pm, when she had confirmed that she would be available.

79. Finally, Ms Fatania submitted that, if it were practical for the panel to deliver its decision during that period, this would be of benefit to Ms Arnadottir, enabling her to hear the outcome directly. She recognised, however, that this would ultimately depend upon the length of the panel's deliberations and the practicalities of the hearing timetable.
80. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The legal adviser reminded the panel of the relevant provisions of the Social Workers Regulations 2018 and the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) relating to service, including Rules 44 and 45. The panel was advised that, although notice of the adjourned hearing had been served one day short of the usual 28 day notice period, the information before the panel was that Ms Arnadottir had confirmed receipt of the notice, was satisfied with service, had no objection to the shorter period of notice and had confirmed that she had sufficient time to prepare for the hearing. The panel was advised that it was open to it to conclude that no prejudice had arisen as a result of the short notice.
81. The panel also accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to proceeding in absence. The legal adviser referred the panel to the principles established in *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC 1, *Tait v Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons* [2003] UKPC 34 and *General Medical Council v Adeogba* [2016] EWCA Civ 162. The panel was advised that proceeding in absence is a matter of judicial discretion and that it should consider whether Ms Arnadottir's absence was voluntary, whether an adjournment would be likely to secure her attendance, and whether it would be fair and proportionate to proceed in her absence, having regard to the public interest and the interests of justice.
82. The panel considered the documentary evidence relating to service and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. It had regard to the relevant provisions of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), the Social Workers Regulations 2018 and Social Work England's guidance relating to service of notices.
83. The panel noted that this was the reconvened part of an adjourned final hearing. The hearing was listed for 3 August 2026 and the notice of hearing was sent to Ms Arnadottir on 7 July 2026. The panel recognised that the notice was therefore provided 27 calendar days before the hearing, one day shorter than the usual minimum period of 28 calendar days.
84. The panel was satisfied, however, that the notice had otherwise been served in accordance with the Rules. It took into account the Notice of Hearing, the Service Statement and the evidence demonstrating that the notice had been sent to Ms Arnadottir's registered email address held by Social Work England.
85. The panel also noted that the date of the reconvened hearing had been identified and agreed at the conclusion of the earlier hearing. Accordingly, Ms Arnadottir was already aware that the hearing would reconvene on 3 August 2026.

86. The panel further took into account that the information before it demonstrated that Ms Arnadottir had expressly accepted the shorter period of notice, had confirmed that she was satisfied with service and had raised no objection to the hearing proceeding on that basis.
87. The panel also noted that Ms Arnadottir attended the parties' meeting at 9.00am on the morning of the hearing. The panel was satisfied that this further demonstrated that she had received the hearing documentation, was fully aware of the hearing and had sufficient time to prepare.
88. The panel further noted that Ms Arnadottir had provided detailed written submissions addressing sanction. There was no evidence before the panel that the shorter period of notice had caused her any procedural disadvantage or prevented her from presenting her case fully.
89. In all the circumstances, the panel was satisfied that Ms Arnadottir had suffered no prejudice as a result of receiving one day less than the usual notice period. The panel therefore concluded that service had been properly effected.

Proceeding in the absence of Ms Arnadottir

90. The panel next considered whether it was fair and appropriate to proceed in the absence of Ms Arnadottir. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser and had regard to the relevant provisions of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), Social Work England's guidance on proceeding in the absence of a social worker and the principles derived from the relevant case law.
91. The panel reminded itself that the decision whether to proceed in absence was a matter of judicial discretion which must be exercised with great care and caution, balancing fairness to Ms Arnadottir with the public interest in the timely disposal of regulatory proceedings.
92. The panel was satisfied that Ms Arnadottir was fully aware of the hearing. She had attended the earlier part of the final hearing, knew that the matter had been adjourned for the panel to consider sanction, was aware of the reconvened hearing date and had attended the parties' meeting on the morning of this adjourned hearing.
93. The panel accepted that Ms Arnadottir had explained that she was required to attend court. The panel was satisfied that her absence was not the result of disengagement from the regulatory process or any failure to appreciate the importance of the proceedings.
94. The panel noted that, at the parties' meeting, Ms Arnadottir confirmed that she wished the hearing to proceed in her absence, requested the panel to consider her written submissions and indicated that she wished the matter to be concluded. She further confirmed that she would be available between 1.00pm and 2.00pm should the panel require any clarification or wish to hear further from her.

95. The panel approached Ms Arnadottir's consent with particular care. [PRIVATE].
96. Having considered all the circumstances, the panel was satisfied that Ms Arnadottir had voluntarily waived her right to attend the hearing.
97. The panel considered whether an adjournment would be likely to secure Ms Arnadottir's attendance. It concluded that it would not. Ms Arnadottir had not requested an adjournment. On the contrary, she had expressly requested that the hearing continue in her absence and that the panel determine the matter on the basis of her written submissions.
98. The panel recognised that there is an inherent disadvantage to a social worker in not being present during a sanction hearing. It gave careful consideration to that potential disadvantage, particularly given the importance of the issues to be determined.
99. However, the panel was satisfied that any potential disadvantage had been substantially mitigated. Ms Arnadottir had provided comprehensive written submissions addressing sanction. She had been aware, following the earlier hearing, of the submissions likely to be advanced by Social Work England and had had a full opportunity to respond to those matters in writing.
100. The panel also took into account that Ms Arnadottir had indicated that she would remain available during her lunch break should the panel require clarification on any issue arising during its deliberations. Accordingly, should the panel have considered it necessary to hear further from her, a practical mechanism remained available to facilitate her participation.
101. The panel next considered whether any useful purpose would be served by adjourning the hearing. It concluded that there was no realistic prospect that an adjournment would materially improve the fairness of the proceedings. Ms Arnadottir had not sought an adjournment, had expressly requested that the hearing proceed and had placed before the panel detailed written submissions addressing all relevant issues.
102. The panel also attached significant weight to the public interest in the timely disposal of fitness to practise proceedings. It noted that approximately 5 and a half years had elapsed since the convictions giving rise to these proceedings. The panel considered that there was a strong public interest in bringing the proceedings to a conclusion without unnecessary further delay. The panel also considered that proceeding was consistent with Ms Arnadottir's own expressed wish that the matter be concluded.
103. Having balanced all the relevant factors, the panel was satisfied that Ms Arnadottir had been afforded every reasonable opportunity to participate effectively in the proceedings, that she had voluntarily chosen not to attend the hearing itself, that any disadvantage arising from her absence had been adequately mitigated and that an adjournment would serve no useful purpose.
104. The panel therefore concluded that it was fair, proportionate and in the interests of justice to proceed with the hearing in Ms Arnadottir's absence.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

Social Work England:

105. Ms Fatania submitted that Social Work England's position was that the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case was a warning order for a period of one year.
106. She reminded the panel that, having made a finding of current impairment, it was required to consider the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness and to impose the least restrictive sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.
107. Ms Fatania submitted that, whilst it was open to the panel to take no further action following a finding of impairment, Social Work England considered that outcome would not be appropriate in this case. She submitted that the convictions were sufficiently serious that some formal regulatory response was required to mark the conduct and maintain public confidence in the profession.
108. Turning to advice, Ms Fatania acknowledged that Ms Arnadottir had invited the panel in her written submissions to consider that outcome. However, Social Work England did not consider that advice would be sufficient or proportionate. She submitted that advice is generally intended to remind a social worker of the steps that should be taken to avoid repetition of the conduct giving rise to the concerns.
109. Ms Fatania submitted that this was not a case in which further advice was required. She accepted that Ms Arnadottir had already taken significant steps to address the issues which had contributed to the offending behaviour. She further accepted that the material before the panel demonstrated that Ms Arnadottir had developed insight into her conduct and had addressed the circumstances that gave rise to the convictions. Indeed, she submitted that this was reflected in Social Work England's position at the impairment stage, where it had not invited the panel to find impairment on the personal component but had instead invited the panel to make a finding of impairment on the public component because of the seriousness of the convictions.
110. Ms Fatania therefore submitted that the appropriate sanction was a warning order. She submitted that the purpose of a warning order was to demonstrate a clear regulatory disapproval of the conduct in question whilst recognising that no restriction upon practice was required. She submitted that such an outcome was consistent with the panel's findings on impairment.
111. She further submitted that a warning order is likely to be appropriate where the fitness to practise concerns are isolated or limited, there is a low risk of repetition and the social worker has demonstrated insight. Whilst acknowledging that this case involved two convictions, Ms Fatania submitted that they arose during the same period of Ms Arnadottir's life and against the background of the personal circumstances previously described to the panel. She submitted that there had been no further convictions or regulatory concerns since that time.

112. Ms Fatania submitted that the evidence demonstrated that the risk of repetition was low and that Ms Arnadottir had demonstrated insight into the seriousness of her conduct. Those matters, she submitted, had been accepted by Social Work England throughout the proceedings and explained why it had not contended that Ms Arnadottir remained impaired on the personal component.
113. Turning to the duration of the warning order, Ms Fatania reminded the panel that the available periods were 1, 3 or 5 years. She referred the panel to the relevant provisions of Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.
114. Ms Fatania acknowledged that the convictions could not properly be described as being of relatively low seriousness. Nevertheless, she submitted that, when determining the appropriate duration of any warning, the panel was entitled to take into account the significant period that had elapsed since the offending, the absence of any repetition during that time and the positive steps already taken by Ms Arnadottir to address the issues which had contributed to her offending.
115. She submitted that, whilst the guidance indicates that a 3 year warning may be appropriate for more serious concerns, that period is intended, amongst other matters, to allow sufficient time for any ongoing risk of repetition to be addressed. In the present case, she submitted that the evidence demonstrated that those objectives had already been achieved. Ms Arnadottir had already demonstrated insight and remediation, and there had been no recurrence of similar conduct.
116. Accordingly, Ms Fatania submitted that a warning order for a period of one year appropriately balanced the seriousness of the convictions with the substantial mitigation identified by the panel. She submitted that such an order would formally mark the seriousness of the conduct, demonstrate clear regulatory disapproval and maintain public confidence in the profession, whilst also recognising the significant period that had already elapsed and the positive steps taken by Ms Arnadottir since the convictions.
117. For those reasons, Ms Fatania submitted that a 1 year warning order represented the least restrictive and proportionate sanction necessary to meet the overarching objective. She submitted that no more restrictive sanction was necessary or proportionate in the circumstances of the case.
118. In response to a question from the panel regarding whether the imposition of a warning order would amount to punishing Ms Arnadottir twice, given the criminal proceedings and the passage of time, Ms Fatania submitted that the purpose of the warning order was not punitive. Rather, its purpose was to demonstrate clear regulatory disapproval of the conduct and to mark the seriousness of the convictions in order to maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper professional standards. She submitted that, notwithstanding the time that had elapsed and the positive steps taken by Ms Arnadottir, a formal regulatory response remained necessary and that a warning order for one year achieved that objective in a proportionate manner.

Social worker:

119. The panel received and considered the following written submissions on behalf of Ms Arnadottir in relation to the appropriate sanction:

“These submissions are made on behalf of myself, Ms K. Arnadottir, regarding the appropriate sanction following the panel’s finding of current impairment on the public element only on 04/06/2026.

The panel is respectfully reminded of the established legal principle in Meadow v GMC: the purpose of fitness to practise proceedings is entirely protective and regulatory, not punitive. Under paragraphs 12–15 of Social Work England’s Impairment and Sanctions Guidance, any sanction imposed must be the minimum necessary to achieve the overarching objective: protecting the public, maintaining public confidence, and upholding proper professional standards.

A pivotal factor in the panel’s assessment must be that nearly five and a half years have elapsed since my criminal convictions. Throughout this extensive five-and-a-half-year period, I have continuously practiced frontline social work. My public and private conduct has been completely unblemished.

My professional competencies have consistently been described by former senior staff and colleagues as “extremely positive,” noting that my social work practice has brought positive outcomes and meaningful changes to vulnerable children, parents, carers, and their families. Furthermore, my former Director of Operations testified that I maintained excellent professional competencies throughout, [PRIVATE].

Suspension Order:

A suspension order is not applicable or appropriate in my case. Such an order would be purely punitive and disproportionate under the circumstances. The panel has already determined that my risk of repetition is “extremely low” and that I am “highly unlikely to repeat those actions”. Suspending a highly-skilled social worker who has successfully and safely practiced for five and a half years post-offense achieves no protective purpose for the public.

Conditions of Practice Order:

A condition of practice order is also not applicable. The purpose of conditions is to remediate practice standards that fall short, skill deficits, or a lack of knowledge. Because the panel has found no deficits in my social work practice, there are no elements of my work that require formal monitoring or remediation.

Warning Order:

If the panel considers that the public interest strictly requires a formal declaration to maintain public confidence in me as a social worker, it is noted

that a 1-year warning order was recommended by Ms Fatania, the legal representative for Social Work England.

It is submitted that a warning order limited strictly to 1 year represents the absolute maximum and upper limit of a fair, proportionate sanction. Any period longer than 1 year (such as 3 or 5 years) would entirely fail to reflect the five and a half years of excellent frontline social work practice I have delivered to date. It would be excessively harsh given the severe mitigating factors that the panel has already accepted regarding the circumstances and context of these historical offenses.

Advice:

I respectfully ask the panel to consider the option of "Advice" as the most appropriate and proportionate outcome in these circumstances.

On 04/06/2026, the panel explicitly noted that a "considerable amount of time" has passed since the criminal convictions. Moreover, the panel recognized that over these five and a half years, I have continuously practiced frontline social work without a single issue regarding my public or private conduct.

I fully accept the panel's finding of public impairment under the circumstances, reflecting "the importance of the standards," because breaching a court order is a serious matter. However, the regulatory guidance dictates that the panel must choose the minimum necessary sanction to mark this finding.

Given the panel's explicit conclusion that I present no risk to the public and no personal impairment, a non-restrictive order of advice is entirely sufficient, fair, and proportionate to maintain public faith in the social work profession.

While the historical breach of a court order is serious, the public interest does not demand harsh punishment when a social worker has already served their criminal sentence, [PRIVATE], self-funded independent training, and demonstrated "an in-depth insight".

On balance, an informed public opinion would likely be highly sympathetic. The public would likely view me as a resilient and dedicated professional who was harmed in the line of duty, [PRIVATE] that resulted in these unfortunate, historical events which I have now fully remedied.

It is also fair to assume that an informed public would deeply identify with the [PRIVATE] cause to frontline workers, as well as the universally felt impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic to all.

A formal sanction of advice successfully meets this public interest requirement. Because it appears on the public register, Social Work England officially and visibly records its disapproval of that historical lapse in my judgment. This fully upholds professional standards to the public and my colleagues, without

ignoring [PRIVATE] or punishing me twice for a matter where I have already fully served my criminal sentence.

Advice perfectly balances public accountability with true regulatory proportionality.”

Legal advice:

120. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to sanction.
121. The legal adviser reminded the panel that, when exercising its sanction powers, it must pursue the overarching objective of protecting, promoting and maintaining the health, safety and wellbeing of the public, maintaining public confidence in the social work profession and upholding proper professional standards. The panel was advised that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker but to protect the public and the wider public interest.
122. The panel was advised to have regard to Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance', together with its earlier findings on the statutory ground and current impairment. The legal adviser reminded the panel that it should identify any relevant aggravating and mitigating factors, apply the principle of proportionality, and impose the least restrictive sanction necessary to meet the overarching objective. The panel was further reminded that the consequences of a sanction for the social worker's personal circumstances should not ordinarily influence the assessment of the appropriate and proportionate sanction.
123. The legal adviser reminded the panel of the sanctions available under the Social Workers Regulations 2018, namely taking no further action, giving advice, or making a final order in the form of a warning order, conditions of practice order, suspension order or removal order. The panel was advised that it should consider each available sanction in ascending order of seriousness and give reasons for accepting or rejecting each option before determining the appropriate and proportionate outcome.
124. The panel was advised that taking no further action is likely to be appropriate only in exceptional circumstances where the finding of impairment itself is sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest. Advice and warning orders do not restrict practice and are therefore generally unsuitable where there is a current risk to the public. Conditions of practice are generally appropriate where concerns are capable of remediation and workable, measurable and proportionate conditions can be formulated. Suspension may be appropriate where the concerns are too serious for conditions but do not require removal, whereas a removal order is appropriate only where no lesser sanction would be sufficient to protect the public or maintain public confidence and proper professional standards.
125. The legal adviser further reminded the panel that, where it considered imposing a warning order, Rule 48 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) requires the panel to specify whether the warning is to remain on the register for one, three or five

years. The panel was advised that it should determine the minimum period necessary to meet the overarching objective and give clear reasons for the duration selected.

Panel decision:

126. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser and had regard to the overarching objective, namely the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the social work profession and the upholding of proper professional standards. The panel also had regard to Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance', its earlier findings on the statutory ground and current impairment, the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, and the detailed written submissions provided by Ms Arnadottir.
127. The panel reminded itself that the purpose of sanction is not to punish a social worker for past misconduct but to protect the public and the wider public interest. It further reminded itself that it was required to consider each available sanction in ascending order of seriousness and impose the least restrictive sanction necessary to meet the overarching objective.
128. The panel first identified the aggravating and mitigating factors.
129. In mitigation, the panel attached significant weight to the exceptional personal and professional circumstances which existed at the time of the offending. It accepted that Ms Arnadottir was working under sustained and exceptional pressures, both professionally and personally. The panel recalled its earlier findings regarding the significant workplace pressures she experienced, including managing responsibilities for which she had acknowledged she was not yet ready, the lack of adequate organisational support, the significant challenges arising during the Covid-19 pandemic, and the impact of serious threats made against her by a service user. The panel also took into account the [PRIVATE].
130. The panel attached substantial weight to Ms Arnadottir's conduct since the offences. It noted that approximately 5 and a half years had elapsed since the convictions. Throughout that period she had continued to practise as a frontline social worker without any further criminal offending, regulatory concerns or concerns regarding her professional practice. The panel accepted that this lengthy period of safe and unrestricted practice was a significant indicator that the offending represented an isolated episode rather than an ongoing pattern of behaviour.
131. The panel also placed considerable weight upon Ms Arnadottir's full engagement throughout both the criminal and regulatory proceedings. She admitted the offending at an early stage, engaged fully with the regulator and demonstrated genuine acceptance of responsibility.
132. The panel further found that Ms Arnadottir had demonstrated exceptional insight into the circumstances that gave rise to the offending. Since the first stage of the hearing, the panel considered that her insight had developed further. She had reflected deeply upon her actions, accepted responsibility for the decisions she made, recognised the

impact of those decisions upon public confidence in the profession and demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of maintaining appropriate professional judgement even during periods of significant personal adversity.

133. The panel also attached substantial weight to the extensive remediation undertaken by Ms Arnadottir. She had completed [PRIVATE], undertaken further professional training at her own expense, received consistently positive professional appraisals and testimonials, and demonstrated through her continued practice that she had successfully addressed the factors which contributed to the offending. The panel was particularly persuaded by the consistently positive evidence regarding her professional competence from senior colleagues and managers throughout the period following the convictions.
134. The panel further noted the absence of any previous fitness to practise history and the considerable evidence of good character placed before it.
135. Against those substantial mitigating factors, the panel identified the following aggravating features. Firstly, the case involved two criminal convictions rather than a single isolated offence. Secondly, the second conviction involved a breach of a court order, which the panel regarded as particularly serious. The panel considered that compliance with court orders lies at the heart of the rule of law. As social workers are regularly required to work within statutory frameworks and court orders affecting vulnerable service users, such offending was capable of undermining public confidence in both the profession and the regulator. The panel also considered that, at the relevant time, Ms Arnadottir failed to recognise that the pressures she was experiencing were affecting her judgement to the extent that she should have stepped back from certain responsibilities.
136. Having balanced those factors, the panel turned to consider the available sanctions in ascending order.
137. The panel first considered whether to take no further action. It reminded itself that such an outcome is likely to be appropriate only in exceptional cases where the finding of impairment alone is sufficient to satisfy the wider public interest.
138. The panel acknowledged that there were features of this case which strongly favoured such an outcome, including the extraordinary mitigation, the significant passage of time, the absence of repetition, the extensive insight and remediation, and the overwhelming evidence of safe and effective practice over many years. Nevertheless, the panel concluded that taking no further action would not sufficiently mark the seriousness of the convictions or adequately maintain public confidence in the profession, particularly given its earlier finding that Ms Arnadottir's fitness to practise remained impaired on the public component alone. Having found public impairment, the panel considered that some formal regulatory response remained necessary. It therefore concluded that taking no further action would be insufficient and disproportionate.

139. The panel next considered whether advice would be sufficient. It carefully considered the thoughtful written submissions made by Ms Arnadottir inviting the panel to impose advice. The panel accepted that advice is intended to remind a social worker of the standards expected and the steps necessary to avoid repetition.
140. However, the panel concluded that advice would not adequately reflect the seriousness of the convictions or sufficiently mark the public interest concerns identified in its impairment decision. The panel accepted that Ms Arnadottir had already undertaken the learning, reflection and remediation which advice would ordinarily seek to achieve. Whilst advice would acknowledge those matters, the panel concluded that it would not provide a sufficiently clear regulatory response to conduct which had resulted in criminal convictions, including a breach of a court order. Accordingly, the panel determined that advice would be insufficient to maintain public confidence and uphold proper professional standards.
141. The panel then considered whether to impose a warning order. It was satisfied that this case fell squarely within the circumstances identified in the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' where a warning order may be appropriate. The offending represented isolated conduct arising during a defined period of exceptional personal and professional difficulty. The panel had already found that the risk of repetition was extremely low and that Ms Arnadottir had demonstrated extensive insight and remediation. No restriction upon practice was necessary to protect the public.
142. The panel therefore concluded that a warning order appropriately balanced the seriousness of the offending with the exceptional mitigating factors present in this case. A warning order would formally mark the seriousness of the convictions, demonstrate the regulator's clear disapproval of the conduct, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper professional standards, whilst recognising that Ms Arnadottir no longer presented a current risk requiring any restriction upon her practice.
143. The panel next considered the appropriate duration of the warning order. It recognised that the convictions were serious and did not fall within the category of relatively low seriousness. However, it also reminded itself that the purpose of selecting the duration of a warning order is to identify the minimum period necessary to achieve the overarching objective.
144. The panel carefully considered whether a warning order of 1, 3 or 5 years would be appropriate. It concluded that either period would be disproportionate. The panel was satisfied that the objectives ordinarily served by a longer warning order had already been achieved. Ms Arnadottir had demonstrated considerable insight into her conduct, undertaken extensive remediation, successfully addressed the underlying causes of her offending and practised safely for approximately 5 and a half years without any further criminal, regulatory or professional concerns. The panel was therefore satisfied that the risk of repetition remained extremely low.

145. The panel concluded that a warning order for 1 year represented the minimum sanction necessary to satisfy the overarching objective. It appropriately reflected the seriousness of the convictions whilst recognising the exceptional mitigation, the prolonged period of exemplary professional practice, the extensive remediation undertaken and the absence of any continuing public protection concerns.
146. The panel considered whether a conditions of practice order would be appropriate. It concluded that it would not. The panel had identified no concerns regarding Ms Arnadottir's professional competence, clinical practice or capability that required monitoring or remediation. There were no workable, proportionate or measurable conditions capable of addressing the public interest concerns identified by the panel. Accordingly, a conditions of practice order would be inappropriate.
147. The panel next considered suspension. It concluded that such a sanction would be wholly disproportionate. Whilst the offending represented a serious breach of professional standards, the panel had found no current impairment on the personal component, had found the risk of repetition to be extremely low and had accepted the extensive evidence of insight, remediation and safe professional practice over a prolonged period. The panel was satisfied that suspension would serve no protective purpose and would amount to a disproportionate response to the remaining public interest concerns.
148. Finally, the panel considered whether a removal order was required. It concluded that removal would be entirely disproportionate. The panel was satisfied that the public, public confidence and proper professional standards could all be adequately protected by a significantly less restrictive sanction.
149. Having carefully balanced all of the evidence, the panel concluded that a warning order for a period of 1 year was the least restrictive sanction necessary to protect the wider public interest, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper professional standards. The panel was satisfied that the order appropriately reflects the seriousness of Ms Arnadottir's criminal convictions, demonstrates the regulator's clear disapproval of that conduct and serves as a clear indication that any repetition of similar conduct would be likely to result in a more restrictive regulatory sanction.
150. The panel also considered that this outcome reinforces the importance of registered social workers recognising when personal or professional pressures may adversely affect their professional judgement and of taking appropriate steps to safeguard their own wellbeing so that the high professional standards expected of the profession are consistently maintained. The panel was satisfied that Ms Arnadottir had demonstrated significant insight into those matters and had already taken substantial and meaningful steps to address them.
151. The panel therefore directs that a warning order be imposed for a period of 1 year. The warning order will remain on Ms Arnadottir's entry in the register for a period of 1 year.

Right of appeal:

152. Under Paragraph 16(1)(a) of Schedule 2 of the regulations, the social worker may appeal to the High Court against the decision of adjudicators:
- a. the decision of adjudicators:
 - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under Paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - iii. to make a final order.
 - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
153. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of the regulations an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
154. Under Regulation 9(4) of the regulations this order may not be recorded until the expiry of the period within which an appeal against the order could be made, or where an appeal against the order has been made, before the appeal is withdrawn or otherwise finally disposed of.
155. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended).

The Professional Standards Authority:

156. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a final decision made by Social Work England's panel of adjudicators can be referred by the Professional Standards Authority ("the PSA") to the High Court. The PSA can refer this decision to the High Court if it considers that the decision is not sufficient for the protection of the public. Further information about PSA appeals can be found on their website at:
- <https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work-with-regulators/decisions-about-practitioners>.