

Social worker: Panashe Makombore

Registration number: SW135140

Fitness to Practise

Final Hearing

Dates of hearing: 05 August 2026 to 11 August 2026

Hearing venue: Remote hearing

Hearing outcome:
Fitness to practise impaired, removal order

Interim order:
Interim suspension order (18 months)

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is a hearing held under Part 5 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) (“the regulations”).
2. Ms Panashe Makombore (“Ms Makombore”) did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Mr Adrian Harris (“Mr Harris”) of 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
Wendy Yeadon	Chair
Natalie Pickles	Social worker adjudicator
Margie Leong	Lay adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Andrew Brown	Hearings officer
Nazia Kauser	Hearings support officer
Dido Ofei-Kwatia	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel was informed by Mr Harris that notice of this hearing was sent to Ms Makombore by email to an address provided by the social worker (namely their registered address as it appears on the Social Work England register). Mr Harris submitted that the notice of this hearing had been duly served.
6. The panel had careful regard to the documents contained in the final hearing service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final hearing dated 01 July 2026 and addressed to Ms Makombore at her email address which she provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 01 July 2026 detailing Ms Makombore’s registered address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 01 July 2026 the writer sent by email to Ms Makombore at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
7. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
8. Having had regard to Rules 14, 15, 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), (“the rules”), and all of the evidence before it, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Makombore in accordance with the rules.

Proceeding in the absence of the social worker:

9. The panel heard the submissions of Mr Harris on behalf of Social Work England. Mr Harris, in summary, submitted that notice of this hearing had been duly served; no application for an adjournment had been made by Ms Makombore and as such there was no guarantee that adjourning today's proceedings would secure her future attendance. Mr Harris submitted that there was no good reason to delay the hearing as it can proceed fairly, and therefore invited the panel to proceed in the interests of justice and the expeditious disposal of this hearing.
10. 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's guidance 'Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker'. The panel was also reminded that in the event it decided to proceed in Ms Makombore's absence, it must discharge its duty to take reasonable steps to test the evidence on her behalf as per the case of *McDaid v NMC [2013] EWHC 586 (Admin)*.
11. The panel considered all of the information before it, together with the submissions made by Mr Harris on behalf of Social Work England. The panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore was aware of today's hearing and had requested and received the password for all documents at the case management stage on 11 May 2026, and therefore was aware of the password in order to access the documents. The panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore had not provided any reason for her absence. The panel, therefore concluded that Ms Makombore had chosen voluntarily to absent herself from these proceedings and she had not sought a postponement.
12. The panel acknowledged that proceeding in Ms Makombore's absence might cause her some disadvantage as she would not be able to put forward her version of events directly to the panel or ask questions of the Social Work England witnesses. However, the panel was satisfied that this could be overcome by it carrying out its duty in line with case of *McDaid*.
13. The panel had no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in Ms Makombore's future attendance. Having weighed the interests of Ms Makombore in regard to her non-attendance at the hearing with those of Social Work England, public protection and the public interest in an expeditious disposal of this hearing given the passage of time, the panel decided to exercise its discretion to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Makombore as this could be done ensuring fairness.

Preliminary matters:

Treating the allegations as read into the record.

14. The panel, with the agreement of Mr Harris decided that the allegations would be taken as read into the record.

Witness statements and observers

15. Mr Harris submitted that the statement of case made it clear that some witnesses were not going to be called to give live evidence as the nature of their evidence was such, that it was unlikely that it needed to be probed through questioning as the statements related to the production of documents. Mr Harris firstly sought the admission of these witness statements. He explained that Ms Makombore had been given the opportunity to respond and request witnesses to be called at the hearing, however she did not respond.
16. Upon receiving legal advice as to the nature of the evidence the witnesses attested to and if it was fair to admit the statements, the panel decided to admit the witness evidence as it was satisfied that it would be fair to do so in all the circumstances.
17. Mr Harris also asked that Ms Maggs (a paralegal at Capsticks) be permitted to observe the hearing even though she is a witness. Mr Harris submitted that her evidence was uncontroversial and that the nature of her evidence meant that she did not need to give live evidence. The panel considered her witness statement and was content that it had no questions of her, nor could it see any unfairness in allowing her to observe.

Documents

18. The panel checked and it was confirmed that the relevant following documents are under consideration:
 - Hearing timetable – 4 pages
 - Statement of case – 25 pages
 - Statements bundle – 41 pages
 - Exhibits bundle – 307 pages
 - Social worker response bundle – 20 pages
 - Service and supplementary bundle – 38 pages
19. The panel also took note that at a case management meeting (“CMM”) on 21 May 2026, the two cases FTPS-21084 and FTPS-24087 were joined, to be heard at a single final hearing.

Allegations:

20. The allegations arising out of the regulatory concerns referred by the case examiners on 6 June 2025 are;

FTPS-21084

Whilst registered as social worker:

- 1. You failed to inform your line manager at Wokingham Borough Council and/or make the required written declaration of your connection to Love.Care Limited and/or the conflict of interest that arose as a result of this connection;*
- 2. You gave false and/or misleading information to your employer about your involvement with the company Love.Care Limited;*
- 3. Your conduct at paragraphs 1 and/or 2 above was dishonest;*

FTPS-24087

- 4. You gave false and/or misleading information to New Life Fostering for the purposes of obtaining employment, in that you:*
 - a. Submitted an application form with false and/or misleading content, namely:*
 - i. Included prior work experience as a supervising social worker for an organisation known as Love Care Limited, which was untrue;*
 - ii. Included fabricated details of one or more referees;*
 - b. Failed to disclose a period of employment at Wokingham Borough Council between the approximate dates of 1 September 2020 and 10 March 2022;*
 - c. Failed to disclose a period of employment at Slough Borough Council between the approximate dates of 31 August 2022 and 28 April 2023.*
- 5. For the purposes of obtaining employment with New Life Fostering, you:*
 - a. Were involved in providing, or permitted to be provided, a fabricated Ofsted inspection report when you knew, or ought reasonably to have known, that the report was not accurate;*
 - b. Did not tell New Life Fostering the true position after that Ofsted inspection report had been provided to them, namely that the report provided was fabricated.*
- 6. Your conduct at regulatory concerns 4 and/or 5 was dishonest.*

Admissions:

21. Rule 32c(i)(aa) of the Rules states:

Where facts have been admitted by the social worker, the adjudicators or regulator shall find those facts proved.

22. The panel noted that Ms Makombore had not made any clear admissions and therefore considered all of the allegations to be in dispute.
23. In line with Rule 32c(i)(a) of the Rules, the panel then went on to determine the disputed facts.

Summary of evidence:

Social Work England

24. The panel read all the relevant documents including and not limited to the statement of case, statements bundle, exhibit bundle and Ms Makombore's social worker response bundle.
25. Mr Harris opened on behalf of Social Work England by summarising the statement of case. Oral evidence was given by the witnesses, who adopted their witness statements and (various exhibits) in chief as follows;

FTPS-21084

- Mrs Vicky Scotford ("Mrs Scotford") – Principal Social Worker at Wokingham Borough Council ('Wokingham');
- Ms Julia McMillan ("Mrs McMillan") – Quality Assurance Manager at Wokingham, formerly Senior Social Worker at the time of the concerns and managed Ms Makombore;

FTPS-24087

- Mr Gary Pickles – Independent Social Worker, formerly Responsible Individual at New Life Fostering ("New Life") and involved in recruitment of Ms Makombore for that agency;

Ms Makombore

26. Whilst Ms Makombore did not formally respond to the allegations, it was noted from her response bundle on 12 January 2023, Ms Makombore provided comments in relation to FTPS-21084 in which she wrote:
 - a. In respect of not declaring a financial interest in a company, she wrote that she was completing her ASYE role at Wokingham and '*did not have any financial gain that I have with Love.Care limited as it is not operating yet. Love.Care Limited is intended to offer personal care and care for people in the community however it is not CQC registered yet so it cannot operate now. I believe that the accusations made against me for having financial benefit is not true as there are no financial benefits coming out of this company yet*';
 - b. In respect of denying being linked to Love.Care Ltd, she wrote that this was not true, as she sent an email to her supervisor at the time stating that 'Love

Care was a family business structured to help the community and it was not operating at the time as CQC registration has not been applied for' [sic];

- c. In respect of dishonesty, she wrote that she had apologised for not declaring the company to the council but she had *'no intentions of car[ry]ing out this business without their knowledge. After the set up of the company and I we would have started operating, I would have told my manager about this' [sic].*

27. On 1 April 2025, in relation to FTPS-24087 she wrote:

- a. She denied misleading her employer regarding her employment and experience, adding that she did not believe that she had misled an employer with her work history;
- b. She was employed with love.Care Ltd [sic] in support of them opening an agency;
- c. They needed to give her a position as their supervising social worker to be able to register but their registration was unsuccessful;
- d. She did not continue because she moved away from the area;
- e. She denied sharing a fabricated Ofsted report, adding that *'when the company asked lovecare [sic] for their ofsted report I was not aware of this and when they shared this document with each other I had no idea or which document was sent. I have asked Lovecare [sic] to send me this document but they have not sent this to me till today [sic]'*;
- f. In respect of dishonesty she said *'I believe that it can be easily seen as being dishonesty and I would like to apologise but my intentions were pure'*;
- g. She denied her fitness to practise was impaired, adding that she had never worked in an unprofessional manner *'in any way'*.

28. Mr Harris in closing adopted the statement of case. The panel also had regard to the written responses as provided by Ms Makombore.

Finding and reasons on facts:

29. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser, who reminded it where facts have been admitted they are to be found proved. Where facts are in dispute the panel is required to go on to decide those facts. The burden to prove each allegation rests with Social Work England and the panel must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities.
30. In reaching its decision the panel was reminded to consider all of the documentary evidence before it and oral evidence from the live witnesses. The panel was reminded to give appropriate weight to contemporaneous documents, to treat witness demeanour with caution, and to assess hearsay evidence carefully, attaching weight in light of corroboration, reliability and fairness.
31. In relation to dishonesty, the panel was advised to apply the test as set out in Ivey v Genting Casinos (2017) UKSC 67 and, in so doing, to first determine Ms Makombore's actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts at the relevant time, and then to

consider whether the conduct would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

32. In reaching its decision the panel decided that the witness evidence was clear, and consistent with their exhibits and where relevant, their oral evidence. When questioned by the panel there were no significant inconsistencies in the overall evidence provided. Furthermore, the evidence came from a wide range of lay and professional witnesses from different employers, many of whom did not know each other. The oral evidence was supported by a wide range of contemporaneous documents such as supervising meeting notes and emails. The panel was therefore able to give considerable weight to the evidence of the witnesses in reaching its determination on facts.

Background to Particular 1 (FTPS-21084)

33. On 22 August 2022, Social Work England received a referral from Mrs Scotford on behalf of Wokingham regarding Ms Makombore.
34. Ms Makombore had been employed by Wokingham between 1 September 2020 and 10 March 2022 as part of the Adult Care Reviewing Team. When she began working at Wokingham she had recently finished her social work degree and undertook her Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (“ASYE”) there.
35. The allegations were that Ms Makombore was connected to a company, Love.Care Ltd, that was identified in a directory of care providers supplied to those looking for a package of care. Ms Makombore was listed as the point of contact for the company and enquiries Companies House had revealed that she was the sole director and share holder of the company. Ms Makombore had not disclosed the potential conflict of interest to Wokingham. During enquiries made by management, she had asserted that Love.Care Ltd was controlled by her sister, and she gave differing accounts about whether she thought there was a conflict of interest. Ms Makombore denied any wrongdoing.

Particular 1

Whilst registered as a social worker: You failed to inform your line manager at Wokingham Borough Council and/or make the required written declaration of your connection to Love.Care Limited and/ or the conflict of interest that arose as a result of this connection;

36. Social Work England relied upon the following evidence;
37. Witness statement of Mrs Scotford who explained that the ‘Support with Confidence Scheme’ (‘the scheme’) was a directory of care providers vetted and quality checked by Wokingham, West Berkshire Council and Trading Standards. The purpose of the scheme was for those looking for a new package of care to have assurance that a care provider was of good quality. She said that she believed that Wokingham and relevant

parties would check for things such as the DBS status of the care provider, the safeguarding record, and a history of any complaints made against the care provider.

38. Mrs Scotford's exhibit of a list of companies on the scheme as of 31 January 2022 which shows Love.Care Ltd included, with Ms Makombore named herself as the point of contact and her telephone number included. Mrs Scotford stated that Love.Care Ltd was registered as provider of personal assistance and support services with Support With Confidence.
39. Witness statement and oral evidence of Mrs Scotford who said that whilst employed at the Wokingham, Ms Makombore was part of the Adult Care Reviewing team, and would be visiting people and talking about the care they were receiving. There was the potential for Ms Makombore to recommend her own company, Love.Care Ltd, to service users and subsequently steer business towards the company . Further, if the service user, then chose to use Love.Care Ltd as their provider, this could potentially result in a financial benefit to Ms Makombore. Mrs Scotford added that she did not think that there were any instances of this occurring whilst Ms Makombore was employed at Wokingham, however, the concern was that there was potential for it to happen.
40. Wokingham Officer Code of Conduct policy as exhibited by Ms Scotford. The code contains a section on conflicts of interest which states "*The Council expects its employees...to avoid any situation where private and Council interests may conflict. Employees must declare in writing to their line manager any financial or non-financial conflict of interest...*".
41. Wokingham Borough Council Conduct policy ("the policy") as exhibited by Ms Scotford contains guidance on conflicts of interest and states "*An employee, who believes that they are in a situation that may cause a conflict of interest should discuss their situation with their line manager. Employees must declare in writing to their line manager any financial and/or non-financial interest that may potentially conflict or be seen to conflict with the Council's interests and record this information in Business World On. Where there is a clear conflict of interest which has not been declared this may be considered misconduct...Employees must declare an interest where they:*
 - *Are involved in tendering for, engaging or supervising contractors or have any other official relationship with contractors and have previously had, or currently have a private or domestic relationship with them;*
 - *May potentially become a supplier to the Council separate to their role as an employee*".
42. Statement and oral evidence of Ms Julia McMillan who was Ms Makombore's line manager. She said she held formal and informal supervision sessions with Ms Makombore in line with requirements and that Ms Makombore did not disclose to Mrs McMillan anything about outside business interests or any alternative employment at the same time as her employment at Wokingham.

43. Mrs McMillan also explained that the policy was available on the online system Business World On, to which Ms Makombore had access and that the policy would also have been covered during induction training. Mrs McMillan also said that Ms Makombore by email on 8 September 2020 said she had completed all relevant mandatory training. Exhibited supervision notes of 5 November 2020, in which Ms Makombore informed Mrs McMillan that she had completed several aspects of training, including conduct training. However, when Mrs McMillan checked the council's records whilst preparing her statement for these proceedings, these do not show the training was completed.

Panel's evaluation

44. The panel took note that as per the allegation Ms Makombore had been employed by Wokingham from 01 September 2020 to 10 March 2022 as part of the Adult Care Reviewing Team.
45. The panel took note of Mrs McMillan's oral evidence in which she explained that ASYE is the first year after qualification as a social worker. The social worker receives support, supervision, training and reduction of caseload. Mrs McMillan confirmed that she managed Ms Makombore during her ASYE and that this was also during the pandemic. She explained that formal supervisions took place fortnightly and notes were written up and case recording notes were completed. Also, she said informal supervisions took place whenever needed, and that Ms Makombore did call on occasion. Ms McMillan stated that if Ms Makombore had an issue she would have known to either contact her or Ms Scotford and she could have approached her during the period.
46. The panel took note of Ms McMillan's Companies House exhibit which indicated Love.Care Limited was incorporated on 12 August 2021 and that Ms Makombore was listed as Director and appointed on 12 August 2021 and resigned on 10 February 2023.
47. The panel accepted the evidence of Ms Scotford as to the services Love.Care Ltd offered and that it had advertised itself as a care provider on the scheme as of 31 January 2022, with Ms Makombore as the point of contact.
48. The panel considered Mrs McMillan's exhibited meeting notes of 03 February 2022 – 13:00 which says "*Panashe said 'it is my company' and that she opened it when she wanted to do her support work (prior to Social Work)'. [...] explained that the work in Hillingdon doesn't fit with support with confidence in Wokingham. It should have also been noted that this was a conflict in interest with the Wokingham area since you also work in this area. Support with Confidence was under the impression you were leaving the Social Work area? Panashe highlighted 'we haven't had a chat regarding this with Support with Confidence' and highlighted it hadn't been there for long. Julia highlighted that this has been listed with Support with Confidence since 17th January 2022. [...] highlighted the Professional standards within Social Work and how it states conflicts of interest should be declared and solved. P highlighted that she didn't know her sister put her name on the listing and that she didn't realise this was a conflict of interest. [...] highlighted that this is more to do with being a director of a company and the*

involvement rather than her name being listed itself. [...] highlighted that HR will have to be involved”.

49. The panel noted exhibited email correspondence of Mrs McMillan dated 03 February 2022 at 14:54 where she recounts a 10am conversation she had with Ms Makombore and stated *“A conversation was had at 10am between myself (Julia McMillan) and Panashe regarding the situation and to gather further information. Panashe highlighted to me that this was her sisters company, Elizabeth Makombore, and that she would ask for the information to be changed through support with confidence. I asked why her name was present on the list and why she didn’t know about this, to which she said my sister must have put it on there. I asked what involvement she had with the company and she said that she wasn’t really involved much at all, however did recently volunteer on Sunday just gone, with a customer in Newbury (unpaid)”.*
50. The panel decided that although Ms Makombore had given differing explanations as to her role in the company, she was very clearly involved and it took the view that she was the Director as indicated by the Companies House exhibit.
51. The panel took the view that being the Director of a company that advertised on the scheme whilst working as a social worker on the Adult Care Reviewing Team was a conflict of interest. The panel decided that Ms Makombore had the potential to become a supplier to the Council separate to their role as an employee.
52. The panel was further satisfied that as per both the Wokingham Officer Code of Conduct policy and the Wokingham Borough Council Conduct policy, there was a duty on her to declare in writing to their line manager any financial or non-financial conflict of interest. The panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore would have known about these policies from her induction and also the Conduct training that Ms Makombore herself confirmed that she had completed.
53. The panel accepted the oral evidence of Mrs McMillan, that Ms Makombore made no declaration in relation to her connection to Love.Care Ltd or the conflict of interest that arose as a result of the connection.
54. The panel concluded that there was a clear conflict of interest that Ms Makombore should have been aware of. She should have informed her line manager or made the required written declaration of her connection to Love.care Ltd and the conflict of interest that arose as a result of this connection. However, the panel concluded that Ms Makombore had failed to take any action at all.
55. **The panel found allegation 1 proved by the documentary evidence and the witness evidence of Mrs Scotford and Mrs McMillan.**

Particular 2

Whilst registered as a social worker: You gave false and/or misleading information to your employer about your involvement with the company Love.Care Limited;

56. Social Work England relied upon the following evidence;

57. Witness statement evidence of Mrs McMillan who said she was first made aware of a potential conflict of interest because another team manager at Wokingham contacted her after she had read the newsletter for the scheme and had seen Ms Makombore's name listed as the point of contact for Love.Care Ltd. Mrs McMillan also said that Ms Makombore had said that she was unaware of being a Director of the company.
58. Companies House exhibit that indicated Love.Care Limited was incorporated on 12 August 2021 and that Ms Makombore was listed as Director and appointed on 12 August 2021 until the point of her resignation as Director on 10 February 2023.
59. Exhibited forwarded email sent to Mrs McMillan having been received by an administrator on 03 February 2022, The email was sent at 11:58 from *admin@lovecareltd.co.uk* with the title "Love Care Administrator". The mail read *"Could you please correct the details on Wokingham list you have put panashe's details on the list she does not help under Berkshire. Could you please correct it to Elizabeth Makombore [PRIVATE]"* with the message signed *Elizabeth*". The contact details were amended as asked.
60. Exhibited email of Mrs McMillan sent to Human Resources business partner on 03 February 2022 at 14:54, setting out the content of discussions with Ms Makombore which in summary was that Ms Makombore said that she did not know her name was on the scheme and that her sister must have put her name there.

Panel's evaluation

61. As above the panel decided that although Ms Makombore had given differing explanations as to her role in the company, she was very clearly involved and it took the view that she was the Director as indicated by the Companies House exhibit.
62. The panel took note that in the exhibit of the meeting dated 03 February 2022, Ms Makombore initially said that she had helped her sister Elizabeth Makombore start a recruitment agency under Love.Care Ltd. The panel also took note Ms Makombore later admitted that the company was hers, and that she started it when she wanted to do her support work, "prior to social work". The panel concluded that this was false information as the Companies House information clearly stated that Love.Care Limited was incorporated on 12 August 2021 and that Ms Makombore was listed as Director and appointed on 12 August 2021. The panel was satisfied that Love.Care Ltd was not incorporated prior to social work as Ms Makombore had started work at Wokingham 01 September 2020 when starting her ASYE.
63. The panel concluded that Ms Makombore gave false and misleading information to Wokingham about her involvement with Love Care Ltd.
64. **The panel found allegation 2 proved by the documentary evidence and the witness evidence of Mrs McMillan.**

Particular 3

Your conduct at paragraphs 1 and/or 2 above was dishonest;

Panel's evaluation

65. In approaching the allegation of dishonesty, the panel first considered Ms Makombore's knowledge or belief as to the facts at the time and then decided the question of whether Ms Makombore's conduct was dishonest by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people.
66. The panel took note of Ms Makombore's response to the allegations;
- a. In respect of not declaring a financial interest in a company, she wrote that she was completing her ASYE role at Wokingham and *'did not have any financial gain that I have with Love.Care limited as it is not operating yet. Love.Care Limited is intended to offer personal care and care for people in the community however it is not CQC registered yet so it cannot operate now. I believe that the accusations made against me for having financial benefit is not true as there are no financial benefits coming out of this company yet'*;
 - b. In respect of denying being linked to Love.Care Ltd, she wrote that this was not true, as she sent an email to her supervisor at the time stating that *'Love Care was a family business structured to help the community and it was not operating at the time as CQC registration has not been applied for'* [sic];
 - c. In respect of dishonesty, she wrote that she had apologised for not declaring the company to the council but she had *'no intentions of car[ry]ing out this business without their knowledge. After the set up of the company and I we would have started operating, I would have told my manager about this'* [sic].
67. The panel considered the oral evidence of Mrs McMillan who explained that Ms Makombore as part of the adult review team, worked reviewing packages yearly. She managed complex cases, would assess packages, settle disputes and undertake reassessments. The service users included people with learning and physical disabilities and dementia. Ms Makombore would speak directly to families or individuals and she could have provided the Support with Confidence scheme booklet which has details of Love.care Ltd. This document highlighted Ms Makombore as a main contact for a recruitment agency which is a 'Agency for Personal Assistants who provide Personal Care & home help for Older People and people with Dementia, Learning disabilities, Physical disabilities, Sensory Impairment, Substance misuse'. Ms Makombore also discussed care options with service users and could have sent work her own way. Mrs McMillan acknowledged that there was no suggestion that Ms Makombore had done so.
68. The panel took the view that Ms Makombore despite giving various alternative explanations was the Director of Love.Care Ltd, and that as per her admission, the company was hers. It was further satisfied that notwithstanding her role at Wokingham, Love.Care Ltd registered with the scheme in January 2022 and that Ms Makombore failed to declare the conflict of interest and also knowingly gave Wokingham false and misleading information in relation to her role in Love.Care Ltd.
69. The panel was further satisfied that she clearly misrepresented the date that the company had been set up, as it was not prior to her social work. The panel further noted

that Ms Makombore was unable to provide a plausible explanation for her actions given what she should have known about the conflict of interest policies.

70. The panel decided that Ms Makombore attempted to conceal her involvement with Love.Care Ltd. It was satisfied that when it became apparent that she had been found out, instead of responding fully and engaging with the inquiries of management and logging the conflict of interest on Business World One as directed, she instead chose to resign from her position. The panel noted the resignation email sent by Ms Makombore dated 10 February 2022 as exhibited by Mrs McMillan.
71. The panel was satisfied that an ordinary person would find that Ms Makombore was dishonest in failing to declare the conflict of interest and providing false and misleading information in relation to her role with Love.care Ltd. The panel determined Ms Makombore was being deliberately deceptive in a bid to cover up actions she knew she should not have been taking.
72. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Makombore's actions were dishonest.
73. **The panel found allegation 3 proved by its assessment of the evidence.**

Background to Particular 2 (FTPS-24087)

74. On 28 January 2025, Social Work England received a referral from Mr Pickles on behalf of New Life regarding Ms Makombore.
75. The allegations were that when Ms Makombore had been recruited by New Life, she had concealed employment periods at two councils, including Wokingham, and had covered this by falsely asserting that she had been employed by Love.Care Ltd. During local enquiries into discrepancies, a number of email messages were exchanged with individuals that Social Work England say do not exist and that Ms Makombore maintained her deception, to the extent of a fabricated Ofsted report being sent to New Life in order to support her claims as to the nature of Love.Care Ltd.

Particular 4a(i)

You gave false and/or misleading information to New Life Fostering for the purposes of obtaining employment, in that you: Submitted an application form with false and/or misleading content, namely: Included prior work experience as a supervising social worker for an organisation known as Love Care Limited, which was untrue;

76. Social Work England relied upon the following evidence;
77. Witness statement evidence of Mr Pickles that Ms Makombore applied for a vacancy at New Life. She was successful in being invited to interview due to her stating that she had a significant level of experience as detailed on her application form as she had disclosed that she had numerous years' experience operating in the same role he was recruiting for. Mr Pickles said Ms Makombore attended an interview on 13 November 2024 and scored well.

78. Exhibit of Mr Pickles showing that Ms Makombore had been introduced to New Life via a recruiter who set out her extensive experience as over 4 years working with fostering and children including 4 years with 'Love-Care Fostering Agency'.
79. Exhibit of Mr Pickles of Ms Makombore's application form in which she states that between November 2020 and November 2024 she had been employed by 'Lovecare fostering agency' as a Supervising Social Worker, the application included a typed signature dated 18 November 2024.
80. Oral evidence of Mr Pickles that he was employed as a "responsible individual" at New Life at the time. He explained in oral evidence that a responsible individual has oversight of ensuring that the agency they are responsible for is legally compliant. They have oversight of recruitment processes and would be involved at the start and at the end. The responsible individual would also be involved in shortlisting and interviewing and they were involved in different elements of the recruitment process. He also confirmed that he was part of Ms Makombore's interview panel.
81. Witness statement of Mr Pickles that also explained that when he reviewed Ms Makombore's application, he noticed discrepancies, for example she appeared to have used the title 'social worker' prior to obtaining her social work degree. He discussed this with her and later the New Life office manager, and it was agreed that because she had interviewed so well, Ms Makombore could resubmit her application with the correct job title substituted which she did.
82. Mr Pickles exhibited resubmitted handwritten application of Ms Makombore. This application included a typed signature dated 18 November 2024 [sic].

Panel's evaluation

83. The panel took note of Ms Makombore's amended handwritten application as submitted and noted:
 - a. She wrote that between March 2015 and September 2016 she had been employed as a Family Support Worker, but had initially written that her employer was 'Lovecare Ltd with a contact email address for background checks of *'info@lovecareltd.co.uk'* before crossing these entries through and inserting details of Comfort Care Service, as she had included before;
 - b. Her entry in respect of November 2020 to November 2024 was now broken down into three entries:
 - i. November 2020 to August 2021: employed by Love Care Fostering Agency as Supervising Social Worker with a contact email address for background checks given as *'Lindavines@lovecareltd.co.uk'*;
 - ii. August 2021 to February 2023: employed by Love Care Fostering Agency as Managing Director with a contact email address for background checks given as *'Lindavines@lovecareltd.co.uk'*;
 - iii. February 2023 to November 2024: employed by Love Care Fostering Agency as Supervising Social Worker with a contact email address for background checks given as *'Lindavines@lovecareltd.co.uk'*.

84. The panel had no evidence before it to confirm that a company called Love Care Fostering Agency existed or that Ms Makombore had worked for it in any capacity during the period November 2020 and November 2024. As per the Companies House exhibit Love.Care Limited was incorporated on 12 August 2021 and Ms Makombore was listed as Director and appointed on 12 August 2021, up until she resigned as director on 10 February 2023.
85. The panel therefore concluded that on the balance of probabilities Love Care Fostering Agency was more likely than not, to have been fabricated by Ms Makombore to support her assertion that she had extensive experience within the fostering environment. In the absence of any information to the contrary, the panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore gave false information to New Life for the purposes of obtaining employment and submitted an application form with false content by including prior work experience which was untrue.
86. **The panel found allegation 4a(i) proved by the documentary evidence and the witness evidence of Mr Pickles.**

Particular 4a(ii)

You gave false and/or misleading information to New Life Fostering for the purposes of obtaining employment, in that you: Submitted an application form with false and/or misleading content, namely: Included fabricated details of one or more referees;

Panel's evaluation

87. The panel reminded itself of its findings at 4a(i) above that it had no evidence before it to confirm that a company called Love Care Fostering Agency existed and that on the balance of probabilities Love Care Fostering Agency was more likely than not, to have been fabricated by Ms Makombore.
88. Ms Makombore's application included details of two required referees. The request set out that one should be her current employer and she nominated "*Elizabeth Marky of Lovecare fostering agency*". This name was given in the first application, but the social worker had changed the contact details in the subsequent application to "*Linda Vines*".
89. Written statement and exhibits of Miriam Maggs ("Ms Maggs") a paralegal with Capsticks LLP who on 26 August 2025, she wrote to Love.Care Ltd asking for the contact details of Elizabeth Marky and Linda Vines. Ms Maggs explained that on 29 August 2025, Capsticks' administrative team received a telephone call from an individual identifying themselves as Linda Vines from Love.Care and seeking the password for the letter. The call was received from a number ending [PRIVATE]. She said this telephone number was the registered contact number for Ms Makombore held by Social Work England as part of her registration. Ms Maggs said that shortly afterwards, she received an email from the '*Love Care Information Desk*' (info@lovecareltd.co.uk) saying that '*Elizabeth has left the service however you can contact Linda vines [sic] at lindavines@lovecareltd.co.uk and her contact number is*

[PRIVATE]. She then explained that Capsticks LLP instructed an Enquiry Agent to establish the contact details for Elizabeth Marky and Linda Vines (with the alternate spelling of Linda Vibes also provided). The results of these tracing enquiries were provided in two reports she exhibits. The reports state no individual with the name Linda Vines had links to the Reading or Berkshire area and nobody with the name Linda Vibes had ever been registered in the UK. There was nobody identified in the UK with the name Elizabeth Marky, the number ending [PRIVATE] was out of service and that name has never appeared on the electoral roll in the UK. The number ending [PRIVATE] was registered to a different individual in Nottinghamshire, but an identical number save that it ended [PRIVATE] was registered to Ms Makombore.

90. The panel therefore took the view any referee information provided in relation to Love Care Fostering Agency was fabricated.
91. **The panel found allegation 4a(ii) proved by the documentary evidence and the witness evidence of Mr Pickles.**

Particular 4b

You gave false and/or misleading information to New Life Fostering for the purposes of obtaining employment, in that you: Failed to disclose a period of employment at Wokingham Borough Council between the approximate dates of 1 September 2020 and 10 March 2022;

92. Social Work England relied upon the following evidence;
93. Exhibit of Ms Makombore's application form for New Life which required employment history to be a month-by-month timeline of "*all your activity in the UK or abroad since the age of 16 years*". The application made no reference to Ms Makombore having worked at Wokingham.

Panel's evaluation

94. The panel took note of both of Mr Pickles exhibits of Ms Makombore's original application form and the amended handwritten version. The panel was satisfied that neither version contained any reference to Ms Makombore's employment at Wokingham.
95. The panel also had regard to the Fostering Service (England) Regulations 2011, Schedule 1, which reads "4. *Where a person has previously worked in a position whose duties involved work with children or vulnerable adults verification, so far as reasonably practicable, of the reason why the employment or position ended...6. A full employment history, together with a satisfactory written explanation of any gaps in employment*". The panel noted that this was contained within the New Life job application form.
96. The panel was therefore satisfied that Ms Makombore knew that she was supposed to disclose her entire employment history and that she did not do this. The panel concluded that she gave false information, in that it was incomplete and misleading as

she failed to disclose her employment at Wokingham from 01 September 2020 and 10 March 2022 (the date her resignation of 10 February 2022 took effect).

97. **The panel found allegation 4b proved by the documentary evidence and the witness evidence of Mr Pickles.**

Particular 4c

You gave false and/or misleading information to New Life Fostering for the purposes of obtaining employment, in that you: Failed to disclose a period of employment at Slough Borough Council between the approximate dates of 31 August 2022 and 28 April 2023.

98. Social Work England relied upon the following evidence;
99. Witness statement of Mrs Andrea Rodin (“Ms Rodin”), who was Head of Service at Slough Borough Council (“Slough”) and confirmed that Ms Makombore was employed at Slough as an agency contractor between 30 August 2022 and 2 May 2023, as a social worker in the Adult Social Care division of the East Locality Team.

Panel’s evaluation

100. The panel took note of both of Mr Pickles exhibits of Ms Makombore’s original application form and the amended handwritten version. The panel was satisfied that neither version contained any reference to Ms Makombore’s employment at Slough.
101. The panel also had regard to the Fostering Service (England) Regulations 2011, Schedule 1, which reads “4. *Where a person has previously worked in a position whose duties involved work with children or vulnerable adults verification, so far as reasonably practicable, of the reason why the employment or position ended...6. A full employment history, together with a satisfactory written explanation of any gaps in employment*”. The panel noted that this was contained within the New Life job application form.
102. The panel was therefore satisfied that Ms Makombore knew that she was supposed to disclose her entire employment history and that she did not do this. The panel concluded that she gave false information, in that it was incomplete and misleading as she failed to disclose her employment at Slough Wokingham from 31 August 2022 to 28 April 2023.
103. **The panel found allegation 4b proved by the documentary evidence and the witness evidence of Mr Pickles.**

Particular 5a

For the purposes of obtaining employment with New Life Fostering, you: Were involved in providing, or permitted to be provided, a fabricated Ofsted inspection report when you knew, or ought reasonably to have known, that the report was not accurate;

104. Social Work England relied upon the following evidence;

105. Witness statement of Mr Pickles in which he says that on 05 December 2024 he sent Ms Makombore an email asking her to provide New Life with an Ofsted unique reference number (“URN”) or an inspection report for Love.Care, because he could not locate Love.Care as an agency on either Ofsted’s website or the internet generally.
106. Exhibits of emails of 10 December 2024 in which Mr Pickles is chasing his request and Ms Makombore’s response of 11 December 2024 in which she says, “*I have requested them to send you a copy of their reports*”.
107. Mr Pickles exhibit of an email he received on 1 December 2024, from the address ‘*lindavines@lovecareltd.co.uk*’. This enclosed a document titled ‘*Ofsted report 2016*’ and said that she had been asked by Ms Makombore to send one of their ofsted reports, adding that they had ‘*dissolved their registration for ofsted*’. The email was signed ‘*Linda vibes*’ [sic], giving her job titled as ‘*Registered manager*’ [sic] and a telephone number ending [PRIVATE].
108. Witness evidence and exhibit of the Ofsted report in which Mr Pickles said he was suspicious of the Ofsted report provided by Ms Vines for numerous reasons: the report itself contained a considerable amount of typos and formatting errors. Additionally, certain letters were capitalised when they should not have been, and vice versa. He said that throughout his career he had looked at many Ofsted reports, and could tell that this one was not right. Mr Pickles said he forwarded the email and report to the office manager at New Life. Subsequent correspondence with Ofsted led to Mr Pickles being assisted by Melissa McMillan (Ms M McMillan), a compliance officer at Ofsted.
109. Written statement of Ms M McMillan a regulatory inspection manager at Ofsted. She sets out the role of Ofsted in regulating Independent Fostering Agencies, which must be registered with Ofsted. The URN SC476785 on the report is not known to Ofsted and Ofsted records have no record of Love.Care being a registered fostering agency, nor any record of the report in question being authentic. The parent company mentioned in the report is not known to Ofsted. The named responsible individual and registered manager for Love.Care are not registered with Ofsted in any capacity. She added a genuine report would appear on the database and would be traceable by its URN. The report supplied in respect of Ms Makombore is not authentic.

Panel’s evaluation

110. The panel accepted the statement and documentary evidence of Ms M McMillan and was satisfied that the setting and URN used on the submitted report are incorrect. Love.Care is not a setting known to Ofsted and this was not a report written by them. Further, Linda Vines was not known to Ofsted as a registered manager.
111. The panel accepted the evidence of Ms Maggs and was satisfied that there was enough information that linked back to Ms Makombore and her telephone number, for it to be satisfied that she was involved in providing a fabricated Ofsted report.
112. The panel therefore took the view that for the purposes of obtaining employment with New Life Ms Makombore was involved in providing, or permitted to be provided, a

fabricated Ofsted inspection report when you knew, or ought reasonably to have known, that the report was not accurate.

113. The panel found allegation 5a proved by the documentary evidence and the witness evidence of Mr Pickles.

Particular 5b

For the purposes of obtaining employment with New Life Fostering, you: Did not tell New Life Fostering the true position after that Ofsted inspection report had been provided to them, namely that the report provided was fabricated.

Panel's evaluation

114. The panel acknowledged Social Work England's evidence as referred to at 5a above. It additionally considered the written and oral evidence of Mr Pickles who confirmed that Ms Makombore did not tell him that the Ofsted report was fabricated.
115. The panel therefore took the view that for the purposes of obtaining employment with New Life Ms Makombore did not tell the true position after that Ofsted inspection report had been provided to them, that the report provided was fabricated.
- 116. The panel found allegation 5b proved by the documentary evidence and the witness evidence of Mr Pickles.**

Particular 6

Your conduct at paragraphs 4 and/or 5 above was dishonest;

Panel's evaluation

117. In approaching the allegation of dishonesty, the panel first considered Ms Makombore's knowledge or belief as to the facts at the time and then decided the question of whether Ms Makombore's conduct was dishonest by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people.
118. The panel took note of Ms Makombore's response to the allegations;
- a. She denied misleading her employer regarding her employment and experience, adding that she did not believe that she had misled an employer with her work history;
 - b. She was employed with love.Care Ltd [sic] in support of them opening an agency;
 - c. They needed to give her a position as their supervising social worker to be able to register but their registration was unsuccessful;
 - d. She did not continue because she moved away from the area;
 - e. She denied sharing a fabricated Ofsted report, adding that '*when the company asked lovecare [sic] for their ofsted report I was not aware of this and when they shared this document with each other I had no idea or which*

document was sent. I have asked Lovecare [sic] to send me this document but they have not sent this to me till today [sic]”²;

- f. She admitted dishonesty, adding ‘*I believe that it can be easily seen as being dishonesty and I would like to apologise but my intentions were pure*’;
- g. She denied her fitness to practise was impaired, adding that she had never worked in an unprofessional manner ‘*in any way*’.

119. The panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore knew the true position in respect of her employment history and that she gave a false version of her employment history, that would boost her prospects of securing a position at New Life. She also provided false details of referees. Additionally, she knew that she was clearly required to provide a full, accurate employment history. However, she did not do so, and instead omitted her employment at both Wokingham and Slough.
120. The panel was also satisfied that Ms Makombore was involved with providing or permitting to be provided, a false Ofsted inspection report. The panel took the view that notwithstanding her denial, and saying that she was not responsible for sending the report, Ms Makombore even if she did not provide the report herself would have known that no genuine report existed. The panel concluded that she must have been party to its creation and provision.
121. In misrepresenting her work experience Ms Makombore sought to boost her experience and by asserting she had such extensive experience in fostering work she sought to artificially make herself appear a more attractive candidate. This panel noted that her actions fell foul of the Fostering Service (England) Regulations 2011. Additionally, in omitting employment from her application form she prevented New Life from being able to accurately check her work history and ensure due diligence was being carried out as part of the recruitment process. Effectively, this ensured her employment difficulties at Wokingham would go unnoticed.
122. The panel was satisfied that an ordinary person would find that Ms Makombore was dishonest in providing a false employment history, and Ofsted report. The panel determined Ms Makombore was being deliberately deceptive in a bid to cover up actions she knew she should not have been taking.
123. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Makombore’s actions at particulars 4 and 5 were dishonest.
124. **The panel found allegation 6 proved by its assessment of the evidence.**

Findings and reasons on grounds:

125. Mr Harris made submissions as outlined in Social Work England’s statement of case and addressed the panel on the professional standards it believed Ms Makombore had breached, namely 2.1, 2.7, 3.1 and 5.2 of the Social Work England Professional

Standards (2019). The panel was invited to find Ms Makombore's conduct was serious in nature and as such amounted to the statutory ground of misconduct.

126. Ms Makombore had not provided written representations specifically for this stage of the hearing, but the panel considered her response bundle Ms Makombore had not provided written representations specifically for this stage of the hearing, but the panel considered her response bundle.
127. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser that, in line with the case of *Roylance v General Medical Council (No 2) 2000 1 AC 311* "misconduct is a word of general effect involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances. The standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a...practitioner in the particular circumstances". It was also advised to decide for itself the professional standards it believes have been breached. Further, the panel was reminded that a breach of standards is not necessarily determinative of the issue, but that the conduct must be serious for the panel to conclude it amounts to misconduct.
128. The panel was satisfied that the conduct found proved was a departure from the usual and accepted standards of social work practice. The panel decided that Ms Makombore had breached the following Social Work England Professional Standards (2019):

As a social worker, I will:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.

Respect and maintain people's dignity and privacy.

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

3.1 Work within legal and ethical frameworks, using my professional authority and judgement appropriately.

As a social worker, I will not:

5.2 Behave in a way that would bring into question my suitability to work as a social worker while at work, or outside of work.

129. The panel decided that Ms Makombore's conduct found proved both individually and collectively was so serious that it called into question her recognition and observance of fundamental tenets of social work.
130. The panel noted that the nature of the misconduct was serious as Ms Makombore had misrepresented her skills and experience. She also dishonestly: failed to declare a conflict of interest, provided false and misleading information in relation to her role with Love.care Ltd, provided a false employment history, and was involved in providing a false Ofsted report. The panel considered that the conduct was made more serious by the fact that it continued over an extended period of time and across two organisations. The panel took the view that Ms Makombore incrementally worsened her dishonesty over time and this culminated in going so far as to fabricate referees for a fictitious

company. Additionally, Ms Makombore breached not only Social Work England's Professional Standards but also the Fostering Service (England) Regulations 2011. The panel concluded Ms Makombore's conduct as proved was so serious it amounts to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Findings and reasons on current impairment:

131. On the question of impairment, Mr Harris submitted that Ms Makombore's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal and public grounds. He then outlined the serious misconduct in question. Mr Harris stated that there is insufficient evidence of insight and that Ms Makombore had breached professional boundaries and brought the profession into disrepute. The panel was asked to find that Ms Makombore's fitness to practise is currently impaired.
132. The panel noted Ms Makombore's response to whether her fitness to practise is currently impaired to which she said, "*I am no danger to the community nor have I ever put any clients at risk or worked in an unprofessional manner in anyway*".
133. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser, who referenced Council for Healthcare and Regulatory Excellence v NMC and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) the panel was reminded to consider the following questions: a) If Ms Makombore has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or b) has in the past and/or is she liable in the future to bring the profession into disrepute; and/or c) has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the profession and/or d) has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future. Further, the case of Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) in that it should consider if the conduct in question is easily remediable, has already been remediated, and that it is highly unlikely to be repeated. The panel was also reminded of Social Work England's Impairment and Sanctions Guidance ('the guidance').
134. The panel considered Ms Makombore's current fitness to practise firstly from the personal perspective and then from the wider public perspective. The panel also had regard to whether the conduct in this case is easily remediable, whether it has been remedied and whether it was likely to be repeated.
135. In deciding current impairment, the panel considered whether:
 - a) Ms Makombore has in the past and/or is liable in the future to place service users at unwarranted risk of harm.
 - b) Ms Makombore has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the profession into disrepute.
 - c) Ms Makombore has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the profession.
 - d) Ms Makombore has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.

136. The panel took note of the guidance and reminded itself that an action that had not caused harm can potentially cause an unacceptable risk of serious harm if repeated. The panel decided that Ms Makombore's actions caused an unacceptable risk of serious harm to the service users of New Life. The panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore should have foreseen the risk of harm in misrepresenting herself and omitting details from her employment history. The panel noted the guidance which states that *'the risk of harm... can be as important as actual harm caused.'* The panel was satisfied that it had no evidence before it to suggest Ms Makombore had any experience working with children or that she had the skill set required to be responsible for the placement of children that needed foster care. The panel also noted that given her fabricated work experience it is unlikely that Ms Makombore would have been subject to adequate supervision and oversight. In misrepresenting herself and her abilities, the panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore placed service users at unwarranted risk of harm.
137. Further, the conduct found proved which included providing misleading information in relation to her role with Love.care Ltd and omitting previous employments from her work history was such that the panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore had brought the profession into disrepute and breached fundamental tenets of the profession. The panel concluded that it is a public expectation of the profession that a social worker acts appropriately by observing and maintaining professional standards and obligations.
138. The panel determined that Ms Makombore had in the past acted dishonestly, by virtue of her failing to declare the conflict of interest, providing a false employment history, and being involved in providing a false Ofsted report. The panel was satisfied that all 4 limbs of *Grant* were engaged.
139. In deciding the question of Ms Makombore's current fitness to practise, the panel first considered the personal element of impairment. The panel considered the extent to which the misconduct in this case can be, and has been remediated by Ms Makombore, and whether it is likely to be repeated.
140. The panel noted that the misconduct found was underpinned by dishonesty. The panel considered paragraph 43 of the guidance and that *"In some cases, the concerns may relate to the social worker's character. If so, it can be more difficult to evidence remediation that has reformed their character. For example, if the concerns relate to dishonesty, breaches of trust or abuses of position"*. The panel was satisfied that character concerns, evident from Ms Makomore's dishonesty are attitudinal in nature and indicative of poor judgement. The panel took the view that misconduct of such nature is often harder to remediate as per the guidance.
141. The panel also took note of paragraph 177 and 178 of the guidance, and that 'submitting inaccurate or misleading information in a CV or job application' was an example of the most serious dishonesty in professional practice as it had the potential to put service users at risk. It also noted paragraph 180 in particular which states, *"Dishonesty through misrepresenting qualifications, skills and experience, for example*

on a CV, is also particularly serious. This is because it may lead to the social worker being appointed to roles and responsibilities that they cannot safely carry out. The public and employers must be able to trust the accuracy of such information provided by social workers”.

142. Additionally, the panel noted that Ms Makombore denied the dishonesty and in relation to Wokingham stated she had, *“no intentions of car[ry]ing out this business without their knowledge. After the set up of the company and I we would have started operating, I would have told my manager about this”* and in relation to New Life she said, *“I believe that it can be easily seen as being dishonesty and I would like to apologise but my intentions were pure”*. The panel was satisfied that Ms Makombore had not provided any evidence to indicate that she understands what led to the events of her misconduct; recognises what went wrong; accepts her role and responsibilities in relation to the events; appreciates what could (and should) have been done differently and has addressed how she might act or react differently if the same circumstances were to happen again (to avoid reoccurrence of similar concerns). The panel concluded that Ms Makombore’s insight is minimal at best.
143. The panel then went on to consider remediation and whether Ms Makombore has put right any deficiencies or shortfalls in the behaviour that led to the concerns. The guidance reminds the panel that *“remediation is best shown by objective evidence: successful completion of education or training courses; satisfactory performance appraisals and/or other positive feedback in relation to their professional practice... Remediation can include steps the social worker has taken to make things right, such as apologising.”* The panel took note that Ms Makombore had not provided any evidence of remediation.
144. Whilst the panel acknowledged that Ms Makombore is not currently working as a social worker, the panel considered that it was open to her to seek to demonstrate improved awareness, attitude, judgement and behaviours in roles outside of paid work as a social worker – for example, paid work in another field, or voluntary work. However, no such evidence has been provided.
145. Taking all the relevant matters into account the panel was not satisfied that Ms Makombore had remediated her conduct, furthermore the panel took the view that Ms Makombore is incapable of successful remediation until she develops insight first.
146. The panel then analysed whether there is risk of repetition (now or in the future). The panel considered the risk of repetition to be linked to Ms Makombore’s insight and remediation. The misconduct in question is serious and, as detailed above, Ms Makombore has not demonstrated insight and remediation. The panel therefore concluded that there is a greater risk of repetition as Ms Makombore failed to fully understand what she did wrong and why her actions were wrong. The panel’s view was strengthened by noting that there had already been repetition as the allegations from Wokingham and New Life occurred 3 years apart and were both underpinned by dishonesty.

147. The panel found no evidence that Ms Makombore's conduct has been remediated and that she has undertaken any reflection on what went wrong, why, and the impact her actions had on others. Bearing in mind the nature and gravity of the misconduct, together with the lack of insight, the panel decided that there remained a risk of repetition of the misconduct.
148. The panel concluded that Ms Makombore's fitness to practise is currently impaired from the personal perspective.
149. On the public element of current impairment, the panel decided that Ms Makombore in misrepresenting her skills and experience and dishonestly; failing to declare a conflict of interest, providing false and misleading information in relation to her role with Love.care Ltd, providing a false employment history, and being involved in providing a false Ofsted report, had brought the profession into disrepute. The panel was satisfied that the public is entitled to expect that social workers observe the position of trust that they hold and that they act with honesty and integrity in the course of their professional duties and personal lives.
150. The panel was satisfied an informed and reasonable member of the public would be concerned if there were no finding of impairment as it would expect the regulator to take action to mark its disapproval of this misconduct. The panel concluded that the finding of public impairment was necessary to maintain and declare the standards of the social work profession and uphold the public's confidence in the social work profession.
151. The panel concluded that the public interest requires a finding that Ms Makombore's fitness to practise is also currently impaired from the public perspective.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

152. Mr Harris made submissions on sanction and asked the panel to refer to the guidance when coming to its decision. He said that Social Work England seeks a removal order as this is most appropriate sanction to protect the public and to maintain confidence in the profession and ensure professional standards are upheld.
153. Ms Makombore had not provided written representations specifically for this stage of the hearing, but the panel considered her response bundle.
154. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser who reminded it that powers at this stage are set out in paragraphs 12 and 13 of Schedule 2 of the regulations. The panel may take no further action, give advice, give a warning order, impose a conditions of practice order, impose a suspension order, or remove the social worker from the social work register. It was also reminded that the purpose of a sanction was not to punish Ms Makombore but to protect the public and the wider public interest.
155. The panel was also advised in line with the cases of *Professional Standards Authority v The Health and Care Professional Council & Mohammed Ghaffar [2014] EWHC 2723 (Admin)* and *Abbas v GMC [2017] EWHC 51 (Admin)*. These cases highlighted the

importance of honesty in health and care professions, such that striking off may be an appropriate sanction, if the dishonesty is combined with a lack of insight under the indicative sanctions guidance. It was also reminded that as per the case of *Atkinson v GMC [2009] EWHC 3636 (Admin)* erasure is not necessarily inevitable and a lesser sanction may suffice where the panel had compelling evidence of insight and a number of other factors upon which it could rely on that the dishonesty in question appeared to be out of character or somewhat isolated in its duration or range.

156. The panel was advised to consider any aggravating and mitigating factors it sees fit. The panel was also asked to ensure that when considering sanctions, it begins with the lowest sanction and moves through all the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness, before identifying the sanction it agrees is sufficient to protect the public and maintain confidence in the profession and uphold professional standards. Additionally, it was reminded that any sanction imposed must be proportionate, balancing the interests of the social worker with the interests of the social work profession and the public interest. The panel carefully considered the guidance.

157. The panel identified the following mitigation;

- Initial engagement with investigations

158. The panel identified the following aggravating factors;

- Calculated dishonesty
- Repetition of conduct occurring between 2021 and 2024
- Minimal insight
- No evidence of remediation
- First concern less than 2 years post qualification
- Minimal ongoing engagement with regulator
- No testimonials or character references
- Fraudulent actions for personal gain
- Risk of harm to people who use social work services

159. The panel reminded itself of its findings of fact that Ms Makombore had misrepresented her skills and experience. She also dishonestly: failed to declare a conflict of interest, provided false and misleading information in relation to her role with Love.care Ltd, provided a false employment history, and was involved in providing a false Ofsted report. The misconduct continued over an extended period of time, across two organisations and incrementally worsened over time. The misconduct was underpinned by dishonesty which was not out of character or isolated in nature.

160. The panel has assessed that the misconduct involved serious breaches of fundamental tenets of social work practice. In summary, it was satisfied that there were a number of aggravating factors with little mitigation present in this case.

No action, advice or warning

161. As per its findings the panel concluded that Ms Makombore's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal and public grounds and that there remains a risk of repetition which poses a current risk to public safety. Having considered paragraph 76 of the guidance, the panel decided to exercise its discretion and move beyond the lower sanctions of no action, advice or a warning. The panel was satisfied that none of these outcomes would be sufficient to address the risks as identified, as they would not restrict Ms Makombore's ability to practise and would not be subject to any reviews. Additionally, it would also send the wrong message about the seriousness of this misconduct and therefore not be in the public interest nor maintain public confidence in the profession.

Conditions of practice

162. With reference to paragraph 114 of the guidance the panel noted that a "conditions of practice order may be appropriate in cases where all of the following are engaged;

- *the social worker has demonstrated insight*
- *the failure or deficiency in practice is capable of being remedied*
- *appropriate, proportionate, and workable conditions can be put in place*
- *decision makers are confident the social worker can and will comply with the conditions*
- *the social worker does not pose a risk of harm to the public by being in restricted practice".*

163. Further the panel reminded itself of the paragraph 116 of the guidance which states;

"When considering public protection, decision makers must fully assess insight and the social workers past engagement with the regulator and any employer. This should help to determine whether the social worker can comply with conditions of practice.

164. The panel also took note of the paragraph 118 and 119 of the guidance which reads;

"118. Conditions of practice are less likely to be appropriate in cases of character, attitude or behavioural failings. They may also not be appropriate in cases raising wider public interest issues"

119. For example, conditions are unlikely to be appropriate in cases of (any of the following):... dishonesty..."

165. The panel noted its findings that Ms Makombore's had minimal insight at best. Also, her misconduct was underpinned by dishonesty and the character concerns evident from Ms Makomore's dishonesty are attitudinal in nature and indicative of poor judgement. The panel reminded itself Ms Makombore's lack of insight means that she is incapable of successful remediation.

166. The panel decided that Ms Makombore's conduct could not be managed by a conditions of practice order. It noted that the guidance stated that a conditions of

practice order is unlikely to be appropriate in cases involving dishonesty. The panel was satisfied that a conditions of practice order would not address the character and behavioural issues that led to Ms Makombore acting in the way that she did.

167. The panel also concluded that that it was not possible to formulate appropriate, proportionate, and workable conditions which would be sufficient to protect service users and the wider public interest. Such an order, to be effective in addressing the risk of harm as assessed by the panel would need to be so restrictive it would be tantamount to a suspension.
168. Further, the panel was of the view that a conditions of practice order would be impractical in all the circumstances as it had no information in relation to Ms Makombore's current employment situation and no information to suggest that she would be willing or able to comply with a conditions of practice order.

Suspension order

169. The panel noted paragraph 138 of the guidance which says;

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

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

170. The panel was satisfied that given its findings in relation to the misconduct, the serious breach of professional standards and lack of remediation, that as per paragraph 138 suspension is unsuitable in the circumstances.
171. The panel was satisfied it had no evidence to suggest Ms Makombore was 'willing and able to resolve her failings.' The panel took the view that over time Ms Makombore had distanced herself from the process and this had also hampered her ability to develop insight. Ms Makombore's response to the allegations has persistently lacked any element of self-evaluation and/or reflection. The panel had no evidence to suggest that Ms Makombore is working towards remediation, or recognises the ramifications of her actions. The panel concluded that the imposition of a suspension order would not serve any useful purpose or be suitable in these circumstances.
172. Given the reasons set out above, the panel decided that a suspension order was not the necessary and proportionate sanction in the circumstances and that protection of the public, maintaining public confidence in the profession and upholding professional standards could not be met with a suspension order.

Removal Order

173. The panel was clear that a removal order was the necessary and proportionate sanction in the circumstances. It was satisfied that as per paragraph 148 of the guidance no

other outcome would be enough to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.

174. The panel considered paragraph 149 which states “*A removal order may be appropriate in cases involving (any of the following)...dishonesty, especially where persistent and/or concealed (see section ‘dishonesty’)...persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of their actions or consequences social workers who are unwilling and/or unable to remediate...*”
175. The panel was satisfied that as per its findings Ms Makombore’s dishonesty incrementally increased over time and that she has displayed a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of her actions.
176. Additionally, it was satisfied that as per paragraph 150 of the guidance, Ms Makombore did not meet any of the circumstances in which removal orders are not available. There were no adverse physical or mental health considerations, lack of competence or capability issues or not having the necessary knowledge of English.
177. The panel took note of the case of *Bolton v Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512*, and carefully considered Ms Makombore’s interests but decided they were outweighed by the need to protect the public and the wider public interest.
178. The panel therefore imposed a removal order.

Interim order:

179. The panel next considered an application by Mr Harris for a new 18-month interim suspension order under schedule 2 paragraph 11(1)(b) of the regulations to cover the appeal period before the final order becomes effective. He said that Ms Makombore is already subject to an interim suspension order that expires in September and that there was nothing preventing the panel from imposing a new order. He said that in the event of such an order there is no requirement in the rules to give Ms Makombore notice. He submitted that this was necessary for the protection of the public, in light of the panel’s findings at the impairment and sanctions stages.
180. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser who drew its attention to paragraphs 203 to 204, 206 to 208 and 214 of the guidance. The panel was also advised that the requirement to provide the social worker with notice as set out in schedule 2, paragraph 11(2) does not apply to interim orders made when making a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b) of the regulations.
181. It was also emphasised that any order must be necessary for the protection of the public or in the best interests of Ms Makombore. The panel was also reminded of the need for it to have regard to its findings at the impairment and sanction stages, and any risks it had identified. The panel was reminded that it must apply the principle of proportionality and impose the least severe restriction necessary to address the risks as identified.

182. The panel was mindful that it had found a risk of repetition of misconduct, impaired fitness to practise and concluded that a final order of removal was the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case. Since the panel's final order of removal would not come into effect until the expiry of the 28-day appeal period, or until any appeal is dealt with, it considered that an interim order was necessary to protect the public.
183. The panel referred to paragraph 207 of the guidance which highlighted that "*an interim order may be necessary where the adjudicators have decided that a final order is required, which restricts or removes the ability for the social worker to practise...without an interim order, the social worker will be able to practise unrestricted until the order takes effect. This goes against our overarching objective of public protection*".
184. The panel reminded itself that appropriate and workable conditions could not be formulated to address the risks in this case. Therefore, an interim order of conditions of practice order would be insufficient to protect the public. It decided that the appropriate and proportionate type of interim order to impose at this stage was an interim suspension order.
185. Accordingly, the panel concluded that an 18-month interim suspension order will allow sufficient time for any appeal that might be lodged to be dealt with. When the appeal period expires, this interim order will come to an end unless an appeal has been filed with the High Court. If there is no appeal, the final order of suspension shall take effect when the appeal period expires.

Right of appeal

186. 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.
187. 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.
188. 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.

189. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Social Work England Fitness to Practice Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

190. Under Paragraph 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of the regulations:
- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry
 - 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker
 - 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5), and a final order does not have effect until after the expiry of that period
191. Under Rule 16(aa) of the rules a social worker requesting a review of a final order under Paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

The Professional Standards Authority:

192. 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>.