Social worker: Nicola Moyse
Registration number: SW23864
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review Meeting

Date of Meeting: 15 September 2026

Meeting venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension Order (expiring 27 October 2026)

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

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 2 years imposed by the case examiners (through accepted disposal) on 27 October 2024.
2. Ms Nicola Columba Moyse did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England's written submissions are set out within the notice of hearing letter.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter "the panel") and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	**Role**
Sarah Fulton	Chair
Joma Wellings-Longmore	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	**Role**
Paul Harris	Hearings officer
Lorna Lord	Hearings support officer
Mark Kamlow	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
    - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 6 August 2026 and addressed to Ms Moyse at the email address which they provided to Social Work England;
    - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 6 August 2026 detailing Ms Moyse's registered email address;
    - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 6 August 2026 the writer sent by email to Ms Moyse at the email address referred to above the notice of hearing and related documents; and
    - A copy of the email delivery receipt confirming delivery of the email sent to Ms Moyse on 6 August 2026.
6. The legal adviser referred the panel to paragraph 14(6) of Schedule 2 to the Social Workers Regulations 2018 and Rules 16, 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).
7. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.

8. Having had regard to the relevant provisions of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Ms Moyse in accordance with those Rules.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

9. The notice of final order review informed Ms Moyse that the review would take place as a meeting. The notice stated:

   "If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm on 20 August 2026. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you do not want to attend a hearing and Social Work England may decide to deal with the review as a meeting. If Social Work England do hold a meeting, the adjudicators will be provided with a copy of this letter setting out Social Work England's submissions and a copy of any written submissions you provide."

10. The panel received no information to suggest that Ms Moyse had responded to the notice of final order review. Ms Moyse had not submitted a notice of representation form, indicated that they wished to attend the review, or provided any written submissions.

11. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) which provides:

    "Where the registered social worker does not state within the period specified by the regulator whether they intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may determine whether to make an order by means of a meeting."

12. The panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(c).

Review of the current order:

13. This final order review hearing is taking place under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

14. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 27 October 2026. The order subject to review is a suspension order.

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

15. The regulatory concerns which resulted in the imposition of the suspension order on 27 October 2024 were as follows:

    'Whilst registered as a social worker:

    1. On 11 November 2022, you were convicted of driving or being in charge of a motor vehicle with proportion of controlled alcohol above the prescribed limit in your blood, contrary to section 5A(1)(b) 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988

    [redacted]

    3.You were under the influence of alcohol whilst at work.

    4. **[PRIVATE]**

    [Schedule 1 not reproduced herein.]'

16. The regulatory concerns also included **[PRIVATE]**, which were considered to have the potential to affect the Ms Moyse's practice.

17. The case examiners concluded that the conviction amounted to the statutory ground of conviction, that the conduct concerns amounted to misconduct, and that the health concerns engaged the statutory ground of adverse physical or mental health.

18. Ms Moyse had returned an accepted disposal response declaration confirming that they had read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guidance, admitted the key facts set out in the decision, accepted that their fitness to practise was impaired and accepted the proposed disposal in full.

In the accepted disposal decision dated 25 October 2024, the case examiners determined the following with regard to impairment:

19. The case examiners stated as follows in relation to impairment:

    '*Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:*

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

    2. The public element, established through consideration of whether a finding of impairment might be required to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in the maintenance of proper standards for social workers.

    Personal element

    With regards to the concerns before the regulator, the case examiners have given thought to their guidance, and they note that they should give consideration to whether the matters before the regulator are easily remediable, and whether the social worker

has demonstrated insight and/or conducted remediation to the effect that the risk of repetition is highly unlikely.

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied

The case examiners consider that the concerns highlighted in this case can be remedied in a number of ways, including:

20. - **[PRIVATE]**

21. - **[PRIVATE]**

Insight and remediation

22. *Based on all the evidence presented to them, the case examiners are not satisfied that the social worker has demonstrated full insight into their actions.* **[PRIVATE].** *None of these matters are addressed in the submissions made to Social Work England.*

In their initial submissions to the regulator, on 29 March 2023, the social worker maintained that on the day of their arrest (17 August 2022) they had not been drinking alcohol but had drank mouthwash which was in the car while they were parked at the hospital. This was despite the fact they had been convicted on 11 November 2022 of a drink driving offence.

In their later submissions (15 February 2024) the social worker states that "it may be more helpful to respond to the concerns as a whole rather than individually…I accept all the concerns raised and that these will have raised concerns over my fitness to practice".

23. *They further state that they accept the offence of "being under the influence at the time of the driving offence"* **[PRIVATE]** *and using "alcohol as a coping mechanism".*

24. **[PRIVATE]**

The case examiners have concluded, therefore, that the social worker has not demonstrated sufficient insight and remediation.

Risk of repetition

25. **[PRIVATE]**

Given the absence of full insight and remediation, the case examiners are of the view that there is a risk of repetition.

Public element

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

26. *The case examiners are of the view that a well informed member of the public would be concerned that the regulator had not made a finding of impairment for a social worker*

who was found three times over the legal limit of alcohol whilst at work. Additionally, the case examiners acknowledge that the public would want to be assured that a social worker **[PRIVATE]** *was not left to practise unrestricted, where a risk to the public remained.*

In conclusion, the case examiners are satisfied that there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators will determine that the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired.

27. The case examiners therefore concluded that Ms Moyse's fitness to practise was impaired on both the personal and public components.

In the accepted disposal decision dated 25 October 2024, the case examiners determined the following with regard to sanction:

28. The case examiners stated as follows in relation to sanction:

'The case examiners note that the social worker requested information relating to voluntary removal from the register. Their comments are ambivalent however, about their long term intentions. The case examiners have previously concluded that the social worker could remediate in order to return to safe practice.

The case examiners have decided that a suspension order is more appropriate given the social worker's current circumstances. This sanction will ensure protection of the public as it is more restrictive than their original proposal but it will also provide the social worker time to decide on their future plans and to evidence that they have addressed the concerns detailed in this decision.

...

The case examiners therefore conclude that a suspension order is the most appropriate outcome, allowing the social worker time to decide on their future plans, to remediate should they wish to return to the profession and to protect the public in the interim.

...

The case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a suspension order of 2 years duration.'

Social Work England submissions:

29. As the review proceeded as a meeting, there was no representative of Social Work England in attendance. The panel had regard to Social Work England's written submissions as set out in the notice of final order review dated 6 August 2026.

30. Social Work England's written submissions were as follows:

'Subject to any evidence which demonstrates remediation and insight, or a completed voluntary removal application provided by the social worker, Social Work England invites the Panel to find that the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired, and to impose a Removal Order.

Since the accepted disposal was accepted and imposed in October 2024, the social worker has complied with the order. The social worker has subsequently confirmed that she is currently working within a customer service role.

Throughout the duration of the Order, the social worker has expressed an interest in voluntary removal and submitted a reflective piece confirming such intention in November 2024. Despite the relevant guidance being sent to the social worker, including a voluntary removal application form, on several occasions, Social Work England has not received a completed application from the social worker. Furthermore, the social worker has not provided any evidence of insight or remediation in advance of the upcoming review.

In the absence of such evidence, it is submitted that the Panel cannot be satisfied that the social worker has fully addressed the concerns identified by the Case Examiners. As such, it is further submitted that the risk of repetition remains. Social Work England submits that the concerns remain remediable, in line with the Case Examiners' recommendations.

A Removal Order is available to the Panel as the concerns feature several statutory grounds and all remain live. Social Work England submits that this is the most ppropriate order as it would not be in the public interest to continue extending the existing order, where there remains no meaningful evidence that the Social Worker is willing or able to remediate the concerns.'

Social worker submissions:

31. Ms Moyse did not attend the review and was not represented. No written submissions had been provided by Ms Moyse for the purposes of the review.

32. The panel nevertheless had regard to the information previously provided by Ms Moyse and contained within the bundle, insofar as it was relevant to the issues of current impairment and sanction.

Legal advice on the panel's remit, powers and approach to the review:

33. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser as to the purpose of this mandatory final order review and the powers available to it under paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 to the Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended). The legal adviser advised that the review process should not undermine the original decision made by the case examiners. The panel's task was not to revisit the original regulatory concerns

or the accepted disposal, but to consider what had happened since the suspension order was imposed and to determine whether the social worker's fitness to practise remained currently impaired.

34. The legal adviser referred the panel to Social Work England's Impairment and sanctions guidance. The panel was advised that a social worker must not be permitted to resume unrestricted practice unless it was satisfied that their fitness to practise was no longer impaired. In determining current impairment, the panel should consider whether the social worker had demonstrated remediation, insight and/or remorse; whether they had demonstrated that they were now safe to practise and/or that there was no longer a risk to the public; whether they had taken steps to maintain their skills and knowledge; and whether they had sufficiently addressed the concerns which led to the original order. The panel should also have regard to compliance with the existing order and any steps taken to address the original concerns.

35. The legal adviser drew the panel's attention to the principles in *Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin)*, and advised it to consider whether the conduct was remediable, whether it had been remediated and whether it was highly unlikely to be repeated. The panel was also referred to *CHRE v Grant and NMC [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin)* and advised to consider both the personal and public components of impairment, including the risk of harm, the need to maintain public confidence in the profession and the need to uphold proper professional standards.

36. The legal adviser advised that the panel was not required to make fresh findings in relation to the facts or statutory grounds which formed the basis of the accepted disposal. **[PRIVATE]**.

37. The panel was advised that, if it concluded that the social worker's fitness to practise was no longer impaired, it had the power under paragraph 15(1)(d) of Schedule 2 to revoke the current suspension order with immediate effect. If it concluded that fitness to practise remained impaired, it should consider what, if any, order was necessary and proportionate. Under paragraph 15(1), the panel had power to extend or further extend the existing suspension order, replace the suspension order with a conditions of practice order, or make any order which the case examiners or adjudicators could have made at the time the original order was imposed, subject to the statutory requirements applicable to any such order.

38. The legal adviser advised that, if impairment remained, sanction should be considered afresh and in ascending order of seriousness, applying the principle of proportionality and identifying the least restrictive sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest. The purpose of sanction was not to punish the social worker. The legal adviser referred the panel to *Bolton v Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512*, concerning the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession when determining sanction.

39. In relation to removal, the legal adviser drew the panel's attention to paragraph 13(2)(c) of Schedule 2, which contains the statutory gateway applicable where the original final

order was imposed by the case examiners following disposal without a hearing. The panel was advised that it should satisfy itself that the requirements of paragraph 13(2)(c) were met before considering a removal order. If removal was available, it remained a sanction of last resort and could only be imposed if the panel concluded that no lesser outcome would adequately protect the public or the wider public interest.

40. Finally, the legal adviser advised that any new order made under paragraph 15(1)(b), or any extension or conditions of practice order made under paragraph 15(1)(a) or (c), would take effect from the date on which the existing suspension order would otherwise expire. By contrast, revocation under paragraph 15(1)(d) would take effect on the date of the review. The early review provisions in paragraph 15(2) were not engaged in this mandatory review.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

41. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the accepted disposal decision of the case examiners dated 25 October 2024 and the reasons for that decision. The panel recognised that the purpose of the review was not to revisit or undermine the original decision, but to consider what had happened since the order was imposed and whether the concerns which led to the accepted disposal and suspension order had been sufficiently addressed. The panel exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment and took into account Social Work England's Impairment and sanctions guidance.

42. The panel also had regard to the subsequent correspondence with Ms Moyse and Social Work England's written submissions. The panel noted that no written submissions or further evidence had been provided by Ms Moyse for the purposes of this review. It also noted Social Work England's submission that Ms Moyse had complied with the suspension order **[PRIVATE].** The panel further noted that Ms Moyse had not completed and submitted a registration renewal application or paid the registration fee by the end of the renewal period on 30 November 2024.

43. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser.

44. The panel first considered whether Ms Moyse's fitness to practise remained impaired.

45. The panel noted that, when accepting the disposal proposed by the case examiners, Ms Moyse had admitted the key facts underlying the regulatory concerns and had accepted that their fitness to practise was impaired. The case examiners had nevertheless concluded that Ms Moyse had not demonstrated sufficient insight or remediation. In particular, there had been insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the matters which had contributed to the regulatory concerns had been addressed, and the case examiners had considered that a risk of repetition remained. **[PRIVATE].**

46. The panel considered the recommendations made by the case examiners as to the material which could assist a future reviewing panel. These included **[PRIVATE]**, evidence of relevant learning and a reflective piece. The panel noted that Social Work England had subsequently invited Ms Moyse on a number of occasions to provide updating evidence. No substantive reflective material demonstrating further insight, evidence of relevant learning or training, evidence of maintenance of professional knowledge and skills, or other evidence demonstrating remediation of the concerns had been provided since the disposal order was made.

47. The panel took into account Ms Moyse's communications with Social Work England. In particular, on 22 April 2025, Ms Moyse stated that they wished to apply for voluntary removal and did not wish to continue practising and, on 11 November 2025, they again stated that they had no intention of returning to social work and intended to submit a voluntary removal application. No completed voluntary removal application has subsequently been received. The panel considered that those communications demonstrated Ms Moyse's stated intention not to return to social work, but did not demonstrate that the regulatory concerns themselves had been remediated.

48. The panel also noted that Ms Moyse had previously indicated that, whilst they did not envisage returning to social work within the next couple of years, they had not entirely ruled out doing so in the future. The panel therefore considered that the absence of evidence of reflection and remediation remained relevant in the event that Ms Moyse's intentions changed.The panel did not treat Ms Moyse's limited engagement as a separate regulatory concern.

49. **[PRIVATE]**

50. The panel gave appropriate weight to Ms Moyse's compliance with the suspension order. However, compliance with an order preventing social work practice did not, of itself, demonstrate remediation of the concerns which led to the order. Nor was there evidence of subsequent social work practice from which the panel could assess whether Ms Moyse had demonstrated safe practice without repetition. The panel also had no evidence that Ms Moyse had taken steps to maintain their social work knowledge and skills during the period of suspension. The panel considered that the fact Ms Moyse was not practising did not prevent them from undertaking training, reading or other activities to maintain their professional knowledge and skills.

51. Turning to the personal component of impairment, the panel acknowledged Ms Moyse's previous acceptance of the regulatory concerns and of impairment. However, there was no subsequent evidence demonstrating developed insight into the causes of the concerns, their potential impact on service users, colleagues and the wider public, or how Ms Moyse would act differently in the future. In particular, there was no evidence of reflection on the risks arising from attending work whilst under the influence of alcohol, including the potential impact on service users and on the exercise of professional judgement when working with vulnerable people.

52. **[PRIVATE]** There was similarly no substantive evidence of remediation. In those circumstances, the panel was not satisfied that the concerns which led to the accepted disposal and suspension order had been sufficiently addressed. It concluded that the risk of repetition remained and that, if Ms Moyse were permitted to return to unrestricted social work practice, there remained a risk to the public.

53. The panel also considered the public component of impairment. It had regard to the seriousness of the underlying concerns, which included a criminal conviction arising from alcohol-related conduct and being under the influence of alcohol whilst at work. The panel considered the particular reputational implications of a social worker attending work whilst under the influence of alcohol, given that social workers are required to engage with vulnerable service users and families and to exercise professional judgement in the course of their work.

54. The panel considered that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a social worker were permitted to return to unrestricted practice where concerns of that seriousness had not been shown to have been sufficiently addressed. A finding of impairment also remained necessary to uphold proper professional standards.

55. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Moyse's fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of misconduct and conviction, on both the personal and public components.

Decision and reasons:

56. Having found that Ms Moyse's fitness to practise remained impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, order was necessary and proportionate. The panel had regard to all of the information before it, including Social Work England's written submissions, and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.

57. The panel noted that Social Work England invited it to impose a removal order. Social Work England submitted that, in the absence of evidence demonstrating remediation or insight, the panel could not be satisfied that the concerns identified by the case examiners had been fully addressed and that the risk of repetition remained. Social Work England further submitted that, although the concerns remained remediable, it would not be in the public interest to continue extending an order where there was no meaningful evidence that Ms Moyse was willing or able to remediate the concerns. The panel also took into account Social Work England's Impairment and sanctions guidance.

58. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Moyse, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and upholding proper professional standards. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Ms Moyse's interests against the public interest.

59. The panel considered the available outcomes in ascending order of seriousness.

Revocation or allowing the order to expire

60. The panel first considered whether the current order could be revoked or allowed to expire without replacement. Given its finding that Ms Moyse's fitness to practise remained impaired and that there remained a risk to the public, the panel concluded that this would not provide sufficient public protection.

Warning

61. The panel considered whether to impose a warning order.

62. The panel noted that a warning order would not directly restrict Ms Moyse's ability to practise and was therefore not appropriate where there remained a current risk to the public. In any event, given the seriousness of the concerns identified and the panel's finding that the risk of repetition remained, some restriction on Ms Moyse's practice was required.

63. The panel therefore concluded that a warning order would be inappropriate and insufficient to protect the public and meet the wider public interest.

Conditions of practice order

64. The panel then considered whether a conditions of practice order would be sufficient.

65. It recognised that the concerns were capable of remediation. However, Ms Moyse was not currently practising as a social worker and had provided no current indication that they intended to return to social work practice. The panel had no evidence of developed insight or remediation and no current information from which it could be satisfied that workable and effective conditions could be formulated or that Ms Moyse would be willing and able to comply with them. The panel was not confident, on the information before it, that Ms Moyse would comply with any conditions imposed.

66. The panel also noted that conditions of practice had initially been proposed by the case examiners. However, the social worker did not engage with that proposal and instead indicated that they did not envisage returning to social work within the following couple of years. The case examiners subsequently proposed a suspension order in place of conditions of practice, which the social worker accepted.

67. The panel therefore concluded that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate or sufficient to protect the public or meet the wider public interest, including the need to uphold proper professional standards.

Suspension order

68. The panel next considered whether a further period of suspension would adequately protect the public and meet the wider public interest. It recognised that suspension would continue to protect the public by preventing Ms Moyse from practising. It also considered carefully whether a further period of suspension would provide a meaningful opportunity for Ms Moyse to develop further insight and remediate the concerns.

69. The panel noted that Ms Moyse had already been subject to suspension for almost two years. The case examiners had identified material which could assist a future reviewing panel, including evidence of relevant learning, reflection and updated information addressing the concerns. Social Work England had subsequently invited Ms Moyse on a number of occasions to provide updating evidence. No substantive evidence of remediation had been provided.

70. The panel also took into account that Ms Moyse had stated in April 2025 that they did not wish to continue practising and wished to pursue voluntary removal, and in November 2025 again stated that they had no intention of returning to social work. Although no completed voluntary removal application had been received, those communications were relevant to the panel's assessment of whether a further period of suspension was likely to serve a useful rehabilitative purpose. It also took into account that Ms Moyse had not completed and submitted a registration renewal application or paid the registration fee by the end of the renewal period on 30 November 2024.

71. The panel concluded that there was no sufficient basis to consider that a further period of suspension would result in the concerns being addressed. It considered that extending the suspension would simply continue the existing position without any clear prospect of Ms Moyse undertaking the remediation necessary to return safely to unrestricted practice. There was no indication that Ms Moyse would use a further period of suspension to undertake the reflection, learning or remediation required. The panel also considered the impact on Ms Moyse of extending the suspension for a further substantial period where no useful rehabilitative purpose had been identified. In those circumstances, it did not consider that prolonging the suspension would be in either Ms Moyse's interests or the wider public interest.

72. The panel therefore concluded that a further suspension order would not be sufficient or proportionate.

Removal order

73. The panel was satisfied that a removal order was available to it as the Ms Moyse's fitness to practise had been determined to be impaired on the basis of grounds set out in regulation 25(2)(a) and (c) of the Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), namely misconduct and a criminal conviction in the United Kingdom.

74. The panel noted that a removal order is a sanction of last resort where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest. The panel considered that a removal order was appropriate in this case because Ms Moyse had already been subject to suspension for almost two years, during which no substantive evidence of further insight, remediation, relevant learning or maintenance of professional knowledge and skills had been provided. The panel also had regard to paragraph 149 of Social Work England's Impairment and sanctions guidance, which states that a removal order may be appropriate where a social worker is unwilling and/or unable to remediate, including where there is clear evidence that they do not wish to practise as a social worker in the future.

75. The panel had found that the risk of repetition remained. It also took into account Ms Moyse's repeated statements that they did not intend to return to social work practice. Having considered all lesser sanctions, including a further period of suspension, the panel concluded that there was no sufficient basis to consider that a further period of restriction would result in the concerns being addressed. No lesser order would therefore adequately protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper professional standards.

76. The panel therefore determined that a removal order was the necessary and proportionate sanction.

77. As this was a mandatory review under paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 to the Regulations, the panel considered whether the early review provisions in paragraph 15(2) were engaged and concluded that they were not. Accordingly,the removal order will take effect on expiry of the current suspension order.

Right of appeal:

78. Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the social worker may appeal to the High Court against:

    a. the decision of adjudicators:

        i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),

        ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,

        iii. to make a final order,

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

79. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.

80. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.

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

Review of final orders:

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

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

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

The Professional Standards Authority

84. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a review decision made by Social Work England's panel of adjudicators can be referred by the Professional Standards Authority ("the PSA") to the High Court. The PSA can refer this decision to the High Court if it considers that the decision is not sufficient for the protection of the public. Further information about PSA appeals can be found on their website at:

    https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work-with-regulators/decisions-about-practitioners