Social worker: Odesanmi Akinpeluola Odoginyon
Registration number: SW132166
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of hearing: 09 October 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 25 November 2026)

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

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the third review of a final suspension order originally imposed by a panel of adjudicators on 30 August 2024.
2. Mr Odoginyon 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**
Rachel O'Connell	Chair
Sue Williams	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	**Role**
Hannah Granger	Hearings officer
Lorna Lord	Hearings support officer
Joanne Close	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel had regard to the service bundle and noted that notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Odoginyon by email to an address provided by Mr Odoginyon, namely his registered address as it appears on the Social Work England Register.
6. 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 3 September 2026 and addressed to Mr Odoginyon at his email address which he provided to Social Work England;
    - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 3 September 2026 detailing Mr Odoginyon's registered address;
    - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 3 September 2026 the writer sent by email to Mr Odoginyon 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 16, 44 and 45 and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Odoginyon in accordance with the Rules.

Proceeding as a meeting and in the absence of Mr Odoginyon:

9. The notice of final order review informed Mr Odoginyon that the review may 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 2 October 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 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."

11. The panel received no information to suggest that Mr Odoginyon had responded to the notice of final order review and he has not attended. The notice contained all the information Mr Odoginyon might require to inform him how to participate. The notice made clear that if he did not respond, the review may proceed as 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).

13. The panel determined that because the practical effect of proceeding as a meeting was to conduct the review of the suspension order without Mr Odoginyon, it should have regard to the test for considering whether to proceed in the absence of Mr Odoginyon.

14. The panel also had regard to the Social Work England guidance 'Service of Notices and Proceeding in the Absence of the Social Worker' and the House of Lords decision in R v Jones [2002] UKHL5 with the further guidance given to panels by the Court of Appeal in GMC v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162 summarized in Davies v Health and Care Professions Council [2016] EWHC 1593 (Admin.)

15. The panel approached the question with particular care. The panel considered all of the information before it, which included: a 'Main FOR bundle' of 101 pages; and a 'Service & Supplementary bundle' of 16 pages.

16. The panel determined the following:

    i. The notice of hearing contained sufficient information, including telephone numbers and email addresses from which Mr Odoginyon could find out all he wanted to know if he had wanted to participate in today's hearing and it noted that he had not made contact with Social Work England.

ii. Mr Odoginyon had not requested an adjournment of the matter and there was no indication that Mr Odoginyon would be willing or able to attend on an alternative date. Therefore, re-listing this hearing would serve no useful purpose;

iii. Mr Odoginyon has not responded at all. The panel was satisfied that it was reasonable to conclude that Mr Odoginyon's non-attendance was voluntary and therefore a deliberate waiver of his right to participate in person;

iv. the panel noted the pattern of non attendance, as Mr Odoginyon had not attended the previous hearings and there was no information before the panel to suggest that should it adjourn the review that this would be likely to secure Mr Odoginyon's future attendance;

v. the panel recognised that there may be some disadvantage to Mr Odoginyon not being able to give evidence or make oral submissions to it. However, the panel was satisfied that Mr Odoginyon was aware of Social Work England's submissions to it, as they were outlined within the notice, and should he have wished to contest them he had been afforded with an opportunity to do so. The panel would take his previous submissions into account;

vi. the panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon would be aware, further to the contents of the notice, that the panel may proceed in his absence; and

vii. the panel also considered the public interest need to deal with mandatory order review matters expeditiously.

For all of the aforementioned reasons the panel determined that it was reasonable and in the public interest to proceed in the absence of Mr Odoginyon.

Review of the current order:

17. 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).

18. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 25 November 2026. The order subject to review is a suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months following a final hearing 17 to 21 June 2024, and 29 to 30 August 2024, reviewed and extended for a further 6 months on 15 August 2025, and reviewed and extended for a further 8 months on 11 February 2026.

19. The panel noted that the previous review hearing decisions on 15 August 2025 and 11 February 2026 do not refer to the allegations after 3(b). Both omit the allegations found proved on 30 August 2024 at 3. c) i, ii and iii and 4. a), b) and c).

20. The panel determined that they are required to make their decision on the full facts found at the substantive fitness to practise hearing that concluded on 30 August 2024 and under Rule 32 (a) it is fair to include them as part of their review decision making process.

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

"While registered as a social worker and employed by Southend Borough Council:

1) *In relation to Service User 1:*

    a. *[Redacted.]*

    b. *On or after 8 January 2021, you did not put a plan in place for contact between Service User 1 and his grandfather.*

    c. *On or around 21 March 2021, did not prepare an adequate risk assessment for Service User 1 in that:*

        i. *You did not obtain multiagency insight and/or feedback and/ or;*

        ii. *You did not obtain Service User 1's views on the plan;*

    d. *Did not take appropriate safeguarding action after becoming aware of Service User 1's suicide attempt on or around 13 April 2021 in that you:*

        1. *Did not visit Service User 1 and/ or;*
        2. *Did not contact medical professionals and/ or;*
        3. *Did not ascertain the trigger for Service User 1's actions and/ or;*
        4. *Did not call a timely strategy meeting.*

2) *In relation to Service User 2:*

    a) *Between around January 2021 and around May 2021, you did not familiarise yourself with the case notes of Service User 2 such that you were not sufficiently aware of his vulnerabilities and existing safeguarding concerns.*

    b) *On becoming aware that Service User 2 had on or around 8 March 2021, been in a volatile state and in need of calming down, you:*

        i) *Did not make a welfare call to Service User 2 and/ or;*

        ii) *Did not contact Service User 2 to ascertain what support he needed.*

    c) *Between around 23 March 2021 and around May 2021, you did not take appropriate safeguarding action after becoming aware that Service User 2*

was engaged in sexual communications online with other service users in that you:

i) Did not inform the Team Manager of the incident and/ or;

ii) Did not undertake sexual exploitation work with Service User 2 and/ or;

iii) Did not complete a multiagency risk assessment.

d) Between January 2021 and around 6 April 2021, you:

i) Did not ensure a risk assessment was completed prior to Service User 2 having unsupervised contact with his parents and/or;

ii) [Redacted]

iii) Failed to action a home visit in a timely manner.

e) You did not take appropriate safeguarding action upon being made aware that Service User 2 was being bullied on or around 6 April 2021, in that you:

i) Did not discuss these concerns with the placement staff and/ or;

ii) Did not visit Service User 2 and/ or;

iii) Did not update Service User 2's Care Plan in a timely manner and/ or;

iv) Did not complete a safety plan and/ or;

v) Did not call a multiagency meeting.

3) In relation to Service User 3:

a) [Redacted]

b) On or around 26 January 2021, you prepared a risk assessment in relation to Service User 3 which was inadequate in that:

i) It incorrectly assessed Service User 3's health risk level as "low" where it should have been "high" and/ or;

ii) It did not include details about Service User 3's general health and/ or;

iii) It did not contain adequate detail on how risk factors could be reduced and/or;

[Redacted]

c) You did not take appropriate safeguarding actions upon becoming aware between around February 2021 and around March 2021 that Service User 3 was accessing extremist content online, in that you:

i) Did not promptly report concerns to your Team Manager and/ or;
ii) Did not take steps to gather information without prompting and/ or;
iv) Did not gather relevant information prior to meeting with police.
[Redacted]

4) *On or around 8 January 2021, on becoming aware from a foster carer of a video depicting an unknown child being sexually abused, you did not respond adequately, in that you:*
a) Did not contact the foster carer to obtain further information and/ or;
b) Did not inform your Team Manager and/ or;
c) Did not notify the police."

The final hearing panel on 30 August 2024 determined the following with regard to impairment:

21. *"Personal impairment*

The panel considered the guidance provided in Cohen v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 581 which invited panels to consider:

- *whether the Registrant's conduct was easily remediable;*
- *whether it had been remedied; and*
- *whether it was highly unlikely to be repeated.*

The panel concluded that Mr Odoginyon's lack of capability or competence was remediable, albeit with some difficulty. Mr Odoginyon had not, the panel understood, been able to continue in practice as a social worker since being subject to an interim suspension order. However, he had taken up work in a related though unqualified adviser capacity in which there was evidence of good practice dating back to 2022. The panel had nothing more recent. The certificates produced by Mr Odoginyon all predated his ASYE employment. There was no evidence of any targeted remediation such as courses of training or insight and reflection dealing with competence and capability. Mr Odoginyon emphasised the alleged failings of others as being instrumental in his inability to progress and demonstrate competence. He said that he had been set up to fail by being placed in a demanding job without adequate supervision or training. He did not acknowledge the measure of support provided to him including a very restricted caseload.

The panel considered that Mr Odoginyon had not been able to provide any practical evidence or any up-to-date reflections which addressed a relevant degree of insight into his lack of competence or capability.

Mr Odoginyon had wholly failed to engage meaningfully with the serious and substantial failings captured in the allegations. In particular, Mr Odoginyon had not expressed any real grasp of his personal responsibility for his failings, particularly in respect of his working collaboratively with partner colleagues, identifying and acting on alarming risks

for service users, and his failures to build relationships with his professional colleagues and the service users in his caseload.

Mr Odoginyon said in his response to the Case Examiners that he had learned from his experience and he set out some things which he said he would do differently. However these were superficial and were not accompanied by any measure of real ownership of his failings and any sense of remorse for the potential consequences of his lack of competence and capability. Instead, Mr Odoginyon couched his analysis in criticisms of Mr Kappan which he held to be the real cause of his difficulties. Mr Odoginyon said that he had been oppressed by the organisation that had employed him.

More significantly for the panel, Mr Odoginyon said that he had not posed a risk to any adult or child. The panel considered this to be an almost complete absence of insight on Mr Odoginyon's part.

There was no recognition by Mr Odoginyon of the impact that his actions had on vulnerable service users and others and the risks that his sustained lack of competence or capability had created. There was no fundamental engagement with the serious issues in this case. As a result, the panel could not be reassured that Mr Odoginyon would not repeat similar failings through an unaddressed lack of capability or competence.

The panel found that it could not conclude that it was highly unlikely that Mr Odoginyon's misconduct would be repeated.

The panel was disappointed not to have been provided with any real expression of remorse by Mr Odoginyon.

The panel concluded that Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise is currently impaired by virtue of the personal component.

<u>Public impairment</u>

The panel paid close regard to the Social Work England guidance from paragraph 60 onwards. The panel also considered that Mr Odoginyon's actions engaged limbs (a), (b) and (c) of the test formulated in the High Court by Cox J in Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) at paragraph 76:

'Do our findings of fact in respect of [Mr Odoginyon's] misconduct, … show that his fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that [he]:

a. has in the past acted and/or is liable to act in the future so as to put a [service user] or at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or

b. has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the [social work] 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 [social work] profession; and/or

d. … ’.

The panel recognised that the risks of harm that Mr Odoginyon’s inadequate and unimproved professional performance exposed vulnerable service users to were significant and unacceptable.

The panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon’s actions, even though conducted over a relatively short period of time and in relation only to one employer at an early stage in his career, did have the potential to bring the reputation of the profession into disrepute. Mr Odoginyon had failed to properly arrange important meetings with partner professionals on more than one occasion. That had attracted concern and criticism from his professional colleagues. In these circumstances, the well-informed member of the public would have little difficulty in understanding the loss of confidence in the profession that this might attract.

The panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon had breached at least one of the fundamental tenets of the profession. Mr Odoginyon had failed to identify and act on clear and immediate risks for the service users in his caseload. He had not acted on information which pointed to a need for urgent protective steps to be taken. He had consistently demonstrated a lack of professional curiosity. He had failed to engage with fellow professionals both internally with his employer and externally in partner organisations including the police. Broader safeguarding matters had not been identified and dealt with. Mr Odoginyon’s failures to build positive relationships with service users by responding to their needs was particularly concerning. Arising out of this Mr Odoginyon had not been an advocate for the service users and he had not prioritised their needs over his own. This ran contrary to the fundamental tenets of social work which Mr Odoginyon would, like all social workers, have been immersed in from the very beginning of his career.

The panel considered that the public would be concerned at Mr Odoginyon’s unaddressed lack of capability and competence, unrecognised by him over an eight-month period of extensively supported ASYE practice. He had, in consequence of his unimproved competence placed at added risk a disadvantaged group of adolescent service users of being inadequately safeguarded.

In all of these circumstances, a finding of impairment was necessary in order to declare and uphold Standards for social workers and to maintain the trust and confidence of the public in the profession.

The panel, therefore, found Mr Odoginyon’s fitness to practise to be impaired on the grounds of public protection and in the wider public interest.”

The final order review panel on 15 August 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

22. *“<u>Personal impairment</u>*

The panel considered the guidance provided in Cohen v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 581 which invited panels to consider:

- *whether the Registrant's conduct was easily remediable;*
- *whether it had been remedied; and*
- *whether it was highly unlikely to be repeated.*

The panel concluded that Mr Odoginyon's lack of capability or competence was remediable, albeit with some difficulty. Mr Odoginyon had not, the panel understood, been able to continue in practice as a social worker since being subject to an interim suspension order. However, he had taken up work in a related though unqualified adviser capacity in which there was evidence of good practice dating back to 2022. The panel had nothing more recent. The certificates produced by Mr Odoginyon all predated his ASYE employment. There was no evidence of any targeted remediation such as courses of training or insight and reflection dealing with competence and capability. Mr Odoginyon originally emphasised the alleged failings of others as being instrumental in his inability to progress and demonstrate competence. He said that he had been set up to fail by being placed in a demanding job without adequate supervision or training. He did not acknowledge the measure of support provided to him including a very restricted caseload.

The panel considered that Mr Odoginyon had not been able to provide any practical evidence or any up-to-date reflections which addressed a relevant degree of insight into his lack of competence or capability.

Mr Odoginyon had wholly failed to engage meaningfully with the serious and substantial failings captured in the allegations. In particular, Mr Odoginyon had not expressed any real grasp of his personal responsibility for his failings, particularly in respect of his working collaboratively with partner colleagues, identifying and acting on alarming risks for service users, and his failures to build relationships with his professional colleagues and the service users in his caseload.

There was no recognition by Mr Odoginyon of the impact that his actions had on vulnerable service users and others and the risks that his sustained lack of competence or capability had created. There was no fundamental engagement with the serious issues in this case. As a result, the panel could not be reassured that Mr Odoginyon would not repeat similar failings through an unaddressed lack of capability or competence.

The panel found that it could not conclude that it was highly unlikely that Mr Odoginyon's misconduct would be repeated.

The panel noted that the original panel considered that the review panel would be assisted by Mr Odoginyon:

- *Engaging with Social Work England*

• A reflective piece highlighting his past failings and the impact they had on the safety of service users, his colleagues, and on public trust and confidence in the profession.

• Mr Odoginyon may also wish to provide the reviewing panel with a history of his employment and training since the ending of his ASYE contract. That might include:

i. reflections on that work or training

ii. how that has addressed and developed his competence and capability

iii. explaining why he would not again be responsible for failings in practice related to a lack of competence or capability should he return to social work practice unrestricted.

The panel found in the absence of any evidence that demonstrated the development on insight, remorse and competence and capability from Mr Odoginyon and continued lack of engagement with Social Work England since the original panel, the aggravating factors remain unchanged.

The panel concluded that Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise is currently impaired by virtue of the personal component.

<u>Public impairment</u>

The panel paid close regard to the Social Work England guidance from paragraph 60 onwards. The panel also considered that Mr Odoginyon's actions engaged limbs (a), (b) and (c) of the test formulated in the High Court by Cox J in Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) at paragraph 76:

'Do our findings of fact in respect of [Mr Odoginyon's] misconduct, … show that his fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that [he]:

a. has in the past acted and/or is liable to act in the future so as to put a [service user] or at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or

b. has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the [social work] 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 [social work] profession;

The panel recognised that the risks of harm that Mr Odoginyon's inadequate and unimproved professional performance exposed vulnerable service users to were significant and unacceptable.

The panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon's actions, even though conducted over a relatively short period of time and in relation only to one employer at an early stage in his career, did have the potential to bring the reputation of the profession into disrepute. Mr Odoginyon had failed to properly arrange important meetings with partner

professionals on more than one occasion. That had attracted concern and criticism from his professional colleagues. In these circumstances, the well-informed member of the public would have little difficulty in understanding the loss of confidence in the profession that this might attract.

The panel was also satisfied that Mr Odoginyon had breached at least one of the fundamental tenets of the profession. Mr Odoginyon had failed to identify and act on clear and immediate risks for the service users in his caseload. He had not acted on information which pointed to a need for urgent protective steps to be taken. He had consistently demonstrated a lack of professional curiosity. He had failed to engage with fellow professionals both internally with his employer and externally in partner organisations including the police. Broader safeguarding matters had not been identified and dealt with. Mr Odoginyon's failures to build positive relationships with service users by responding to their needs was particularly concerning. Arising out of this Mr Odoginyon had not been an advocate for the service users and he had not prioritised their needs over his own. This ran contrary to the fundamental tenets of social work which Mr Odoginyon would, like all social workers, have been immersed in from the very beginning of his career.

The panel considered that the public would be concerned at Mr Odoginyon's unaddressed lack of capability and competence, unrecognised by him over an eight-month period of extensively supported ASYE practice. He had, in consequence of his unimproved competence placed at added risk a disadvantaged group of adolescent service users of being safeguarded.

In all of these circumstances, a finding of impairment was necessary in order to declare and uphold Standards for social workers and to maintain the trust and confidence of the public in the profession.

The panel, therefore, found Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise to be impaired on the grounds of public protection and in the wider public interest."

The previous final order review panel on 11 February 2026 determined the following with regard to impairment:

23. *The panel first considered whether Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise remains impaired. First, the panel considered whether Mr Odoginyon's lack of capability or competence was easily remediable. The panel concluded that it is potentially remediable but noted that Mr Odoginyon has still not provided an explanation as to what went wrong and why he failed to meet the required standards of competency, in particular in relation to identifying safeguarding concerns and taking the required action.*

"The panel noted that the panel at the final hearing had concluded with regard to safeguarding service users, that:

His varied and frequent failures across all of these Standards had placed vulnerable service users at risk. He had been unable to show consistent improvement in his level of capability.

The panel identified that Mr Odoginyon had failed to identify risks and safeguarding issues and to act accordingly. That amounted to a fundamental failure to observe the Standards of competence and capability identified by the panel.

The panel went on to consider if the lack of capability or competence had been remedied. The panel carefully considered the detailed written submissions Ms Odoginyon had provided in advance of this hearing. The panel was very pleased to see that he was now engaging with his professional regulator and had begun to consider the issues which might lead to developing insight and remediation. The panel considered that Mr Odoginyon had begun to engage with some of the recommendations of the previous panels. However, the panel found that his written submissions sought to emphasise his perception of the failures of others to support him in his foundation years and found that he had failed to engage meaningfully with the extensive concerns which had been found proved. Mr Odoginyon had not expressed any real understanding of his personal responsibility for his failings in particular in respect of his working collaboratively with partner colleagues, identifying and acting on alarming risks for service users.

Although Mr Odoginyon had stated in his submissions (as detailed in paragraph 19 above) that he had used the period of suspension to "reflect on the findings and to develop and broaden ... insight [and] ... demonstrate remediation", the panel could find no detail or evidence of any meaningful reflection, insight or remediation into the findings. In particular whether he accepts the gravity of the findings, how it happened, why it happened, the impact it might have had on the service users, the wider profession or public and how he would ensure the conduct would not be repeated in the future. The panel noted the following findings of the final hearing panel in relation to the question of insight and concluded that they were still applicable today:

Mr Odoginyon said in his response to the Case Examiners that he had learned from his experience and he set out some things which he said he would do differently. However, these were superficial and were not accompanied by any measure of real ownership of his failings and any sense of remorse for the potential consequences of his lack of competence and capability. Instead, Mr Odoginyon couched his analysis in criticisms of Mr Kappan which he held to be the real cause of his difficulties. Mr Odoginyon said that he had been oppressed by the organisation that had employed him.

More significantly for the panel, Mr Odoginyon said that he had not posed a risk to any adult or child. The panel considered this to be an almost complete absence of insight on Mr Odoginyon's part.

The panel went on to consider whether the conduct was highly unlikely to be repeated. The panel found that the conduct found proved identified very serious failings across his engagement with three service users and included failures to recognise risk and to undertake necessary safeguarding actions in situation that could have led to direct harm to vulnerable people in his care. The panel found that recognising risk and undertaking appropriate safeguarding actions are the bedrock of social work. The panel concluded that without further information and engagement from Mr Odoginyon demonstrating meaningful understanding, insight and remediation, it was unable to conclude that the conduct was highly unlikely to be repeated.

The panel noted that Mr Odoginyon had provided some information about his employment since the final hearing but with insufficient detail about his role or his employer to allow the panel to fully understand its relevance to his remediation of the specific concerns found proved. There is also no independent evidence to support his assertion that his employment has developed his competence and capabilities to the extent that there is no longer a risk of repetition.

The panel noted that Mr Odoginyon had provided detailed information about the training he has undertaken but has not explained how the training is relevant to the specific concerns, lack of competence/capabilities identified at the final hearing and how he would apply his learning to his practice.

The panel went on to consider whether public confidence in the profession would be damaged if a finding of impairment was not made. The panel found that members of the public would be very concerned if a social worker was allowed to return to unrestricted practice when they had failed to evidence that their risk of repetition had been reduced, following such serious findings.

The panel therefore concluded that Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise is currently impaired."

The previous final order review panel on 11 February 2026 determined the following with regard to sanction:

24. *"The panel considered whether to take no further action, issue advice or impose a warning order. The panel noted that all of these actions/sanctions would not restrict Mr Odoginyon's ability to practise and were therefore not appropriate where there is a current risk to public safety. Therefore, the panel concluded that taking no further action, issuing advice or imposing a warning would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.*

The panel went on to consider whether a conditions of practice order would be appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances. However, the panel noted that Mr Odoginyon had been subject to extensive supervision and a reduced workload at the time the conduct arose. Given the significant level of support previously provided and

the lack of remediation which led the panel to conclude that there remained a risk of repetition of the same conduct, the panel was unable to formulate workable conditions which would address the risk identified that would not be tantamount to a suspension.

The panel considered whether the current suspension order should be extended for a further period of time. The panel determined that a suspension order would prevent Mr Odoginyon from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest. It would also allow Mr Odoginyon further time to fully engage with the findings against him and demonstrate meaningful insight and remediation.

The panel determined that the suspension order should be extended for a period of 8 months, to allow sufficient time for Mr Odoginyon to reflect on the panel's findings and devise a plan of action targeted towards an unrestricted return to the register.

The panel noted that under paragraph 150 of the Social Work England Sanctions Guidance, a removal order is not available to it in the current situation, but will be available to the reviewing panel on the next occasion.

This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, a future reviewing panel would expect Mr Odoginyon to attend the review hearing. This panel would have been greatly assisted by the ability to ask Mr Odoginyon questions in order to explore his written submissions. It would be of assistance to that panel if he was able to provide evidence that he had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction. This may include:

- *A further reflective piece focussing on his views of the final hearing panel's findings on facts and impairment and the impact of his conduct on the service users in question.*
- *Mr Odoginyon's reflections on what he would do if faced with similar circumstances in the future to ensure that his practice remains safe and effective.*
- *References and testimonials from employers or volunteering positions since the date of the final hearing.*
- *Any additional training and CPD undertaken since the final hearing and evidence of putting his learning into practice."*

Social Work England submissions:

25. The panel had regard to the written submissions from Social Work England set out in the notice of 3 September 2026:

"Social Work England invites the Panel to find the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired and to impose a Removal Order from the expiry of the current Order.

The social worker's fitness to practise was found to be impaired on the statutory ground of lack of capability or competence. The regulatory concerns relate to serious safeguarding failures involving several service users.

At the previous review hearing, on 11 February 2026, the Panel identified that a future reviewing panel may be assisted by the following, which would assist in an assessment of remediation:

• Attendance at future hearings and engagement with the process;
• A reflective piece highlighting their past failings and the impact they had on the safety of service users, their colleagues, and on public trust and confidence in the profession;
• A history of their employment and training since the ending of their ASYE contract. That might include:

i. reflections on that work or training
ii. how that has addressed and developed their competence and capability
iii. explaining why they would not again be responsible for failings in practice related to a lack of competence or capability should they return to social work practice unrestricted.

The social worker has not provided Social Work England with demonstrable evidence of compliance with any of those recommendations. In particular, Social Work England have not been provided with any correspondence, a reflective piece, or other evidence from the social worker during the review cycle to demonstrate that they have developed insight into the concerns, understood the impact of their actions, or taken appropriate steps to remediate the identified deficiencies.

Although information provided in advance of the previous review hearing regarding further education and employment in roles akin to social work suggested some progress towards remediation, it was found that the social worker sought to apportion blame. As there has been no further engagement during this review cycle, Social Work England is unable to identify any sustained evidence of reflection, insight or remediation.

The social worker has also not attended the previous hearings. It is submitted that their continued failure to engage with the regulatory process means that the Panel has no new evidence upon which it can properly assess whether the underlying concerns have been addressed.

Accordingly, Social Work England submits that the concerns which led to the finding of impairment have not been demonstrated to be remediated.

It is submitted that there continues to be a lack of engagement from the social worker. As such, there would be no benefit in extending the current Order. Furthermore, it would be contrary to the public interest to maintain an order where there is clear evidence of prolonged disengagement with the regulatory process.

Social Work England further submits that, given the seriousness of the regulatory concerns, the absence of any evidence demonstrating meaningful remediation, and the length of time the order has been in place, a Removal Order is the only proportionate disposal in this matter.

A Removal Order is available to the Panel at the review hearing as the social worker will have been subject to the Final Order for two years. Social Work England submits that such an order is, therefore, the most appropriate order at this stage."

Social worker submissions:

26. The panel had no new written submissions from Mr Odoginyon before it. The panel had regard to the written submissions made by Mr Odoginyon, provided to the previous final order review panel in February 2026:

> *"The suspension order had provided me with the time to reflect on the findings and to develop and broaden my insight. It has also allowed me the scope for opportunities to demonstrate remediation of my competence and capability in my practice, albeit not as a practising social worker but as a trained social worker.*
>
> *...*
>
> *I respectfully appeal for fairness and understanding in the consideration of my case. My intention is to be given the chance to restore my professional career and to continue making a meaningful contribution to the community. I am hopeful that I may move forward with the dignity and support that every professional deserves, enabling me to once again have a positive impact through my work."*

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

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

28. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel, the two previous review panels, and the written

submissions made by Social Work England, and previous submissions from Mr Odoginyon.

Legal advice:

29. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser who reminded them that this was a Final Order Review as the order was due to expire on 25 November 2026, and of their options as set out in the Social Workers Regulations 2018 Schedule 2, paragraphs 15(1)(a) to (d).

30. The panel was reminded of the overarching objective to protect the public and the wider public interest in upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession under S 37 Children and Social Work Act 2017.

31. The panel was directed to Social Work England's Sanctions Guidance, in particular the need when considering whether fitness to practise is impaired, to consider both the personal and the public element and the factors to consider.

32. The panel was required to assess current impairment on the evidence now before it and was reminded of the principles in the case of Abrahaem v GMC [2008] EWHC 183 (Admin) in relation to the need to consider whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the tribunal's satisfaction, with a persuasive burden on the practitioner to demonstrate at the review hearing that he fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient, and how he had sufficiently addressed the past impairments through insight, application, education, supervision or other achievement.

33. The questions to consider set out in Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) were highlighted to assist with the personal element of impairment specifically whether the conduct is easily remediable or has been remedied by the social worker, and the risk of repetition.

34. Further guidance was drawn from Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) which sets out that impairment is an evaluative judgment, including consideration of whether the registrant has acted, or is liable in the future to act, in a manner that puts service users at unwarranted risk of harm, brings the profession into disrepute, breaches fundamental professional standards, or acts dishonestly'

35. The panel was reminded of the long standing principles from case law in relation to the public element in

    a) Bolton v The Law Society Court of Appeal [1994] 1 WLR 512, that the reputation of the profession is more important than the fortunes of any individual member.

    b) General Medical Council v Chaudhury [2017] EWHC 2561 (Admin) which strongly emphasised the importance of undertaking "a proper balance of all

three elements of the tripartite public interest" in deciding whether fitness to practise is impaired, as the whole of the public interest is vital.

36. Finally, the panel was reminded that if they move on to consider sanction it must be on a proportionate basis, considering the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest. The purpose of sanctions is not punitive but to protect the public.

Decision:

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

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

Personal element of impairment:

39. The panel first noted Mr Odoginyon's employment history and relative inexperience. He was first registered with Social Work England on 13 August 2020, commenced employment on 7 September 2020 and was put on a capability plan on 2 October 2020, 25 days after commencing employment as a social worker on the Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (ASYE) programme. The proven facts amounting to lack of competence and capability relate to the period January to May 2021.

40. The panel had regard to the principles of Abrahaem v GMC [2008] EWHC 183 (Admin) and considered whether he had satisfied them that the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction, whether he had fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient, and how he had sufficiently addressed the past impairments.

41. The panel considered the previous findings of impairment as set out above before moving to consider the current impairment.

42. The current information before this panel indicates that Mr Odoginyon has not fully acknowledged why his past professional performance was deficient, and how he had sufficiently addressed the past impairments.

43. He has not complied with the previous panel's recommendations.

44. He has not attended on this occasion, and the panel was unable to ask him questions about his remediation, insight, education, employment and application.

45. He has not addressed the original concerns from the original finding.

46. He has provided no evidence of remediation, insight or further education since the last hearing. There is no acknowledgement of the impact of his actions on the vulnerable service users he was to protect.

47. Mr Odoginyon has not chosen to make further submissions in addition to the submissions made to the previous review, where the panel could find "*no detail or evidence of any meaningful reflection, insight or remediation into the findings. In particular whether he accepts the gravity of the findings, how it happened, why it happened, the impact it might have had on the service users, the wider profession or public and how he would ensure the conduct would not be repeated in the future.*"

48. The panel determined these questions remain outstanding along with the lack of acceptance of responsibility for the lack of competence and capability and lack of acceptance that there has been any risk to service users.

49. The panel had no evidence from Mr Odoginyon to suggest that his fitness to practise is no longer impaired, or that he showed any remorse, remediation or insight. It was disappointed that he has not complied with any of the suggestions of the previous panel to assist them.

50. The panel noted that for the previous review hearing, Mr Odoginyon had provided a list of further training he had undertaken since the final order was imposed, but there was no evidence from him as to how this knowledge was applied by him and might prevent any repetition.

51. The panel noted they had been supplied with no information of current employment or supervision or a history of competent employment covering the period since 2021.

52. Considering the guidance in Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) the panel determined that while the lack of capability or competence may not be easily remediable, given the extent of the concerns, there is potential for remediation if a person was willing to engage. It might be harder for Mr Odoginyon as he was new to social work when the lack of competence and capability arose however remediation might be possible with application and engagement. However, the panel has received no evidence that Mr Odoginyon has remedied the lack of competence or capability which the panel considered equates to a significant likelihood of repetition.

53. Considering the guidance in Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) the panel found that Mr Odoginyon's lack of competence or capability occurred from the very start of his professional journey and when under significant guidance. It amounted to very serious, fundamental, wide-ranging breaches of professional standards, that showed a failure to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and wellbeing of the service users affected and therefore the public. His failure would bring the profession into disrepute.

54. The panel concluded that Mr Odoginyon has made very little progress in the 26 months since the final suspension order was imposed on 30 August 2024 and for the reasons above his fitness to practise remains impaired.

<u>Public element of impairment:</u>

55. In the panel's view, the public could have no confidence in the profession or the regulator if Mr Odoginyon was allowed to practise unfettered having been proven to have behaved in this way and not having addressed the failings.

56. For these reasons the panel concluded Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise remains impaired on both the public and personal components.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

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

58. The panel considered the submissions on behalf of Social Work England inviting them to remove Mr Odoginyon from the register of social workers because the concerns have not been demonstrated to be remediated as there "*continues to be a lack of engagement from the social worker. As such, there would be no benefit in extending the current Order. Furthermore, it would be contrary to the public interest to maintain an order where there is clear evidence of prolonged disengagement with the regulatory process.*"

59. The panel also took into account the previous engagement of Mr Odoginyon including the submissions he had made previously, and the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.

60. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Odoginyon, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Mr Odoginyon's interests with the public interest.

61. The panel considered whether to take no further action, issue advice or impose a warning order. The panel noted that all of these actions/sanctions would not restrict Mr Odoginyon's ability to practise and were therefore not appropriate because of the impairment already found. These sanctions would fail to protect the public or maintain public safety. Therefore, the panel concluded that taking no further action, issuing advice or imposing a warning would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.

62. The panel went on to consider whether a conditions of practice order would be appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances. Mr Odoginyon has not engaged with the regulator and there is no evidence he would engage with any conditions of practice. There is no information about his current employment. Mr Odoginyon had not maintained standards at a time when he was heavily supervised with a reduced caseload. He put service users at risk and there has been no evidence provided that the likelihood of repetition does not remain high.

63. The panel determined that any conditions of practice would be so extensive to address the risks identified, that they would be tantamount to suspension and it was unable to formulate any workable conditions.

64. The panel considered whether the current suspension order should be extended for a further period of time.

65. The record of participation from Mr Odoginyon has been limited, and there has been no engagement in the last 6 months despite the previous panel making recommendations to "*allow Mr Odoginyon further time to fully engage with the findings against him and demonstrate meaningful insight and remediation*." Mr Odoginyon has not engaged at all since then and there is no evidence that he has reflected on the panel's findings and devised a plan of action targeted towards an unrestricted return to the register as the panel suggested.

66. Mr Odoginyon has not engaged or taken advantage of the opportunity to engage with the findings against him by demonstrating remediation or insight, and instead has been silent. The panel found no evidence to believe a fourth period of suspension would be utilised constructively and did not believe further suspension was appropriate or proportionate.

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

67. The panel was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Mr Odoginyon's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of one or more grounds as set out in regulation 25(2)(b) and he had been suspended from practice or subject to a conditions of practice final order (or a combination of both) for a continuous period of two years immediately preceding the day when the removal order would take effect - since the 30 August 2024.

68. 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 took the view that a removal order would be appropriate because taking into account the seriousness of the conduct establishing the lack of competence and capability, the continuing lack of meaningful engagement from Mr Odoginyon, and the continued impaired fitness to practise, the panel concluded that no other sanction would be sufficient to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession, and maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England.

Right of appeal:

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

    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.

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

71. Under Paragraph 15(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.

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

Review of final orders:

73. 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).

74. 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

75. 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