Social worker: Chipo Dhinda
Registration number: SW89485
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of hearing: 26 October 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 05 December 2026)

Hearing outcome:
Revoke the suspension order with immediate effect

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a panel of adjudicators on 7 November 2025.
2. Ms Dhinda attended and was represented by Mr Martyn Burrell of the British Association of Social Workers.
3. Social Work England was represented by its case presenter, Ms Carla Hazelwood.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter "the panel") and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	**Role**
Karen McArthur	Chair
Ian Vinall	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	**Role**
Hannah Granger	Hearings officer
Anne Briggs	Hearings support officer
Rosemary Rollason	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel had sight of a notice of this hearing dated 24 September 2026 sent to Ms Dhinda by email to an email address provided by Ms Dhinda (namely their registered address as it appears on the Social Work England Register).
6. As Ms Dhinda was present and represented at the hearing, there was no issue as to service.

Review of the current order:

7. 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).
8. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 5 December 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:

1. Whilst working as a social worker, between 1 March 2020 and 11 June 2020:

a. You represented that a Core Group Meeting took place on 9 March 2020 for Children A, B and C when no such meeting took place.

b. *You represented that a Core Group Meeting took place on 11 May 2020 for Children A, B and C when no such meeting took place.*

2. *Your actions in relation to paragraph 1 (a) and/ or paragraph 1 (b) were dishonest in that you knew that no such meeting had taken place and that your representations would give the impression that a meeting did take place.*

3. *-*

4. Between 1 March 2019 and 11 November 2020, you did not make timely and/or accurate recordings on your allocated cases and/or failed to carry out actions in a timely manner or at all as set out in Schedule 1

Schedule 1

(a) Case of Child D

A Child Protection case, in which you recorded a visit as a Child in Need visit and not a Child Protection visit.

(b) Case of Child O

A Child in Need case, in which:

(i) -

(ii) you failed to carry out a Child in Need review between 23 March 2020 and 1 July 2020.

(c) Case of Child L

A Child in Need case, in which:

(i) you failed to record the Child in Need reviews on 20 November 2019, and 27 January 2020 until 22 June 2020 and/ or;

(ii) you failed to record, in Child L's case notes, that Child L was seen in person on 16 June 2020 (along with Child M).

(d) Case of Child M

A Child in Need case, in which you failed to record the Child in Need reviews on 20 November 2019 and 27 January 2020 until 22 June 2020.

(e) Case of Child J, a Child in Need case, in which:

(i) -

(ii) you failed to carry out Child in Need reviews between 24 February 2020 and 19 July 2020.

(f) Case of Child H

A Child in Need case, in which:

(i) you failed to carry out a Child in Need review between 12 February 2020 and 30 June 2020 and/ or;

(ii) -

(g) Case of Child G

A Child in Need case, in which:

(i) you failed to carry out a Child in Need review between 12 February 2020 and 30 June 2020 and/ or;

(ii) –

(h) Case of Child C

A Child Protection case, in which:

(i) you failed to carry out Core Group meetings between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or

(ii) -

(iii) you failed to carry out a Child Protection visit between 16 May 2020 and 3 June 2020; and/ or

(iv) you failed to complete a record for a Child Protection visit, which took place on 4 June 2020, until the 10 June 2020.

(i) Case of Child A

A Child Protection case, in which:

(i) you failed to carry out Core Group meetings between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or

(ii) -

(iii) you failed to carry out a Child Protection visit between 16 May 2020 and 3 June 2020; and/ or

(iv) you failed to complete a record for a Child Protection visit, which took place on 4 June 2020, until the 10 June 2020.

(j) Case of Child B

A Child Protection case, in which:

(i) you failed to carry out Core Group meetings between 9 January 2020 and 18 June 2020; and/or

(ii) -

(iii) you failed to carry out a Child Protection visit between 16 May 2020 and 3 June 2020 and/ or

(iv) you failed to complete a record for a Child Protection visit, which took place on 4 June 2020, until the 10 June 2020.

(k) Case of Child I

In which you failed to make a recording of the Core Group Meeting, which took place on or around 8 October 2019 to 23 October 2019, until 9 and/or 10 June 2020.

(l) Case of Child E

A Child in Need case, in which you failed to carry out and/or record any Child in Need reviews between 27 January 2020 and 7 September 2020.

(m) Case of Child F

A Child in Need case, in which you failed to carry out and/or record any Child in Need reviews between 27 January 2020 and 7 September 2020.

(n) Case of Child N

A Child Protection case, in which you, between 1 November 2019 and 27 February 2020:

(i) did not hold any Core Group Meetings; and/ or

(ii) -

(o) Case of Child K

A Child Protection case, in which you, between 1 November 2019 and 27 February 2020:

(i) did not hold any Core Group Meetings and/ or;

(ii) -

The matters at paragraphs 1-4 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

At the final hearing which concluded on 7 November 2025, the panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

9. The panel stated in its determination:

'After finding that the facts proved amounted to serious misconduct, the panel went on to consider whether Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise was currently impaired. In doing so, it reminded itself of the need to assess both the personal component, which addresses the risk of repetition and protection of the public, and the wider public component, which concerns the maintenance of confidence in the profession and the upholding of proper standards.

In relation to the personal component, the panel determined that the misconduct was not restricted to isolated mistakes but included serious and intentional failings. The dishonesty in official documentation, specifically to mislead professionals into believing actual meetings had taken place was an act of deliberate concealment. The panel is satisfied that Ms Dhinda's actions when creating records of the meetings on 9 March 2020 and 11 May 2020 were taken in a deliberate attempt to conceal gaps in her practice; she was coming under increased pressure and her behaviour placed her personal needs above professional duty.

The panel found there was clearly a significant risk of harm as meetings did not happen within the required timescales and minutes of meetings were falsified. Ms Dhinda should have anticipated the risk of harm by not having the meetings and then falsifying paperwork. Ms Dhinda acknowledged that children could have been at significant risk, stating that Children A, B and C were part of a family where domestic abuse was a concern.

The panel also noted that Ms Dhinda had sought to shift responsibility for her actions onto others. She stated that AA had known that the meeting of the 9 March 2020 had not taken place and specifically instructed her to make the recording. In her evidence for impairment, Ms Dhinda was again clear that AA knew the meeting on the 9 March 2020 had not taken place and had signed off the record in that knowledge, despite the panel having made findings that Ms Dhinda lied under oath on this matter. The panel considered that such attempts to deflect blame were inconsistent with genuine acceptance of responsibility and further demonstrated a lack of meaningful insight.

The panel also placed particular weight on the element of dishonesty that ran through Ms Dhinda's misconduct. Dishonesty is regarded as especially serious because it undermines the trust placed in social workers by service users, colleagues, courts, and

the public. In this case, her dishonest production of minutes of core group and CIN meetings demonstrated a willingness to mislead in order to protect her own position. Such behaviour not only placed service users at risk but also threatened the integrity of multi-agency safeguarding processes. The panel considered that this sustained dishonesty compounded the gravity of the case and was itself a significant factor in its finding on impairment.

In addition, the panel found there was incomplete reflection. Ms Dhinda has accepted the findings in relation to her poor record keeping and failure to carry out critical meetings and visits and was able to articulate how this could have placed children and families at risk, impacted their willingness to engage with social work services and damaged the reputation of the profession. However, when it came to findings on dishonesty the panel determined that there was little to no genuine reflection. Ms Dhinda stated on more than one occasion that whilst she accepted her actions appeared dishonest; she was not being intentionally dishonest. The panel rejects her assertion that she can accept her actions were dishonest without having the intention behind those actions. It is the panel's view that she knew exactly what she was doing in falsifying the records of the 9 March 2020 and the 11 May 2020 and that there was no substantial reflection on the impact of dishonesty upon how either her own practice or the profession as a whole may be viewed.

In explaining to this panel her understanding of the findings, Ms Dhinda did not once acknowledge the findings of dishonesty. She stated in her evidence that she had learned and is now open and honest with managers and seeks clarification when she is uncertain about any issues. However, she failed to inform TS of the finding of dishonesty or that there was a finding she had lied under oath. TS only found out about the dishonesty findings on 18 June 2025; despite confirming she had spoken to Ms Dhinda about the allegations around the beginning of May 2025 after this panel had made the findings. Ms Dhinda had every opportunity of explaining the findings to TS as her manager and her failure to do so leads the panel to consider she has not been reflective, nor has she been open and honest with her employer. There is no evidence before the panel to suggest that Ms Dhinda accepts the findings made in relation to dishonesty. The panel finds there cannot be full remediation until there is a genuine acceptance of the findings.

In evidence from TS, it became clear that Ms Dhinda was encouraged to submit an expression of interest for a permanent position. Ms Dhinda submitted the application, and the Head of Service offered her the post on 16 April 2025. This is 6 days after the adjournment of the hearing of 10 April 2025 where the panel found that Ms Dhinda had been dishonest and lied under oath. The panel finds Ms Dhinda failed to inform her employer of the extent of those findings in the recruitment process, nor did she provide them with a copy of the determination that she had received from the April 2025 hearing as she was not sure she should do so. The panel does not find this to be an example of

her being open and honest with her current managers, and therefore does not accept her assertion that she has learned to do so.

The panel finds that Ms Dhinda minimised responsibility and did not engage with the seriousness of the misconduct. The panel acknowledges her apology, and considers that she has expressed genuine remorse in terms of her failure to complete records and carry out her duties in a timely manner. However, this apology did not extend to an acknowledgement of her dishonest conduct and needs to be considered in the light of the overall minimisation and blame-shifting demonstrated throughout her evidence. Furthermore, Ms Dhinda did not demonstrate meaningful insight or mitigate the seriousness. Taken together, these factors led the panel to conclude that the risk of repetition remained significant.

The panel acknowledged Ms Dhinda's previously unblemished record and noted that since the allegations were made, she has practised successfully under interim conditions of practice. However, without any acknowledgement from Ms Dhinda that her actions were fundamentally dishonest, the panel cannot accept that full remediation has occurred.

The panel found that Ms Dhinda still had some work to do to recognise what went wrong and accept her role and responsibilities in relation to the events. Whilst the panel accepts the time period which covered these events was difficult, it cannot be an excuse for the entirety of the matters that happened. Whilst Ms Dhinda told the panel that she now works closely with her manager and team to raise issues when she feels she has a problem, and allows herself to be more vulnerable, and checks when she is unsure of instructions, she proved this did not happen when asked about sharing the determination or findings with her employer. She was unsure as to whether she could share these, but appeared to take no steps to confirm or deny this belief and simply did not share the document and indeed shared incorrect information, such as stating that misconduct had been found, when it had not.

The panel found that Ms Dhinda has not accepted the panel's finding of her intention to be dishonest. When asked to describe the misconduct she was accepting that she had committed, Ms Dhinda did not mention dishonesty at all, until prompted later. Despite facts being found that she was dishonest, and lied under oath, Ms Dhinda seemed unable to accept that she herself was dishonest.

Dishonesty is generally recognised as one of the most serious forms of misconduct. Panels are directed to consider dishonesty on a scale of seriousness. The panel found that the dishonesty initially occurred during an isolated period of Ms Dhinda's career, namely March to June 2020. However, when put in arguably similar circumstances of pressure, during the hearing, Ms Dhinda was dishonest and was found to have lied under oath. This led the panel to determine that Ms Dhinda's dishonesty is part of a larger problem or pattern of behaviour.

The panel accept this was a difficult time, and Ms Dhinda was experiencing [PRIVATE] which could have contributed to her difficulties at the time. However, the panel found there is no mitigation which could excuse Ms Dhinda's behaviour at the time, and her dishonesty during the hearing.

Ms Dhinda had multiple testimonials which gave positive accounts of her work. Ms Dhinda's manager gave evidence under oath and was very supportive of Ms Dhinda's practice and included the fact that she had been commended by judges on complex Family Court cases.

Given the panel's concerns about the adequacy of Ms Dhinda's insight or remediation the panel concluded there remained a risk of repetition of the past misconduct. The panel concluded that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is impaired in relation to the personal element of current impairment.

Turning to the public component, the panel considered that some concerns are so serious, that if proven, a finding of impairment is likely. This is because a failure to make a finding of impairment may:

- *Undermine public confidence in the profession*
- *Fail to maintain the professional standards expected of social workers*

Social workers hold a position of significant trust, particularly when working with vulnerable service users. Misconduct of this nature undermines that trust and damages the reputation of the profession. The panel also noted that by authoring and submitting flawed and misleading records, Ms Dhinda placed children at potential risk of harm. Child protection processes rely on the accuracy of such reports in making critical decisions affecting children and families, and any dishonesty in this context threatens the integrity of that process.

The panel considered that Ms Dhinda's actions had the potential to affect not only the service users and the children involved, but also the wider system of multi-agency safeguarding, since inaccurate information distorts the work of professionals across agencies who depend on reliable records to make informed decisions. The panel determined that public confidence would be seriously compromised if such conduct were not marked by a finding of impairment. It concluded that it was essential to declare and uphold the standards of professional practice, including maintaining appropriate boundaries, protecting service users from harm, being open and honest, and keeping clear and accurate records.

The panel concurred with the submissions of GMC counsel in the case of Yeong v GMC General Medical Council [2009] EWHC 1923 (Admin), where the court upheld that:

> *"Where a (Fitness To Practise Panel) considers that the case is one where the misconduct consists of violating such a fundamental rule of the professional*

relationship between medical profession and patient and thereby undermining public confidence in the medical profession, a finding of impairment of fitness to practise may be justified on the grounds that it is necessary to reaffirm clear standards of professional conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the practitioner and in the profession."

In light of the above, the panel finds that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is impaired in relation to the public element of current impairment. The protection of the public is the panel's paramount concern.

Having regard to both the personal and public elements, the panel concluded that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise was currently impaired. The seriousness and persistence of the misconduct, the central role of dishonesty, the absence of genuine insight, thus remediation and the importance of maintaining confidence in the profession made a finding of impairment both necessary and proportionate.'

At the final hearing which concluded on 7 November 2025, the panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

10. The panel first decided that to take no action or to issue a warning or advice were not appropriate or sufficient in light of the gravity and attitudinal nature of the misconduct and would fail to address the ongoing risk and the strong public interest in marking the seriousness of the behaviour.

11. The panel then stated:

'Conditions of practice

The panel considered whether conditions of practice would address the misconduct and impairment found. The panel noted the guidance in that conditions of practice are unlikely to be appropriate where dishonesty is found.

The panel could not formulate any workable conditions of practice in light of Ms Dhinda's dishonesty and still developing insight and remediation.

The panel accepts that Ms Dhinda has been subject to an interim conditions of practice order throughout this process and that she has had the fullest support from her current employer. However, the panel finds that this cannot mitigate the risk posed by her dishonest actions should these be repeated.

These concerns were not discrete competence or health issues amenable to supervision or retraining, but arose from fundamental breaches of professional standards and dishonesty. The panel could not frame conditions that would be effective, measurable, or sufficient to protect the public and maintain confidence in the profession.

Suspension order

The panel then considered whether a suspension order would be appropriate.

The panel considered that suspension is appropriate when it is not possible to formulate workable conditions of practice and the case falls short of requiring removal from the register. The panel considered that suspension may be appropriate when the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards, the social worker has demonstrated some insight, and there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve and remediate their failings.

The panel considered suspension is likely to be unsuitable where the social worker has not demonstrated any insight and remediation and there is limited evidence to suggest they are willing or able to resolve or remediate their failings.

The panel has found that Ms Dhinda has limited insight and the panel has seen evidence she has successfully remediated most of the concerns against her. The panel therefore found that there was a willingness and ability to remediate.

In this case, the misconduct involved dishonesty, including lying under oath. The panel finds that dishonesty is a serious breach of the professional standards and can be difficult to remediate. However, the panel found that Ms Dhinda has successfully developed insight into the majority of her failings and if given the chance following the completion of the hearing, she could do so regarding the finding of dishonesty.

The panel decided that a suspension order was appropriate in this case and that it should be for a period of 12 months to allow Ms Dhinda to reflect on her behaviour and demonstrate to any future panel that she had developed insight and attempted to remedy her conduct.

The panel decided that any future panel, when this order is reviewed, would be assisted by Ms Dhinda:

- *Providing a written reflective piece addressing her dishonest behaviour and its impact on others, in particular the impact of her dishonesty on service users and colleagues including managers. This should also include reflection on the impact of her behaviour on the social work profession, upholding professional standards, and public confidence in the regulator. The piece should also demonstrate how Ms Dhinda can prevent recurrence of the behaviour if she finds herself in similar circumstances.*
- *Undertaking training on ethics, probity and transparency in practise.*
- *Provision of up to date character testimonials and employment references whether from paid or unpaid work.*
- *Continued engagement with the regulatory process and attendance at any future hearings.*

The panel made a suspension order for a period of 12 months.

Removal order

The panel also noted that a removal order may be appropriate in cases involving dishonesty, a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of a social worker's actions or consequences and "social workers who are unwilling and/or unable to remediate (for example, where there is clear evidence that they do not wish to practise as a social worker in the future)." The panel considered that a removal order is a sanction of last resort and should be reserved for those categories of cases where there is no other means of protecting the public and the wider public interest.

The panel gave careful consideration to the fact that Ms Dhinda's current employer is fully supportive of her, has found her practice exemplary and that she has no record of concerns since the allegations were made. In light of this, and considering proportionality, the panel considered that to prevent Ms Dhinda from practising again would constitute a loss to the profession and to the public of an experienced social worker."

On balance the panel considered that a removal order would be a disproportionate sanction.'

Social Work England submissions:

12. The panel heard submissions from Ms Hazelwood as to the background and the previous panel's findings in relation to impairment and sanction.

13. Ms Hazelwood told the panel that Social Work England invited the panel to find that the social worker's fitness to practise is no longer impaired and as such, the order should be revoked with immediate effect. Ms Hazelwood noted the following points in her submissions.

14. Since the final hearing, the social worker's employment with London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham was terminated in January 2026. This was on the basis that the social worker was subject to a suspension order during their probationary period, as well as the nature of the concerns. The social worker's former manager confirms that had the social worker not been within the probation process, consideration as to how the social worker could continue their work within the service would have been made.

15. The social worker has continued to engage within these regulatory proceedings. For this review the social worker has provided evidence in the form of testimonials, a reflective statement and a training log.

16. Social Work England submits that the social worker has demonstrated good insight into the concerns. The social worker's detailed reflective statement demonstrates remorse, accountability and an understanding into the importance of both general case-management and honesty. The social worker has reflected on the concerns in detail and has considered the actions that should be taken in the future to prevent recurrences.

17. Social Work England also submits that the social worker has demonstrated sufficient remediation. The social worker's training log is extensive, showing that they have undertaken numerous training courses which are targeted towards the concerns.

18. Whilst it is noted that the final hearing panel were satisfied that the social worker's behaviour placed their personal needs over their professional duty when under increased pressure, Social Work England highlights that these concerns date back to 2019/2020 and before the final hearing, the social worker continued to undertake several social work roles without any further practice concerns being raised. Each testimonial, particularly those from TS and PS who worked with the social worker after the concerns were raised, speaks highly of the social worker and raises no concerns regarding their practice.

19. In light of the above, Social Work England submitted that the social worker has demonstrated sufficient insight and remediation. It is further submitted that the evidence suggests that there is minimal risk of repetition and therefore, the social worker's fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

20. Ms Hazelwood stated that should the panel agree that the social worker is no longer impaired, Social Work England submits that the order should be revoked with immediate effect. This is on the basis that the order would no longer serve any useful purpose, and it is in the public's interest for a social worker to return to unrestricted practice as soon as possible where it is safe to do so.

Social worker submissions:

21. Mr Burrell on behalf of Ms Dhinda submitted that the panel should find that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is no longer impaired and that the order of suspension should be revoked today. Mr Burrell supported the position put forward by Social Work England. He noted that none of the evidence put forward by Ms Dhinda was disputed.

22. Mr Burrell drew attention to the evidence Ms Dhinda had submitted, including her reflective statement, the log showing extensive training and the three testimonials submitted. Mr Burrell said it was evident that Ms Dhinda had spent significant time reflecting on the concerns. He submitted that she had carried out the learning obtained from her training and continues to do so and that the panel could be satisfied that similar conduct would never be repeated. Mr Burrell submitted Ms Dhinda has demonstrated good insight and a commitment to learning. She has understood the concerns and has used her learning to fill the gaps and to strengthen her practice to ensure there was no risk of repetition.

23. Mr Burrell said that the testimonials from Ms Shirley and Ms Simpson were important as both had worked with Ms Dhinda after the concerns were raised and were fully aware of them.

24. Mr Burrell reminded the panel that Ms Dhinda has practised as a social worker since 2012 and there were no concerns previous to those which were the subject of the hearing. He submitted she is a diligent and committed social worker. The concerns

leading to the original hearing have forced Ms Dhinda to reflect and to take steps to ensure such a situation does not occur again. Mr Burrell submitted that Ms Dhinda has also faced up to the wider implications and impact of her conduct. She accepts that she had let down her employer, the service users and their families and the wider profession.

25. Mr Burrell submitted that Ms Shirley's evidence provided context in which Ms Dhinda's employment with the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham was terminated. She was in her probationary period and that impacted on the decision. Ms Shirley had stated that if the position had been different, there would have been consideration as to how Ms Dhinda could continue in the service. Ms Shirley noted that she continues to believe that Ms Dhinda has many strengths, including her willingness to learn and determination to improve her practice and her commitment to service users and their families.

26. Mr Burrell submitted that Ms Shirley's evidence was the best evidence of the journey and progression Ms Dhinda had undergone as a result of these proceedings. His submission was that the order should be revoked. Ms Dhinda wishes to prove her value to the social work profession and to return to unrestricted practice as soon as possible.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

27. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel took into account all the documentation submitted and the submissions of the parties.

28. The panel was reminded that its task is to conduct a comprehensive review of the current order of suspension before its expiry on 5 December 2026. The purpose of the review is not to re-open the earlier determination of the final hearing panel. The panel's role is to consider and determine, taking account of all the information available today, whether the social worker's fitness to practise remains impaired and if so, to consider what order to impose.

29. The panel was reminded that it should exercise its own independent judgement. It should take account of Social Work England's current Impairment and sanctions guidance.

30. In undertaking this review the panel had regard to the over-arching objective of protecting the public which involves the pursuit of the following objectives:

    - To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public.
    - To promote and maintain public confidence in the profession.
    - To promote and maintain proper professional standards of conduct for members of the profession.

31. The panel was mindful of the importance of a review hearing, and that it should follow the sequence of decision making set out in *Abrahaem v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 183:*

    - Address whether the fitness to practise is impaired before considering the appropriate sanction.
    - Whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment have been sufficiently addressed to the panel's satisfaction.
    - In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision, or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairment.

32. The panel was referred to the personal and public elements of impairment, as explained in the guidance.

33. With regard to the "personal element", the panel was referred to the four tests identified by Dame Janet Smith in the Fifth Shipman Report and cited in CHRE v (1) NMC and (2) Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) and the principles referred to in Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin). The panel should consider if the conduct is remediable, has the conduct been remediated and is the misconduct highly unlikely to be repeated.

34. The panel was reminded that insight is a key component of the determination of issues of current impairment and remediation. When a panel is considering whether fitness to practise is currently impaired, the level of insight shown by the practitioner is central to a proper determination of the issue.

35. The "public interest element" requires the panel to consider whether a finding of impairment is necessary to uphold public confidence in the profession. Social Work England's impairment and sanctions guidance states that a panel may find there is impairment in respect of the public element even if there is no personal impairment and they do not consider that the social worker represents a risk to the public.

36. The panel was reminded that a social worker's fitness to practise is impaired if they pose a risk to public safety, or if their conduct or performance undermines the confidence the public is entitled to place in all social workers in England. A social worker's fitness to practise may also be impaired if their actions make it necessary to send a public message about the standards expected of social workers.

37. The public interest includes the protection of service users, colleagues and the wider public from the risk of harm, maintaining public confidence in the social work profession, protecting the reputation of the social work profession and declaring and upholding appropriate standards of conduct and competence among social workers.

38. Finally, in accordance with the authority in the case of Grant, the panel must not lose sight of the wider considerations: the need to protect the public, to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and whether public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of current impairment were not made. The panel should ensure that it considers all elements of the public interest. the panel must take into account that even where the misconduct is easily remediable, has been remedied and there is no risk of repetition a registrant's fitness to practise may still be impaired & CHRE v NMC & Grant.

39. The panel was reminded, were it to find that the social workers fitness to practise is currently impaired, of the order it may then make under Paragraph 15 of schedule 2, part 5 of the Social Worker Regulations 2018.

40. The panel first considered whether Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

41. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel and the new documentation provided by Ms Dhinda.

42. The panel received and considered three references. The first was from TS, Social Worker Team Manager, dated 12 August 2026. TS worked with Ms Dhinda from November 2023 to February 2026 at Hammersmith and Fulham.

43. The second reference was from TT, Advanced Social Worker in a children with disabilities team, dated 13 August 2026. She has known Ms Dhinda for 12 years, having worked with her between August 2014 and September 2016.

44. A further reference was provided from PS, Social Worker Advance Practitioner, dated 14 August 2026. PS was Ms Dhinda's line manager and supervisor between July and December 2021.

45. Ms Dhinda provided a detailed reflective statement dated 14 August 2026. Ms Dhinda provided evidence of a significant number of continual professional development training courses she has attended during the period since the suspension order was imposed at the final hearing in November 2025. These courses included training on integrity, probity and ethics and professional conduct in social work. Ms Dhinda also provided evidence concerning a series of coaching sessions she has undertaken with The British Association of Social Workers Professional Services.

46. The panel reminded itself of the concerns identified by the final order hearing panel in its determination of 7 November 2025. The panel noted that the final hearing panel found that Ms Dhinda had gained a limited degree of insight and had successfully remediated most of the concerns against her. It concluded that there was a willingness and ability to remediate on Ms Dhinda's part. However, it concluded that the dishonesty it had found proved was a serious breach of professional standards which could be difficult to remediate. The final hearing panel found that Ms Dhinda had not at that time demonstrated remediation of the dishonesty issues which she had continued to dispute during the hearing and about which it found that she had lied under oath.

47. In conducting this review, this panel was satisfied that Ms Dhinda has made serious and sustained efforts during the period of suspension to fully remediate the final hearing panel's concerns.

48. The panel noted that Ms Dhinda has continued during the period of suspension to engage with Social Work England. She has followed and complied with the four recommendations of the final hearing panel as to the evidence she would need to provide for the purposes of this review.

49. The panel had examined the training log provided by Ms Dhinda and noted that she has undertaken targeted and relevant training which she commenced shortly after the final hearing decision and has continued during the period of the suspension. The panel noted that this focused on the issues relevant to the outstanding concerns in relation to her insight, namely a number of courses concerning integrity, probity and honesty in social work practice. The panel also observed that Ms Dhinda not only attended the courses but she prepared observations on them setting out what she had learned and the impact upon her and how she would apply the learning in practical terms going forward.

50. The panel also heard that Ms Dhinda has engaged in sessions with the British Association of Social Workers where she has openly discussed the findings of the final hearing with a panel of peers.

51. The panel considered Ms Dhinda's reflective statement and concluded that she has reflected deeply and fully on her past misconduct. It is clear that now she has accepted the findings of the final hearing panel in relation to her dishonesty. She has accepted responsibility and apologised to service users and their families, to her colleagues, to the profession and to the wider public. The panel considered that Ms Dhinda has demonstrated a clear understanding of the impact of her actions on those affected and the wider public, as well as the profession.

52. The panel concluded that, as a result of the extensive training she has undertaken and the demonstration of her learning from this training and how she intends to apply this in her future practice if she is able to return to social work without restrictions, Ms Dhinda has now developed a good level of insight into her dishonest conduct.

53. The panel noted that Ms Dhinda was supported by testimonials from social work professionals who had worked with her and were fully aware of the concerns in this case and the final hearing panel's findings. They spoke highly of her professional practice and her commitment.

54. The panel also took into account that the concerns in this matter date back to a period of 2020 and that Ms Dhinda has since undertaken social work practice working under a period of conditions of practice in which no further concerns have been raised. It was mindful that she has practised as a social worker prior to these events since 2012, again with no prior concerns.

55. The panel was satisfied that Ms Dhinda has evidenced full remediation of the past concerns and that the past concerns are highly unlikely to be repeated. The panel concluded that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is no longer impaired in respect of the personal element of current impairment.

56. The panel considered the public element of impairment of fitness to practise, bearing in mind the legal advice it had received and Social Work England's guidance. The panel was satisfied that a member of the public who is aware of the circumstances of this review would be mindful of the insight Ms Dhinda has now gained and the commitment she has shown to remediating the concerns, including the relevant and targeted training she has undertaken concerning issues of honesty, integrity and probity. The panel considered that the public would be satisfied that Ms Dhinda has remedied the concerns and that her past misconduct is now unlikely to be repeated. The panel was mindful that there is a public interest in allowing an experienced social worker whose fitness to practise is no longer impaired to return to social work practice.

57. The panel was satisfied in all the circumstances that public confidence in the social work profession would not be undermined by finding that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

Revoke the suspension order with effect immediately

58. Having found that Ms Dhinda's fitness to practise is no longer impaired in respect of either the personal or public elements of current impairment, the panel accepted the submission of both parties that the suspension order should be revoked. The panel was satisfied that the suspension no longer has a purpose and therefore decided that the order should therefore be revoked with effect from today.

Right of appeal:

59. 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.

60. 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.

61. 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.

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

Review of final orders:

63. 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).

64. 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

65. 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