

Case Examiner Decision
Beatrice Eduah – SW123162
FTPS-23193

Contents

The role of the case examiners	3
Decision summary	4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns.....	7
Preliminary issues	9
The realistic prospect test	10
The public interest.....	12
Accepted disposal	14

The role of the case examiners

The case examiners perform a filtering function in the fitness to practise process, and their primary role is to determine whether the case ought to be considered by adjudicators at a formal hearing. The wider purpose of the fitness to practise process is not to discipline the social worker for past conduct, but rather to consider whether the social worker's current fitness to practise might be impaired because of the issues highlighted. In reaching their decisions, case examiners are mindful that Social Work England's primary objective is to protect the public.

Case examiners apply the 'realistic prospect' test. As part of their role, the case examiners will consider whether there is a realistic prospect:

- the facts alleged could be found proven by adjudicators
- adjudicators could find that one of the statutory grounds for impairment is engaged
- adjudicators could find the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired

If the case examiners find a realistic prospect of impairment, they consider whether there is a public interest in referring the case to a hearing. If there is no public interest in a hearing, the case examiners can propose an outcome to the social worker. We call this accepted disposal and a case can only be resolved in this way if the social worker agrees with the case examiners' proposal.

Case examiners review cases on the papers only. The case examiners are limited, in that, they are unable to hear and test live evidence, and therefore they are unable to make findings of fact.

Decision summary

Decision summary	
Preliminary outcome	4 August 2026
	Accepted disposal proposed - removal order
Final outcome	24 August 2026
	Accepted disposal - removal order

Executive summary

Regulatory concern 1

The case examiners established that in accordance with paragraph 1(2) of Schedule 2 to The Social Workers Regulations (2018), there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators would determine that the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired.

This relates to cases where a social worker has received a custodial sentence having been convicted of a criminal offence. The case examiners have had sight of the certificate of conviction that shows the social worker was convicted for dishonestly making a false representation. They have also had sight of evidence from the court that shows the social worker had a custodial sentence imposed on them of 6 months imprisonment, suspended for 12 months.

Normally, whilst case examiners are required to apply the realistic prospect test in order to reach a determination on potential impairment, in instances where the above mentioned section of the regulations is engaged this test is not needed to be carried out. This is because the conclusion of there being a realistic prospect of a finding of impairment is automatic, as it is deemed that criminal matters of such seriousness as to require time in custody (including sentences that are suspended) are likely to engage the public interest and require case examiners to conclude that there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding that the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired.

In Summary:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 1 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concern 1 being found to amount to the statutory ground of a conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence.
3. For regulatory concern 1, there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In accordance with the regulations, the case examiners therefore commenced their decision making by considering whether there is a public interest in referring this case to a hearing.

The case examiners did not consider it to be in the public interest for the matter to be referred to a final hearing and they are satisfied that the case can be concluded by way of accepted disposal. As such, the case examiners requested that the social worker be notified of their intention to resolve the case with a removal order.

The social worker responded to the case examiners' proposal and confirmed that they accepted it.

The case examiners have considered all of the documents made available within the evidence bundle. Key evidence is referred to throughout their decision and the case examiners' full reasoning is set out below.

Anonymity and redaction

Elements of this decision have been marked for redaction in line with our Fitness to Practise Publications Policy. Text in [blue](#) will be redacted only from the published copy of the decision, and will therefore be shared with the complainant in their copy.

The complaint and our regulatory concerns

The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer
Date the complaint was received	29 November 2023
Complaint summary	The complainant stated that the social worker was under investigation for working for two local authorities concurrently, and claiming payment for which they were not entitled to. The complainant states that social worker had fraudulently claimed for additional hours worked at a loss to the local authority of £17,668.53 between the dates of 26 June 2023 and 14 November 2023. Following on from this investigation, the social worker was prosecuted and pled guilty at court on 19 May 2025 (having previously pled not guilty), being convicted on that date. The social worker was issued with a suspended custodial sentence.

Regulatory concerns and concerns recommended for closure

Regulatory concerns

While registered as a social worker:

1. On or around 19 May 2025, you were convicted of dishonestly making false representation to make gain for self/another or causing loss to other/exposing other to risk, contrary to the Fraud Act 2006.

The regulatory concern at 1 amounts to the statutory ground of a conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of a conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence.



Preliminary issues

Investigation		
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has been notified of the grounds for investigation?	Yes	☒
	No	☐
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has had reasonable opportunity to make written representations to the investigators?	Yes	☒
	No	☐
Are the case examiners satisfied that they have all relevant evidence available to them, or that adequate attempts have been made to obtain evidence that is not available?	Yes	☒
	No	☐
Are the case examiners satisfied that it was not proportionate or necessary to offer the complainant the opportunity to provide final written representations; or that they were provided a reasonable opportunity to do so where required.	Yes	☒
	No	☐

The realistic prospect test

Fitness to practise history

The case examiners have been informed that there is no previous fitness to practise history.

Decision summary

Is there a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired?

Yes



No



The case examiners established that in accordance with paragraph 1(2) of Schedule 2 to The Social Workers Regulations (2018), there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators would determine that the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired.

Reasoning



Regulatory concern 1

As detailed above, the case examiners are not required to apply the realistic prospect test in cases where Paragraph 1(2) of Schedule 2 to The Social Workers Regulations (2018) applies. As such, there is no need to establish if the facts could be found

proven, if the statutory ground of a conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence is engaged, or if the social worker could be found currently impaired.

To assist, and in order to demonstrate why this is the case, the wording of the regulations is as follows (emphasis added in bold):

(2) Where a question arises as to whether a social worker's fitness to practise is impaired—

(a) as a result of them having been convicted of an offence in respect of which a custodial sentence has been imposed, other than a listed offence, there are reasonable grounds for investigating whether the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired, **and there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators would determine that the social worker's fitness to practise is impaired.**

The public interest

Decision summary

Is there a public interest in referring the case to a hearing?	Yes	☐
	No	☒

Referral criteria

Is there a conflict in the evidence that must be resolved at a hearing?	Yes	☐
	No	☒
Does the social worker dispute any or all of the key facts of the case?	Yes	☐
	No	☒
Is a hearing necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession, and/or to uphold the professional standards of social workers?	Yes	☐
	No	☒

Additional reasoning

The case examiners note that the social worker has not indicated to the regulator if they accept the facts of the case or if they consider their fitness to practise to be currently impaired. Where a social worker does not accept either of these, case examiner guidance suggests that a referral to a hearing may be necessary in the public interest.

However, the case examiners note that the guidance states the social worker must accept the facts and the matter of impairment at the point of *concluding* the case, and are of the view that this does not prevent them offering accepted disposal prior to this.

The case examiners consider that it is reasonable to offer accepted disposal in this case because:

- This is a case of conviction and cannot present a factual dispute as the matters have been found proved by the court.

- The case examiners are of the view that the risk of repetition can be managed, and they have a number of sanctions available to them in order to satisfy the public that this risk is being managed without the need for this to be examined within a public hearing.
- The accepted disposal process will provide the social worker an opportunity to review the case examiners' reasoning on impairment and reflect on whether they are able to accept a finding of impairment. It is open to the social worker to reject any accepted disposal proposal and request a hearing if they wish to explore the question of impairment in more detail.
- The case examiners are also of the view that the public would be satisfied to see the regulator take prompt, firm action in this case, with the publication of an accepted disposal decision providing a steer to the public and the profession on the importance of adhering to the professional standards expected of social workers in England.

Accepted disposal

Case outcome		
Proposed outcome	No further action	☐
	Advice	☐
	Warning order	☐
	Conditions of practice order	☐
	Suspension order	☐
	Removal order	☒
Proposed duration	Where a social worker is removed from the register, there is no defined end to the finding of impairment. A social worker that has been removed from the register may only apply to be restored to the register 5 years after the date the removal order took effect. The adjudicators will decide whether to restore a person to the register.	

Reasoning
As there is a realistic prospect the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the case examiners have considered what, if any, sanction they should propose in this case. The case examiners have taken into account the sanctions guidance published by Social Work England. They are reminded that a sanction is not intended to be punitive but may have a punitive effect and have borne in mind the principle of proportionality and fairness in determining the appropriate sanction. The case examiners are also mindful that the purpose of any sanction is to protect the public which includes maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The case examiners have considered each available sanction in ascending order of severity. Though the case examiners are not required to apply the realistic prospect test for impairment, they consider that it is necessary to turn their minds to the risk of repetition in this case in order to establish the most suitable sanction.

The social worker was convicted for a dishonesty related offence in which there was deliberate, persistent dishonesty by the social worker in order to financially gain. In such circumstances, the case examiners consider that this raises significant character and attitudinal concerns that inherently create a risk of repetition as they are extremely difficult to remediate.

The case examiners note that the sanctions guidance states they should consider mitigating and aggravating circumstances when considering the appropriate sanction, and provides examples. The case examiners are not limited to the examples provided. The case examiners have identified the following:

Mitigating factors

- Absence of previous fitness to practise history

Aggravating factors

- Repetition of concerns or a pattern of behaviour
- Persistent dishonesty
- The social worker's actions resulting in a significant loss of public funds

In determining the most appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case, the case examiners considered the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness:

No further action, Advice, Warning

The case examiners are aware that where a social worker's fitness to practise is potentially impaired, they will usually need to ensure the public is protected through some action by the regulator. The case examiners have decided that such protection cannot be met by taking no further action, issuing advice, or providing a warning order.

Social Work England's sanction guidance states that an outcome of no further action will not be appropriate where there is any continuing risk to the public of the social worker behaving in the same way again. The same guidance goes on to say that an outcome of advice or a warning is not appropriate where the social worker poses a current risk to the public given that neither sanction directly restricts a social worker's practice. The case examiners have determined that there is a risk of repetition in this case. In addition, the case examiners do not consider that any of the three sanctions would be sufficient to uphold public confidence.

Conditions of practice

The case examiners went on to consider conditions of practice. They concluded that conditions were more relevant in cases requiring some restriction due to practice shortfalls and were not suitable for this case that centres around dishonesty. The case examiners consider that it would not be possible to formulate workable conditions to address the attitudinal concerns that exist in this case.

Further, the case examiners did not consider that the sanction would be sufficient to protect the wider public interest. In reaching this conclusion they have taken into account the case examiner guidance that says conditions of practice are less likely to be appropriate in cases of character, attitude or behavioural failings, or in cases that raise wider public interest issues. The guidance goes on to give examples of types of case that conditions of practice are unlikely to be appropriate in, of which dishonesty is one.

Suspension

The case examiners considered a suspension order.

The case examiners are of the view that the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards. The social worker has not engaged with the case examiner process so there is no evidence of insight. The nature of the serious and persistent dishonesty suggests that the social worker may be unable to resolve or remediate their failings given the attitudinal nature of the conduct.

Further, the case examiners have taken into account the sanctions guidance which states a removal order must be made where the decision makers conclude that no outcome other than removal would be enough to (do one or more of the following):

- protect the public
- maintain confidence in the profession
- maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England

Given the nature of the concerns, the case examiners are of the view that all three of the above points apply in this case.

Accordingly, a suspension order is not appropriate.

Removal

In concluding that no other outcome than removal would be enough to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession, or maintain proper professional standards for social workers in England, the case examiners took into account the

sanctions guidance. In particular they noted the examples given where a removal may be appropriate, and identified that two were applicable in this case. Specifically:

- dishonesty, especially where persistent and/or concealed
- criminal convictions for serious offences

The case examiners are aware dishonest conduct can take various forms, some destroying trust instantly, others undermining it to a lesser extent. The case examiners consider that the social worker's conviction for a dishonesty related offence which involved defrauding a local authority of thousands of pounds unquestionably sits at the top end of the spectrum of seriousness.

The case examiners consider that the following comments made by the Judge, captured within the judgment document are telling, and help provide context to the seriousness:

- *'What you chose to do was shameful, it was not a misjudgement, it was not a mistake, it was not based on any confusion or misunderstanding of what you were permitted to do. You were not overwhelmed and unsure how to exit the situation, as you claimed to the probation officer who wrote the report, that is self-serving nonsense, but any point, you could have thought to yourself, "I really shouldn't be doing this.", and simply resigned from one or more of the jobs, until you were only doing one fulltime job.'*
- *'It was choice not to do so, and it's a choice your made, quite plainly, so you could squeeze as much money as you could out of as many employers as you could con; that's fraud, it's stealing. It's stealing money paid for by taxpayers from an organisation responsible for providing funds to some of the most vulnerable members of society. Local authorities are and have been, for a long time, experiencing extremely difficult financial circumstances. They are often faced with unenviable choices of which key services to cut, and when services are cut, it's usually the most vulnerable who lose out.'*
- *'In a nutshell, you've walked off with nearly £18,000 worth of the public's money.'*

The case examiners conclude that the social worker's dishonesty would destroy public confidence in them as a social worker, and consider that the social worker's actions are incompatible with social work practice.

The case examiners have determined that, in all the circumstances, a removal order is necessary in this case.

Conclusion:

The case examiners will notify the social worker of their proposal to issue a removal order and will seek the social worker's agreement to dispose of the matter accordingly. The social worker will be offered 28 days to respond.

If the social worker does not agree, or if the case examiners revise their decision regarding the public interest in this case, the matter will proceed to a final hearing.

Response from the social worker

The social worker provided a response to the case examiners' proposal and confirmed *'I have read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guide. I admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision, and that my fitness to practise is impaired. I understand the terms of the proposed disposal of my fitness to practise case and accept them in full.'*

Case examiners' response and final decision

The case examiners concluded that the social worker's fitness to practise was likely to be found impaired but that the public interest could be met through a prompt conclusion, published decision and removal order, rather than through a public hearing. They proposed a removal order, and the social worker accepted this proposal.

In light of the social worker's acceptance of the removal order, the case examiners have considered again whether there would be a public interest in referring this matter to a public hearing. They remain of the view that this is unnecessary for the reasons set out earlier in the decision.

Having been advised of the social worker's response, the case examiners have again turned their minds as to whether a removal order remains the most appropriate means of disposal for this case. They have reviewed their decision, paying particular regard to the overarching objectives of Social Work England, i.e. protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the social work profession, and the maintenance of proper standards. Having done so, they remain of the view that an

accepted disposal by way of a removal order is a fair and proportionate disposal, and is the minimum necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

The case examiners note that there is an interim order currently in effect, which will be revoked upon enactment of the agreed order.