

Case Examiner Decision
Arooj Naeem – SW127168
FTPS-24832

Contents

The role of the case examiners	3
Decision summary	4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns.....	6
Preliminary issues	8
The realistic prospect test	9
The public interest.....	18
Accepted disposal	19

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	09 September 2026
	Accepted Disposal proposed - Removal order
Final outcome	16 September
	Accepted Disposal Removal order - agreed

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2, 3 and 5 being found proven by the adjudicators. [REDACTED]
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2, 3 and 5 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1, 2, 3 and 5 there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators determining that the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

The case examiners did not consider it to be in the public interest for the matter to be referred to a final hearing and determined that the case could be concluded by way of accepted disposal.

As such, the case examiners have requested that the social worker be notified of their intention to resolve the case with a removal order, which they have now accepted in full.

The case examiners have considered all 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. Text in **red** will be redacted from both the complainant's and the published copy of the decision.

The complaint and our regulatory concerns

The initial complaint

The complainant	The complaint was raised by the social worker's former employer; [REDACTED]
Date the complaint was received	22 July 2025
Complaint summary	The concerns raised relate to the social worker's alleged failure to visit service users within required timescales and the creation of false or misleading entries in case records. This includes an allegation of dishonesty. There were further practice [REDACTED] concerns, recommended for closure.

Regulatory concerns and concerns recommended for closure

Regulatory concerns are clearly identified issues that are a concern to the regulator. The regulatory concerns for this case are as follows:

Between or around May 2025 and July 2026, and whilst registered as a social worker you:

1. Failed to visit service users within required timescales.
2. Made false or misleading entries in case records.
3. Your conduct at Regulatory Concern 2 was dishonest.

Grounds of impairment:

The matters outlined in regulatory concerns above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct; [REDACTED]

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Concerns being recommended for closure:

Concerns being recommended for closure are concerns raised by the complainant, for which no evidence has been found during the investigative process or where the evidence obtained negates the concern(s). Decisions regarding concerns being recommended for closure remains the remit of the case examiners.

5. You repeatedly cancelled meetings with service users and professionals.

Grounds of impairment:

The matter above amounts to the statutory ground of misconduct;

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 have determined that there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1, 2, 3 and 5 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory grounds of misconduct and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

Reasoning

Facts

Between or around May 2025 and July 2026, and whilst registered as a social worker you:

1. Failed to visit service users within required timescales.

Given that there is a realistic prospect of a finding of fact for regulatory concern 2 as outlined below, the case examiners consider that for at least those three service users [REDACTED] there is evidence to suggest that the social worker did not visit them at the required visiting intervals. For another two service users, [REDACTED] there appears to be audit evidence demonstrating that visits did not occur on at least three occasions each. This aligns with evidence showing appropriate allocation dates, with requirements for 4 weekly visiting intervals dates as specified by management emails, backed up by a supporting local authority visitor policy.

In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern.

The case examiners consider there is **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 1.**

2. Made false or misleading entries in case records.

The case examiners have independently reviewed the evidence obtained from the local authority. This comprises database case notes of the alleged false or misleading entries, with respective dates, created by the social worker. These are accompanied by additional evidence, provided by foster carers and service users, stating which visits they believed had occurred and when.

The case examiners are satisfied from the information provided to them that there is some evidence to suggest that, in the case of three service users [REDACTED] the social worker may have created false or misleading entries.

This evidence includes, for example:

- The existence of three detailed case notes with detailed qualitative content for specific visit dates.
- Evidence from foster carers, provided via the local authority, to support that visits did not take place [REDACTED] on the dates recorded by the social worker.
- Evidence from a service user [REDACTED] to suggest visits on dates recorded by the social worker did not take place.

In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern in full.

The case examiners consider there is sufficient and cogent evidence to conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 2.**

3. Your conduct at regulatory concern 2 was dishonest.

In considering regulatory concern 2, the case examiners have applied the test for dishonesty, which consists of two parts – the subjective test and the objective test.

The subjective test:

The subjective test requires the case examiners to assess the evidence to ascertain the social worker's actual knowledge or belief as to the facts. The question is not whether the social worker's beliefs are reasonable, but whether they were genuinely held at that time.

In their final submissions to the regulator, the social worker accepts that they fabricated case records 'in a moment of poor judgement'. They state that they deeply regret their actions, acknowledging that dishonesty is a serious matter which has the potential to threaten public confidence in the profession.



When considering any evidence about social worker's subjective beliefs, there is information to suggest that the social worker engaged in premeditated attempts to produce detailed case notes which the social worker knew to contain inaccurate information about visits to three service users, which had not taken place. The case examiners consider that this evidence has the potential to undermine the social worker's assertion that their actions in creating inaccurate case notes was 'unintentional'.

The case examiners are of the view that the social worker would have been aware at the time of making these case notes that the content of such records would be required to be accurate, and that if they had not conducted the visits as recorded, they would have been aware that they were creating records which were not a true representation of the facts.

The objective test:

The objective test requires the case examiners to consider whether the social worker's alleged conduct may be considered dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement for the social worker to appreciate that their conduct is, by the objective standards of ordinary decent people, dishonest.

The case examiners are satisfied that ordinary decent people would consider it dishonest for a social worker to take active steps to provide fabricated and inaccurate information in case notes. Further, the public would be very concerned to learn that service users may have had factitious information written and recorded

about them. They would be concerned to know that such information had the potential to place vulnerable persons at potential and / or actual risk of harm.

The case examiners consider that ordinary decent people would consider the conduct alleged in this case to be inherently dishonest.

The case examiners consider there is **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 3.**

Concerns being recommended for closure:

The following concerns in this case have been presented to the case examiners with a written recommendation for closure, as permitted by the Social Work England appointment rules. In determining whether the concerns can be closed, the case examiners have applied the realistic prospect test, as outlined in the case examiner guidance.



5. You repeatedly cancelled meetings with service users and professionals.

The case examiners are satisfied that there is evidence from foster carers [REDACTED] [REDACTED] that show multiple cancellation dates initiated by the social worker. There is further evidence of cancellation visits initiated by the social worker from another service provider on two occasions [REDACTED]. There is further email evidence from the social worker cancelling a visit on the 27 June 2025 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], and a further visit cancelled the following day because they

were out of the borough. There is further evidence provided by a [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] cancelling a meeting on or around 11 June 2025.

While the case examiners accept that some visits were cancelled due to personal reasons that were beyond the social worker's control, there is a pattern seen throughout the evidence bundle, that indicates a level of unreliability communicated by the social worker, resulting in repeated cancellations and / or re-arrangements of meetings which did not always take place.

In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker accepts this regulatory concern, acknowledging that they repeatedly cancelled meetings with service users and professionals. They state that their actions were unprofessional.

The case examiners conclude **a realistic of the adjudicators finding the facts proven for regulatory concern 5.**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Grounds

Facts with a realistic prospect of being found proven: 1, 2, 3 and 5.

The matters outlined in the regulatory concerns above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Misconduct: The case examiners are aware that there is no legal definition of misconduct, but it generally would consist of serious acts or omissions, which suggest a significant departure from what would be expected of the social worker in the circumstances. This can include conduct that takes place in the exercise of professional practice, and conduct which occurs outside the exercise of professional practice but calls into question the suitability of the person to work as a social worker.

To help them decide if the evidence suggests a significant departure from what would be expected in the circumstances, the case examiners have considered the following standards, which were applicable at the time of the concerns:

As a social worker I will:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.

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

3.8 Clarify where the accountability lies for delegated work and fulfil that responsibility when it lies with me.

3.11 Maintain clear, accurate, legible and up to date records, documenting how I arrive at my decisions.

As a social worker I will not:

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

5.3 Falsify records or condone this by others.

Regulatory concerns 1 and 2: Allegedly failing to visit at least three service users within required timescales is aggravated by the alleged act of making false and misleading entries in case records. The insertion of potentially factitious information, and / or neglecting to include actual risk information elicited due to non-visiting, has the potential to place service users at risk of harm. Maintaining accurate, clear, objective, and up-to-date records is an essential part of social work. Documenting decisions and actions provides a clear record of work with people; these records are open to scrutiny and help to provide a continuity of support if people are transferred between social workers. They can help to protect people and social workers.

Regulatory concern 3: Any alleged finding of dishonesty attracts a high level of seriousness which throws into significant doubt the social worker's level of probity and integrity, having the potential to significantly question the nature of the social worker's character. The case examiners are aware that where dishonesty is repeated and subsequently found proven, this is particularly serious. Guidance for social workers in relation to the professional standards sets out that social workers are required to be open and honest with people, including when anything goes wrong. Where they are not open and honest, it can put people at risk and may damage confidence in them as a social worker and the social work profession.

Regulatory concern 5: the case examiners are of the view that repeatedly cancelling meetings with service users and professionals may constitute a breach of standards 2.1, and 3.8, which require social workers to be reliable and to fulfil their responsibilities for delegated work. In this case, there is evidence that repeatedly cancelling meetings, as alleged, resulted in service users feeling let down and disappointed, so losing confidence in the social worker and the profession.

In review of the alleged conduct, the case examiners consider that there may have been a significant and serious departure from the listed professional standards.

The case examiners conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators finding the grounds of misconduct proven, for the regulatory concerns, as listed above.**

Impairment

Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:

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

Personal element

With regards to the concerns before the regulator, the case examiners have given thought to their guidance, and they note that they should give consideration to whether the matters before the regulator are easily remediable, and whether the social worker has demonstrated insight and/or conducted remediation to the effect that the risk of repetition is highly unlikely.

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied: Failing to meet service users within required timescales and the repeated cancellation of meetings is a potentially remediable issue. For example, this could be achieved through evidence of good insight by the social worker into why they acted as they did; an understanding of the potential for harm, and the adverse impact on the profession and public confidence; and evidence of reflection and further training, to a degree that would reassure the case examiners that future repetition is highly unlikely.

An alleged finding of dishonesty based on fabrication of case records is significantly more difficult to remediate as they indicate potential attitudinal or character flaws. In any remediation, the social worker would again have to convince the regulator that any risk of repetition would be highly unlikely.

Insight and remediation: While the social worker has accepted the regulatory concerns in full and has engaged in the investigation, this does not of itself demonstrate developing insight. While they accept the seriousness of the concerns and appear to be remorseful, they do not offer a clear account or explanation into the reasons for their alleged conduct, including dishonesty. This would suggest that insight is incomplete.

The social worker has offered no remediation. They have, however, indicated that they do not wish to continue practising as a social worker due to the challenges that they consider social workers face.



Risk of repetition:

Given the limited insight and absence of remediation offered, the case examiners can only conclude the risk of repetition remains high.

Public element

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

The case examiners consider that the public would be troubled to learn that a social worker has been alleged to have engaged in acts of dishonesty relating to the fabrication of case visit records for visits which did not occur. The public would likely view this as a very serious matter and would wish to be assured that the maintenance of proper standards for social workers be maintained. They would wish to seek reassurance that any repetition of such matters be effectively addressed both personally and professionally by the social worker. Given that a high risk of repetition has been identified, the public trust and confidence in the profession would be at risk, if the social worker were allowed to practise without restriction.

The case examiners conclude **a realistic prospect of the adjudicators making a finding of impairment in this case.**

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 appears to accept the facts that are core to the concept of impairment. The case examiners consider that the public would be reassured by the regulator taking prompt action in this case, through the accepted disposal process, which includes imposition of an agreed sanction and publication of a decision on the register. The case examiners are satisfied that such steps are sufficient to safeguard the public interest.

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
Having found a realistic prospect the social worker's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the case examiners have considered what sanction they should propose in this case. The case examiners have considered 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. They 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 it's regulator and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. In assessing and determining the most appropriate sanction, the case examiners will summarise the mitigation and aggravating factors in this case:

Mitigating factors:

- an absence of previous fitness to practise history

Aggravating factors:

- limited evidence of insight and no remediation
- evidence of multiple occurrences of dishonesty

The case examiners have considered the principle of proportionality by weighing the social worker's interests with the public interest when considering each available sanction in ascending order of severity.

In determining the most appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case, the case examiners have considered the available options in ascending order of seriousness.

No further action, advice or warning: The case examiners consider that the outcomes of no further action, advice, and warning order would be insufficient in this case. In reaching this conclusion, they reminded themselves that the regulator's sanctions guidance is clear that all three outcomes, which offer no restriction to a social worker's practice, are not appropriate where there is a high risk of repetition.

In addition, given the concerns in this case relate to particularly serious allegations of dishonest conduct, the case examiners considered that all three outcomes would be wholly insufficient to mark the serious nature of the concerns before the regulator and would not protect the public or public confidence.

Conditions of practice order: With reference to the regulator's sanctions guidance, the case examiners note that conditions of practice are less likely to be appropriate in cases of character, attitude or behavioural failings.

The case examiners are satisfied that a conditions of practice order would therefore be insufficient in this case, which includes alleged conduct that could reasonably be viewed as significant acts of dishonesty. The case examiners consider that a conditions of practice order would fail to properly address the wider public interest, which includes upholding public confidence in the social work profession, and maintaining proper professional standards for social workers.

Furthermore, conditions of practice are unlikely to be workable, given the attitudinal nature of the concerns. Such an order would also be unworkable as the social worker

has expressed their clear intention that they do not ever intend or wish to practise as a social worker again.

Suspension Order: With reference to the regulator's sanctions guidance, the case examiners note the following:

Suspension may be appropriate where (all the following):

- the concerns represent a serious breach of the professional standards
- the social worker has demonstrated some insight
- there is evidence to suggest the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate their failings

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

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

Given that the social worker has displayed only limited insight and has offered no remediation, the case examiners are of the view that a suspension order would not be suitable. The social worker has offered no remediation and has stated that they do not intend to practise as a social worker in the future.

A removal order: A removal order must be made where the decision makers conclude that no other outcome 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

The case examiners consider that the level of dishonesty in terms of being repeated, misleading their employer, and placing service users at risk to be very serious. The case examiner guidance clearly states that the serious examples of professional dishonesty and abuses of trust would ordinarily warrant a sanction of a removal order.

The mitigating circumstances in this case, while noted, appear limited. Given that the social worker has offered limited insight and no remediation, this is a matter of serious concern. Given that the risks of repetition remain high, that the social worker

is currently not practising and has no intention of returning to practise, the case examiners consider a removal order is the most appropriate outcome in all the circumstances of this case.

A removal order is also appropriate as there is no other outcome that could protect the public, maintain proper standards for social workers and maintain confidence in the profession.

The case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a removal order. They will now notify the social worker of their intention and 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 case examiners have reviewed an 'accepted disposal response form' submitted by the social worker to the regulator on 11 September 2026. This states that they have read the case examiners' decision and the accepted disposal guide. They admit the key facts set out in the case examiner decision and accept that their fitness to practise is impaired. They understand the terms of the proposed disposal of their fitness to practise case and accept them in full.

Case examiners' response and final decision

Having reviewed the social worker's response, the case examiners are satisfied that a removal order is the most appropriate outcome. The case examiners have not been presented with any new evidence that might change their previous assessment.

Having 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. The case examiners therefore direct that the regulator enact a removal order.