Case Examiner Decision
Jacqueline Hanson – SW100533
FTPS-25239

Contents

The role of the case examiners 3
Decision summary 4
The complaint and our regulatory concerns 6
Preliminary issues 7
The realistic prospect test 8
The public interest 19
Accepted disposal 21

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	11 September 2026
	Accepted disposal proposed - warning order (1 year)
Final outcome	28 September 2026
	Accepted disposal - warning order (1 year)

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 3 being found proven by the adjudicators.

2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1 and 3 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

3. For regulatory concerns 1 and 3, 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 requested that the social worker be notified of their intention to resolve the case with a warning order of 1 year duration, which they have now accepted in full.

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.

In accordance with Social Work England's fitness to practise proceedings and registration appeals publications policy, the case examiners have anonymised the names of individuals to maintain privacy. A schedule of anonymity is provided below for the social worker and complainant and will be redacted if this decision is published.

Family A Manager A Manager B	

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	04 December 2025
Complaint summary	The complainant stated the social worker had falsified an unannounced visit record to foster carer [redacted] It was subsequently alleged by the regulator that the social workers' conduct in relation to this was dishonest.

Regulatory concerns

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

Whilst registered as a social worker:

1. On or around 4 June 2025 you falsified an unannounced visit record.

[redacted]

3. Your conduct at regulatory concern 1 was dishonest.

The concerns outlined at regulatory concerns 1 to 3 amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason 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 and 3 being found proven, that those concerns could amount to the statutory ground of misconduct, and that the social worker's fitness to practise could be found impaired.

Reasoning

Facts

Whilst registered as a social worker:

1. On or around 4 June 2025 you falsified an unannounced visit record.

By way of background the social worker was employed as a supervising social worker by the fostering agency. The employer stated the social worker was not the allocated social worker for Family A, however instead of the allocated social worker completing unannounced visits for the first half of the year, they ask other supervising social workers to do the unannounced visits. The employer said the social worker had been allocated to do the visit to Family A.

The case examiners have seen a copy of a visit record dated 4 June 2025, which states "unannounced home visit – successful". Within the record it states that an unannounced visit was conducted by the social worker to Family A and it contains detail relating to the visit, such as that the children were just getting home from school and that dinner was being prepared. The visit record states that both children were seen and were happy and comfortable. The end of the form is electronically signed and dated by the social worker.

The case examiners have also seen a transcript of an investigation meeting, at which two senior managers from the fostering agency were present. Within the meeting Manager A states their involvement was that they received a telephone call from the allocated social worker of Family A, who advised the family had signed off an unannounced visit on Charms, the recording system used, but that the visit "had not taken place at all". Within the meeting Manager B states that they spoke to Family A on 16 July 2025 who confirmed they had not had a visit from the social worker and had signed off the record on the Charms system as they did not like to see items showing as overdue on there. Family A confirmed that they had not had any other contact from the social worker via phone, text, or email.

The case examiners have seen a transcript of an online meeting between the social worker and Manager B dated 24 July 2025, within which the social worker states "I actually realised when I was putting them on that I hadn't completed the visit. So my plan was to do it when I got back from annual leave…I shouldn't have recorded that I'd done it, but I was going to update the record when I had done it when I got back from leave".

In their investigatory interview with the employer on 12 August 2025, the social worker said they did attempt to do an unannounced visit on 4 June 2025 but that it was unsuccessful. The social worker said that when they came to write up the visit after a period of sickness absence that they "realised I hadn't done it and I panicked" and that they "uploaded it in error" when uploading a number of unannounced visit records.

In their submissions the social worker said they accept this concern and provide detail of mitigating factors, which will be addressed later within this decision. The social worker acknowledges they did not conduct the visit or seek appropriate support. The social worker said they created the record in anticipation of completing the visit, with the intention of returning to amend and finalise the record following completion.

The case examiners are of the view that the evidence suggests the social worker falsified an unannounced visit record.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this concern being found proven by adjudicators.

[redacted]

[redacted]

3. Your conduct at regulatory concern 1 was dishonest.

When considering dishonesty, there are two tests the case examiners are required to consider. Firstly, to consider if there is anything that may demonstrate the social worker's actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts. This is called a subjective test. The next part is to consider whether the conduct is likely to be deemed dishonest by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people. This is called an objective test.

In respect of the subjective test the case examiners note that the social worker said to their employer when first asked in an online meeting on 24 July 2025 that "I actually realised when I was putting them on that I hadn't completed the visit. So my plan was

to do it when I got back from annual leave…I shouldn't have recorded that I'd done it, but I was going to update the record when I had done it when I got back from leave". The case examiners note that the social worker later said that when they came to write up the visit after a period of sickness absence that they "realised I hadn't done it and I panicked" and that they "uploaded it in error" when uploading unannounced visit records.

The case examiners have also noted the level of detail included in the visit record, which includes that the children were just getting home from school and that dinner was being prepared. The visit record states that both children were seen and were happy and comfortable. The case examiners note there is nothing within the visit record which might indicate the visit was unsuccessful or had not yet taken place.

In their submissions the social worker said they created the record in anticipation of completing the visit, with the intention of returning to amend and finalise the record following completion. The social worker said they recognise that creating a record prior to the visit taking place is inappropriate and that the level of detail within the record contributed to the impression that the visit had already taken place. The social worker said it was not their intention to mislead or act dishonestly. The social worker said their actions reflected flawed and reactive decision making in the context of pressure and competing demands.

The case examiners are of the view that the evidence suggests that that the social worker was aware they had not completed the visit at the point they completed and uploaded the visit record and that the record was not a genuine record of a visit.

In respect of the objective test the case examiners have considered whether the conduct is likely to be deemed dishonest by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people. The case examiners believe it is reasonable to conclude that, if a social worker was proven to have falsified a visit record, an ordinary decent person is likely to view that as dishonest.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this concern being found proven by adjudicators.

Grounds

The case examiners must next consider whether, if found proven, the concern could amount to the statutory ground of 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 also 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 Social Work England Standards 2019, and consider the following to be relevant:

As a social worker, I will:

2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair.



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 your suitability to work as a social worker, while at work or outside work.

5.3 Falsify records or condone this by others.

The case examiners are of the view that, if found proven, falsifying an unannounced visit record would not be likely to be considered open, honest or reliable and would not be considered to be maintaining clear and accurate records. This would therefore not align with the standards above.

Where it is found that a social worker acted dishonestly, this is always likely to be considered serious. Honesty is key to good social work practice. When a social worker does not act honestly, this brings into question their suitability to work as a social worker. The evidence suggests that the social worker knew they had not visited the family as instructed by their manager.

The case examiners are of the view that dishonesty by a social worker, if found proven, should be viewed as significant and serious misconduct. They note the professional standards guidance (April 2020) which states “Where [social workers] 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”.

The case examiners consider that dishonesty in the form of misleading your manager, and other professionals, that you have visited children when you have not, could be particularly serious as it has the potential to cause harm to service users. However, the case examiners acknowledge that in this case, any potential harm was reduced

by the fact that the foster carers continued to receive regular visits from their supervising social worker. The case examiners also acknowledge that they have not been provided with any evidence of any actual harm being caused.

When reviewing dishonesty, according to their guidance the case examiners can consider factors such as the duration of dishonesty and whether the social worker admitted the dishonest behaviour at the earliest opportunity. The evidence suggests that when challenged the social worker admitted that they had not visited the foster family and that they had falsified the record in error and intended to rectify this on their return from leave. The case examiners acknowledge this is an isolated incident.

The case examiners are satisfied in light of the evidence provided that this is a serious matter and, if proven, a significant departure from the professional standards identified above.

As such, the case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the conduct in relation to regulatory concerns 1 and 3 would amount to misconduct.



Impairment

Having concluded there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators establishing the statutory ground of misconduct in relation to regulatory concerns 1 and 3, the case

examiners must consider whether there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding current impairment. Assessment of impairment consists of two elements:

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

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

Personal element

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

Whether the conduct can be easily remedied

The case examiners acknowledge that dishonest conduct can be difficult to remediate, as it is characterised in case law as a behavioural or attitudinal issue. However, having considered their guidance, case examiners are of the view that by developing insight into what happened and what they would do differently in the future, alongside learning or training and evidence of positive current practice, a social worker in these circumstances, could demonstrate there is a low risk of repetition and that they are capable of safe practice.

Insight and remediation

When considering insight, the case examiners note that the social worker admits the key facts and accepts their role and responsibilities in relation to the events that gave rise to the concerns. In addition, the social worker made admissions to their employer at an early stage in the process. The social worker has provided detail of mitigating circumstances around the time of the alleged conduct, which include a demanding workload with multiple time-sensitive responsibilities, [redacted] which the case examiners acknowledge. The social worker explains how these matters impacted their capacity, resilience and professional judgment and describes their conduct as "uncharacteristic of my usual practice".

The social worker has addressed what went wrong and has explained how they might act differently going forward. The social worker explains that they recognise they should have escalated their inability to complete the visit and ensured that the case record accurately reflected the factual position at the time. The social worker has

also acknowledged the potential impact of their conduct on colleagues, service users and for the reputation of the profession of social work. The social worker has also addressed the safeguarding implications for the service user in this matter. The case examiners consider the social worker has demonstrated a good level of insight.

Turning next to consider remediation, the case examiners are aware remediation is best shown by objective evidence, for example successful completion of education or training courses, satisfactory performance appraisals or other positive feedback in relation to professional practice.

The case examiners note their guidance that states where concerns relate to a social worker's character, such as, dishonesty, it can be more difficult to evidence remediation. This is because it is more difficult to provide objective evidence of reformed character. The guidance also states that evidence of professional competence cannot mitigate serious or persistent dishonesty. Dishonest conduct is highly damaging to public confidence in social work. Therefore, it is likely to warrant a finding of impairment and a more serious sanction of suspension or removal.

The case examiners have seen evidence that the social worker has completed relevant training in record keeping and professional standards, [redacted] resilience and record keeping. The social worker has demonstrated within their reflective statement and submissions that they have learned from this training and states "the impact of this training on my practice has been practical and sustained".

The case examiners note the social worker has [redacted] engaged in peer support [redacted].

The case examiners have seen a testimonial from the social workers current employer, dated May 2026, which states the social worker is "an exceptional social worker", describing them as a "vital member of the team". The testimonial goes on to say the social worker provides knowledge and support to the team, builds excellent relationships and that their work is of a high standard. The employer notes the social worker to be tenacious and thorough and states there is no concern in relation to the social worker's integrity or professionalism. The testimonial also indicates that the social worker disclosed this matter to their current employer at interview.

The case examiners are therefore of the view that there is evidence that the social worker has directly addressed what went wrong and has now demonstrated safe and effective practice for a period of 8 months since the concerns were raised.

The case examiners reiterate that dishonesty is fundamentally serious and they revisited their guidance that states evidence of professional competence cannot mitigate serious or persistent dishonesty. However, there is a recognised spectrum of

dishonesty, and the context should be considered. The case examiners will now consider the context around the dishonest conduct and draw on case law to assist them.

GMC v Chaudhary

This case outlined the concept that dishonesty does not have to be an all-pervading trait in the sense that a person can be dishonest on just one occasion. The case also highlighted that remediation and unlikelihood of repetition are important factors in considering current impairment.

PSA v GMC and Uppal

The court commented in this case that decision makers were entitled to find that the dishonest incident was isolated and make a finding of no impairment. The professional's insight and remediation were relevant as well as the low risk of recurrence.

In this case the case examiners consider the following to be important context around the dishonest conduct:

- The evidence suggests that the social worker realised they had made an error of judgment and intended to rectify that upon returning from annual leave. In addition, there is evidence of some mitigating factors.
- The dishonesty was not persistent or a repetitive pattern of behaviour.
- There is objective evidence from the current employer that there have been no issues with the social worker's practice.
- The social worker has demonstrated insight and remediation.

Risk of repetition

The social worker has shown significant insight into what went wrong and accepted their role and responsibilities in the relation to the events. It is noted that dishonesty is typically more difficult to remediate but, the passage of time in this case, during which the social worker has demonstrated safe and effective practice and other significant remediation, is important context. It is important because it is objective evidence that the social worker has, and continues to, remediate their misconduct.

The case law assists the case examiners in noting that whilst dishonesty is considered serious, remediation and unlikelihood of repetition are important factors when considering current impairment. Having considered the passage of time

together with evidence of significant insight and remediation, the case examiners are of the view that the risk of repetition is low.

In summary, the case examiners note their guidance that states:

A finding of personal impairment is **usually** (emphasis added by the case examiners) not needed if (both of the following):

- The social worker has understood the causes of and learnt from any mistakes or misjudgements.
- There is no risk of repetition.

The case examiners are satisfied that based on the context and evidence in this case the risk of repetition is low but acknowledge that they cannot state definitively that there is no risk of repetition.

The case examiners therefore looked again at their guidance which states that a finding of impairment is 'usually' not needed in the circumstances set out above. The case examiners draw on the flexibility suggested by the use of the word 'usually' in their guidance, which indicates that they are not always directed to find personal impairment where they have not concluded that there is no risk of repetition.

The case examiners feel that whilst both of the above points are not strictly engaged in this case, for the reasons set out above, they do not consider the social worker to be currently personally impaired, despite not being able to definitely state that there is no risk of repetition.

Public element

The case examiners are satisfied that the social worker does not represent a risk to the public, but they must always consider the public interest when assessing impairment. As such, a finding of public impairment may be required.

In considering the public element, the case examiners were mindful of the regulator's guidance, which explains that allegations of dishonesty are particularly serious. Honesty is key to good social work practice, therefore conduct amounting to dishonesty will likely undermine public confidence in the social work profession.

Case law assists here; the case of Bolton v Law Society made it very clear that 'the reputation of the profession is more important than the fortunes of any individual member. Membership of a profession brings many benefits, but that is part of the price'.

In such circumstances, the case examiners can only conclude that a failure to find impairment would be highly likely to damage public confidence in the social work profession and would fundamentally undermine the maintenance of proper professional standards for social workers.

Having considered both the personal and public elements, the case examiners do not consider the social worker to be personally impaired, but they have concluded there is a realistic prospect that adjudicators would find the social worker to be currently impaired when considering the public element.

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 have carefully considered whether a referral to a hearing may be necessary in the public interest. They note the social worker has accepted the key facts; however, the social worker does not accept they are currently impaired.

Where a social worker does not accept impairment, the 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 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:

- The social worker accepts the key facts of the concern.
- The social worker is clear that they accept that their conduct fell short of the standards expected of them.

- The case examiners recognise that not all professionals will have an understanding of how and when the public element of impairment may be engaged, or how exactly this might impact upon findings concerning current fitness to practise.

- 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.

The case examiners are aware that a case cannot be concluded through an accepted disposal process where a social worker does not agree that they are currently impaired. At this stage, the case examiners' proposal for an accepted disposal process does not mark the conclusion of the case, as that would require a response from the social worker for the case examiners' consideration and is also subject to a final review of the case by the case examiners, who may determine to send the matter to a hearing following any response received.

Accepted disposal

Case outcome		
Proposed outcome	No further action	☐
	Advice	☐
	Warning order	☒
	Conditions of practice order	☐
	Suspension order	☐
	Removal order	☐
Proposed duration	1 year	

Reasoning

In considering the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners had regard to Social Work England's sanctions guidance and reminded themselves that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish the social worker, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. Furthermore, the guidance requires that decision makers select the least severe sanction necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

The case examiners have identified the following mitigating and aggravating factors in this case:

Mitigating

- The social worker has demonstrated insight and remorse.
- The social worker made early admission of the facts.
- There was no actual harm caused and the risk of harm was relatively low.
- The social worker has fully engaged with investigations.
- The social worker has taken remedial steps.
- There is positive feedback from the social worker's current employer.

- The social worker was experiencing difficult personal circumstances.
- The social worker has no previous fitness to practise history.

Aggravating

- Alleged dishonest conduct.

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

The case examiners considered the option of taking no further action. The sanctions guidance states that, when decision makers find impairment, an outcome of 'no further action' is rare. The case examiners acknowledge the mitigating circumstances shared by the social worker, however, consider they alone do not amount to exceptional circumstances which might enable justification of an outcome of no further action.

The case examiners consider the nature and seriousness of the social worker's alleged conduct leads them to conclude that taking no further action would not satisfy the public interest given the allegation of dishonesty in this case.

Advice

The case examiners next considered whether offering advice would be sufficient in this case. Advice will normally set out the steps a social worker should take to address the behaviour that led to the regulatory proceedings; however, it is acknowledged that the case examiners considered the risk of repetition to be low in this case. The case examiners decided however that due to the seriousness of the alleged conduct in this case, that issuing advice was not sufficient. Furthermore, it would be insufficient to maintain public confidence and uphold the reputation of the reputation of the profession.

Warning order

The case examiners next considered whether a warning order would be appropriate in this case. The case examiners had regard to their guidance, which states a warning is likely to be appropriate where (all of the following):

- The fitness to practice issue is isolated or limited.

- There is a low risk of repetition.
- The social worker has demonstrated insight.

The case examiners consider that all three of the above criteria apply in this case. The case examiners have decided that the most appropriate outcome in this case is a warning order. A warning order implies a clear expression of disapproval of the social worker's conduct and the case examiners conclude that a warning order is the appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case and represents the minimum sanction necessary to uphold the public's confidence.

Having concluded that a warning order is the appropriate outcome in this case, the case examiners went on to consider the duration for the order. When considering a warning order, case examiners can direct that a warning order will stay on the social worker's register entry for periods of one, three or five years.

The case examiners have considered the length of time for the published warning and consider one year to be proportionate in this case. The case examiners consider that a period of one year is appropriate in the circumstances to maintain public confidence and to send a message to the public, the profession and the social worker about the standards expected from social workers. This is because, although dishonesty is always considered serious, as previously mentioned case law suggests that dishonesty does not have to be an all-pervading trait and a person can be dishonest on just one occasion. The case examiners consider this relevant in the circumstances of this case, whereby the conduct appears to be isolated, the social worker has demonstrated good insight and remediation, and the risk of repetition is classified as low.

The case examiners did not feel that a three-year warning would be appropriate as they consider the social worker has already addressed the risk of repetition. The case examiners do not consider that the matter fell marginally short of the need to restrict practice, and therefore five years would be disproportionate.

<u>Conditions of Practice/Suspension</u>

The case examiners went on to consider whether the next available sanctions of conditions of practice and suspension were appropriate in this case. They concluded that conditions were more relevant in cases requiring some restriction in practice, for example, in cases involving health or competence and capability. It has been acknowledged that the social worker has been successfully working without restriction with no further incident since the alleged conduct. Therefore, conditions are not proportionate or suitable in this case. The case examiners again note that this is not a case that has fallen only marginally short of requiring removal, they therefore

considered that suspension from the register would be a disproportionate and punitive outcome in this case.

The case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a warning order of 1 year duration. 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 14 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.

Content of the warning

The regulatory concerns in this case represent a significant departure from the expectations of social workers in relation to record keeping. You are reminded of the importance of accurate and honest record keeping going forward.

You are therefore warned that in future, you should adhere to Social Work England's professional standards, and specifically the following standards:

As a social worker, I will:

> 2.1 Be open, honest, reliable and fair
>
> 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 your suitability to work as a social worker, while at work or outside work.
>
> 5.3 Falsify records or condone this by others.

Your conduct should not be repeated. Any similar matters brought to the attention of the regulator are likely to result in a more serious outcome.

Response from the social worker

The social worker provided a response on 28 September 2026 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

Having reviewed the social worker's response, the case examiners are satisfied that a warning order of 1 year duration 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 warning order of 1 year duration.