



Case Examiner Decision
Marie Unger – SW118151
FTPS-24298

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	9
The public interest	17
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	
1 st preliminary outcome	24 February 2026
	Information requested
2 nd preliminary outcome	11 May 2026
	Accepted disposal proposed – warning order (5 years)
Final outcome	19 May 2026
	Accepted disposal – warning order (5 years)

Executive summary

The case examiners have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1(a-b), 2 and 3 being found proven by the adjudicators.
2. There is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1(a-b), 2 and 3 being found to amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.
3. For regulatory concerns 1(a-b), 2 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 five years. The social worker accepted this proposal.

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 [REDACTED] 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.

Support worker A	[REDACTED]
------------------	------------

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	03 May 2025
Complaint summary	The social worker was subject to disciplinary proceedings, following an internal investigation which found that they had falsely recorded supervisions with support worker A.

Regulatory concerns

Whilst registered as a social worker between April 2024 to 13 February 2025:

1. You falsified or misrepresented supervision records, in that:
 - a) You recorded three supervisions that did not take place.
 - b) You recorded one supervision with an incorrect date to align with internal expectations.



2. Your actions set out at regulatory concern 1 were dishonest.
3. Having been dismissed by your employer on 13 February 2025, you failed to inform the regulator of your dismissal within an appropriate timescale.

The matters outlined in regulatory concern 1, 2 and 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the case examiners satisfied that the social worker has had reasonable opportunity to make written representations to the investigators?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Requests for further information or submissions, or any other preliminary issues that have arisen

24 February 2026

The case examiners note that the complainant has not been provided a reasonable opportunity to make written representations in response to the social worker's submissions. The case examiners are aware that such opportunity is discretionary to the regulator, however, they consider that in the circumstances it is necessary.

The social worker's submissions allege that they were directed by their line manager to write up the informal conversations as formal supervision records, and they were reluctant to do so but pressure was put on them in December 2024 as the human resources department was putting pressure on their manager. The social worker says they raised this during their final meeting and told the managing director they were acting on instruction from their line manager but there was no comment. The

case examiners consider it important for the regulator to put these allegations to the former employer and/or former line manager and seek a response.

May 2026

Further work has been undertaken by the investigators and the case examiners are satisfied there are no further preliminary issues.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

The case examiners have determined that there is a realistic prospect of regulatory concerns 1a, 1b, 2 and 3 being found proven, that 1a, 1b, 2 and 3 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 between April 2024 to 13 February 2025:

1. You falsified or misrepresented supervision records, in that:
 - a) You recorded three supervisions that did not take place.

The case examiners have been provided with supervision records relating to support worker A, written by the social worker and dated 28 June 2024, 17 September 2024 and 17 December 2024.

The evidence suggests that following support worker A raising concerns about a lack of supervision from the social worker, the former employer interviewed the social worker who is recorded as admitting there were no supervisions held in June, September and December 2024. The case examiners have also been provided with

evidence of the social worker's call logs, which suggest that no calls took place between the social worker and support worker A around these dates.

The social worker accepts this regulatory concern and states they were advised to record the supervisions by their line manager.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to adjudicators.

b) You recorded one supervision with an incorrect date to align with internal expectations.

The case examiners note that the call logs between the social worker and support worker A suggest there was no telephone call between them on 22 March 2024, despite a supervision being recorded as having taken place. During an interview with their former employer, the social worker is recorded as admitting they dated a supervision from April as taking place in March, it was clarified that this was recorded as such because they "*were conscious you had run out of timescales*".

This is accepted by the social worker.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to adjudicators.

2. Your actions set out at regulatory concern 1 were dishonest.

When considering dishonesty, the case examiners have applied two tests, in line with relevant case law.

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.

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 social worker submits that they were struggling to find time to complete the supervisions with support worker A and as the support worker was not around this time completing any support work with children and carers, they did not prioritise this above their other responsibilities. They submit that their manager knew this and advised them to write up the supervisions based on the text and WhatsApp message contact they had with support worker A. Their line manager disputes this, and this is a conflict the case examiners cannot resolve. However, regardless of whether they were advised to record supervision records incorrectly or not, the evidence suggests and it appears accepted by the social worker, that they knew they had not undertaken supervision sessions or, in the case of regulatory concern 1b, that the session had taken place a month later than recorded.

The case examiners are of the view that an ordinary decent person would view recording supervision sessions which did not take place as dishonest. Similarly, the case examiners consider that many people would view intentionally recording an incorrect date on a supervision record to be dishonest.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, in relation to 1a and 1b only, should the matter go forward to adjudicators.

3. Having been dismissed by your employer on 13 February 2025, you failed to inform the regulator of your dismissal within an appropriate timescale.

The case examiners have been provided with a letter from the social worker's former employer which advises them that they have been dismissed following a disciplinary meeting. This letter is dated 13 February 2025. The regulator was informed of this by

the former employer's referral. The social worker appears to have been informed of this referral on 28 May 2025 by Social Work England. This suggests that the social worker had a period of 3 months to inform the regulator of their dismissal.

The case examiners have had sight of the regulator's guidance on when social workers should make a self-referral, which states "You need to tell us if you've been involved in any disciplinary proceedings at work that could affect your fitness to practise".

The social worker accepts that they did not inform the regulator and submits, "I have not been proactive and it is not from wanting to mislead or be dishonest about anything. I have felt overwhelmed and unable to act, I know this does not justify my lack of action".

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of this regulatory concern being found proven, should the matter go forward to adjudicators.

Grounds

This case has been presented as amounting 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 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.

3.8 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.

6.6 Declare to the appropriate authority and Social Work England anything that might affect my ability to do my job competently or may affect my fitness to practise, or if I

am subject to criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is made against me, anywhere in the world.

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.

The case examiners recognise that not all departures from the professional standards will be significant enough to engage the ground of misconduct. The evidence suggests that the social worker's lack of supervision sessions with support worker A made the member of staff feel isolated and unvalued. The case examiners do acknowledge however, that support worker A was a sessional worker and at the time of the concerns was not providing any support to children and their carers. This suggests that any impact upon the children supported by the fostering agency may have been minimal.

The case examiners are of the view that honesty and integrity are such an essential part of the social work values, that falsifying records is always likely to represent a significant breach of standards 2.1, 5.2 and 5.3. The professional standards guidance sets out "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".

As previously noted, the social worker describes a difficult working environment and states that they were instructed to declare they had completed supervision sessions and so they "wrote up supervision notes based on whatsapp messages/observation/keeping in touch calls". The former line manager disputes this and states their understanding "was that supervisions did take place, albeit with minimal content as [support work A] was not providing support at this time". Whilst the case examiners cannot determine whether the social worker or their former line manager's account is accurate and can only assess on the papers alone, they are of the view that even if this mitigation was accepted by adjudicators, it would not be sufficient to undermine the social worker's culpability. As an experienced professional, the social worker would be expected to know that any records they create must be accurate and truthful.

In relation to regulatory concern 3, the case examiners are of the view that while the evidence suggests the social worker was overwhelmed and in denial about their situation, the requirement to self-refer is essential for the regulator to carry out risk assessments in order to protect the public. Whilst the regulator was made aware of the dismissal, this was not by the social worker, and this could be seen as a serious breach of standard 6.6. The case examiners are of the view that the regulator must take failures to declare seriously or there is a risk that the regulator's core functions of protecting the public and upholding public confidence could be undermined.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding the statutory ground of misconduct engaged, in relation to regulatory concerns 1a, 1b, 2 and 3.

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 regard to concerns 1a, 1b, 2 and 3, the case examiners note from their guidance 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 are of the view that the alleged conduct in regulatory concerns 1a, 1b, 2 and 3 could be remedied, in that the social worker could evidence reflection on what went wrong and what they would do differently in the future. The case examiners guidance states "in some cases, the concerns may relate to the social worker's character. If so, it can be more difficult to evidence remediation that has reformed their character. For example, if the concerns relate to dishonesty, breaches of trust or abuses of position".

Insight and remediation

The case examiners recognise that the social worker admits all of the regulatory concerns. The evidence from the former employer suggests that the social worker

initially denied some of the falsification but during the course of their interview acknowledged that they had done what was alleged. The social worker is also reported to have understood the potential impact upon support work A.

In their submissions to the regulator, the social worker puts forward mitigation, including that they were told to write up supervision records on the basis of WhatsApp messages. Whilst the social worker's submissions focus on what they say was a difficult working environment due to senior management and foster carer dissatisfaction, they also recognise that they should have refused to write up supervisions which did not occur. They state, "I accept that the actions were dishonest and that I should not have acted on [former line manager's] instructions". They also submit "I have learnt from this experience and will always double check procedures, confirm instructions in writing and seek other advice if I am ever unsure in the future". The social worker has advised the regulator how they have taken steps to prevent a recurrence in the future and what they would do if faced with a similar situation.

In terms of remediation, the case examiners note this is best demonstrated by objective evidence. Whilst the social worker has not provided any evidence of learning or training, their subsequent employer has provided a reference which speaks very positively of the social worker. Specifically, it is stated that the team manager "has had no cause for concern in respect of [the social worker's] practice, honesty or integrity. It is relevant to add that [the social worker] has been honest and indeed proactive in sharing information both in respect of her initial dismissal from her previous post and the current Fitness to Practice [sic] investigation. [The social worker] has shared information in a timely manner and understands the need for this information to be shared with senior managers".

Risk of repetition

In relation to regulatory concern 2, the case examiners recognise that their guidance suggests that dishonesty may be considered an attitudinal issue, meaning that a social worker who has acted dishonestly in the past, is more likely to behave in a dishonest manner in the future. The case examiners acknowledge that while the concerns spanned a period of many months, they related to a single support worker (who was not conducting frontline work) out of the 8 being supervised by the social worker and the many foster carers they also supported. The case examiners are of the view that in this case, in light of the insight and remediation demonstrated, the risk of repetition is low.

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.

Although the case examiners are satisfied that the risk of repetition is low, their guidance sets out that they “may decide that even though the social worker is not personally impaired, a finding of impairment is still in the public interest” and goes further to state that “some concerns are so serious that if proven, a finding of impairment is likely. This is because in these cases, a failure to make a finding of impairment may (do one or more of the following):

- undermine public confidence in the profession
- fail to maintain the professional standards expected of social workers”.

One of the examples of such cases in the guidance is dishonesty. The case examiners acknowledge the sanctions guidance which states that “dishonest behaviour is nuanced and can take different forms. [Decision makers] should consider it on a scale of seriousness”. The case examiners have established that there was no evidence of harm to service users caused by the social worker's actions, neither was there any apparent risk of harm to the public. However, as previously stated, the case examiners are of the view that the public expect social workers to act with integrity and honesty and a failure to do so is likely to undermine public confidence in the profession. Therefore, the case examiners consider that the public would expect a finding of impairment when a social worker has been found to act dishonestly.

The case examiners are satisfied there is a realistic prospect of adjudicators finding 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	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Referral criteria

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

Additional reasoning

The case examiners have concluded that the public interest in this case is engaged. However, they are satisfied that this interest may be appropriately fulfilled by virtue of the accepted disposal process.

Whilst the matter is serious, the case examiners are not of the view that it is so serious that a hearing might be necessary to maintain public confidence in the social work profession, or in Social Work England's maintenance of the standards expected of social workers.

The case examiners have noted that the social worker has accepted the regulatory concerns but has indicated to the regulator that they do not consider their fitness to practise to be currently impaired. Where a social worker does not accept impairment, 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 have also identified that there is some conflict in the case, in that the social worker submits they were advised by their former line manager to record supervision sessions which had not taken place and their former line manager disputes this. Whilst it is open to the social worker to request that their case is heard by adjudicators where live evidence can be tested and witnesses can be cross examined, the case examiners consider that the mitigation, even if accepted by adjudicators, is unlikely to reduce the social worker's culpability to the extent that they would not be found impaired.

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

- The social worker accepts all of the regulatory concerns.
- The case examiners are of the view that there is low risk of repetition, and therefore any finding of impairment would be primarily made in the public interest, to safeguard public confidence.
- The case examiners recognise that not all professionals will have a clear understanding of how and when the public interest may be engaged, or how exactly this might impact upon findings concerning current fitness to practise.
- The accepted disposal process will provide to 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	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Advice	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Warning order	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Conditions of practice order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Suspension order	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Removal order	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed duration	5 years	

Reasoning

The case examiners have identified the following mitigating and aggravating factors;

Aggravating

- Concerns spanned a number of months
- The concerns involved dishonesty

Mitigating

- No previous fitness to practise concerns
- The conduct was limited in that it related to one support worker and there is no evidence of wider concerns about the social worker's conduct.
- There was no evidence of direct harm caused to service users and it did not appear to have the potential to put service users at risk
- The social worker submits that they were practising in a difficult context
- The social worker has demonstrated good insight and provided recent evidence of positive practice, there appears to have been no repetition of any concerns with their new employer.

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.

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 and advice

The case examiners have dismissed the sanctions of no further action and advice due to the seriousness of the conduct. They are aware that no further action would only be appropriate in exceptional circumstances and while the social worker has provided context, there is nothing they would consider exceptional.

The case examiners acknowledge that there appears to be a low risk of repetition, which suggests that a restrictive sanction is not necessary, however they have also considered the sanctions guidance which sets out that “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”.

However, the case examiners note that the guidance states it is likely, rather than necessary to impose a more serious sanction and they have considered the factors outlined above in determining whether a restrictive sanction is necessary, despite the low risk of repetition.

Warning order

The case examiners note the sanctions guidance which states “a warning order is likely to be appropriate where (all of the following):

- the fitness to practise issue is isolated or limited
- there is a low risk of repetition
- the social worker has demonstrated insight”.

The guidance therefore suggests that a warning order could be the most appropriate order in this case. In order to test their rationale, the case examiners have considered restrictive sanctions also.

Conditions of practice order

The case examiners note that conditions of practice are generally suitable in cases of lack of competence or adverse health. Given that there appears to be a low risk of repetition, they do not consider there are suitable nor proportionate conditions which would address the conduct alleged.

Suspension

As previously noted, the case examiners consider that it could be argued that suspension is the most appropriate sanction, despite the low risk of repetition, due to the alleged dishonesty. However, given the mitigating factors including the lack of evidence of harm and risk to the public, the case examiners consider that, in this case, suspension is not the minimum necessary to uphold public confidence. They are assured that a warning order is sufficient for a social worker who has demonstrated insight and remediation, including openness and honesty with their subsequent employer.

Length of warning order

The case examiners have then turned their minds to the appropriate length of a warning. They have discounted a one-year warning, given these are aimed at “an isolated incident of relatively low seriousness”. Whilst the evidence suggests that the social worker’s alleged conduct was limited, it cannot be said to be isolated, nor can it be characterised as relatively low seriousness, given the dishonesty.

The guidance sets out that “3 years may be appropriate for more serious concerns” and 5 years “may be appropriate for serious cases that have fallen only marginally short of requiring restriction of practice”. Both are aimed at helping to maintain public confidence and highlight the professional standards as well as allowing further time for the social worker to show that they have addressed any risk of repetition.

The case examiners have concluded that this is a case which has fallen only marginally short of requiring a restrictive sanction, as set out above. They are balancing their assessment of dishonesty being a serious and a significant departure from how the public would expect a registered professional to behave along with the evidence which indicates that this was a limited incident which the social worker regrets and has taken steps to prevent recurrence. The case examiners believe that a 5-year warning is a proportionate and suitable sanction in the circumstances.

The case examiners have decided to propose to the social worker a warning order of 5 years 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

It is important that any records made for work are accurate and honest, to ensure that service users receive a safe and effective provision of services.

The conduct that led to these allegations should not be repeated. Any similar conduct or matters brought to the attention of the regulator are likely to result in a more serious outcome.

The case examiners particularly remind the social worker of the following Social Work England professional standards:

As a social worker, I will:

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.

This warning order will be for a duration of 5 years.

Response from the social worker

On 18 May 2026, the social worker returned their completed accepted disposal response form, confirming the following:

“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 have again considered the public interest in this matter and, as they have not been presented with any new evidence that might change their previous assessment, they are satisfied that it remains to be the case that the public interest in this case may be fulfilled through the accepted disposal process.

The case examiners therefore direct that the regulator enact a warning order of 5 years duration.