



Social worker: Paul Stephen
Fannon

Registration number: SW28989

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review meeting

Date of meeting: 06 May 2026

Meeting venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed:
Suspension order (expiring 17 June 2026)

Meeting outcome:
Impose a new order namely a removal order with effect from the expiry of
the current order

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the first review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a panel of adjudicators on 20 March 2025.
2. Mr Fannon did not attend and was not represented.
3. Social Work England was represented by Capsticks LLP and their written submissions are set out within the notice of hearing letter.
4. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Paul Grant	Chair
Suzanna Jacoby	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Ruby Wade	Hearings officer
Asma Ansar	Hearings support officer
Kerry Smith	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel noted notice of this hearing was sent to Mr Fannon by email to an address provided by him (namely their registered address as it appears on the Social Work England Register).
6. The panel of adjudicators had careful regard to the documents contained in the final order review service bundle as follows:
 - A copy of the notice of the final order review hearing dated 2 April 2026 and addressed to Mr Fannon at his email address which he provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 2 April 2026 detailing Mr Fannon’s registered email address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 2 April 2026 the writer sent an email to Mr Fannon at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
 - A copy of the email to Mr Fannon at 4.22pm on 2 April 2026.
7. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
8. Having had regard to the Fitness to practise rules 2019 (as amended) and all of the information before it in relation to the service of notice, the panel was satisfied that notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Fannon in accordance with Rules 14, 16, 44 and 45.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting in the absence of the social worker:

9. The notice of final order review informed Mr Fannon that the review would take place as a meeting. The notice stated:

“If you would like to attend before the adjudicators in order to make oral submissions, please confirm your intention by no later than 4pm on 17 April 2026. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we shall assume that you do not want to attend a hearing and Social Work England may decide to deal with the review as a meeting. If Social Work England do hold a meeting, the adjudicators will be provided with a copy of this letter setting out Social Work England’s submissions and a copy of any written submissions you provide.”

10. The panel received no information to suggest that Mr Fannon had responded to the notice of final order review requesting a hearing. The panel took into account Mr Fannon’s emails dated 10 March 2026 and 2 April 2026 in which he explained he has a different career and has no appetite to ‘re-enter’ the regulatory process to return to social work. Mr Fannon was informed that in his absence, the review could proceed as a meeting.
11. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser with regard to Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended) which provides:

“Where the registered social worker does not state within the period specified by the regulator whether they intend to attend before the regulator, the regulator may determine whether to make an order by means of a meeting.”

12. The panel was satisfied that it would be fair and appropriate to conduct the review in the form of a meeting in accordance with Rule 16(c) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).
13. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in respect of proceeding in the absence of Mr Fannon. The panel determined that Mr Fannon had voluntarily absented himself and had therefore waived the right to attend a hearing. The emails from Mr Fannon dated 10 March and 2 April 2026 demonstrate that he was aware that a review was being held. This is a mandatory review of a suspension order that is due to expire on 17 June 2026 and, as such, there is a public interest in proceedings being dealt with expeditiously and without delay. The key consideration for the panel is one of fairness. The panel was satisfied that there could be a fair review of the final order in the absence of Mr Fannon. Whilst there may be some disadvantage to him not attending, he had the opportunity to make written submissions and he provided emails dated 10 March and 2 April 2026 setting out his position and the information he wanted the panel to take into account when making its decision.

Review of the current order:

14. This final order review hearing is taking place under Paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) and Social Work England's Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended). The purpose of this meeting is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 17 June 2026. The order subject to review is a suspension order.

The allegations found proved which resulted in the imposition of the final order were as follows:

15. The allegations that were found proved at the final hearing which resulted in the imposition of a suspension order were:

“Whilst registered as a social worker:

1. *You inappropriately restrained Child 1 on one or more occasions [limited to two specific incidents]:*
 - a. *On or around September 2021;*
 - b. *On or around 06 January 2022;*
 - ...
2. *On or around 06 January 2022, you did not report the restraining of Child 1 that occurred in January 2022 to your manager.*
3. *Your actions at regulatory concern 2 were dishonest*

The matters set out at paragraphs 1–3 above, amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.”

The final hearing panel determined on 20 March 2025 the following with regard to impairment:

16. The relevant passage from the final hearing decision is:

“Personal Component

155. *In assessing the personal component, the panel considered whether Mr. Fannon's misconduct has been remediated, whether there is a risk of repetition, and whether he has demonstrated insight into his conduct. The panel was also mindful of the four elements from case law 'Grant' which are often considered when determining whether a practitioner's fitness to practice is impaired:*

- a) *Whether service users have been put at unwarranted risk of harm;*

- b) *Whether the registrant has brought the profession into disrepute;*
- c) *Whether there has been a breach of a fundamental tenet of the profession;*
- d) *Whether the registrant has acted dishonestly.*

156. *The panel found that all four limbs of the Grant test had been established in this case. Mr. Fannon's conduct placed a vulnerable child at actual and potential risk of physical and emotional harm. The panel was particularly concerned that one of the restraints lasted up to ten minutes, which went far beyond any proportionate response to an immediate danger. His failure to follow explicit management instructions and subsequent dishonesty in concealing the incident from his manager undermines public trust in the profession. His actions breached fundamental professional tenets, including safeguarding children, complying with management oversight, and acting with honesty and integrity. The panel accepted Mr. Fannon's admission of dishonesty in failing to report the second incident in a timely and accurate way. Although not premeditated, the dishonesty was self-serving and serious.*
157. *In relation to insight, the panel accepted that while Mr. Fannon has shown some developing awareness by expressing regret and acknowledging that restraint was outside the scope of his role. His insight was found to be limited, and he has not demonstrated full insight. Although Mr. Fannon acknowledged that restraint was not part of his role, he accepted that his actions in restraint were not permitted. Throughout the proceedings, both in his written submissions and during the hearing, Mr. Fannon has continued to justify his actions as appropriate in the circumstances and maintained that his personal judgment of the situation was preferable to the instruction of his line manager. He maintained that he believed he was acting in the child's best interest, and while there was some recognition that his actions were wrong, the panel considered that he had not fully understood or internalized the risks or the inappropriateness of his behavior.*
158. *This was of particular concern to the panel. Although he expressed that he would not repeat the conduct, stating that he believed his fitness to practice was impaired then but not now, his insight appeared to be focused on the consequences to himself, and lacked full acknowledgement of the impact of the harm caused to Child 1. The panel found that Mr. Fannon failed to demonstrate a genuine understanding of the harm, risks and impact on the child, the family, his employer, and public confidence in social workers. The panel therefore considered that his limited insight and failure to demonstrate*

learning indicate a lack of proactive steps to address the misconduct and present an increased risk that similar issues may arise in future.

159. *The panel considered whether the misconduct was remediable and whether it had been remedied. The panel accepted that while aspects of the misconduct are theoretically remediable, the attitudinal elements, particularly his disregard for clear management instruction and dishonesty make successful remediation more difficult.*
160. *Mr. Fannon had not provided any evidence of formal remediation, such as relevant up-to-date training, or professional testimonials from his current role, nor had he provided any reflective pieces demonstrating insight into his conduct, understanding of risks or how he would prevent such misconduct from happening in the future. While the panel acknowledged that Mr. Fannon has not been working as a registered social worker, the absence of recent references or evidence of safe practice raises concerns about whether he has effectively addressed the issues identified. The panel considered that steps such as undertaking training, engaging in voluntary work, obtaining character references, or preparing a comprehensive reflective piece would have been realistic and proportionate expectations to demonstrate remediation.*
161. *The panel, therefore, concluded that there remains a risk of repetition. While the panel found that the risk may be low, it remains present, especially given Mr. Fannon's entrenched belief that his actions were justified in that circumstance. In the panel's judgement, this continuing belief poses a potential risk to the public were he to return to social work without restriction, as it is not satisfied that he would act differently in similar circumstances without restriction.*
162. *The panel therefore determined that Mr. Fannon's fitness to practice is currently impaired on the personal component.*

Public Component

163. *In considering the public component of impairment, the panel reminded itself that this part of the test is concerned with maintaining public confidence in the profession and in Social Work England as its regulator, as well as upholding proper professional standards and conduct.*
164. *The panel had regard to the serious nature of the misconduct found proved. Mr. Fannon's conduct was not only inappropriate but also incurred actual*

harm to a vulnerable child. Moreover, it occurred against clear managerial instructions and involved dishonesty in failing to adequately report the incident. He prioritized his own judgment above that of his professional obligations, which undermines the regulatory and management framework designed to protect the public.

165. *The panel considered that a reasonably informed member of the public, knowing the facts of this case, would be alarmed if no finding of impairment were made, particularly given the absence of demonstrable remediation and the ongoing risk to the public.*
166. *The panel emphasized that social workers are expected to model safe, proportionate, and ethical responses to risk. Mr. Fannon's actions were fundamentally incompatible with the standards expected of a social worker, and his failure to report the incident and subsequent dishonesty further undermined the integrity of the profession.*
167. *The panel, therefore, concluded Mr. Fannon's fitness to practice is currently impaired on the public component in light of the nature and seriousness of the misconduct.*
168. *The panel carefully considered the additional written submissions provided by Mr Fannon titled 'Submission in the matter of Mr Paul Stephen Fannon (SW28989)'. The panel acknowledged that Mr Fannon presented his actions as being motivated by a genuine desire to protect Child 1, the child's baby sibling, and others present. The panel accepted that Mr Fannon acted with good intentions and believed he was acting in the best interests of those involved at the time.*
169. *However, the panel found that this belief, while sincerely held, reflected poor professional judgment, particularly in light of Mr Fannon's experience as a qualified social worker. The panel was concerned that Mr Fannon's written submissions reinforced the extent to which he remains convinced that his actions were justified. Rather than demonstrating full insight or critical reflection on the risks and inappropriateness of his conduct, the submissions sought to reassert the lawfulness and proportionality of his actions.*
170. *In the panel's view, this reinforced its view that Mr Fannon's insight is still developing and remains incomplete. His persistent justification of his conduct, despite the panel's findings, suggests a continuing attitudinal concern and an absence of meaningful remediation. The panel concluded that Mr Fannon's written submissions further demonstrate how deeply*

embedded his belief in the reasonableness of his actions remains, and this supports the panel’s finding that his fitness to practise is impaired on both the personal and public elements.

171. *Having considered all of the evidence before it, including the submissions of Social Work England, Mr. Fannon’s written submissions and oral testimony, and the guidance provided, the panel determined that Mr. Fannon’s fitness to practice is currently impaired on both the personal and public components.”*

The final hearing panel on 20 March 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

17. The relevant passage from the final hearing decision is:

180. *“In reaching its decision on sanction, the panel had careful regard to the Sanctions Guidance published by Social Work England (December 2022), the overarching objective of public protection, and the need to maintain confidence in the profession and uphold proper standards. The panel followed the structured approach set out in the guidance by considering the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness and selecting the least restrictive outcome necessary to protect the public and satisfy the public interest. The panel also considered the relevant aggravating and mitigating factors, as well as its earlier findings of impairment on both personal and public grounds.*

181. *The panel took into account the following aggravating and mitigating factors in determining the appropriate sanction.*

The panel identified the following aggravating factors:

- **Repetition of conduct:** *The inappropriate restraint occurred on two separate occasions.*
- **Disregard for direct management instruction:** *Mr Fannon repeated the behaviour despite being expressly instructed not to do so after the first incident. He placed his own views above those of senior professional colleagues and organisational procedures.*
- **Dishonesty:** *He deliberately failed to inform his manager about the second incident, calling into question his integrity and professional judgment. However, the dishonesty was limited in extent to effectively one incident and limited in duration.*

- **Lack of authority and training:** Mr Fannon used a physical intervention technique without current, relevant training or authorisation.
- **Limited insight:** Mr Fannon continues to justify his conduct and has not fully demonstrated an appreciation of the risks posed by his actions.
- **Lack of remediation:** He has not taken meaningful steps to address the concerns or demonstrate how similar conduct would be avoided in the future.
- **Risk of harm to the child and wider implications:** The conduct caused actual emotional and physical harm to a child and also risked undermining the employer's procedures and public trust in the profession.

The panel identified the following mitigating factors:

- **Genuine remorse:** Mr Fannon offered sincere apologies and expressed regret for his actions.
- **Some developing insight:** He acknowledged that his actions were outside the scope of his role and indicated a willingness to learn.
- **Early admission of facts:** He admitted to the factual basis of the allegations at an early stage in proceedings.
- **Full engagement with investigations:** He participated in Social Work England's investigation and engaged with the hearing process throughout.
- **Contextual factors:** The incidents occurred in a highly pressured and complex situation involving a child with extremely challenging behaviour. The child's parents expressed appreciation for the support provided by Mr Fannon and did not criticise his intervention.
- **No malicious intent:** The panel accepted that Mr Fannon acted with good intentions and believed he was protecting those involved.
- **Willingness to remediate:** He expressed a desire to demonstrate further insight and return to social work.

- **Absence of previous fitness to practise history:** Mr Fannon had practised as a social worker for approximately 10 years with no prior concerns.

182. *The panel considered the full range of available sanctions in turn, beginning with the least restrictive. The panel first considered whether to take no further action. It concluded that this would be wholly inappropriate given the seriousness of the misconduct, the risk of repetition, and the panel's finding that Mr Fannon's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both the personal and public components. Taking no further action would fail to provide the necessary public protection and would undermine public confidence in the profession. The panel noted that this outcome is never appropriate where serious findings of misconduct have been made.*
183. *The panel next considered whether issuing advice or a warning would be sufficient. It concluded that such an outcome would also be inappropriate in this case. A warning or advice is intended to serve as a reminder to a social worker about their obligations and the potential consequences of further misconduct. However, such outcomes do not restrict practice, are not reviewable, and would allow Mr Fannon to return to unrestricted practice immediately. In the panel's view, this would not adequately reflect the seriousness of the misconduct or address the identified ongoing risk to the public.*
184. *The panel noted that although there were early admissions, Mr Fannon had not fully demonstrated an understanding of the broader implications of his misconduct, including the safeguarding risks and the importance of complying with managerial instructions. His insight remains limited and developing. Therefore, advice or a warning would be insufficient to mark the seriousness of the regulatory concerns or to uphold public confidence.*
185. *The panel then considered whether a conditions of practice order would be a sufficient and proportionate response. Conditions may be appropriate where the concerns identified are capable of being remedied, and where the social worker is willing and able to comply. However, the panel was not satisfied that it could formulate workable, appropriate, and proportionate conditions in this case.*
186. *Mr Fannon is not currently working in social work and has not done so for some time. The concerns in this case arise from deeply held attitudinal issues and a lack of insight into professional boundaries and the appropriate use of authority. The panel found that his personal belief in the justification of his actions remains entrenched. Although he has expressed a willingness to remediate, he has not yet demonstrated any concrete steps towards doing so, nor is there sufficient*

evidence to indicate that he would be capable of adhering to and benefiting from conditions at this stage.

187. *For these reasons, the panel concluded that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate or effective at this time. The concerns in this case are too serious and too closely linked to professional judgment, insight, and values, which cannot be adequately addressed through conditions at this stage.*
188. *The panel next considered whether a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction. The 'Sanctions' Guidance states that a suspension order may be appropriate where the panel cannot formulate workable conditions to protect the public or the wider public interest, and where removal from the register would be disproportionate.*
189. *The panel concluded that a suspension order would be sufficient to protect the public, uphold public confidence in the profession, and give Mr Fannon the opportunity to demonstrate further insight and remediation. The panel had regard to the 'Sanctions' Guidance, which states that suspension may be appropriate where there is a serious breach of professional standards, some demonstration of insight, and evidence to suggest that the social worker is willing and able to resolve or remediate their failings.*
190. *The panel found that these criteria are met. Mr Fannon's misconduct was serious, involved dishonesty, and resulted in actual harm to a vulnerable child. However, the panel also accepted that Mr Fannon has shown some developing insight and remorse. He has expressed a desire to return to social work and a willingness to address the issues identified. He has no previous regulatory history and has otherwise practised for 10 years without regulatory concerns.*
191. *In determining the length of suspension, the panel carefully balanced the need to protect the public and uphold standards with the risk that a lengthy suspension may lead to deskilling. The panel noted that it is in the public interest to support a trained and skilled social worker to return to practice where it is safe to do so. The panel was satisfied that a 12-month suspension order was the minimum period necessary to allow Mr Fannon to reflect, develop insight, and begin the process of remediation.*
192. *For completeness, the panel went on to consider whether a removal order would be appropriate. The panel concluded that such an outcome would be disproportionate at this time. While the misconduct was serious, the panel found that there is potential for Mr Fannon to remediate and return to safe and effective practice. He has expressed a strong desire to continue his career, and the panel*

was mindful of the principle that removal should only be imposed where no lesser sanction is sufficient.

193. *The panel noted that Mr Fannon is an experienced social worker, has shown a genuine desire to improve, and is capable of being supported to return to practice safely. A removal order would fail to support a skilled professional to re-enter the profession safely and would be inconsistent with Social Work England's guidance.*

194. *The panel therefore determined that a suspension order for a period of 12 months was the appropriate and proportionate sanction."*

Social Work England submissions:

18. The panel had written submissions on behalf of Social Work England as to the background and the previous panel's findings in relation to impairment and sanction. Social Work England invited the panel to make a removal order.

Social worker submissions:

19. The panel had two emails from Mr Fannon dated 10 March and 2 April 2026. In these emails Mr Fannon sets out that he has moved into a different career and does not intend to return to social work practice. He explains that, as a result, he will not be progressing the recommendations of the original panel as regards the preparation of a reflective statement, testimonials, or additional evidence for the final order review. He references the significant length of time taken for the regulatory process to reach a hearing, approximately four years, and during that time his professional direction changed and he has moved into other work. He expresses he no longer has the appetite to return to social work or to reenter the regulatory process. He advised he would not be submitting further material for the upcoming final order review. Mr Fannon asked Social Work England if there were any formal steps required from him in light of his decision.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

20. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It took into account the decision of the previous panel. However, it has exercised its own judgement in relation to the question of current impairment. The panel also took into account Social Work England's 'Impairment and sanctions guidance'.

21. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel, the written submissions on behalf of Social Work England, and the two emails from Mr Fannon dated 10 March and 2 April 2026.

22. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public and the wider public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession.
23. The panel first considered whether Mr Fannon's fitness to practise remains impaired.
24. The panel noted that Mr Fannon had expressed remorse at the final hearing and that the original panel had considered that the concerns about Mr Fannon were capable of being remedied. The original panel set out recommended actions Mr Fannon may wish to consider taking to demonstrate that he had developed sufficient insight and begun remediation, which included a written reflective statement, testimonials from professionals, evidence of relevant training, and any evidence of peer reflection.
25. Mr Fannon has not acted upon the recommendations of the original panel for the reasons he sets out in his two emails, namely that due to the delay in the fitness to practise process he has established himself in a different career and did not feel able to engage fully in the process required to return to social work practice as this would require, in his view, for him to run two careers in tandem for a period of time.
26. The panel understands the pragmatism of Mr Fannon's position however, the panel reminded itself that there is a persuasive burden on Mr Fannon to demonstrate his fitness to practise is no longer impaired. Mr Fannon has not provided any evidence that he has addressed the concerns or acted on the recommendations. He has not provided any evidence of remediation or that he has maintained his skills and knowledge.
27. The panel considers that there has been no material change in circumstances since the the original panel made a final suspension order. Accordingly, the panel determined that Mr Fannon's fitness to practise remains impaired in relation to the personal and public component of the overarching objective. The panel is of the view that the public would be concerned if it were to learn that a social worker who has not addressed concerns about their fitness to practise would be allowed to return to practice without restrictions.

Decision and reasons on sanction:

28. Having found Mr Fannon's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel had regard to all the information and the written material and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.
29. The panel considered the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, which invited the panel to consider imposing a removal order, and the emails of Mr Fannon dated 10 March and 2 April 2026. The panel also took into account the 'Impairment and sanctions guidance' published by Social Work England.
30. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Mr Fannon, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The public interest includes

maintaining public confidence in the profession and Social Work England as its regulator and by upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The panel applied the principle of proportionality by weighing Mr Fannon's interests with the public interest.

No action / advice / warning

31. The panel decided that taking no action, issuing advice or a warning would not address the serious nature of Mr Fannon's misconduct nor would they adequately protect the public as they would not restrict Mr Fannon's practice. As such, they were not appropriate or sufficient to address the concerns raised, which have not been remedied.

Conditions of practice order

32. The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order could be imposed. The panel could not formulate conditions which it considered would be sufficient to protect the public given the nature of the concerns in relation to Mr Fannon's practice. Given Mr Fannon does not intend to return to social work, a conditions of practice order would not be practicable or workable.

Suspension order

33. The panel next considered confirming and extending the existing suspension order. The panel took into account that a suspension order had now been in place for almost 12 months and, during that period, Mr Fannon has not engaged with the recommendations of the original final hearing panel for the reasons he sets out in his emails dated 10 March and 2 April 2026. Mr Fannon has stated he does not intend to return to social work and has established himself in a different profession. Whilst suspension would protect the public, in view of Mr Fannon's stated intention not to return to social work, the panel determined a suspension order would not serve the public interest or be in Mr Fannon's best interests and therefore was not appropriate or proportionate.

Removal order

34. The panel was satisfied it could consider that a removal order was available to the panel as Mr Fannon's fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of the statutory ground of misconduct as set out in regulation 25(2)(a).
35. The panel noted that a removal order is a sanction of last resort where there is no other means of protecting the public or the wider public interest.
36. The panel noted that Social Work England had, in an email to Mr Fannon dated 12 March 2026, notified him of his right to request voluntary removal and provided him with the link to the voluntary removal guidance. The panel had no evidence or information to indicate Mr Fannon has made a voluntary removal application.
37. The panel took the view that a removal order would be appropriate in this case. Mr Fannon has set out that he does not intend to return to social work and has established a different career. The panel took into account that a removal order is a significant step and can have a punitive effect however, in the circumstances of this case, the panel

was satisfied that it was necessary and proportionate in the public interest and in the best interests of Mr Fannon.

Right of appeal:

38. Under Paragraph 16(1)(b) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), the social worker may appeal to the High Court against:
 - a. the decision of adjudicators:
 - i. to make an interim order, other than an interim order made at the same time as a final order under paragraph 11(1)(b),
 - ii. not to revoke or vary such an order,
 - iii. to make a final order,
 - b. the decision of the regulator on review of an interim order, or a final order, other than a decision to revoke the order.
39. Under Paragraph 16(2) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended) an appeal must be filed before the end of the period of 28 days beginning with the day after the day on which the social worker is notified of the decision complained of.
40. Under Paragraph 15(1A) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended), where a social worker appeals against a decision made under sub-paragraph (1), the decision being appealed takes effect from the date specified in that sub-paragraph notwithstanding any appeal against that decision.
41. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

The Professional Standards Authority:

42. Please note that in accordance with section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, a review decision made by Social Work England's panel of adjudicators can be referred by the Professional Standards Authority ("the PSA") to the High Court. The PSA can refer this decision to the High Court if it considers that the decision is not sufficient for the protection of the public. Further information about PSA appeals can be found on their website at:

<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/what-we-do/our-work-with-regulators/decisions-about-practitioners>.