

Social worker: Noor Yusuf
Registration number: SW118547
Fitness to Practise
Final Order Review Hearing

Date of Hearing: 01 June 2026

Hearing venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed: Suspension order (expiring 02 July 2026)

Hearing outcome: Revoke the suspension order with immediate effect

Introduction and attendees:

1. This is the second review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a panel of adjudicators on 6 March 2024.
2. At the first review on 19 August 2025 the panel of adjudicators extended the suspension order for a period of 9 months with effect from the expiry of the original order.
3. Mr Yusuf attended and was represented by Mr Patel.
4. Social Work England was represented by its case presenter Ms Hazelwood.
5. The panel of adjudicators conducting this review (hereafter “the panel”) and the other people involved in it were as follows:

Adjudicators	Role
Gill Murgatroyd	Chair
Anna Racher	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Poppy Muffett	Hearings officer
Raegan Kirkland	Hearings support officer
Scott McDonnell	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

6. As Mr Yusuf attended the hearing with Mr Patel, and no issues were raised or identified regarding service, the Panel was satisfied that notice of the hearing had been properly effected in accordance with the relevant Rules.

Review of the current order:

7. 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).
8. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 2 July 2026. The order subject to review is a suspension order.
9. The panel confirmed that it was in receipt of the hearing bundle (106 pages) and the service and supplementary bundle (94 pages).

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

Whilst registered as a Social Worker:

1. You were convicted of the following offences:

- a. *Dangerous driving contrary to section 2 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 on or around 22 October 2021 at Manchester Crown Court and/or;*
- b. *Using a motor vehicle without insurance contrary to section 143 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 on or around 18 October 2021 at Manchester Crown Court and/or;*
- c. *Driving without due care and attention, contrary to section 3 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 on or around 2 May 2018 at Greater Manchester Magistrates' Court.*

2. You failed to inform the regulator that you had:

- a. *Been arrested and/ or charged with the following offences:*
 - i. *Causing death by dangerous driving contrary to section 1 of the Road Traffic Act 1988, following an incident on 28 February 2019 and/ or;*
 - ii. *Causing death by dangerous driving whilst unlicensed, disqualified or uninsured contrary to section 3ZB of the Road Traffic Act 1988 following an incident on 28 February 2019.*

The matters outlined at paragraph 1 above amount to the statutory ground of a conviction in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence

The matters outlined at paragraph 2 above amount to the statutory ground of misconduct.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your convictions and/ or misconduct.

The previous final order review panel on 18 August 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

10. *“The Panel noted that the original findings of fact and the determination of impairment remain binding. The Panel recognised that Mr Yusuf was convicted of a number of criminal offences, including dangerous driving and driving without insurance, which were of a serious nature and carried with them both personal and public elements of impairment. The original panel determined that his fitness to practise was impaired on the basis of these convictions, his failure to notify the regulator, and concerns regarding risk of repetition and the wider impact on public confidence in the profession.*
11. *In reviewing the current evidence, the Panel considered the areas of remediation that had been identified as necessary by the previous panel. These included: (i) evidence of engagement in appropriate education and training, particularly in*

relation to social work skills, ethics, and governance; (ii) a reflective piece demonstrating insight into the seriousness of the misconduct, the impact on the public and on the reputation of the profession; (iii) references or testimonials from those of good standing addressing his suitability to return to practice; and (iv) evidence of completion of the extended driving test.

12. *The Panel accepted that Mr Yusuf has now successfully completed the extended driving test, as evidenced by the return of his driving licence. This demonstrates some progress in addressing the risks associated with his convictions and provides evidence of developing insight. The Panel also acknowledged the submission of a reflective piece in July 2025. However, the Panel agreed with Social Work England that this reflection focussed primarily on the personal impact of events on Mr Yusuf, and his failure to report his convictions to his regulator. The Panel considered that there was insufficient analysis of the seriousness of the underlying criminal conduct and its effect on public confidence in the social work profession. However, the Panel was encouraged by Mr Yusuf's stated willingness to revisit and strengthen this reflection, but it considered that the current document did not evidence full insight.*
13. *The Panel further noted that although Mr Yusuf has completed the academic component of a return to social work course and is due to commence a supervised placement, there was no independent evidence before the Panel of his progress or performance. The Panel accepted that an email between Social Work England and Manchester University confirmed that he may undertake this placement as a "return to social work student." However, there was no formal feedback or corroborative evidence from the university in relation to the academic part of the course. In addition, no testimonials or references from those of good standing were provided.*
14. *Taking all of the evidence into account, the Panel concluded that whilst there are signs of developing insight and some early steps towards remediation, the process is incomplete and unsupported by independent corroboration. The absence of robust evidence in relation to insight, remediation, and sustained engagement means that the concerns identified by the original panel remain.*
15. *Accordingly, the Panel found that Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise remains impaired. On the personal component, the Panel determined that there continues to be a risk of repetition in light of the incomplete remediation and insufficient demonstration of full insight. On the public component, the Panel considered that confidence in the profession and the need to uphold proper standards would be undermined if a social worker with such serious convictions, and with limited evidence of remediation, were permitted to return to unrestricted practice at this stage.*
16. *For these reasons, the Panel determined that Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise remains currently impaired on both personal and public components."*

The previous final order review panel on 19 August 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

17. *“The panel first considered whether to take no further action, issue advice, or impose a warning order. The panel concluded that these outcomes would not be sufficient to address the seriousness of the regulatory concerns, nor would they adequately protect the public nor to uphold public confidence in the profession.*
18. *The panel next considered whether to impose a Conditions of Practice Order. The panel recognised that Mr Yusuf has shown some engagement and a degree of remediation, including passing the extended driving test, producing a reflective piece, and commencing a return to social work practice course with Salford City Council. These steps demonstrate a willingness to re-engage with the profession and indicates developing insight. However, the panel concluded that his insight remains limited, that the reflective piece does not fully address the impact of Mr Yusuf’s behaviour on public confidence, and he has not yet completed the practical component of the course or produced any supporting testimonials or references. The panel was not satisfied that conditions of practice could be formulated at this stage to adequately address the seriousness of the risks identified.*
19. *The panel therefore determined that a Suspension Order remains the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case. The Panel considered that a Suspension Order will provide Mr Yusuf with further time to complete the practical component of his return to practice course, consolidate his learning through reflection, and provide testimonials and references to demonstrate his readiness to return safely to practice.*
20. *Without binding a future reviewing panel, the panel agreed with the previous panel that any future reviewing panel would be assisted by evidence of:*
 - *Completion of appropriate education and training, including an update to social work skills, ethics and professional governance;*
 - *A written reflective piece addressing what Mr Yusuf has learned from the events leading to this hearing and their impact on public confidence; and*
 - *Testimonials or references from individuals of good standing supporting his suitability to return to social work practice.*
21. *The panel considered the appropriate length of suspension. It determined that a period of 9 months was proportionate. This period provides Mr Yusuf with sufficient time to complete the 35-day practice placement of his course, develop further insight and reflection, and gather the necessary supporting evidence including testimonials and references. The panel noted that under the Fitness to Practise Rules and the Early Review Guidance, Mr Yusuf may request*

an early review of the Suspension Order should he be able to provide new evidence of compliance, remediation, and insight before the expiry of the order.

22. Accordingly, the panel decided to confirm and continue the Suspension Order for a further period of 9 months. This order is necessary and proportionate to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour.”

Social Work England submissions:

23. The panel heard submissions from Ms Hazelwood as to the background and the previous panel’s findings in relation to impairment and sanction.
24. Ms Hazelwood informed the panel that Mr Yusuf had complied with the recommendations of the previous panel and had supplied a number of documents in support of remediation.
25. Ms Hazelwood referred the panel to the documents in the two bundles, which showed that there was now evidence of Mr Yusuf having completed the return to social work training and receiving very positive feedback on his placements. Mr Yusuf had provided evidence of supervision and reflection on the work undertaken and that his driving license remains full and clear.
26. Mr Yusuf had provided a further reflection on the conduct forming the regulatory concerns, addressing honesty and transparency around disclosure of the offences, as well as a further piece of work addressing reflection on the serious offence that brought Mr Yusuf before the regulator.
27. Ms Hazelwood submitted that Mr Yusuf had been very frank in accepting the effect of his actions and showed an appreciation and understanding of the offences.
28. Ms Hazelwood submitted that Mr Yusuf had demonstrated that it was now safe for him to return to practise in the profession.
29. She informed the panel that there had been no new fitness to practise cases and no concerns regarding Mr Yusuf during the period of his suspension.
30. Ms Hazelwood submitted that Mr Yusuf had demonstrated full remediation. He had complied with all of the recommendations of the previous review panel
31. Ms Hazelwood submitted that in light of this it was the position of Social Work England that Mr Yusuf’s practice was no longer currently impaired and she invited the panel to revoke the suspension order with immediate effect.
32. Ms Hazelwood submitted that it was in the public interest for Mr Yusuf to return to work as soon as possible.

Social worker submissions:

33. Mr Patel informed the panel that Mr Yusuf had tried his best to rehabilitate himself and remediate. Mr Patel told the panel that Mr Yusuf wished to thank Social Work England for its patience and giving Mr Yusuf the time to take the necessary steps to demonstrate that his practice was no longer impaired.

Panel decision and reasons on current impairment:

34. 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 panels. 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'.
35. The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the previous review panel and any new documentation provided by Ms Yusuf which included his reflective statements, testimonials and evidence of training and work placements.
36. The panel also took account of the submissions made by Ms Hazelwood on behalf of Social Work England and those made by Mr Patel on behalf of Mr Yusuf.
37. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel was reminded that a social worker's fitness to practise is impaired if they pose a risk to public safety, or if their conduct or performance undermines the confidence the public is entitled to place in all social workers in England. A social worker's fitness to practise may also be impaired if their actions make it necessary to send a public message about the standards expected of social workers.
38. If the panel decided that Mr Yusuf's practice is currently impaired then it should then consider what sanctions are available and refer to Social Work England's "Sanctions Guidance". The panel must start from the least restrictive sanction. Insight and remediation are important factors.
39. The panel first considered whether Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise remains impaired.
40. The panel noted that Mr Yusuf had complied with all the recommendations of the previous review panel and this was to his credit.
41. The panel noted that Mr Yusuf had received positive feedback from his supervisors and had performed to a high standard.
42. Mr Yusuf had demonstrated humility and commitment. He had used the time during his suspension to positive effect.
43. The panel concluded that Mr Yusuf had shown genuine and whole-hearted remorse for his actions and demonstrated full insight. He had talked clearly about the effect on family members of the victim, the profession and colleagues.

44. The panel noted that Mr Yusuf's has received glowing testimonials, including his supervisor being willing to employ him. *"I feel he has grown and is now a more mature and responsible adult... He was a great asset to the team and had there been a vacant post in our team we would have been encouraging him to apply for a post, as we all really enjoyed working with him."*
45. The panel decided that Mr Yusuf's practice had been strengthened by his reflection and remediation and as such there was no risk of repetition.
46. The panel considered that members of the public would be most encouraged by work that Mr Yusuf had done during his suspension and felt that he had used his time wisely.
47. The panel decided that Mr Yusuf's practice was no longer impaired in light of all of these circumstances.

Decision and reasons:

Revoke the suspension order with effect immediately.

48. Having found that Mr Yusuf's fitness to practise was no longer impaired the panel decided to revoke the suspension order with immediate effect.
49. The panel determined that Mr Yusuf's practice was no longer impaired and decided that the suspension order should be revoked with immediate effect as there was no purpose in the order remaining in force any longer.
50. Mr Yusuf should be permitted to return to work as a social worker as soon as possible.

Right of appeal:

51. 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.
52. 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.
53. 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.

54. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

55. Under regulation 15(1), 15(2) and 15(3) of Schedule 2 of The Social Workers Regulations 2018 (as amended):

- 15(1) The regulator must review a suspension order, or a conditions of practice order, before its expiry.
- 15(2) The regulator may review a final order where new evidence relevant to the order has become available after the making of the order, or when requested to do so by the social worker.
- 15(3) A request by the social worker under sub-paragraph (2) must be made within such period as the regulator determines in rules made under Regulation 25(5).

56. Under Rule 16(aa) of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended), a social worker requesting a review of a final order under paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 must make the request within 28 days of the day on which they are notified of the order.

The Professional Standards Authority

57. 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>