

Social worker: Faiza Mulbocus

Registration number: SW127796

Fitness to Practise

Final Order Review Meeting

Date of Meeting: 23 June 2026

Meeting venue: Remote

Final order being reviewed: Suspension order (expiring 04 August 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 third review of a final suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a panel of adjudicators on 7 March 2024. It was first reviewed on 23 January 2025, on that date the panel extended the order for a further 9 months from the expiry of the previous order. It was last reviewed on 24 October 2025, on that date the panel extended the order for a further 8 months from the expiry of the previous order. The current suspension order is due to expire on 4 August 2026.
2. Ms Mulbocus 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
Karen McArthur	Chair
Sarah (Sally) Scott	Social worker adjudicator

Hearings team/Legal adviser	Role
Molly-Rose Brown	Hearings officer
Nabiha Asam	Hearings support officer
Zill-e Huma	Legal adviser

Service of notice:

5. The panel 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 11 May 2026 and addressed to Ms Mulbocus at her email address which she provided to Social Work England;
 - An extract from the Social Work England Register as of 11 May 2026 detailing Ms Mulbocus’ registered email address;
 - A copy of a signed statement of service, on behalf of Social Work England, confirming that on 11 May 2026 the writer sent by ordinary email to Ms Mulbocus at the address referred to above: notice of hearing and related documents;
6. The panel accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to service of notice.
7. Having had regard to Rule 16, 44 and 45 of Social Work England 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 Ms Mulbocus in accordance with the Rules.

Proceeding with the final order review as a meeting:

8. The notice of final order review informed Ms Mulbocus 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 26 May 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.”

9. 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.”

10. The panel considered with great care whether it was appropriate to proceed in the absence of Ms Mulbocus by way of a meeting. In reaching its decision, the panel took into account Rule 16(c), the guidance entitled ‘Service of notices and proceeding in the absence of the social worker’, and the principles set out in *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5* and *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. The panel bore in mind that fairness to Ms Mulbocus was of paramount importance and exercised its discretion with the utmost care and caution.
11. The panel noted that Ms Mulbocus had neither responded to the Notice of Hearing nor sought an adjournment. The panel further noted Ms Mulbocus’ lack of engagement with these proceedings since January 2025 and that she had not attended the previous review hearing. In the absence of any explanation for her non-attendance, the panel concluded that Ms Mulbocus had waived her right to participate in these proceedings and had voluntarily absented herself.
12. The panel considered whether an adjournment would be likely to secure Ms Mulbocus’ attendance or engagement at a future hearing. Having regard to Ms Mulbocus’ sustained pattern of non-engagement and unanswered correspondence from Social Work England, the panel concluded that there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would result in her attending or engaging with these proceedings in the future. The panel also considered the public interest in the expeditious disposal of regulatory proceedings and the need to avoid unnecessary delay.
13. Balancing all these factors, the panel determined that it was fair, proportionate and in the interests of justice to proceed in Ms Mulbocus’ absence by way of a meeting.

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).
15. The purpose of this review is to review the current order, which is due to expire at the end of 4 August 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:

Whilst working as a registered social worker at Achieving for Children:

- 1. Between 31 March 2020 and 4 September 2020, you were provided with management instructions as set out in Schedule 1.*

Schedule 1

- i. On 31 March 2020, Person A asked you to reach out to available resources of additional support for the mother of Child E.*
- ii. On a date around the 30 July 2020, you were asked by Person A to contact Child A's parents to arrange a meeting but to refrain from telling them that the meeting was about child protection issues.*
- iii. On or about 30 July 2020 Person A told you to ask Child A's school for,*
 - a. school reports;*
 - b. an overview of what they felt Child A could do;*
 - c. support needs;*
 - d. whether Child A received any therapy;*
 - e. whether they felt anything was missing;*
 - f. their worries and/or what was working.*
- iv. On or about 3 August 2020 you were asked by Person A to obtain consent from Child A's mother for information about Child A to be shared with other professionals involved in Child A's care.*
- v. On 11 August 2020, Person A asked you to complete a case summary for Child D by 14 August 2020.*
- vi. On the 17 August 2020, you were given a management instruction/task by Person A in relation to Child B to:*

- a. Find out what care and support was being put in place that week;*
- b. Prepare a chronology of concerns;*
- c. Prepare the necessary information so that you could complete the Section 47 application within a week;*
- d. Prepare a list of helpers;*
- e. Arrange a family/friends network discussion in the next day or two.*

1.1 You did not carry out the instructions at Schedule 1 as follows

1.1.1 You did not gather any additional support for Child E's mother as set out in part (i) of Schedule 1.

1.1.2 You did not ask any of the matters that you were told to as set out in part (iii) of Schedule 1.

1.1.3 You did not ask for the consent as set out in part (iv) of Schedule 1.

1.1.4 You did not prepare the case summary as set out in part (v) of Schedule 1.

1.1.5 You did not carry out any of the work as set out at part (vi)(a)-(e) of Schedule 1.

1.2 You acted contrary to the instructions as follows,

1.2.1 You told Child A's mother the reason for the meeting contrary to part (ii) of Schedule 1

2 You did not maintain up to date case file records as set out in Schedule 2.

Schedule 2

i. Between 18 October 2019 and 19 May 2020 you did not update Child C's Child in Need Plan

ii. On or about 4 September 2020 you did not ensure that all child case files were up to date as instructed by Person B.

3 You did not produce assessments to the standard expected as set out in Schedule 3.

Schedule 3

i. In August 2020 you produced a Child and Family assessment for Child A in which;

a. You omitted relevant information about:

1. Health;

2. Education;
3. Family and Social Relationships;
4. Social Presentation;
5. Self-Care Skills;
6. Employment and Income;
7. Basic Care;

b. You did not explain clearly why you had formed a view that a Child Protection Conference was necessary;

c. You omitted evidence to support your view about 'Guidance and Boundaries;'

d. You did not explain clearly how or why you had arrived at your conclusion that Child A should remain at home with their parents;

e. You omitted information from the family friend that had raised the initial concerns about Child A;

f. You omitted your own view as the allocated social worker about what was working well for Child A;

g. You omitted your own view as the allocated social worker about what needed to happen next for Child A.

ii. In May 2020 you carried out an assessment of Child F's needs which required the following improvements;

a. Information was required about how long the child had been receiving care from the Council for and how long you had been their allocated social worker;

b. The section about the child required more information about them;

c. A paragraph was required to explain the impact of Covid;

d. It implied that the Child was going to school but then said that they were not;

e. Information was required about the facility Croft Cottage and why the child may go there, the implications if they were not to go and any concerns from their mother or school;

f. Clarity was required on whether a contingency discussion had taken place with the child's mother;

g. Information was required about whether there was a short break package in place and if so whether it was working, including an analysis of what was being offered and recommendations from you;

h. Your conclusion that the child should remain in school full-time lacked information as to how you had arrived at this view.

4 You did not adequately safeguard service users as set out in Schedule 4.

Schedule 4

i. Between 18 October 2019 and 25 September 2020 you did not always demonstrate ‘professional curiosity’ during visits to Child C

ii. Between 29 March 2020 and 28 May 2020, you did not contact Child E’s mother with any additional support resources.

The matters outlined in paragraphs (1) – (4) of the allegations amount to the statutory ground of lack of competence/capability.

Your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of a lack of competence/capability.

The previous final order review panel on 24 October 2025 determined the following with regard to impairment:

16. *“In considering the question of current impairment, the panel undertook a comprehensive review of the final order in light of the current circumstances. It considered the decision of the previous panels and all of the evidence presented. 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’.*
17. *The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the decision and reasons of the original panel and previous review panel and the submissions previously made by Ms Mulbocus at the last review hearing which included details of training she had undertaken, her oral submissions and references. The panel also took account of the written submissions of Social Work England.*
18. *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.*
19. *The panel first considered whether Ms Mulbocus’ fitness to practise remains impaired.*
20. *The panel noted that the previous review panel had found that Ms Mulbocus had limited insight and had demonstrated insufficient remediation, in particular in relation her*

failure to complete relevant training and produce a reflective piece. This panel was disappointed that Ms Mulbocus had not taken into account the advice and recommendations made by the previous review panel.

- 21. The panel noted that the last review panel had been encouraged by the commitment of Ms Mulbocus to remain in the profession and her “continued engagement with the regulatory process”, however, regrettably since the last review there appears to have been no engagement from Ms Mulbocus with Social Work England. In the absence of any engagement and a reflective piece to demonstrate her insight and remediation the panel could not be reassured that sufficient progress was being made by Ms Mulbocus to ensure that her previous behaviour would not be repeated in the future.*
- 22. The panel had no new evidence since the last review to suggest that Ms Mulbocus had made any progress or had taken into account the last review panel’s findings and reflected upon them. The panel had no knowledge as to how Ms Mulbocus was performing in her current role, whether she had undertaken any additional training to support a return to social work or had taken any steps to maintain her social work skills and knowledge.*
- 23. This panel shared the view of the previous panel that Ms Mulbocus remained impaired personally and that a finding of impairment was necessary to uphold the public’s confidence in the profession.*
- 24. The panel was satisfied that there remained a risk of repetition and public protection concerns should Ms Mulbocus be permitted to practise without restriction. The panel considered that public confidence, and proper professional standards in the social work profession, would be undermined if a finding of impairment was not made in these circumstances.”*

The previous final order review panel on 24 October 2025 determined the following with regard to sanction:

- 25. “Having found Ms Mulbocus’ 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 the written submissions along with all the information and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.*
- 26. The panel considered the written submissions made on behalf of Social Work England, during which they invited the panel to consider imposing a further eight month suspension order. The panel also took into account the ‘Impairment and sanctions guidance’ published by Social Work England.*
- 27. The panel was mindful that the purpose of any sanction is not to punish Ms Mulbocus, 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 Ms Mulbocus' interests with the public interest

28. *Starting with the least restrictive sanction the panel considered the appropriate sanction to impose.*

Warning/ Advice

29. *The panel noted that issuing a warning or advice would not restrict Ms Mulbocus' ability to practise and was therefore not appropriate. The deficiencies identified with Ms Mulbocus' practice combined with her lack of insight and remediation had the potential to have wide-ranging adverse consequences on service users and therefore some restriction on her practice is required. Therefore, the panel concluded that issuing a warning or advice would be inappropriate and insufficient to meet the public interest.*

Conditions of Practice

30. *In light of the wide-ranging allegations that were admitted/proven in Ms Mulbocus' practice and the risk of repetition, the panel was unable to formulate workable conditions sufficient to protect the public that were not so restrictive that they would be tantamount to suspension.*
31. *The panel noted that in her oral evidence before the previous panel Ms Mulbocus' had accepted that she needed to "gain more experience to be confident" prior to returning to a social work role. The panel could not be satisfied that Ms Mulbocus had gained this necessary experience. Furthermore, given Ms Mulbocus' lack of engagement with Social Work England the panel could not be satisfied that even if it were to devise conditions Ms Mulbocus would adhere to these. In these circumstances, the panel discounted conditions of practice.*
32. *Extend the current suspension order for a further 8 months with effect from the expiry of the current order:*
33. *The panel concluded that the appropriate sanction remains a suspension order. A suspension order would prevent Ms Mulbocus from practising during the suspension period, which would therefore protect the public and the wider public interest.*
34. *The panel determined that the current suspension order should be extended for a further 8 months.*
35. *The panel was satisfied that this period was appropriate because it would provide sufficient time for Ms Mulbocus to complete a reflective piece and demonstrate that she has completed relevant training. The panel considered 8 months was a proportionate period, striking a balance between imposing the order for a reasonable period to protect the public whilst providing the necessary impetus to Ms Mulbocus to re-engage with Social Work England and demonstrate any progress she has made.*

36. *The suspension period reflects the amount of time that Ms Mulbocus may need to reflect on the panel's findings and devise a plan of action targeted towards an unrestricted return to the register.*
37. *This panel cannot bind a future panel. However, a future reviewing panel would expect Ms Mulbocus to attend the review hearing and it would be of assistance to that panel if they she was able to provide evidence that she had undertaken significant steps that would facilitate a safe and effective return to the register without restriction.*
38. *The panel encourage Ms Mulbocus to re-engage with Social Work England and reiterate the advice of the previous reviewing panel that it would be helpful for Ms Mulbocus to provide the following to assist a future panel:*
- A. Evidence of training undertaken by Ms Mulbocus, including her reflection on what she has learned from the training and how this will improve her future practice. In particular in respect of:*
- 1. Undertaking and completing assessments*
 - 2. Safeguarding service users*
- ii. Evidence of how she has kept her understanding and knowledge of social work practice up to date.*
- iii. A written reflective piece from Ms Mulbocus addressing her past failings to demonstrate her understanding of what went wrong and the implications of those failings and their potential impact on service users, colleagues and the reputation of the profession. Ms Mulbocus should demonstrate how she has addressed those failings and how she will prevent them from recurring in the future should she be permitted to return to social work practice unrestricted.*

Removal order

39. *The panel considered whether a removal order may be appropriate however, it noted that a removal order was not available to the panel as Ms Mulbocus' fitness to practise was originally found impaired on the basis of one or more grounds as set out in regulation 25(2), (b), (e) or (h) she had not yet been suspended from practice or subject to a conditions of practice final order (or a combination of both) for a continuous period of two years immediately preceding the day when the removal order would take effect."*

Social Work England submissions:

40. *The panel received and considered written submissions on behalf of Social Work England.*

"Social Work England invites the Panel to consider that the fitness to practise of the Social Worker remains impaired, on the basis that they have failed to provide any further evidence of reflection, remediation or insight. Social Work England remains concerned that the Social Worker has not engaged with regulatory process since the first Review in

January 2025. Since the last review the Social Worker has not provided any evidence of remediation or reflection; and correspondence with their Case Review Officer has continued to go unanswered.

The continued lack of engagement is particularly concerning as the first reviewing panel specifically encouraged the Social Worker to engage and to work with Social Work England to address the concerns with respect to her fitness to practise. Subject to any engagement from the Social Worker prior to the review, Social Work England invites the panel to consider that a removal order is now appropriate. The Social Worker has failed to follow the recommendations of the first and second reviewing panels and, as it stands, there is no indication that the Social Worker will submit evidence that their fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

There has been no material received since the first review to suggest a reduction in risk. It is submitted that the Suspension Order should not be permitted to continue indefinitely, and that a third extension to the Suspension Order would not be appropriate without ongoing engagement from the Social Worker. The Social Worker has been afforded ample opportunity to demonstrate remediation and insight. She appears to have now completely disengaged from the review process. This suggests that the Social Worker is either unwilling, or unable to remediate. She has shown no recent indication of a desire to remain registered or to return to safe and effective practice.

In these circumstances, it is submitted that a removal order is now the appropriate sanction.

As the Social Worker will have been subject to a continuous period of suspension of around 26 months by the time of the third review, a removal order is available to the Panel.

If evidence of remediation is received from the Social Worker following the Notice of Hearing being sent, then Social Work England may reconsider its position.”

Social worker submissions:

41. The panel noted that it had not received any written submissions from Ms Mulbocus.

Legal advice:

42. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser in relation to the purpose of this mandatory review hearing and the powers available to it under paragraph 15(1) of Schedule 2 to the Social Workers Regulations 2018. The legal adviser reminded the panel that its task was first to determine whether Ms Mulbocus' fitness to practise remains currently impaired. If the panel concluded that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired, it would have the power to revoke the current suspension order with immediate effect. However, if the panel concluded that fitness to practise remains impaired, it would be required to consider sanction afresh, in ascending order of

seriousness and in accordance with the Sanctions Guidance, bearing in mind the principle of proportionality.

43. The panel was further advised that, if impairment remained, it had the power to extend the suspension order, make a conditions of practice order, or make any order which could have been made when the original order was imposed. The legal adviser drew the panel's attention to paragraphs 15(1)(b) and 13(2)(b) of Schedule 2 to the Social Workers Regulations 2018 and advised that, as Ms Mulbocus had now been subject to a suspension order, a conditions of practice order, or a combination of both for a continuous period of two years immediately preceding the date on which a removal order would take effect, the statutory gateway for a removal order was now available.
44. The panel was advised that, should it conclude that a removal order is the appropriate and proportionate sanction, any such order would take effect upon expiry of the current suspension order. The legal adviser reminded the panel that it was a matter for the panel to determine whether removal was necessary and proportionate, having regard to insight, remediation, risk of repetition, public protection and the wider public interest.

Panel's decision and reasons on current impairment:

45. In considering the question of current impairment, the panel carefully considered all the information before it and made its own independent decision. In reaching its decision, the panel had regard to the previous substantive and review determinations, the documentation provided for this review, the submissions made on behalf of Social Work England and the advice of the legal adviser, which it accepted.
46. The panel reminded itself that the purpose of this review was not to revisit the findings previously made by the substantive panel. Those findings stand. The panel's task was to determine whether Ms Mulbocus' fitness to practise remains currently impaired. In making that assessment, the panel adopted a forward-looking approach and considered the extent to which the concerns identified by previous panels had been addressed.
47. The panel noted that there has been no new information before it and no material change in circumstances since the previous review hearing. The panel was particularly mindful of the serious concerns identified at the substantive hearing relating to Ms Mulbocus' professional practice. Those concerns included failures to follow management direction, failures in recording, insufficient professional curiosity, inadequate analysis and deficiencies in evidenced decision-making. The panel considered these to be fundamental aspects of safe and effective social work practice.
48. The panel considered that social workers are routinely required to identify, assess and manage risk in order to safeguard vulnerable service users. The deficiencies identified by the substantive panel created a risk that safeguarding concerns may not be appropriately identified, analysed or escalated, thereby leaving vulnerable service users exposed to unmanaged risk. The panel considered that a failure to demonstrate

adequate professional curiosity, analysis and decision-making in safeguarding situations has the potential to place service users at significant risk of harm.

49. The panel noted that previous review panels had identified a number of steps which would assist future panels in assessing Ms Mulbocus' insight, remediation and current competence. Those recommendations included the provision of evidence of training, reflective pieces, references and evidence demonstrating the development and maintenance of professional skills, particularly in relation to professional curiosity, analysis, assessment and decision-making. However, the panel noted that no such evidence has been provided.
50. The panel noted that Ms Mulbocus has not engaged with Social Work England since January 2025. The panel acknowledged that, at the first review hearing, Ms Mulbocus had engaged meaningfully with the regulatory process. She had provided detailed and thoughtful submissions, demonstrated a degree of insight into the concerns and articulated a plan as to how she intended to address the deficiencies in her practice. [PRIVATE].
51. The panel considered that the concerns identified by the substantive panel were, at least initially, highly remediable, particularly given that Ms Mulbocus was at an early stage in her career and had demonstrated some insight into the deficiencies in her practice. The panel considered it disappointing that Ms Mulbocus had not continued to engage with the regulatory process.
52. However, despite the opportunities afforded to her by previous panels, Ms Mulbocus has not provided any evidence of remediation, reflection, training, continuing professional development or maintained competence since January 2025. Nor has she provided any information regarding her current circumstances or intentions in relation to returning to practice. In the absence of any evidence demonstrating remediation or maintained competence, the panel was unable to conclude that the risk of repetition has reduced.
53. The panel considered that Ms Mulbocus' prolonged and complete disengagement from the regulatory process means that the concerns identified by the substantive panel continue to require evidence of remediation. Accordingly, the panel concluded that the risk of repetition remains significant.
54. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Mulbocus' fitness to practise remains impaired on public protection grounds.
55. The panel also considered the wider public interest. The panel concluded that members of the public and fellow professionals would be concerned if a social worker who had not addressed serious concerns relating to safeguarding practice, and who had disengaged from the regulatory process for a prolonged period, were permitted to return to unrestricted practice. The panel determined that public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process would be undermined if a finding of continuing impairment were not made.

56. Accordingly, the panel concluded that Ms Mulbocus' fitness to practise remains currently impaired

Panel's decision and reasons on sanction:

57. Having found that Ms Mulbocus' fitness to practise remains currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what, if any, sanction was necessary and proportionate. The panel had regard to Social Work England's Sanctions Guidance and accepted the advice of the legal adviser. The panel applied the principle of proportionality, balancing Ms Mulbocus' interests against the need to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper professional standards and conduct.

58. The panel bore in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish Ms Mulbocus, although it may have a punitive effect. Rather, the purpose of a sanction is to protect the public and to address the wider public interest. The panel considered the available sanctions in ascending order of seriousness.

59. The panel first considered taking no action and making a caution order. The panel concluded that neither of these outcomes would adequately address the ongoing risk identified, nor would they sufficiently maintain public confidence in the profession or uphold proper professional standards. The panel therefore concluded that neither taking no action nor imposing a caution order would be appropriate or proportionate.

60. The panel next considered a conditions of practice order. The panel recognised that the concerns identified in this case are, by their nature, capable of remediation. The panel noted that Ms Mulbocus had previously demonstrated some insight into the concerns and had articulated plans to remediate them.

61. However, the panel noted that Ms Mulbocus has not engaged with Social Work England since January 2025 and has provided no information regarding her current circumstances, employment status or willingness to comply with conditions. The panel concluded that, in the absence of any recent engagement, it could not formulate conditions which would be workable, measurable or verifiable. Further, the panel was not satisfied that Ms Mulbocus would be willing or able to comply with any conditions imposed. Accordingly, the panel concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public and would not be appropriate or proportionate.

62. The panel next considered extending the current suspension order. The panel carefully considered whether a further period of suspension would serve a useful purpose. The concerns arose at a very early stage in Ms Mulbocus' social work career and, in the panel's view, were initially highly remediable. The panel acknowledged that Ms Mulbocus had previously demonstrated a degree of insight into the concerns and had, at an earlier stage, provided thoughtful and reflective submissions regarding the steps she intended to take to remediate the deficiencies in her practice.

63. The panel also recognised that Ms Mulbocus had previously informed Social Work England of [PRIVATE]. The panel considered that these factors may have impacted upon her ability to engage with the regulatory process.

64. However, the panel noted that Ms Mulbocus has now had the benefit of repeated opportunities to engage with the regulatory process and to demonstrate insight, remediation and maintained competence. Despite those opportunities, she has not engaged with Social Work England for approximately seventeen months and has provided no evidence whatsoever of reflection, remediation, training, continuing professional development or maintained competence in that time.
65. The panel concluded that there is no evidence before it to suggest that a further period of suspension would be likely to result in meaningful engagement or remediation. In particular, the panel noted Ms Mulbocus' prolonged and complete disengagement from the regulatory process and concluded that there is no realistic prospect that a further period of suspension would serve a useful purpose. Nor would it be in the wider public interest.
66. The panel next considered whether a removal order was appropriate and proportionate. The panel recognised that a removal order is the most serious sanction available and should be imposed only where no lesser sanction would adequately protect the public or satisfy the wider public interest.
67. The panel noted that a removal order was not available to previous review panels because Ms Mulbocus had not then been subject to a suspension order and/or a conditions of practice order for a continuous period of two years immediately preceding the date on which a removal order would take effect. The panel was satisfied that this statutory requirement has now been met. Accordingly, a removal order is now available to the panel.
68. The panel carefully considered whether a removal order would be disproportionate in light of the nature of the original concerns. The panel acknowledged that the concerns in this case did not involve dishonesty or attitudinal concerns and that, at an earlier stage, they appeared to be capable of remediation. The panel also acknowledged that Ms Mulbocus had previously demonstrated a degree of insight and had experienced significant personal difficulties, which may have affected her ability to engage with the regulatory process.
69. However, the panel concluded that these factors are outweighed by Ms Mulbocus' prolonged and complete disengagement from the regulatory process, the absence of any evidence of remediation or maintained competence, and the lack of any indication that she intends to return to safe social work practice. The panel concluded that there is no realistic prospect that the concerns identified by the substantive panel will be remedied within a reasonable period.
70. The panel determined that Ms Mulbocus has now been afforded sufficient time and opportunity to demonstrate insight, remediation and a commitment to returning to safe practice. Despite these opportunities, she has failed to engage with the regulatory process since January 2025 and has provided no evidence that would assist the panel in concluding that a lesser sanction would adequately protect the public.

71. The panel concluded that a further period of suspension would serve no useful purpose and would merely prolong proceedings without any realistic prospect of remediation. The panel was satisfied that public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process would be undermined if Ms Mulbocus were permitted to remain on the Register in circumstances where serious concerns relating to safeguarding practice remain unaddressed.
72. Balancing all of the circumstances of this case, the panel concluded that a removal order is the only sanction capable of adequately protecting the public and maintaining public confidence in the profession and the regulatory process.
73. The panel therefore determined that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is a removal order, which shall take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order on the 4 August 2026.

Right of appeal:

74. 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.
75. 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.
76. 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.
77. This notice is served in accordance with Rules 44 and 45 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2019 (as amended).

Review of final orders:

78. 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).

79. 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

80. 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>