

**Notice of Decision of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council's Fitness to Practise Committee**

---

**Name:** Margaret Amanda Haren

**SCR No:** 6029152

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT** the Fitness to Practise Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council, at its meeting on **08 September 2021**, made the following decision about your registration with the Northern Ireland Social Care Council:

**The Committee found the facts proved;**

**The Committee found that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct;**

**The Committee decided to make an Order for removal of your registration from the Register ('a Removal Order').**

**Particulars of the Allegation:**

That, being registered under the Health and Personal Social Services Act (Northern Ireland) 2001 (as amended):

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | You, whilst working as a domiciliary care worker for North West Care, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, Lissan House, 41A Dublin Road, Omagh, on dates between 01 February 2019 and 14 March 2019, stole cash to the value of £280 or thereabouts belonging to [Service User A].  |
| 2. | On 05 January 2021, it was found proven at the Magistrates' Court that you, on dates between 01 February 2019 and 14 March 2019, stole cash to the value of £280 or thereabouts belonging to [Service User A], contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969 and the Magistrates' Court imposed a monetary penalty of £280 and made a Conditional Discharge for one year. |

And your actions as set out above show that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

**Procedure**

The hearing was held under the fitness to practise procedure.

**Preliminary Matters**

The Registrant was not in attendance and the Council was represented by Mr Anthony Gilmore, Solicitor, Directorate of Legal Services.

## **Declaration of Interest**

The Chair of the Committee advised that all Committee Members had confirmed that they did not have any conflict of interest with the case.

## **Service**

Mr Gilmore told the Committee that the Notice of Hearing and hearing bundle were emailed to the Registrant's registered email address on 03 August 2021. A delivery receipt was received on the same day. The Committee Clerk attempted to call the Registrant on 01 September 2021 to confirm if she would be in attendance at the fitness to practise hearing. The Committee Clerk left a voicemail message requesting that the Registrant confirm if she would be in attendance. The Registrant sent an email to the Council on 03 September 2021, stating that she was not able to attend the hearing. The Committee Clerk responded to the Registrant and informed her that the Committee may proceed in her absence. The Committee Clerk asked the Registrant to notify her if she had any issues or objections to the Committee proceeding in her absence. There was no response from the Registrant.

The Committee received legal advice from the Legal Adviser, and she referred the Committee to the requirements as set out in the Northern Ireland Social Care Council's ('the Council') Fitness to Practise (Amendment) Rules 2019 ('the Rules') and, in particular, Rule 3 which states that proof of service shall be treated as being effected on the day after it was properly sent. The Committee took into account that the Notice of Hearing had provided details of the date and time of the hearing and that it was to be held virtually. In addition, it contained information about the Registrant's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the power to proceed in her absence.

The Committee, in all of the circumstances of the case, was satisfied that the Notice of Hearing had been served in accordance with Rule 3 of the Rules, and the requirements of Paragraph 5 of Schedule 2 of the Rules.

## **Proceeding in the Absence of the Registrant**

Mr Gilmore made an application to proceed in the absence of the Registrant under Paragraph 15 of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and submitted that the Committee should hear and determine the case in her absence. He invited the Committee to conclude that the Registrant's absence and email communicating to the Council that she was not able to attend was a voluntary waiver of her right to do so. He further suggested that it was in the public interest for the case to proceed, as this would ensure a fair and expedient disposal of the hearing.

The Committee was mindful that the discretion to proceed in the absence of the Registrant should only be exercised with the utmost care and caution. In considering the application, the Committee sought to satisfy itself that all reasonable efforts had been made to notify the Registrant of the hearing, and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. She referred the Committee to the cases of R v Jones 2003 1 AC, Adeogba and Visvardis v GMC 2016. She reminded the Committee that in exercising its discretion to proceed in the Registrant's absence, it must have regard to all of the circumstances with fairness to the Registrant being of prime consideration,

although fairness to the Council and the public interest must also be taken into account. She reminded the Committee to avoid reaching any improper conclusion about the Registrant's absence, and not to accept it as an admission in any way.

In reaching its decision, the Committee had particular regard to the factors as set out in the case of and R v Jones 2003 1 AC and noted that:

- The Registrant had not made an application for an adjournment;
- The Registrant had informed the Council that she was unable to attend and was made aware that the Committee may proceed in her absence;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning the case would secure her attendance at a future date;
- The allegation relates to events which occurred in 2019; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious disposal of this case.

Therefore, after careful consideration of all of the issues, the Committee decided to exercise its discretion to proceed in the absence of the Registrant, striking a careful balance between fairness to the Registrant and the wider public interest. The Committee reminded itself that it must avoid reaching any improper conclusion about the Registrant's absence.

### **Application to Admit Hearing Bundle**

The Committee accepted the bundle into evidence and marked it as Exhibit 1. Mr Gilmore made an application for two names to be redacted from the bundle of evidence, and this application was granted in the interests of fairness to all parties.

### **Background**

The Registrant was employed as a domiciliary care worker by North West Care, commencing in this post on 01 February 2018.

The Registrant came to the Council's attention as a result of an Employer Referral Form ('ERF') from the registered manager of North West Care, dated 14 March 2019. The registered manager advised that the Registrant had been suspended from her duties as a domiciliary care worker on 13 March 2019, as a result of allegations of theft from a service user's home.

The ERF set out that the family of a service user and his wife (Service User A), who were both in receipt of care packages from North West Care, became concerned that money was going missing from their family home. The family installed a camera within their home and captured images of the Registrant taking money.

The allegation was investigated by the Police and, on 04 November 2020, the Registrant appeared before the Magistrates' Court and pleaded not guilty to a charge that on dates between 01 February 2019 and 14 March 2019, she stole cash to the value of £280 or thereabouts belonging to [Service User A], contrary to Section 1 of

the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969. On 05 January 2021, a conviction was made, and the Magistrates' Court imposed a monetary penalty of £280 and made a Conditional Discharge for one year.

## **Evidence**

Mr Gilmore directed the Committee to the evidence contained within the hearing bundle, and submitted that the Council sought to rely on this evidence to prove the case.

The Committee heard that the ERF contained within the bundle provided the context to the allegation and evidence of how the Council became aware of the allegation. The Committee heard that there was no internal investigation in this case because firstly, the Police were investigating and secondly, because the Registrant resigned before such an investigation could take place. Mr Gilmore told the Committee that the Council had sought the Registrant's account of events but had not received a response from her.

Mr Gilmore directed the Committee to the transcript of the PACE interview with the Registrant on 23 September 2019. He submitted that this document was reliable and admissible evidence. The Registrant did not admit the theft, but did admit that it was her on the CCTV footage. During the interview, the Registrant made the case that she had been given the permission of Service User A to take the money from one purse and put it in another purse. The Registrant stated that she understood that Service User A had dementia or Alzheimer's, and that there were other carers employed to provide her care. She did not tell these carers that she was taking money to move it from one purse to another, nor did she tell the family members. The Registrant accepted that the care plan under which she was working did not include the handling of any money. Mr Gilmore submitted that during the interview, the Registrant accepted that she had been recorded on the CCTV in the bedroom of Service User A, and that she could be seen taking money. When she was asked why she closed the door before doing so, and why she was keeping watch of the door, she could not provide any explanation.

Mr Gilmore directed the Committee to the 'Case Summary' contained within the bundle of documents. He submitted that whilst the Registrant had not objected to the document, it should be seen as the Police case was at its height and, in his opinion, less weight should be placed on this document than the transcript of the PACE Interview and the Court Order.

Mr Gilmore asked the Committee to pay careful attention to the Court Order. He submitted that this document was evidence that it was found proved beyond reasonable doubt that the Registrant, between 01 February 2019 and 14 March 2019, stole £280 from Service User A. She pleaded not guilty and was convicted on 05 January 2021, when the Court imposed a Conditional Discharge for one year and a Compensation Order. Mr Gilmore told the Committee that as a Conditional Discharge was imposed, the Council could not rely on a gateway of conviction as the basis for the allegation of impairment, but submitted that in his opinion it is strong and reliable evidence on which the Council relies. He submitted that the Committee should place great weight on the findings of the Court as evidence that the Registrant stole £280 from Service User A.

## **Findings of Fact**

The Committee took into account the submissions made on behalf of the Council and the legal advice from the Legal Adviser. She advised the Committee that the burden of proof was on the Council to prove the facts as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation, and that to find the facts proved the Committee must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities. This means that for any fact to be found proved, the Committee must be satisfied that it was more likely than not to have occurred. The Legal Adviser advised the Committee that as this was a misconduct case, it must not use the findings of the Court as a substitute for reaching its own decision on the issues before it. She advised that the Committee must take into account all of the evidence, and apply its own judgement and common sense to the weight of that evidence.

**Particular 1: You, whilst working as a domiciliary care worker for North West Care, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Lissan House, 41A Dublin Road, Omagh, on dates between 01 February 2019 and 14 March 2019, stole cash to the value of £280 or thereabouts belonging to [Service User A].**

When considering this Particular, the Committee paid careful attention to all of the documentary evidence contained within the hearing bundle.

The Committee noted the context of the allegation as set out in the ERF, and the concerns of the family of Service User A, which led to a camera being placed in the home. The Committee also took into account that this allegation was then investigated by the Police and criminal charges brought as a result of the Police investigation.

The Committee accepted that the transcript of the PACE interview with the Registrant, dated 23 September 2019, was an accurate account of this interview. The Committee noted that the Registrant accepted during the interview that the footage did show images of her taking money from the purse of Service User A. The Committee determined that as she was not employed to provide care to Service User A, and the care plan which she was following made no reference to handling finances, the Registrant ought not to have been taking money from Service User A's purse. The Committee noted that the Registrant stated that she was doing this at the request of Service User A to move money from one purse to another. On the balance of probabilities, the Committee did not accept this explanation as the Registrant did not tell the carers providing care to Service User A or to her family at the time that this was what she was doing.

The Committee determined that it was more likely than not that further evidence referred to in the PACE interview was placed before the Court and, on the basis of the evidence before it, the Court was satisfied that the Registrant had stolen the money.

Taking into account all of the documentary evidence placed before it, the Committee found this Particular proved on the balance of probabilities.

**Particular 2: On 05 January 2021, it was found proven at the Magistrates' Court that you, on dates between 01 February 2019 and 14 March 2019, stole cash to the value of £280 or thereabouts belonging to**

**[Service User A], contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969 and the Magistrates' Court imposed a monetary penalty of £280 and made a Conditional Discharge for one year.**

When considering this Particular, the Committee had careful regard to the Certificate of Order / Conviction from the Magistrates' Court. The Certificate of Order / Conviction clearly recorded that the charge was that the Registrant, between 01 February 2019 and 14 March 2019, stole cash to the value of £280 or thereabouts belonging to [Service User A], contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969. The Committee noted that on 04 November 2020, the Registrant pleaded not guilty to the charge against her. The Committee determined that on 05 January 2021, the Court made a conviction and imposed a monetary penalty and a Conditional Discharge for one year.

The Committee, therefore, had no hesitation in finding this Particular proved on the balance of probabilities.

### **Fitness to Practise**

The Committee proceeded to consider if the Registrant's fitness to practise was impaired. The Committee heard submissions from Mr Gilmore.

Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant's actions, which led to the imposition of a Conditional Discharge and a monetary penalty, called into question her ability to work in social care services and to remain on the Register without restriction, or to be registered at all.

Mr Gilmore submitted that her actions, both in terms of taking money from a vulnerable service user in her own home, and in terms of the findings of the Criminal Court, constituted serious misconduct. Mr Gilmore referred the Committee to breaches of the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers as follows: Standards of Conduct, Standard 1- 1.2 & 1. 6, Standard 2- 2.1 & 2.7, Standard 3- 3.7, Standard 5- 5.1, 5.3 and 5.8. Mr Gilmore also submitted that there had been a breach of the Standards of Practice, Standard 3- 3.1 and 3.12. He submitted that social care workers are in a privileged position as a result of their work and have a duty to uphold trust and confidence. In his opinion, the Registrant's actions fell far below the minimum standards expected of a registered social care worker. Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant's lack of engagement with the Council meant that she had not demonstrated insight or remorse. He submitted that the Committee had no evidence before it to show that the Registrant had attempted to remediate her behaviour, and that the public must have confidence that the Council, as a regulator of social care workers, will protect the most vulnerable in society when they are receiving care.

The Committee considered the submissions from Mr Gilmore on behalf of the Council, and had regard to all of the evidence in the case. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. She referred the Committee to Paragraph 24 Schedule 2 of the Rules, and the requirements as set out in the case of the GMC v Cohen, looking at the current competence and behaviour of the Registrant, along with the need to protect service users, members of the public, the upholding of proper standards of behaviour and maintaining of public confidence in social care services. She further referred the Committee to the findings of Dame Janet Smith in the 5th Shipman

Report as regards the potential causes of impairment. She also referred the Committee to the cases of Roylance v GMC No 2 [2001] AC 311 and CHRE v NMC & Grant [2001] EWHC 927.

The Committee considered whether the Registrant's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of her misconduct as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation.

The Committee, in considering the issue of impairment of fitness to practise, took account of Paragraph 24 (3) of Schedule 2 of the Rules, which states that it should have regard to:

- (a) whether it is satisfied as to the reason for the alleged impairment of fitness to practise;
- (b) the Standards of Conduct and Practice issued by the Council under Section 9 of the Act;
- (c) whether the impairment is capable of remediation;
- (d) whether the impairment has been remediated;
- (e) the risk of repetition; and
- (f) the public interest.

The Committee had regard to the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers and the Council guidance titled 'Making a Determination of Impaired Fitness to Practise: Guidance for Committees on Remediation'. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant's actions were in breach of the following Standards of Conduct:

**Standard 1: As a social care worker, you must protect the rights and promote the interests and wellbeing of service users and carers. This includes:**

1.2 Treating people with consideration, respect and compassion.

**Standard 2: As a social care worker, you must strive to establish and maintain the trust and confidence of service users and carers. This includes:**

2.1 Being honest and trustworthy.

**Standard 3: As a social care worker, you must promote the autonomy of service users while safeguarding them as far as possible from danger or harm. This includes:**

3.7 Recognising and using responsibly with service users and carers, the power that comes from your work role.

**Standard 5: As a social care worker, you must uphold public trust and confidence in social care services. In particular you must not:**

5.1 Abuse, neglect or harm service users, carers or colleagues;

5.2 Exploit service users, carers or colleagues in any way;

5.3 Abuse the trust of service users and carers or the access you have to personal information about them or to their property, home or workplace; or

5.8 Behave in a way, in work or outside work, which would call into question your suitability to work in social care services.

The Committee noted that the Registrant's conditional discharge and monetary penalty arose from an incident in which she was caught on video footage taking money from Service User A's purse. The Committee was particularly concerned that the actions occurred during the Registrant's employment, and whilst she was providing care to another service user in his own home, which he shared with Service User A. Both service users were dependent on carers coming into their home and the Registrant abused her position of trust for financial gain. The Committee was in no doubt that the Registrant's conduct had breached a fundamental tenet of social care services.

The Committee carefully considered whether theft by a registered social care worker from a vulnerable service user could be remediated. The Committee concluded that misconduct of this type was typically very difficult to remediate and, in this case, there was no evidence of remediation. The Committee noted that there was no information before it to show that the Registrant had acknowledged the impact of her behaviour on Service User A, her family or on social care services generally. The Registrant did not produce any evidence to demonstrate remorse, regret, or insight. The Committee considered that it was likely that the money had been paid back but only because a monetary penalty was imposed by the Criminal Court. The Committee could not, therefore, give this weight as an act of remediation. The Committee noted that these events occurred in 2019, and determined that the Registrant had had a significant period of time to reflect on her actions, to express remorse and to develop insight. The Committee concluded that she had failed to do so. As a result, the Committee had no evidence to suggest that the Registrant would act differently in the future. Accordingly, the Committee found there to be a risk of repetition.

In all of the circumstances, the Committee concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was, therefore, necessary to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in social care services and the Council as its regulator. The Committee concluded that public confidence in social care services would be undermined if a finding of impaired fitness to practise was not made.

Therefore, the Committee concluded that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct.

### **Sanction**

In reaching its decision on sanction, the Committee considered the submission from Mr Gilmore on behalf of the Council, and had regard to all of the evidence in the case. Mr Gilmore referred the Committee to various mitigating and aggravating factors, and the NISCC Indicative Sanctions and Use of Interim Orders: Guidance for Fitness to Practise Committees ('the Sanctions Guidance'). He submitted that, in the view of the Council, the Registrant's actions in stealing from a vulnerable service user were fundamentally incompatible with registration as a social care worker.



The Committee accepted advice from the Legal Adviser. She referred the Committee to the Sanctions Guidance, and reminded the Committee to consider the question of sanction in ascending order of severity, paying particular attention to the issue of proportionality.

She referred the Committee to Paragraph 26 of Schedule 2 of the Rules which provides that, upon a finding of impairment of fitness to practise, the Committee may:

- (a) impose no sanction; or
- (b) warn the Registrant and direct that a record of the warning should be placed on the Registrant's entry in the Register for a specified period of up to 5 years; or
- (c) make a Conditions of Practice Order for a specified period not exceeding 3 years; or
- (d) make an Order suspending the Registrant's registration for a specified period not exceeding 2 years (a 'Suspension Order'); or
- (e) make an Order for removal of the Registrant's registration from the Register ('a Removal Order').

She further reminded the Committee that in deciding which sanction to impose, the Committee should take into account:

- (a) the seriousness of the Particulars of the Allegation;
- (b) the degree to which the Registrant has fallen short of any expected standards;
- (c) the protection of the public;
- (d) the public interest in maintaining confidence in social care services; and
- (e) the issue of proportionality.

The Committee applied the principles of fairness, reasonableness and proportionality, weighing the public interest with the Registrant's interests, and took into account any aggravating and mitigating factors in the case. The public interest included the protection of members of the public including service users, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour within the profession. The Committee took into account its powers under Paragraph 26 of Schedule 2 of the Rules in relation to the sanctions available to it, and also had regard to the Sanctions Guidance, bearing in mind that the decision on sanction was one for its own independent judgement.

The Committee recognised that the purpose of sanction was not to be punitive, although a sanction may have a punitive effect. The Committee considered the aggravating and mitigating factors in this case.

The Committee considered the mitigating factors to be:

- The Registrant had the benefit of a good work history with no previous referrals to the Council; and
- The Registrant was employed by her current employer from 01 February 2018 and had no previous disciplinary record with her employer.

The Committee considered the aggravating factors to be:

- This was an abuse of trust;
- The theft took place over a number of weeks. This was not, therefore, an isolated incident;
- The offences took place during work;
- Both services users were vulnerable;
- The Registrant did not demonstrate insight or remorse and, in particular, there was no insight into the impact that her actions had on Service User A or her family;
- The Registrant showed a blatant disregard for the Social Care Council's Standards of Conduct and Practice; and
- Minimal engagement with the Council.

**No sanction** - the Committee had no doubt that it would be entirely inappropriate to impose no sanction in this case. To impose no sanction would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case and would not address the concerns identified.

**Warning** – the Committee considered the issue of a Warning in this case. The Committee determined that the theft from a vulnerable service user constituted a serious failing, and was evidence of a blatant disregard for the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers. The Registrant's impairment of fitness to practise was not at the lower end of the spectrum, nor were the circumstances such that the Committee would be confident that this sanction would provide adequate public protection. The Committee had no evidence of corrective steps taken by the Registrant, nor did it have any references or testimonials as to her character and current circumstances. The Committee noted that there was no evidence before it as regards the Registrant's insight into her behaviour or its impact on the service user. Therefore, a Warning would not be appropriate or proportionate to the serious nature of this case.

**Conditions of Practice Order** – the Committee next considered a Conditions of Practice Order. The Committee noted the Guidance at Paragraph 4.13, which states that conditions may be appropriate in cases involving particular areas of a registrant's performance, and where a Committee is satisfied that it is appropriate for an individual to remain on the Register. The Registrant demonstrated no insight into her actions, nor expressed a desire to remediate her behaviour. In these circumstances, the Committee could not formulate workable, enforceable, or verifiable conditions which would address the Registrant's behaviour and adequately protect the public or meet the public interests in this matter.

**Suspension** – the Committee next considered a Suspension Order. The Committee was of the view that theft from a vulnerable service user in their own home was very serious. The Committee took into account the guidance at Paragraph 4.19, which states: 'Suspension from the Register may be an appropriate sanction for impairment which while very serious, is not so serious as to justify removal from the Register; for example, where there has been an acknowledgment of failings and where a Committee is satisfied that the behaviour is unlikely

to be repeated, and the Registrant has no psychological or other difficulties preventing them from understanding and seeking to remedy the failings and the failings are realistically capable of being remedied, then suspension may be appropriate.’ The Committee considered that the Registrant’s actions evidenced behaviour that was fundamentally incompatible with registration as a social care worker. The Committee determined that a Suspension Order would not address the risk of repetition as identified above. The Committee had no evidence of insight or remediation from the Registrant, nor had it any information to indicate that the Registrant was unlikely to repeat this behaviour in the future. The Committee considered that a social care worker should be trustworthy, particularly where a service user is dependent on a social care worker to provide protection and support. In all of the circumstances, the Committee concluded that a Suspension Order would not be sufficient to mark the seriousness and unacceptable nature of the Registrant’s misconduct.

**Removal** – the Committee next considered a Removal Order. In considering this, the Committee took into account the Guidance at Para 4.26 – 4.28. The Committee concluded that given the seriousness of the Registrant’s misconduct, her lack of insight and remediation of her failings, a Removal Order was the only sufficient sanction. The Committee considered that the theft from a vulnerable service user was a deliberate and fundamental breach of trust in her position as a social care worker. The Committee determined that the Registrant’s behaviour was fundamentally incompatible with being a registered social care worker. In all of the circumstances, the Committee concluded that a Removal Order was the only sanction available to it to protect the public and to meet the public interest, and to mark the seriousness and unacceptable nature of the Registrant’s misconduct.

The Committee considered the potential devastating impact of a Removal Order on the Registrant, but concluded that the protection of service users and wider public interest in the system of regulation outweighed the impact on the Registrant.

The Committee concluded that a Removal Order was a suitable, appropriate, and proportionate sanction, which would be imposed on the Registrant’s registration with immediate effect.

The Committee also directed that the Interim Suspension Order currently in place should be revoked with immediate effect.

---

**You have the right to appeal this decision to the Care Tribunal. Any appeal must be lodged in writing within 28 days from the date of this Notice of Decision.**

**You should note that the Fitness to Practise Committee’s decision takes effect from the date upon which it was made.**

The effect of this decision is that your entry in the Register has been removed.

You are prohibited from working as a social care worker in any of the following positions:

- a.) A member of care staff at
  - a) Children's home;
  - b) Residential care home;
  - c) Nursing home;
  - d) Day care setting;
  - e) Residential family centre.
  
- b.) A person who is supplied by a domiciliary care agency to provide personal care in their own homes for persons who by reason of illness, infirmity or disability are unable to provide it for themselves without assistance.
  
- c.) A manager of a:
  - a.) Residential care home;
  - b.) Day care setting;
  - c.) Residential family care centre; or
  - d.) Domiciliary care agency.

It is **compulsory** for the above social care workers to be registered with the Northern Ireland Social Care Council in order to work. This is pursuant to the Northern Ireland Social Care Council (Social Care Workers Prohibition) and Fitness of Workers Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2013 and the Northern Ireland Social Care Council (Social Care Workers Prohibition) and Fitness of Workers (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2017.

In accordance with Schedule 3, Paragraph 9 of the NISCC Fitness to Practise Rules, you may not apply to be restored to the Register within five years from the date of removal. This does not affect your right to appeal the Committee's decision to the Care Tribunal. You are prohibited from working in a social care role until a successful application for restoration onto the Register has been made to the Council.



14 September 2021

---

Committee Clerk

---

Date