



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

Name: Peter Doyle

SCR No: 6002277

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Fitness to Practise Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council, at its meeting on **24 October 2025**, 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 convictions;

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

Particulars of the Allegation:

That, whilst being registered as a social care worker under the Health and Personal Social Services Act (Northern Ireland) 2001 (as amended), you were convicted at the Crown Court on 05 March 2025 of the following offences:

1. [You] on the 29th day of September 2021, being a person of 18 years or over, having previously communicated with on one or more occasions, another person under 16, or who you did not reasonably believe to be over 16, attempted intentionally to meet that person and at the time of doing so you intended to do an act to, or in respect of, that person during or after the meeting which would involve the commission of a relevant offence. Contrary to section 15(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and Article 3(1) of the Criminal Attempts and Conspiracy (Northern Ireland) Order 1983
2. [You] on dates between the 19th day of September 2021 and the 30th day of September 2021, being a person aged 18 years or over, for the purpose of obtaining sexual gratification intentionally attempted to communicate with [REDACTED] also known as [REDACTED] a person under 16 years, the communication being sexual or intended to encourage the said [REDACTED] also known as [REDACTED] to make a communication that was sexual, and you did not reasonably believe [REDACTED] also known as [REDACTED] was 16 years or over. Contrary to Article 3(1) of the Criminal

	Attempts and Conspiracy (Northern Ireland) Order 1983 and Article 22A of the Sexual Offences (Northern Ireland) Order 2008
3.	[You] on the 23 rd day of May 2021, made an indecent photograph of a child, namely an image entitled [REDACTED] contrary to Article 3(1)(a) of the Protection of Children (Northern Ireland) Order 1978
4.	[You] on the 23 rd day of May 2021, made an indecent photograph of a child, namely an image entitled [REDACTED] contrary to Article 3(1)(a) of the Protection of Children (Northern Ireland) Order 1978
And your convictions as set out above show that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your convictions in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence as per Rule 4 (1) (d) of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council Fitness to Practise (Amendment) Rules 2019.	

Procedure

The hearing was held under the fitness to practise procedure.

Preliminary Issues

The hearing was held remotely by way of video-link. The Registrant was not in attendance, nor was he represented. The Council was represented by Mr Anthony Gilmore, Solicitor, Directorate of Legal Services.

Declarations of Conflict of Interest

The Chair confirmed with the Committee that none of the Members had any conflict of interest with this case.

Service

Mr Gilmore told the Committee that the Registrant is currently held as a prisoner in HMP Magilligan. He said that, on 11 September 2025, the Notice of Hearing and hearing bundle were sent by way of email to the Secretariat at HMP Magilligan, and that an electronic proof of delivery receipt was received on the same date. Mr Gilmore said that, on 17 September 2025, a signed proof of service document was received by the Council, confirming that the Registrant had received the documents associated with the fitness to practise hearing.

The Committee received legal advice from the Legal Adviser. He referred the Committee to the requirements as set out in the Northern Ireland Social Care Council ('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. He outlined the requirements for services to be properly effected under the Rules.

Having reviewed the bundle of documents relating to service, the Committee, in all of the circumstances of the case, was satisfied that the Notice of Hearing has 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. He said that the Registrant had sent confirmation by way of email from the HMP Magilligan Secretariat, on 03 October 2025, which stated that he would not be in attendance at the hearing. Mr Gilmore also confirmed that, on 13 October 2025, an Amendment to the Notice of Hearing, which indicated that the hearing would proceed via video-link, was sent to the Secretariat at HMP Magilligan by way of email for the attention of the Registrant. An electronic proof of delivery receipt was received on the same date. A signed proof of service document was received by the Council on 14 October 2025, which confirmed that the Registrant had received the additional document.

Mr Gilmore said that all reasonable steps had been taken to ensure that the Registrant was aware of proceedings. He said that it had been confirmed that the Registrant had received the documents, as well as the additional document that was sent to him confirming that the venue of the hearing had been changed. Mr Gilmore said that, although the Registrant is currently a prisoner in HMP Magilligan, he could, if he wished, choose to attend by way of video-link, but that he had not changed his position with regard to attendance. Mr Gilmore invited the Committee to conclude that the Registrant's absence was a voluntary waiver of his right to attend. He submitted that it was in the public interest for there to be an expeditious disposal of the hearing. He noted that the Registrant had not made a request for an adjournment, nor had he indicated that he wished to arrange representation. Mr Gilmore submitted that any disadvantage to the Registrant in the hearing proceeding would be outweighed by the public's interest in a fair and expedient hearing.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who referred to the considerations derived from the cases of R v Jones and Adeogba v GMC. He 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. He 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.

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. It reminded itself that service of the Notice of Hearing has been effected in accordance with the Rules, and that the Registrant has acknowledged receipt of the correspondence and has indicated in writing that he does not intend to attend. He has not indicated that he wishes to be represented, and he has not sought a postponement or adjournment.

The Committee concluded that the Registrant, with knowledge of the proceedings, had voluntarily absented himself from the hearing. Taking into account all available information, the Committee considered that there was no reason to suppose that an adjournment of the hearing would secure the Registrant's attendance at a later stage. The Committee also noted the serious nature of the allegations faced by the Registrant. It was also of the view that the public interest was strongly engaged, and that this also included consideration of the expeditious disposal of the hearing. Accordingly, the Committee decided that it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the

hearing in the Registrant's absence. In reaching this decision, the Committee was conscious that fairness to the Registrant is a prime consideration.

Application to Admit Hearing Bundle

The Committee accepted the bundle of documents into evidence, and marked it as Exhibit 1.

Background

The Registrant is registered on Part 2 of the Register.

Mr Gilmore told the Committee that this matter was first brought to the Council's attention by way of Employer Referral Form ('ERF'), received by the Council on 13 October 2021. The ERF advised that the Registrant had disclosed to his line management that he had been arrested on 29 September 2021, was currently released on bail and was subject to an active Police investigation in respect of an alleged child protection issue.

Mr Gilmore said that the Council contacted the PSNI Early Notification Team by email, dated 02 November 2021, requesting if any additional information pertaining to the matter could be shared with the Council under Common Law Police Disclosure ('CLPD'). On 04 November 2021, the Council received a PSNI notification under CLPD advising of a '*pressing social need*' to disclose to the Council that the Police were investigating the Registrant '*in respect of an allegation of attempting to meet a child following Sexual Grooming on 29 September 2021*'.

Mr Gilmore asked the Committee to pay careful attention to the Certificate of Conviction contained within the bundle of evidence. He submitted that this document provides evidence that the Registrant was arraigned and pleaded guilty in the Crown Court on 05 March 2025. On 12 April 2024, he was sentenced to:

- Concurrent sentences of imprisonment / detention for a term of 12 months on Counts 1 and 2;
- Concurrent sentences of imprisonment / detention for a term of five months on Counts 3 and 4;
- A Disqualification Order, disqualifying the Registrant from working with children under the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (Northern Ireland) Order 2003;
- Sexual Offences' Prevention Order for a period of five years; and
- Sex Offenders' Registration required for a period of 10 years.

The Certificate of Conviction also records a number of conditions that the Registrant has been made subject to for a period of five years. Mr Gilmore told the Committee that the Council considers the Registrant's convictions to be very serious.

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. Mr Gilmore submitted that the Certificate of Conviction, along with the ERF and the Case Summary provided by the Police, offer conclusive proof of the facts, and that the Council had discharged the burden of proof in establishing the facts in this case.

Findings of Fact

The Committee heard and accepted the Legal Adviser's advice. In the course of that advice, he reminded the Committee that under Paragraph 12 (5) of Schedule 2 to the Rules, a Certificate of Conviction issued in any UK Criminal Court '*shall be conclusive proof of the facts or conviction so found*'. He advised the Committee that a registrant could challenge a Certificate of Conviction only where there was evidence that it did not refer to the registrant, or where the conviction had been successfully challenged on appeal.

He advised the Committee that it was entitled to rely on the Certificate of Conviction to establish conclusively that the Registrant had been convicted of the offences as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation, if the Committee is satisfied that the Allegation accurately reflects the information in the certificate.

The Committee reminded itself that the burden 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 is more likely than not to have occurred.

The Committee took into account the submissions from Mr Gilmore on behalf of the Council, and had careful regard to all of the documentary evidence submitted. The Committee noted that the facts contained in the Certificate of Conviction were accurately reflected in the Particulars of the Allegation. In addition, the Committee took into account the information in the ERF from the Registrant's employer, dated 13 October 2021, and the Case Summary provided by the Police. The Committee concluded that the Certificate of Conviction was conclusive proof of the convictions and the facts underlying them. The Committee, therefore, found the facts proved.

Fitness to Practise

Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of his convictions. He submitted that the convictions, and the Registrant's actions which led to those convictions, call into question his suitability to work in social care services, to remain on the Register without restriction, or indeed to be registered at all. He submitted that the Registrant's actions constitute serious wrongdoing, and he referred the Committee to Standard 5, in particular 5.8 and 5.9, of the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers ('the Standards') which the Council considers to have been breached.

Mr Gilmore directed the Committee to the decision of CHRE V Grant, and noted that this case established that the level of insight is central to any determination on remediation. He submitted that the Registrant has shown no insight or remorse for his actions. Although the Registrant made some admissions in his Police interview and did plead guilty, he has not provided the Council with any evidence on the issue of insight, remorse or risk of repetition. Mr Gilmore submitted that, in these circumstances, the Council considers that a risk of repetition remains.

Mr Gilmore submitted that the public should have confidence in the Council as a regulator to protect the public, and to ensure that those who care for the most vulnerable in society uphold proper standards of behaviour. He submitted that any option other than a finding of current impairment would impact on public confidence in the Council and in social care services.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He referred the Committee to the Standards, and advised it to adopt a sequential approach when considering this issue. In particular, he asked it to take into account the nature and content of the criminal convictions against the Registrant, and reminded the Committee that it was being asked to determine whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired because of these convictions. He referred the Committee to Paragraph 24 of 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 the social care profession. He further referred the Committee to the findings of Dame Janet Smith in the fifth Shipman Report as regards the potential causes of impairment. He also referred the Committee to the case of CHRE v NMC & Grant and CHRE v GDC and Fleischmann.

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 Rule 4 (1) (d) of the Rules, which states that fitness to practise may be impaired by a criminal conviction, and it was satisfied that the Registrant's convictions for serious offences constituted the reason for the alleged impairment of fitness to practise.

The Committee had regard to the background to the convictions, as outlined in the Police summary and the documentary evidence. It noted the very serious nature of the Registrant's convictions, as specified in the Particulars of the Allegation, and summarised below:

- The Registrant, having communicated on one or more occasions with a person under 16 years old, attempted to meet that person with the intention of committing a sexual act;
- The Registrant attempted to communicate with a person under 16 years old, the communication being sexual or intended to encourage that person to communicate in a sexual manner; and
- Two counts of making an indecent photograph of a child.

The Committee considered that the Registrant's actions very significantly bring the profession into disrepute and breached a fundamental tenet of the profession. The Committee had regard to the Standards, and it was satisfied that the Registrant's actions were clearly in breach of the following paragraphs:

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

- 5.7 Put yourself or other people at unnecessary risk;
- 5.8 Behave in a way, in work or outside work, which would call into question your suitability to work in social care services; or
- 5.9 Use social media or social networking sites or other forms of electronic communication in a way that contravenes professional boundaries, organisational guidelines or NISCC standards.

The Committee considered that the nature of the Registrant's offences are such that they may ultimately not be capable of being remediated. It also noted that the Registrant has not engaged in these proceedings and has provided no evidence to it. As such, there is no evidence from the Registrant before the Committee on issues including the seriousness of his actions, remorse, insight, the risk of repetition or remediation. The Committee considered that, in those circumstances, there is nothing to indicate that the Registrant has taken any steps to attempt to remediate his actions, and that there is no evidence which would indicate that there is no risk of repetition. Indeed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it considered that there currently remains a significant risk of repetition.

The Committee noted the 12-month custodial sentence, the Court imposed registration on the Sex Offenders' Register for a period of 10 years, and a Sexual Offences' Prevention Order. He has also been barred from working with children.

In the circumstances as outlined to the Committee, it determined that a finding of impairment is required in this case to protect the public, to promote and maintain public confidence in the profession and to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of the profession. The Committee considered that the public interest very clearly requires a finding of current impairment in this case. The Committee concluded that the Registrant's convictions bring social care services into disrepute, and that the public would find it totally unacceptable that a registrant convicted in these circumstances was not found to be currently impaired.

In reaching its decision on impairment, the Committee took into account the Guidance issued by the Council for Committees dealing with the issue of impairment and, in particular, paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6.

Therefore, the Committee concluded that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of his criminal convictions.

Sanction

In reaching its decision on sanction, the Committee considered the submission from Mr Gilmore on behalf of the Council, and it had regard to all of the evidence in this 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 Guidance'). He said that, in terms of mitigating factors, the Registrant has no previous disciplinary record with the Council and that he pleaded guilty to the offences at Court. Mr Gilmore said that, to an extent, the Registrant co-operated with the Council's investigation, albeit he has not meaningfully engaged with the substantive fitness to practise hearing. Mr Gilmore said that in terms of aggravating factors, the Certificate of Conviction refers to extremely serious charges of sexual contact with a vulnerable young person. He noted the nature of the sentences imposed on the Registrant by way of imprisonment and license, the imposition of a Sexual Offences' Prevention Order and his being placed on the Sex Offenders' Register.

With regard to sanction, Mr Gilmore submitted that the only appropriate sanction would be that of removal. He submitted that the criminal convictions against the Registrant are of the utmost seriousness. Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant's criminal behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with his continued registration as a social care worker, in particular, he said, as there is no evidence of insight or remediation, and public confidence in the social care sector would be undermined if the Registrant were allowed to remain on the Register. Mr Gilmore submitted that the continued registration of a registrant with such serious convictions would have a devastating impact on public confidence in the profession.

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

Mr Gilmore 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').

The Legal Adviser further reminded the Committee that, in deciding which sanction to impose, it 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.

In reaching its decision, the Committee applied the principles of fairness, reasonableness and proportionality, and it weighed the public interest with the Registrant's interests, having taken into account any aggravating and mitigating factors in the case. The public interest includes 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 Guidance, bearing in mind that the decision on sanction is one for its own independent judgement.

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

The Committee considered the mitigating factors to be:

- the Registrant has not had a previous adverse regulatory history;
- the Registrant pleaded guilty to his offences at Court; and
- to a limited extent, the Registrant has co-operated with the Council.

The Committee considered the aggravating factors to be:

- the very serious nature of the Registrant's criminal offending and the sentences and ancillary orders imposed;
- the Registrant's actions represent a very serious disregard for the Council's Standards of Conduct;
- the Registrant has not meaningfully engaged with the substantive fitness to practise hearing;
- the Registrant has not demonstrated any understanding of the seriousness of his actions or the impact of his actions on the children involved; and
- the Registrant has provided no evidence of regret or remorse. He has demonstrated no insight and has not provided any evidence going to the issue of remediation.

The Committee balanced the above mitigating and aggravating factors when considering which sanction to impose in this case.

No sanction – Taking into account the nature of the Registrant's criminal offences, the Committee had no doubt that it would be entirely inappropriate and completely disproportionate to impose no sanction in this case. Such a decision would be inherently inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the criminal convictions, and would not address the concerns identified. It would undermine confidence in the profession and would not promote proper standards for members of the profession.

Warning – Similarly, again taking into account the nature of the Registrant's criminal offences, the Committee had no doubt that it would be entirely inappropriate and completely disproportionate to end this case by issuing a Warning. Such a decision would be inherently inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the criminal convictions and would not address the concerns identified. It would undermine confidence in the profession and would not promote proper standards for members of the profession. A Warning would not provide adequate public protection as far as the Registrant's suitability was concerned, bearing in mind that a Warning would entitle the Registrant to work unrestricted as a social care worker.

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 a registrant had displayed insight into their failings, and that there is potential for that registrant to respond positively to remediation, re-training or supervision of their work. The Registrant has demonstrated no insight into his criminal actions. He has not expressed any remorse or regret. He has not meaningfully engaged with the substantive fitness to practise hearing. The Registrant received a custodial prison sentence, has been disqualified from working with children and has been included in the Sex Offenders' Register. The Committee previously determined that there is a significant risk of repetition. Taking all available information into account, the Committee concluded that a Conditions of Practice Order was not sufficient to meet the public interest in this matter, given the seriousness of the Registrant's departure from the standards expected of a registered social care worker. The Committee could not formulate workable, enforceable, or verifiable conditions which would address the Registrant's criminal behaviour and adequately protect the public.

Suspension Order – the Committee next considered a Suspension Order. The Committee noted that the Registrant's criminal convictions are of an extremely serious nature, relating to sexual offences involving children. 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'*.

The Committee considered that the nature of the Registrant's offending, giving rise to his criminal convictions, is such that it is 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, or the public interest. The Committee has received no evidence of insight, remorse or remediation from the Registrant, nor any information to indicate that the Registrant is unlikely to repeat his criminal behaviour in the future. The Committee considered that the public would view the Registrant's criminal behaviour as falling so far below what would be expected of a registered social care worker that it is fundamentally incompatible with continuing registration. The Committee, therefore, concluded that a Suspension Order would not be a proportionate or appropriate sanction in this case.

Removal Order – as a result, the Committee decided that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose, with immediate effect, is a Removal Order in respect of the Registrant's registration. In so doing, the Committee had regard to all matters as previously outlined, which included the very serious nature of the Registrant's conduct giving rise to his convictions, the fact that he is required to remain on the Sex Offenders' Register for a period of ten years and the Sexual Offences' Prevention Order which he has been made subject to for five years. The Registrant demonstrated no evidence of insight into the seriousness of his actions and the likely impact on the service user and his professional colleagues. The Committee had previously found that there is a significant risk of repetition. In reaching this decision, the Committee had in mind paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 of the Guidance. The Committee was reminded that these paragraphs outline the particularly serious nature of sexual misconduct by the Registrant. The Committee considered that public confidence in the social care workforce, and the Council as its regulator, would be significantly undermined if a social care worker who has been convicted of offences of the nature under consideration were permitted to remain on the Register. This is particularly so in circumstances in which that Registrant has not meaningfully engaged with the substantive fitness to practise hearing, has not provided any evidence of remorse or regret, has not shown any insight or steps to remediate and, in respect of whom, there remains a significant risk of repetition.

For these reasons, the Committee imposed a Removal Order and decided, with immediate effect, to revoke the Interim Suspension Order, to which the Registrant has been subject until this hearing.

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:

1. A member of care staff at a:
 - a.) Children's home;
 - b.) Residential care home;
 - c.) Nursing home;
 - d.) Day care setting;
 - e.) Residential family centre.
2. 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.
3. 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.



27 October 2025

Hearings Officer
(Clerk to the Preliminary Proceedings Committee)

Date