

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

Name: William Robert Beattie

SCR No: 7027247

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Fitness to Practise Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council, at its meeting on **17 April 2026**, 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 Caution and your inclusion on the barred lists maintained by the Disclosure and Barring Service;

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):

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | You were issued with and accepted a caution in the United Kingdom on 21 October 2024 for the criminal offence of common assault which occurred on 12 June 2023. |
| 2. | You were issued with and accepted a caution in the United Kingdom on 21 October 2024 for the criminal offence of hospital staff ill-treating mental patient which occurred on 12 June 2023. |
| 3. | On 11 February 2025, the Disclosure and Barring Service included your name in the Children's Barred List using barring powers as defined in Schedule 1 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups (Northern Ireland) Order 2007 (SVGO). |
| 4. | On 11 February 2025, the Disclosure and Barring Service included your name in the Adults' Barred List using barring powers as defined in Schedule 1 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups (Northern Ireland) Order 2007 (SVGO). |

And your acceptance of the cautions, as set out at 1 and 2 above, shows that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your conviction or caution in the United Kingdom for a criminal offence.

And on the basis of the decision of the Disclosure and Barring Service, as set out at 3 and 4 above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your inclusion on the Barred Lists maintained by the Disclosure and Barring Service.

Procedure

The hearing was held under the fitness to practise procedure.

Preliminary Issues

The fitness to practise hearing was held remotely by way of video-link. The Registrant was not in attendance, and he was not represented. The Northern Ireland Social Care Council ('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 informed the Committee that the Notice of Hearing and hearing bundle were sent to the Registrant's registered email address on 05 March 2026, and that an electronic proof of delivery receipt was received on the same date.

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 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 service to be properly effected under the Rules. The Committee was reminded by the Legal Adviser of the provisions of Rule 3 and Paragraph 5 of Schedule 2 of the Rules.

The Committee reviewed all of the available documentation relating to service, and it determined that the Notice of Hearing had been served in accordance with the Rules.

Proceeding in the Absence of the Registrant

Mr Gilmore submitted that the hearing should proceed in the absence of the Registrant. He said that all reasonable steps had been taken to ensure that the Registrant was aware of proceedings, and that the Registrant has not provided any reason for his non-attendance. Mr Gilmore informed the Committee that the Committee Clerk had telephoned the Registrant on his registered telephone number on 14 April 2026 and left a voicemail asking him to confirm if he would be in attendance. Mr Gilmore said that, on 14 April 2026, the

Committee Clerk followed that telephone call with an email to the Registrant, which confirmed that the fitness to practise hearing would be held remotely by way of video-link, and again requested the Registrant to confirm if he would be in attendance. Mr Gilmore said that the Registrant has not responded to any of these communications.

Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant has the right to attend. He submitted that the Registrant has not sought an adjournment, nor has he sought legal representation. Mr Gilmore submitted that there appears to be no evidence that the Registrant would attend if the case were adjourned today. He informed the Committee that there has been no past engagement from the Registrant, who did not attend the Preliminary Proceedings Committee on 04 September 2025. Therefore, Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant had voluntarily waived his right to attend. He submitted that it was in the public interest for there to be an expeditious disposal of the hearing, and that there was no good reason for this case not to proceed. He submitted that any disadvantage to the Registrant was outweighed by the public interest in holding a fair and expedient hearing.

The Committee received and accepted advice from the Legal Adviser on the question of whether to proceed in the absence of the Registrant. He referred the Committee to the case of Adeogba v GMC and the principles derived from criminal cases such as R v Jones. He reminded the Committee that in exercising its discretion to proceed in the absence of the Registrant, 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 that its discretion to proceed in the absence of a registrant must be exercised with the utmost care and caution. He reminded the Committee to avoid reaching any improper conclusion about the Registrant's absence.

The Committee considered whether this hearing should proceed in the absence of the Registrant. It reminded itself that fairness to the Registrant should be of prime consideration. As outlined above, the Committee was satisfied that service of the Notice of Hearing had been served on the Registrant in accordance with the Rules, and it was satisfied that reasonable efforts had been made to notify him of the hearing. The Committee noted that the Registrant was not represented, and that there was no information to suggest that he had sought to be represented. The Registrant has not provided any written submissions and has not asked for an adjournment or postponement. He has not previously engaged in the regulatory process. The Committee determined that the Registrant has voluntarily absented himself, and that there was no evidence to suggest that he would be any more likely to participate if the matter were adjourned. The Committee 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. Whilst the Committee considered that there may be some disadvantage to the Registrant by proceeding in his absence, taking all of the circumstances into account, it determined that any potential disadvantage was outweighed by the public interest in the case proceeding today. In reaching this conclusion, the Committee took into account the Registrant's interests and balanced these against the public interest. The Committee was satisfied that its decision to proceed in the Registrant's absence was both appropriate and proportionate.

Application to Admit Hearing Bundle

Mr Gilmore told the Committee that the hearing bundle has been served on the Registrant and that there has been no objection raised. The Committee accepted the hearing bundle into evidence, and marked it as Exhibit 1.

Background

The Council received an Employer Referral Form ('ERF') on 03 November 2023 from Ms Michelle Crean, Area Manager, First Choice Selection Services. The ERF disclosed the following:

'I have been provided limited information from BHSCT.: On reviewing cctv incident witnessed that concerns Physical Manual Handling and concerns relating to dignity. At one point the service users bottoms were falling down exposing incontinence pad which was not fixed and dignity was not maintained.' [sic].

The Council received a letter from the Disclosure and Barring Service ('DBS'), dated 24 February 2025, which indicated that the Registrant was placed on the Barred Lists for both children and adults on 11 February 2025.

Findings of Fact

Mr Gilmore told the Committee that this case was transferred by the Preliminary Proceedings Committee on 04 September 2025. He said that the Council relies solely on the documentation contained in the bundle. He said that the documents in the bundle come from reliable sources, and that these include the Registrant's employer, the police and the DBS.

Mr Gilmore referred the Committee to the Certificate of Caution and the structured outline of the case, as provided by the PSNI. He noted that the Registrant was interviewed by police on 05 February 2024 in relation to the incident which occurred on 12 June 2023, and he referred to the summary of the police interview. That interview outlined that the Registrant was an agency worker in a supported living facility, where he worked between two and four shifts per week. The Registrant described his role as '*hanging out*' with the service user and keeping him safe. The Registrant worked with the service user, along with another colleague. During the interview, the Registrant confirmed that he received '*one or two days*' training in 2023, and he also confirmed that he had received MAPA training.

Mr Gilmore outlined that the Registrant told police during the interview that the service user was in a heightened mood during the incident in question, and that he was shouting loudly and throwing things at the Registrant. The Registrant denied that he was aware of proactive strategies to deal with the service user's behaviours. The Registrant told the police that he was hiding behind the sofa for his own safety. During the interview, the police introduced CCTV footage of the incident, which appeared to show the Registrant on his phone throughout the incident. The CCTV footage also showed the service user's pyjamas falling down, and a failure on the Registrant's part to maintain the service user's dignity. The CCTV further showed the service user approaching the Registrant; the Registrant pushed the service user's upper left arm and then the Registrant pushed the service user through the door. Mr Gilmore outlined that the Registrant asserted in the interview that he was defending himself. Mr Gilmore outlined that the police asked the Registrant if it would be common practice to

do this with a hand and a foot, as they indicated that in the CCTV the Registrant's foot was off ground with his toe towards the back of the service user's knee. The police asked the Registrant why he continued to stay on his phone if he felt in danger, and why did he not get help from his colleague. The Registrant indicated that he had seen a lot of injuries during his career and that he was protecting himself.

Mr Gilmore outlined that the Registrant was asked during the police interview if the force used was proportionate for what he was trying to achieve and, in response, the Registrant said that he did not think that he assaulted the service user.

Mr Gilmore outlined that the Registrant signed and accepted a police caution on 21 October 2024 in respect of the events outlined above. He referred to a copy of the police caution in the bundle of documents, and submitted that the Certificate of Caution proves Particulars 1 and 2 of the Allegation.

With regard to Particulars 3 and 4 of the Allegation, Mr Gilmore referred the Committee to the letter provided by the DBS, dated 24 February 2025, and he submitted that the letter confirms that the Registrant was placed on the DBS Barred Lists for both children and adults on 11 February 2025. He referred the Committee to Paragraph 12 of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and submitted that the Registrant had not provided any evidence as set out at Paragraph 12 (7) to dispute that he was the person named in the correspondence from the DBS or to show that he had successfully appealed his inclusion on the DBS barring lists. Mr Gilmore submitted that the correspondence from the DBS should be regarded as *prima facie* evidence with regard to the Registrant's current DBS status, in accordance with Paragraph 12 (6) of Schedule 2. He, therefore, invited the Committee to find that Particulars 3 and 4 of the Allegation had been proved.

The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who outlined that the burden of proof was on the Council to prove the facts set out in the Particulars of the Allegation, and that the Registrant was not required to prove or disprove any matter. He outlined that the standard of proof is that which applies to civil proceedings - 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 Legal Adviser referred to the need for cogent evidence before finding a fact proved. He indicated that the documentary evidence in the bundle is hearsay evidence, and the Committee should treat such evidence with caution. However, he reminded the Committee that hearsay evidence is admissible in this hearing, and that there has been no objection from the Registrant to any of the documents in the bundle being placed before it. The Legal Adviser reminded the Committee that a caution is not a conviction and, as such, Paragraph 12 (5) of Schedule 2 to the Rules does not apply. With regard to inclusion on the DBS Barring Lists, however, the Legal Adviser reminded the Committee that Paragraph 12 (6) of the Rules provides that written notification from the DBS of current barring status shall be regarded as *prima facie* evidence. He outlined that the only evidence which a registrant may adduce to undermine that position is evidence that the Registrant is not the individual referred to, or evidence that he has successfully appealed the DBS decision.

In reaching its decision in respect of facts, the Committee had careful regard to all of the available evidence, and it took into account the submissions from Mr Gilmore.

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. The Committee was careful not to draw any adverse inference from the absence of the Registrant.

Particular 1: You were issued with and accepted a caution in the United Kingdom on 21 October 2024 for the criminal offence of common assault which occurred on 12 June 2023.

Particular 2: You were issued with and accepted a caution in the United Kingdom on 21 October 2024 for the criminal offence of hospital staff ill-treating mental patient which occurred on 12 June 2023.

The Committee had regard to the Certificate of Caution contained within the bundle. It noted that the certificate contains the Registrant's registered name and date of birth, and that it contains his signature confirming his acceptance of the caution. The Committee reviewed the PSNI structured outline of case and the record of the police interview, and it noted that both relate to the matters under consideration and referred to in the certificate. The Committee noted that the bundle of evidence has been served upon the Registrant, and that he has not disputed the authenticity of the Certificate of Caution and has not asserted that it does not relate to him. He has not objected to the Certificate of Caution being admitted during this hearing. The Committee noted that the Certificate of Caution is an official document, which has been provided to the Council via the PSNI. Taking all of the available evidence into account, the Committee was satisfied that the Certificate of Caution was sufficient evidence to find Particulars 1 and 2 of the Allegation proved.

Particular 3: On 11 February 2025, the Disclosure and Barring Service included your name in the Children's Barred List using barring powers as defined in Schedule 1 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups (Northern Ireland) Order 2007 (SVGO).

Particular 4: On 11 February 2025, the Disclosure and Barring Service included your name in the Adults' Barred List using barring powers as defined in Schedule 1 of the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups (Northern Ireland) Order 2007 (SVGO).

The Committee had regard to the letter from the DBS, dated 24 February 2025, to Ms Rea, Fitness to Practise Officer in the Council, in which the following is stated:

'The current barring status for [the Registrant] is:

Children's List – Barred on 11/02/2025

Adults' List – Barred on 11/02/2025'

The Committee noted that the DBS letter is included in the bundle of evidence and that the bundle has been served upon the Registrant. He has not disputed the contents of the letter and he has not asserted that it does not relate to him. The Registrant has not provided any evidence of having successfully appealed his inclusion on

the barring lists. The Committee accepted that the letter is *prima facie* evidence of the Registrant being included on the barring lists. Taking all of the available evidence into account, the Committee was satisfied that the DBS letter was sufficient evidence to find that Particulars 3 and 4 of the Allegation proved.

Fitness to Practise

Mr Gilmore informed the Committee that the Registrant had not admitted that his fitness to practise is impaired. Mr Gilmore submitted that it is impaired as a result of the facts found proved.

Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant's actions giving rise to the Particulars of the Allegation breached the following provisions of the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers ('the Standards'): 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.8, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 4.1- 4.3, 5.1,5.7,5.8,6.1,and 6.7.

He submitted that the Registrant's actions breached Standards of Practice 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.10, 3.12, and 3.13.

Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant has not produced any evidence of remediation. He said that the Registrant has not challenged the decision of the DBS to include him on either Barred List. He said that there is a lack of insight into the needs of the service user, with only a cursory engagement with the service user care plan. Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant has not engaged with this regulator. He said that the Registrant has not provided any assurance that the core issues have been dealt with or that he is no longer a risk to vulnerable service users. Mr Gilmore said that the Registrant has provided no indication of any remorse or remediation and that there is an ongoing risk of repetition and, therefore, an ongoing risk to service users.

Mr Gilmore said that the public has a legitimate interest in the care of service users. The service user involved in this incident was non-verbal, and was treated in a very inappropriate manner. He said that public confidence in the workforce and the Council would be affected if a finding of impairment was not made in this case. Mr Gilmore submitted that a finding of current impairment is required in the circumstances of this case.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He referred to the Standards, and to Paragraph 24 of Schedule 2 to the Rules. The Legal Adviser advised that there is no burden of proof or required standard of evidence when it comes to determining current impairment, and that the assessment is instead one of professional judgement. He reminded the Committee of the need to protect service users, members of the public, uphold proper standards of behaviour and to maintain public confidence in the social care profession. He further referred the Committee to the findings of Dame Janet Smith in the fifth Shipman Report, and the case of CHRE v NMC & Grant, with regard to relevant considerations.

The Committee took into account 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 also had regard to the Standards and the Council guidance entitled 'Making a Determination of Impaired Fitness to Practise: Guidance for Committees on Remediation' ('the Guidance').

Having considered the full circumstances of this case, the Committee determined that the Registrant's actions giving rise to the Particulars of the Allegation were in breach of the following Standards:

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; and

1.8 Respecting and maintaining the dignity and privacy of service users.

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:

3.1 Promoting service users' independence and empowering them to understand and exercise their rights;

3.2 Using established processes and procedures to assess, respond to and manage dangerous, abusive, discriminatory or exploitative behaviour and practice;

3.3 Following practice and procedures designed to keep you and other people safe from violent and abusive behaviour at work; and

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

Standard 4: As a social care worker, you must respect the rights of service users while seeking to ensure that their behaviour does not harm themselves or other people. This includes:

4.1 Recognising that service users have the right to take positive risks and helping them to identify and manage potential and actual risks to themselves and others; and

4.2 Following risk assessment policies and procedures to assess whether the behaviour of service users or others presents a risk of harm to themselves or other people.

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;

5.7 Put yourself or other people at unnecessary risk; 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.

Standard 6: As a social care worker, you must be accountable for the quality of your work and take responsibility for maintaining and improving your knowledge and skills. This includes:

6.1 Meeting relevant standards of practice and working in a lawful, safe and effective way.

Standards of Practice:

Standard 3: As a social care worker, you must deliver person-centred care and support which is safe and effective. This includes:

3.1 Promoting and applying person-centred values in your day to day work with service users and carers;

3.2 Delivering care in line with assessed needs and service user and carer preferences;

3.10 Supporting service users in their daily living; and

3.12 Contributing to the physical and emotional well-being of service users and carers.

The Committee first noted Rule 4 of the Rules, which provides that a registrant's fitness to practise may be impaired by receiving a caution in the United Kingdom (Rule 4 (1) (d)) and being included on a list maintained by the DBS (Rule 4 (1) (f)). The Committee was satisfied that both of these grounds, which may lead to a finding of impairment, applied to the Registrant's case.

The Committee noted the factual background to this case, and the events which led to the Registrant receiving a caution for two criminal offences and his inclusion on both the DBS Adult and Children Barring Lists, as outlined in the PSNI case summary and in Mr Gilmore's submissions referred to above. The Committee considered that the Registrant's actions fell significantly below the standards expected of a registrant, and that they were in breach of fundamental tenets of the profession. He assaulted an extremely vulnerable service user, and did not take steps to adequately maintain that service user's dignity.

The Committee considered that the Registrant's actions were such that remediation is inherently very difficult. They brought the profession significantly into disrepute and caused risk of harm to a very vulnerable service user. However, even if the Committee was to accept that such actions were in fact remediable, the Committee noted that the Registrant has provided no evidence of having taken any steps in an attempt to remediate. He has not engaged in these proceedings, and has not provided any evidence of reflection or having developed insight. The Committee noted that there has been no evidence of remorse or apology from the Registrant, albeit that it acknowledged that, in accepting a caution, the Registrant accepted that his actions occurred. The Committee acknowledged that there has been no evidence of repetition; however, it considered that this is of very limited relevance in the circumstances in which the Registrant has not been working in a social care setting. The Committee determined that, as things stand and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, there remains a

significant risk of repetition. Taking all of the evidence into account, the Committee considered that public confidence in the profession would be significantly undermined if the Registrant's fitness to practise were not found to be impaired. It considered that an informed member of the public would be extremely concerned to learn of such an outcome in circumstances in which a registrant had assaulted a service user in breach of the Standards referred to above, and had received a caution and was placed on the DBS Barring Lists. The Committee considered that, in circumstances in which a registrant has been included on the DBS Barring Lists, regulatory action in the form of a finding of currently impaired fitness to practise is required to safeguard against risk to service users and in the wider public interest.

Accordingly, as a result of the Registrant's caution and inclusion on the DBS Barred Lists, the Committee concluded that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired on public protection and on public interest grounds. It determined that failure to make a finding on public interest grounds, to the Committee's mind, would undermine the public's trust and confidence in the social care workforce.

Sanction

Mr Gilmore told the Committee that the Registrant has been registered with the Council since February 2023, and has had no previous referrals to the Council or disciplinary matters with his former employer.

Mr Gilmore referred the Committee to those matters which, in the Council's view, amount to mitigating and aggravating factors in this case. With regard to mitigating factors, Mr Gilmore said that the Registrant showed a degree of co-operation in his acceptance of the caution, and that the absence of a previous disciplinary history with his employer or regulatory history with the Council were relevant.

With regard to aggravating factors, Mr Gilmore told the Committee that the Registrant's actions amount to more of an 'episode' than a 'one-off incident' as they involved a number of instances of ill-treatment of a service user. He said that there is a real concern that the Registrant was more concerned about his phone than caring for the service user. He said that the Registrant pushed the service user away while he was on the phone.

Mr Gilmore said that the Registrant has not provided any explanation for his actions, and has not co-operated with the Council. He said that the service user was extremely vulnerable as he was non-verbal and unable to complain. The Registrant has not apologised or expressed remorse, and has shown a serious disregard to the standards expected.

Mr Gilmore submitted that there is a strong need for a sanction to protect the public as there is clear evidence of abuse. He said that there is a very strong public interest in the care of vulnerable service users. He said that this is a case where there has been a fundamental breach in the Standards, and that the only sanction that would protect the public and maintain the public confidence is a Removal Order.

The Committee heard and accepted the Legal Adviser's advice. He set out the range of available sanctions under Paragraph 26 of Schedule 2 of the Rules. In summary, the Committee could impose no sanction, warn the Registrant for a period of up to five years, make a Conditions of Practice Order not to exceed three years,

make a Suspension Order not to exceed two years or make a Removal Order. The Committee was reminded that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although a sanction may have a punitive effect. Instead, in its consideration of a sanction, the Committee should have at the forefront of its mind the need to protect the public and the public interest. The Legal Adviser referred the Committee to the Guidance, and he reminded the Committee to consider the question of sanction in ascending order of severity, paying particular attention to the issue of proportionality. He further reminded the Committee that any measure taken to limit the fundamental right of the Registrant to practise in the social care setting should be no more than what was necessary in the public interest.

The Committee carefully considered all of the available evidence, together with Mr Gilmore's submissions. It also had careful regard to the Guidance, and to its own findings at the facts and impairment stages of the hearing.

The Committee considered whether there were any mitigating or aggravating factors in this case.

The Committee considered the only identifiable mitigating factors to be the fact that the Registrant has not had a previous adverse employment or regulatory history, and that he showed some acceptance of his actions in accepting the caution. However, the Committee did not consider that either of these matters were of significant weight. It considered that the absence of previous regulatory or employment concerns had to be viewed in the context of the Registrant having only been registered with the Council and employed by the employer for a brief period prior to the events under consideration. The Committee also considered that, in the absence of additional evidence from the Registrant, his acceptance of the caution did not provide particularly significant evidence with regard to matters such as remorse, insight or remediation.

The Committee considered that the Registrant's actions were aggravated by the fact that they occurred while he was at work and they involved a significant breach of his trusted position, in that he was tasked with safeguarding the vulnerable service user but instead assaulted him and did not maintain his dignity. The Committee also considered that the Registrant's actions were aggravated by the fact that he has shown no insight, either during his police interview or since. There has been no expression of remorse or regret, and the actions showed a serious disregard for the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers ('the Standards') as outlined previously.

Having considered the overall circumstances of this case, having balanced the mitigating and aggravating factors, and having taken into account the interests of public protection and the public interest, the Committee was satisfied that some form of sanction is necessary. It, therefore, proceeded to consider which sanction to impose.

No sanction – the Committee had no hesitation in concluding that it would be neither appropriate nor proportionate if no sanction were imposed in this case. In the view of the Committee, if no sanction were imposed, this would not mark the seriousness of the issues or meet the public interest in this case.

Warning – having had regard to its findings, the Committee considered that a Warning would be insufficient to mark the seriousness of the Registrant’s actions, or the fact that he has been included on the DBS Barring Lists, or to protect the public. The Committee determined that such a sanction would fail to uphold the public interest.

Conditions of Practice Order – the Committee next considered a Conditions of Practice Order. The Registrant has been included on the DBS Barred Lists, which makes it a criminal offence for him to work with children and vulnerable adults. Therefore, the Committee could not formulate any workable, enforceable or verifiable conditions in light of the Registrant’s barred status. In any event, the Committee considered that the imposition of a Conditions of Practice Order would be insufficient to mark the seriousness of the Registrant’s actions, or to protect the public. The Committee determined that such a sanction would fail to uphold the public interest.

Suspension Order – the Committee next considered a Suspension Order. The Committee noted that it had made findings at the fact and impairment stage of the proceedings which were of a very serious nature. The Registrant has provided no evidence of insight, nor has he submitted evidence of regret, remorse or remediation. It reminded itself that it previously found there to be a risk of repetition. The Committee considered that there was no evidence to indicate that this position would be any different at the end of any period of suspension. Further, the Committee considered that the Registrant’s actions were so serious that an order of suspension would be insufficient, and would not promote and maintain public confidence in the profession, or promote and maintain proper professional standards for members of the profession.

The Committee considered that, in all of the circumstances, a Suspension Order would be inappropriate and disproportionate to the risk from which the Committee is seeking to protect the public. In addition, the Committee considered that a period of suspension would not meet the high public interest, nor take account of the Registrant being included on the DBS lists.

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 reaching this conclusion, the Committee took into account the Guidance at Paragraphs 4.26 – 4.28.

The Committee considered that public confidence in the social care profession, and the Council as its regulator, would be significantly undermined if a social care worker, such as the Registrant, who is barred from working with children and vulnerable adults, was allowed to remain on the Register. The Committee considered that the Registrant’s inclusion on the DBS Barred Lists, and the events giving rise to his receipt of a caution, were evidence of a serious departure from the professional standards expected of a social care worker. The Committee has not been provided with any evidence from the Registrant which would suggest that he has addressed his actions or understands the seriousness of those actions. In considering proportionality, the Committee took into account the impact of a Removal Order on the Registrant. However, it considered that this is outweighed by the serious nature of the concerns raised against him. The Committee considered that any sanction short of a Removal Order would fail to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour and would, further, fail to maintain the reputation of the social care workforce.

The Committee decided, in order to protect the public and in the public interest, to make a Removal Order, with immediate effect, in respect of the Registrant's registration. The Committee also directed that the current Interim Suspension Order will now be revoked and replaced with a Removal Order 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:

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.



22 April 2026

Hearings Officer
(Clerk to the Fitness to Practise Committee)

Date