



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

Name: Nicole Margaret Cahoon

SCR No: 7024167

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Fitness to Practise Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council, at its meeting on **09 September 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 conviction;

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 of the following criminal offences at Coleraine Magistrates' Court on 05 February 2026:

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Defendant [You] on the 14th day of January 2025 stole cash to the value of £20 or thereabouts belonging to [REDACTED] contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969. |
| 2. | Defendant [You] on the 21st day of January 2025 stole cash to the total value of £20 belonging to [REDACTED] contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969. |
| 3. | Defendant [You] on the 21st day of January 2025 stole cash to the value of £10 or thereabouts belonging to [REDACTED] contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969. |
| 4. | Defendant [You] on the 8th day of March 2025 stole cash to the value of £30 or thereabouts belonging to [REDACTED] contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969. |

5.	Defendant [You] on the 22nd day of March 2025 stole cash to the value of £20 or thereabouts belonging to [REDACTED] contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
6.	Defendant [You] on the 6th day of May 2025 stole cash to the value of £20 or thereabouts belonging to [REDACTED] contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
7.	Defendant [You] on the 22nd day of July 2025 stole cash to the value of £30 or thereabouts belonging to [REDACTED] contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
And your actions, as set out at 1 to 7 above, show that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your convictions in the United Kingdom for criminal offences 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 fitness to practise hearing was held remotely by way of video-link. The Registrant was not in attendance, and she was not represented. The Northern Ireland Social Care Council ('the Council') was represented by Ms Anna Price, 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

Ms Price informed the Committee that the Notice of Hearing and hearing bundle were sent to the Registrant's registered email address on 03 August 2026, and that an electronic proof of delivery 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

Ms Price 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 the Registrant's absence. She said that all reasonable steps had been taken to ensure that the Registrant was aware of the proceedings, and that the Registrant had not availed of her right to attend. Ms Price informed the Committee that the Council called the Registrant on her registered telephone number on 03 September 2026, and the Registrant confirmed that she would not be in attendance. The Registrant did not provide a reason for her non-attendance. Ms Price said that on 04 September 2026, the Committee Clerk followed the 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. An electronic delivery receipt was received on the same date.

Ms Price submitted that the Registrant has a right to attend. She submitted that the Registrant has not requested an adjournment, nor has she sought legal or union representation. Ms Price invited the Committee to conclude that the Registrant's absence was deliberate, and that she had voluntarily waived her right to attend. She submitted that, in all of the circumstances, it was fair to proceed with the hearing in the Registrant's absence. Ms Price submitted that the Registrant received the Notice of Hearing, which outlined the date, time and location of the proceedings. Ms Price told the Committee that the Council accepted that the Registrant may be disadvantaged by not attending and giving evidence to the Committee. However, any disadvantage to the Registrant was outweighed by the public interest in the case proceeding. Ms Price submitted that the matter should proceed in the Registrant's absence and, in all of the circumstances, that this was a fair manner in which to deal with this case.

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 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 the Registrant of the hearing. The Committee had regard to the telephone call between the Council and the Registrant on 03 September 2026, when the Registrant confirmed that she would not be in attendance at the hearing. The Committee noted that the Registrant was not represented, and there was no information to suggest that she had sought to be represented. The Registrant

has not asked for an adjournment or a postponement. The Committee determined that the Registrant has voluntarily absented herself, and that there was no evidence to suggest that she would be any more likely to participate if the matter were adjourned. The Committee noted the very 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 her 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

Ms Price 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 Registrant is registered on Part 2 of the Register.

The matter first came to the Council's attention following an Employer Referral Form ('ERF') from Ms Veronica Rossetto, Senior Lead Compliance Officer, Connected Health on 23 July 2025. The ERF disclosed the following:

'On the evening of 22/07/2025, Connected Health's Service Manager was informed that staff member [Registrant] was arrested by the PSNI, following an allegation of theft made by the [next of kin] of Connected Health's Client [REDACTED]. Staff member [Registrant] is out on bail and there is currently an ongoing PSNI investigation. Connected Health contacted OOH Social Work Team and Client's Social Worker, who liaised with the Designated Adult Protection Officer, as the allegation raised were unknown to both Connected Health and the Social Work Team. On 23/07/2025, the Designated Adult Protection Officer advised Connected Health that the PSNI have 'concrete evidence' against staff member. The concerns raised relate to £30.00 being taken, and other 'ongoing events'. The Client's Named Worker will complete an APP1 referral for the Adult Protection Gateway Team. The DAPO will keep Connected Health informed of the screening decision. At present, the matter is being investigated as a Police-Only Investigation. Connected Health has placed staff member [Registrant] on precautionary paid suspension with immediate effect from today 23/07/2025.' [sic]

During police interview, duty records were reviewed and identified the Registrant as having attended care calls on a number of occasions when money was reported missing. In the interview, the Registrant initially denied responsibility for the incidents. She admitted taking £30 from the service user on 22 July 2025, stating that she intended to return the money the following day and acknowledging that her actions were wrong. Following further discussion during the interview, the Registrant accepted responsibility for all of the thefts under

investigation, and referred the experiencing of financial difficulties at the time. The quality of the care which she provided was not otherwise raised as a concern.

On 19 December 2025, the Registrant entered guilty pleas to seven charges of theft. As set out in the Particulars of Allegation, she was convicted at Coleraine Magistrates' Court on 05 February 2026 and received consecutive custodial sentences of two months on each charge, suspended for a period of two years.

Evidence

Ms Price referred the Committee to the documents contained within Exhibit 1, which contained the ERF, the documentation from the Police Service of Northern Ireland ('PSNI') and the certificates of conviction.

Ms Price submitted that the certificates of conviction are conclusive proof of the facts, in accordance with Rule 4 (1) (d) and Paragraph 12 (5) of Schedule 2 of the Rules.

Ms Price referred the Committee to Paragraph 12 (7) of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and submitted that there is no evidence that the Registrant has successfully appealed her convictions or that the convictions do not relate to this Registrant. Accordingly, Ms Price invited the Committee to find the facts proved on the balance of probabilities.

Findings of Fact

The Legal Adviser reminded the Committee that the burden of proof of any fact rests with the Council, and that the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. He advised the Committee that it was entitled to rely on the certificates of conviction to establish conclusively that the Registrant had been convicted of the offences as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation. The Legal Adviser indicated that the limited exceptions to this Rule do not appear to apply in this case. He further referred the Committee to Schedule 2, Paragraph 12 (5) of the Rules.

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 Ms Price on behalf of the Council, and had careful regard to all of the documentary evidence submitted. The Committee found that, on the balance of probabilities, the facts contained in the Particulars of the Allegation had been established. Taking into account Paragraph 12 (5) of Schedule 2 of the Rules, the Committee was satisfied that the certificates of conviction against the Registrant proved the facts therein. The certificates of conviction against the Registrant relate to seven offences of theft from a service user. The Committee further considered Paragraph 12 (7) of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and noted that the Registrant had not adduced any evidence to undermine the findings of fact.

Taking all of this into account, the Committee found proved, on the balance of probabilities, the facts in accordance with Rule 4 (1) (d) of the Rules.

Fitness to Practise

The Committee proceeded to consider if the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired. The Committee heard submissions from Ms Price, who advised that there was no formal admission from the Registrant in relation to impaired fitness to practise. Ms Price submitted that the Registrant's convictions call into question her ability to work in social care services and to remain on the Register without restriction, or to be registered at all. She said that the Registrant's actions related directly to the discharge of the Registrant's professional duty towards a vulnerable service user in her care. Ms Price further said that the allegations against the Registrant are very serious, and relate to the theft from a vulnerable service user in their own home over a prolonged period of time, of approximately seven months. She said that the Registrant's behaviour amounted to financial abuse of a service user. Ms Price referred the Committee to breaches of the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers ('the Standards') by the Registrant as follows: 2, 2.1, 5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.8, 6 and 6.12.

Ms Price submitted that the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of her convictions. She said that the Registrant's convictions fall significantly below the standard expected of a registered social care worker, and raise very serious concerns regarding her fitness to practise. Ms Price submitted that these are relatively recent offences, taking place between January 2025 and July 2025, with convictions in February 2026.

Ms Price submitted that the Registrant has provided no further evidence demonstrating insight into her behaviour, remorse for her actions, or remediation. In all of the circumstances, Ms Price said that there remains an ongoing risk of repetition.

Ms Price submitted that the public interest in this matter was engaged, and that the public should have confidence in the Council as a regulator of social care workers. Ms Price further submitted that the Registrant's actions are very serious, directly relating to her role and involving a vulnerable service user in their own home. Ms Price said that there is a clear risk of harm to others. She said that a finding of impaired fitness to practise is required in this case.

In all of the circumstances, Ms Price submitted that the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of her convictions.

The Committee considered the submission from Ms Price on behalf of the Council. The Committee had regard to all of the evidence in the case. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He referred the Committee to the Standards. He reminded the Committee that it was being asked to determine whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired because of her convictions. He referred the Committee to Paragraph 24 of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and the requirements as set out in the case of GMC v Cohen. He further referred the Committee to the questions posed by Dame Janet Smith in the fifth Shipman Report when considering impairment. He also referred the Committee to the cases of GMC v Meadow and CHRE v NMC & Grant.

The Committee considered whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of her convictions, 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 Rule 4 (1) (d) of the Rules, which states that fitness to practise may be impaired by a conviction. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant's convictions constitute a proper reason for the alleged impairment of fitness to practise.

The Committee had regard to the documentary evidence within Exhibit 1. It noted the very serious nature of the Registrant's convictions, as specified in the allegation.

The Committee considered that the Registrant's actions brought the profession into disrepute and breached a fundamental tenet of the profession. The Committee had regard to the Standards and the Council Guidance titled 'Making a Determination of Impaired Fitness to Practise: Guidance for Committees on Remediation and Insight'. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant's actions were in breach of the following Standards:

Standards of Conduct:

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 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.

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:

6.12 Co-operating with any investigation or formal inquiry into your conduct, the conduct of others, or the care or services provided to a service user where appropriate.

The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant's actions, whereby she has been convicted for seven offences of theft from a service user, were a very serious departure from the standards of behaviour and conduct expected of a registered social care worker.

The Committee noted that the Registrant engaged in a dishonest pattern of behaviour against the service user in question. Such conduct is, by its nature, more difficult to remediate, though the Committee was of the view that it was not impossible for the Registrant to remediate in this case.

The Committee was entirely satisfied that the Registrant has not remediated her conduct given her lack of insight and remorse, together with her failure to engage with the Council at all. The Registrant did not attend the hearing, nor did she provide any submissions or materials for the Committee to consider.

In view of the lack of insight and remediation, the Committee considered that the risk of repetition is high, noting that the Registrant's convictions were not a one-off matter but represented a pattern of premediated behaviour over a considerable period of approximately seven months. The Committee was also mindful that the offending was directly linked to the Registrant's work as it took place against a service user in their own home.

The Committee considered that the Registrant's convictions involved an egregious breach of fundamental tenets of the social care profession. The public would be aghast at the Registrant's behaviour, and would expect that a finding of impaired fitness to practise would be made to uphold and declare standards. A finding of impairment is necessary to mark the very serious nature of the Registrant's convictions.

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

Sanction

The Committee heard a submission from Ms Price on the question of what, if any, sanction should be imposed on the Registrant's registration.

Ms Price 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, Ms Price said that the Council has received no previous referrals in relation to the Registrant. Ms Price said that the Registrant is entitled to the benefit of a good work history and good prior character.

With regard to aggravating factors, Ms Price submitted that the Registrant has been convicted of seven offences in relation to theft. Ms Price told the Committee that:

- there has been an abuse of trust;
- there is no evidence of insight;
- there has been a risk posed to and / or harm caused to a service user and their family;

- there has been no co-operation with the Council's investigation;
- there has been a serious disregard for the Council's Standards;
- the offence was committed in the workplace;
- the evidence that the conduct was persistent; and
- the actions were pre-mediated and deliberate, dishonesty being an essential element of theft.

Ms Price noted that there was no evidence of remorse or remediation before the Committee.

Ms Price submitted that imposing no sanction would not satisfy the public interest. A finding of impairment of fitness to practise has been decided by the Committee. Ms Price submitted that public protection and public confidence in the social care profession would be undermined if no sanction was imposed. Similarly, Ms Price submitted that the Registrant's conduct was neither at the lower end of the spectrum of impairment, nor could the Committee be confident that there is no risk to the public. Therefore, a Warning would not address the seriousness of the Registrant's convictions.

In relation to a Conditions of Practise Order, Ms Price submitted that this sanction may be more applicable in cases involving particular areas of a registrant's performance, such as an isolated incident, or where there is evidence of shortcomings in a specific area of the Registrant's work. She submitted that for conditions to be effective, the Registrant must engage and agree to those conditions. Ms Price submitted, on behalf of the Council, that appropriate and relevant conditions would be difficult to impose which would meet the concerns arising from the Registrant's criminal behaviour.

As regards the sanction of a Suspension Order, she suggested that there may be circumstances where this would be appropriate. However, she submitted that without the attendance of the Registrant at the hearing, that there was no assurance or evidence that the Registrant had learnt from her past behaviours. Ms Price submitted that the risk of repetition remains. She noted that there is no meaningful insight nor evidence that the Registrant wishes to remediate.

Ms Price drew attention to Paragraph 7.24 of the Indicative Sanctions, Interim Orders and Consensual Disposal: Guidance for Fitness to Practise Committees, Fitness to Practise Officers and Preliminary Proceedings Committees ('the Guidance'), and the appropriateness of a Removal Order where there is no other way to protect the public or where the confidence in the social care profession would be undermined by allowing the Registrant to remain on the Register. Ms Price submitted that the public should have confidence in the regulator and that, taking into account the Guidance, the sanction of a Removal Order should be considered. Ms Price noted that this case involved dishonesty and an abuse of trust. Service users rely on the trustworthiness of registrants and have a right to be protected from such very serious behaviour.

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.

He 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').

He 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 carefully considered all of the available evidence, together with Ms Price'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 mitigating factors to be:

- There have been no previous concerns raised with the Council.

The Committee considered the aggravating factors to be:

- Abuse of trust;
- Lack of insight;
- Harm caused to the service user and their family;
- Serious disregard to Council Standards;
- Convictions were directly linked to the Registrant's work;
- There was a pattern of premeditated behaviour;
- There was a lack of remorse and remediation;
- The conduct was fundamentally dishonest; and
- The Registrant had not meaningfully engaged with the Council.

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, and it proceeded to consider which sanction to apply in this case.

No sanction – having regard to its findings, the Committee considered that to conclude this matter and to take no further action would be a wholly inadequate response and would fail to protect the public and uphold the public interest.

Warning – the Committee considered whether to impose a Warning. The Committee considered that to issue the Registrant with a Warning would fail to protect the public and uphold the public interest.

Conditions of Practice Order – the Committee determined that conditions were neither appropriate nor proportionate. A Conditions of Practice Order would not be suitable as the Registrant has not attended the hearing today, and it had no evidence as to the Registrant's current employment and was not aware as to whether an employer would co-operate with the imposition of conditions. In these circumstances, the Committee was unable to formulate workable conditions which would address the Registrant's actions, adequately protect the public and address the wider public interest. In addition, the Committee was of the view that conditions were not appropriate in any event, given the seriousness of the case.

Suspension Order – the Committee gave careful consideration to a Suspension Order. The Committee noted that the Registrant had failed to fully engage with the proceedings and had not provided any evidence of insight, remorse or remediation. The Committee had regard to its findings that the Registrant's convictions for theft were a serious departure from the standards expected of a registered social care worker. The Committee noted that there was no acknowledgment from the Registrant of wrongdoing, and that it had found that the risk of repetition was high. The convictions did not amount to a one-off incident but were part of a pattern of behaviour over a prolonged period of time. The Committee concluded that a Suspension Order would not fully address the findings which it had been made in this case. In particular, the Committee was not satisfied that a Suspension Order would adequately address the public protection and public confidence concerns that had been identified.

Removal Order – the Committee then considered a Removal Order. In making this decision, the Committee took into account the Guidance at 7.24 – 7.26. In particular, the Committee noted 7.24, which states as follows:

'This is the most serious sanction which a Committee can impose. A Removal Order is likely to be appropriate when the registrant's behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with being a registrant. Removal should be used when there is no other way to protect the public, for example, where there is a lack of insight, continuing problems and a pattern of unacceptable behaviour or denial, where there is no evidence that there is likely to be satisfactory remediation and where confidence in the social care profession would be undermined by allowing the registrant to remain on the Register.'

The Committee concluded that given the seriousness of the Registrant's criminal convictions, her lack of engagement and no evidence in relation to her insight, remorse or remediation, a Removal Order was the only sanction appropriate to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the social care profession and the

Council as its regulator. The Committee considered the Registrant's actions to constitute a very serious departure from the professional standards as set out in the Standards.

In all of the circumstances, the Committee concluded that a Removal Order was the only sanction available to it to protect the public, uphold the public interest, and to mark the seriousness and unacceptability of the Registrant's convictions. The Committee considered the potential impact of a Removal Order on the Registrant, but concluded that the protection of service users and wider public interest in the social care profession outweigh the impact on the Registrant.

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 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:

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.

A. Patterson

10 September 2026

Hearings Officer
(Clerk to the Fitness to Practise Committee)

Date