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

REDACTED

Name: **Babafemi Bosede Adeleye**

SCR No: **6000266**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Fitness to Practise Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council, at its meeting on **09 October 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 offence at Laganside Magistrates' Court on 20 October 2025:	
1.	Defendant [You] on 11th day of March 2024 unlawfully assaulted [REDACTED SERVICE USER] contrary to Section 42 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861
And your actions, as set out at 1 above, show that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your conviction 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 fitness to practise hearing was held at the Northern Ireland Social Care Council ('the Council') offices at James House, Belfast. The Registrant was in attendance and was not represented. 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.

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.

Application for hearing to be held in private

[REDACTED].

Ms Price indicated that the Council adopted a neutral position in respect of the application.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He referred the Committee to the principle of open justice as a fundamental tenet of the justice system. He also referred to any derogation from open justice being permissible only if it was strictly necessary. The Legal Adviser referred to the provisions of Paragraph 10 of Schedule 2 to the Northern Ireland Social Care Council Fitness to Practise (Amendment) Rules 2019 ('the Rules').

The Committee took into account the submissions from the Registrant, and from Ms Price on behalf of the Council. The Committee was not satisfied that there was good reason to hold the hearing in private. In particular, the Committee was mindful that the Registrant's purported conviction was a matter of public record. Further, the Committee determined that any evidence or submissions relating to the health of the Registrant, or any other person, as well as any other personal sensitive information could be heard in private with the rest of the hearing being in public. Accordingly, the Registrant's application to have the entire hearing in private was refused. The Committee indicated to the Registrant that he could make submissions to the Council regarding publication at a later stage if the hearing resulted in a sanction against him.

Background

The Registrant is registered on Part 2 of the Register.

On 30 March 2024, a service user reported to a family member that a member of staff had 'flicked' his ear. As a result, Inspire Wellbeing reviewed CCTV footage and identified concerns regarding the Registrant's interactions with a vulnerable service user.

On 20 May 2024, a third-party referral was submitted to the Council from Ms Gemma McGregor, Assistant Director of HR & Health & Safety, Inspire Wellbeing.

The third–party referral described the CCTV footage from 11 March 2024 as showing the Registrant spraying what appeared to be a cleaning product towards the service user's chest, pushing the service user on the chest on two occasions, and grabbing or pushing the service user's arm. The third–party referral documented the physical contact to be unnecessary and outside any therapeutic or personal care intervention. The matter was referred to the Northern Health and Social Care Trust ('the Trust') Adult Protection Service and reported to the Police Service of Northern Ireland ('PSNI').

The matter was further brought to the Council's attention by way of an Employer Referral Form ('ERF') dated 04 June 2024 from Mr Rob Blanchard, Divisional Director, NC Healthcare Ltd. The ERF disclosed the following:

'Advised by Police that a Criminal Investigation will open regarding the concern'.

According to the PSNI MG5 Case Summary, staff became aware on 30 March 2024 of a possible incident involving a vulnerable service user who required significant support. The case summary stated that CCTV footage from 11 March 2024 showed the Registrant spraying the service user with a bottle containing what appeared to be cleaning fluid, pushing the service user in the chest twice, and grabbing or pushing the service user's arm when the service user was attempting to use a light switch. The case summary recorded that there appeared to be no reason for the physical contact.

The Registrant was interviewed by the police on 12 August 2024 and denied the allegations.

By letter, dated 05 September 2025, the Council advised the Registrant that it had received information from NC Healthcare Ltd regarding the criminal investigation into allegations that he had assaulted a service user on multiple occasions during March 2024.

The Council subsequently obtained a Certificate of Conviction relating to the criminal proceedings arising from the incident.

The matter was previously listed for hearing before a Fitness to Practise Committee on 19 August 2026. The hearing was adjourned on that date and relisted for 09 October 2026.

Evidence

Ms Price referred the Committee to the documents contained within Exhibit 1, which contained the ERF, the documentation from the PSNI and the Certificate of Conviction.

Ms Price submitted that the Certificate of Conviction and background information from the PSNI, which included the MG5 Case Summary and the email from Common Law Police Disclosure ('CLPD') Unit, is conclusive proof that the facts are proven, 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 his conviction or that the conviction does not relate to this Registrant. Accordingly, she invited the Committee to find the facts proved on the balance of probabilities.

The Registrant confirmed with the Committee that he had been convicted. However, as he was not legally represented the Committee was reluctant to accept this as a formal admission to the facts. The Registrant addressed the Committee with regard to the incident. He stated that he had known the service user for a long time. He described the relevant service user as 'dangerous' and also said they had injured staff previously. The Registrant said the service user requested to be with him. The Registrant also said that his manager had respected his involvement with the relevant service user, describing difficulties when caring for the service user. The Registrant described regular mess on the floor; the service user's need for 24 / 7 care including clothes changes up to ten times a day; and the service user being particularly challenging around food and accessing his fridge. The Registrant disputed that he had *deliberately* sprayed the service user in the face. He submitted that, while cleaning a room, he believed he was about to be struck and reacted by squeezing the trigger on the cleaning spray he was holding. He stated that he was not challenging the conviction of the criminal court. The Registrant told the Committee that the judge, at his criminal trial, told him that the conviction related to the spraying of the service user and not the alleged push. The Registrant also referred to the criminal court having access to CCTV footage. However, the said footage was not before the Committee.

Findings of Fact

The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He reminded the Committee that it must apply the standard of proof as applicable in civil proceedings, which is the balance of probabilities. The Legal Adviser further reminded the Committee that under Paragraph 12 (5) of Schedule 2 of the Rules, a Certificate of Conviction issued in any UK Criminal Court 'shall be conclusive proof of the facts or conviction so found'. He further referenced the only evidence which may be adduced to undermine a Certificate of Conviction related to the Registrant not being the person to whom the certificate relates or a successful appeal against the relevant conviction.

The Committee reminded itself that the burden was on the Council to prove the facts as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation.

The Committee took into account the submissions from Ms Price on behalf of the Council, the submissions made by the Registrant and had careful regard to all of the documentary evidence submitted. The Committee noted the Certificate of Conviction and was satisfied that it related to the Registrant. There was no evidence to suggest a successful appeal of the conviction, and in his written submission the Registrant had expressly stated that he had not appealed it. Taking into account Paragraph 12 (5) of Schedule 2 of the Rules, the Committee was satisfied that the Certificate of Conviction against the Registrant proved the facts therein. The Certificate of Conviction against the Registrant related to an offence of unlawfully assaulting a service user on 11 March 2024. It also confirmed the relevant sentence as two months imprisonment, suspended for 12 months.

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 conviction called into question his ability to work in social care services and to remain on the Register without restriction, or to be registered at all. She referred the Committee to the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers ('the Standards'), which she submitted that the Registrant's criminal conviction breached the following Standards of Conduct: 1, 1.2 5, 5.1 and 5.8. She also said the Registrant had breached the following Standards of Practice: 3, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.12.

Ms Price told the Committee that the Registrant's conviction, including the actions that gave rise to it, fell far below the minimum standard expected of a registered social care worker, and called into question his fitness to practise. Ms Price invited the Committee to consider whether the Registrant's actions were capable of remediation. She highlighted the Registrant pleading not guilty before later being found guilty. She also highlighted the Registrant's oral evidence at the facts stage in which she said he had attempted to justify his actions by reference to the relevant service user's challenging behaviours. Ms Price said that there was no evidence of developed insight or remediation. She further said that in the Council's view, there is a risk of repetition. Ms Price said that the Registrant has been convicted of unlawful assault on a service user in their own home, and submitted that public confidence in the social care profession and the Council, would be undermined if a finding of current impairment was not made in these particular circumstances.

The Registrant said that he accepted his behaviour was wrong; he regretted his actions; and he takes full responsibility for his conviction.

The Registrant said that he talks to a former pastor about his conviction and his work. He said he was committed to the Council's values and referenced having a degree in Health and Social Care and continuing to work towards his masters. The Registrant referred to his sorrow and his desire for forgiveness.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Registrant confirmed that since the incident, he had been working for Amazon and Evri as a driver. He also referred to being a carer for his wife. When asked about the

impact on the service user, the Registrant referred to the service user really liking him. He also referred to letting the service user down and being angry with himself in respect of the incident.

The Registrant also told the Committee that he was unable to apologise to the service user or their family. When asked what he thought the family would feel about the incident, he said that they would not be happy.

The Committee asked the Registrant how it would know that he had remediated. The Registrant replied saying that he had [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; he let the service user down; he hadn't met the Council's expectations; and he had learnt his lesson and would not let something like this happen again.

Ms Price asked the Registrant how he thought a family member of a future service user might react if they knew about his conviction. The Registrant said 'they wouldn't be happy'.

Ms Price asked the Registrant if he had completed any online courses, including courses relating to dignity and respect in the workplace and physical interventions with service users. The Registrant replied saying he goes to the gym and 'talks to people'. He also referred to reading online articles about social care.

The Committee asked the Registrant how he would respond if faced with the same situation in the future. The Registrant said that he would scream for help. He referred to being scared and having seen other carers suffer injury. In response to further questions, he confirmed that he was MAPA trained at the time of the incident and he accepted he had acted outside of his MAPA training.

The Registrant was again asked what he would do differently in the future. He said he would have got the other people present to stop cleaning and focus on the service user when they became agitated.

The Committee considered the submissions from Ms Price on behalf of the Council, the submissions from the Registrant and had regard to all of the evidence in the case. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. He advised the Committee that it should adopt a two-stage approach to the question of impairment. Firstly, the Committee should satisfy itself that the statutory ground of conviction has been made out, and then consider whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired on the basis of the statutory ground. He referred the Committee to Paragraph 24 of Schedule 2 of the Rules, and the principles as set out in the case of GMC v Cohen, in relation to remediation, insight and risk of repetition. He referred the Committee to the principles identified in the findings of Dame Jane Smith in the fifth Shipman Report in relation to impairment. He also referred the Committee to the cases of GMC v Meadow and CHRE v NMC & Grant, and the need to ensure that the wider public interest was taken into account in relation to upholding public confidence in the profession, upholding proper standards of conduct and maintaining confidence in the Regulator.

The Committee, having considered the Certificate of Conviction, and having found the facts proved by reason of the conviction, was satisfied that the statutory ground of Conviction had been made out.

The Committee next considered whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of his conviction, as set out in the Particulars of the Allegation.

The Committee, in considering the issue of impairment of fitness to practise, 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 noted that the Registrant had been convicted of unlawfully assaulting a service user. The Committee was satisfied that this conviction, which related to the care provided to a vulnerable service user, was serious and was the reason for the alleged impairment of fitness to practise. In the Committee's view, the seriousness of his conviction was illustrated by a sentence of two months' imprisonment, suspended for 12 months.

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:

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

1.2 Treating people with consideration, respect and compassion.

Standard 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: 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.

Standards of Practice:

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; and

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

The Committee concluded that the Registrant's actions fell far below the standards expected of a registered social care worker. The Committee was particularly troubled by the incident involving a vulnerable service user whom the Registrant knew to present with challenging behaviours.

The Committee carefully considered the question of remediation. It found that a conviction for assault against a service user, while not easily remediable, was capable of being remediated. The Committee considered the Registrant's insight and understanding with regard to his conviction, to be inconsistent. In his written submission and in his oral evidence he referred to accepting the outcome of the criminal proceedings. At the same time, his description of the incident was a clear attempt to justify his actions and was akin to an argument of self-defence. The Committee also noted the Registrant had denied his actions when interviewed by the police and pleaded not guilty in court. He also, in his written submission, referred to his [REDACTED] as the basis upon why he had not appealed his conviction.

The Registrant referred to his remorse and sorrow. However, despite questions being asked by the Committee, the Registrant also focused exclusively on himself and not the victim of his offending behaviour. The Committee was struck by the minimal references to the vulnerable service user. In the Committee's view, this undermined his stated remorse and sorrow. The Committee also found the Registrant's comments regarding family members view's to be underwhelming. Likewise, the Committee found the Registrant's answers in respect of handling similar incidents in the future to also be underwhelming. Overall, the Committee concluded that the Registrant had some, albeit limited insight.

There was no corroborating evidence in respect of the Registrant's stated remediation. Combined with limited insight, the Committee concluded that the risk of repetition was high. This was consistent with the Registrant carrying out the offending behaviour, notwithstanding that he had been MAPA trained.

In relation to the wider public interest, the Committee concluded that the Registrant's conviction for unlawful assault brought the social care profession into disrepute. It considered that the public would find it totally unacceptable that a registrant convicted in these circumstances was found not to be impaired.

The Committee concluded that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was, therefore, necessary for the maintenance of public confidence in the social care profession and the Council as its regulator. The Committee also concluded that public confidence in the social care profession would be undermined if a finding of impaired fitness to practise was not made.

For these reasons, the Committee concluded that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of his criminal conviction.

Sanction

In reaching its decision on sanction, the Committee considered the submission from Ms Price on behalf of the Council, the submissions from the Registrant and had regard to all of the evidence in this case. It also had regard to the Northern Ireland Social Care Council Indicative Sanctions, Interim Order and Consensual

Disposal: Guidance for Fitness to Practise Committees, Fitness to Practise Officers and Preliminary Proceedings Committees ('the Guidance').

Ms Price addressed the Committee on the mitigating and aggravating factors relevant to sanction. She submitted that the Registrant had no previous referrals with the Council and so is entitled to the benefit of a good working history and good prior character.

As regards aggravating factors, Ms Price submitted that the public was entitled to expect that care workers would provide safe and effective care to the most vulnerable in society, and suggested that the Registrant's behaviour in assaulting a vulnerable service user was at the higher end of the spectrum of unacceptable behaviour. She submitted that the incident occurred while he was providing care to a vulnerable service user. Ms Price referred to the Registrant's limited level of insight and understanding. She also referred to the lack of evidence in respect of remediation.

Ms Price referred the Committee to the Guidance, and suggested that the sanction of a Removal Order should be considered. She submitted that the Registrant had shown limited insight and no remediation. She also said that his actions amount to a serious disregard to the standards expected. Ms Price 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.

Ms Price submitted to the Committee that to impose no sanction would not satisfy the public interest. She said that a Warning would be more appropriate for conduct at the lower end of the spectrum. She also said that a Conditions of Practice Order was not workable, or appropriate in the circumstances of this case. Ms Price referred to relevant paragraphs within the Guidance when considering whether to impose a sanction of suspension or removal.

The Registrant submitted that he wished to remain on the Register and invited the Committee to consider imposing a Conditions of Practice Order rather than a more restrictive sanction. He stated that he had invested significant time in his profession and studies.

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 Ms Price submissions and the comments of the Registrant. 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 the fact that the Registrant has not had a previous adverse employment or regulatory history. The Committee also had regard to the Registrant attending both the adjourned hearing and the in-person hearing. However, the Committee did not consider that these matters were of significant weight.

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. The Registrant's actions showed a serious disregard for the Standards as outlined previously. The Committee also considered that the Registrant's actions were aggravated by the fact that he has shown limited insight, no corroborated evidence of remediation, and the risk of repetition remains high.

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. The Committee accepted that a sanction towards the upper end of the available sanctions would likely cause some form of financial impact or restricted future working options for the Registrant. The Committee proceeded to consider which sanction to impose.

No sanction – the Committee had no doubt that it would be entirely inappropriate to impose no sanction in this case. To impose no sanction would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the conviction, and would not protect the public or address the public interest.

Warning – the Committee considered the issue of a Warning in this case. It bore in mind the imposition of a Warning for a period of time would not protect the public from risk of repetition, and would not address the risk of harm to service users and members of the public. The Committee considered that the Registrant's criminal conviction demonstrated a serious disregard for the Standards. The circumstances of the Registrant's impairment of fitness to practise were not at the lower end of the spectrum, nor were the circumstances such that the Committee would be confident that this sanction would provide adequate public protection as far as the Registrant's suitability for registration was concerned.

Conditions of Practice Order – the Committee next considered a Conditions of Practice Order. The Registrant's conviction related to a serious abuse of trust when he, as a social care worker, assaulted a vulnerable service user whilst providing care. The Registrant's conviction was for a serious offence committed at work, and this is not something which could be easily addressed through re-training or conditions. The Committee concluded that a Conditions of Practice Order would be insufficient to protect the public and uphold

the public interest, 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 behaviour, adequately protect the public and address the wider public interest.

Suspension Order – the Committee next considered a Suspension Order. The Committee noted that it had made findings at the fact and impairment stages of the proceedings that the conviction in this case was serious, and fell far below the standards to be expected of a registered social care worker. The Standards require a social care worker to treat each person as an individual with consideration, respect and compassion, along with respecting and maintaining their dignity. The Registrant breached these expectations, and failed to adhere to the Standards.

The Committee carefully considered the issue of proportionality, and whether suspension would address the concerns which it had identified. The Committee noted Paragraph 7.17 of the Guidance. The Committee was particularly mindful of the high risk of repetition which related to a serious conviction. The Committee considered the public interest in this matter. In all of the circumstances of this case, the Committee concluded that a Suspension Order would not be sufficient to address the seriousness and unacceptability of the Registrant's criminal conviction for assaulting a service user.

Removal Order – the Committee then considered a Removal Order. In making its 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 where 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 Registrant's criminal behaviour involved an assault on a vulnerable service user, and constituted an abuse of his position of trust as a social care worker. The Registrant's actions have brought social care services into disrepute. The Committee was mindful of its previous findings in respect of insight, remediation and the high risk of repetition.

In all the circumstances, the Committee concluded that a Removal Order was the only appropriate sanction to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the social care profession and in the Council as its regulator. The Committee noted that this was a one-off incident. However, the Registrant's actions constituted a serious departure from the professional standards as set out in the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers, and his conviction is fundamentally incompatibly with continued registration.

The Committee decided, with immediate effect, to impose a Removal Order.

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.



15 October 2026

Hearings Officer
(Clerk to the Fitness to Practise Committee)

Date