

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

Name: Sandra McDaid

SCR No: 6039364

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Fitness to Practise Committee of the Northern Ireland Social Care Council, at its meeting on **25 September 2018**, made the following decision about your registration with the Northern Ireland Social Care Council:

The Committee found the facts proved by admission;

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

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

Particulars of the Allegation:

That, being registered under the Health and Personal Social Services Act (Northern Ireland) 2001 (as amended), and whilst working as a Flexicare Operative for Limavady Community Development Initiative Ltd of 24D Benevenagh Drive, Limavady, BT49 0AQ, you were convicted of the following offences at the Magistrates' Court:

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Defendant on 08/12/2017, stole POST OFFICE CARD to the value of UNKNOWN AMOUNT or thereabouts belonging to [Service User A], contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969. |
| 2. | Defendant on 8 th day of December 2017 dishonestly made a false representation, namely, That you were entitled to withdraw cash from [Service User A]'s post office pension account with the intention, by making the representation, to make a gain for yourself or another or to cause a loss to [Service User A] or to expose her to a risk of loss, in breach of section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, contrary to Section 1 of the Fraud Act 2006. |
| 3. | Defendant on 9 th day of December 2017 dishonestly made a false representation, namely, that you were entitled to withdraw cash from [Service User A]'s post office pension account with the intention, by making the representation, to make a gain for yourself or another or to cause loss to [Service User A] or to expose her to a risk of loss, in breach of section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, contrary to Section 1 of Fraud Act 2006. |
| 4. | Defendant on 11 th day of December 2017 dishonestly made a false representation, Namely, that you were entitled to withdraw cash from [Service User A]'s post office pension account with the intention, by making the representation, to make a gain for yourself or another or to cause loss to [Service User A] or to expose |

	her to a risk of loss, in breach of section 2 the Fraud Act 2006, contrary to Section 1 of the Fraud Act 2006.
5.	Defendant on 11 th day of December 2017 dishonestly made a false representation, namely, that you were entitled to withdraw cash from [Service User A]'s post office pension account with the intention, by making the representation, to make a gain for yourself or another or to cause loss to [Service User A] or to expose her to a risk of loss, in breach of section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, contrary to Section 1 of the Fraud Act 2006.
And that by reason of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired because of your convictions.	

Procedure:

The hearing was held under the fitness to practise procedure.

Preliminary Matters

The Registrant was in attendance and represented herself. The Council was represented by Mr Anthony Gilmore.

Application to Admit Hearing Bundle

The Committee received an application from Mr Gilmore to admit a bundle of papers into evidence. The Committee accepted the submission that the bundle met the requirements of fairness and relevance and admitted the bundle into evidence as Exhibit A, pursuant to Paragraph 12 (1) (a) of Schedule 2 of the NISCC Fitness to Practise Rules 2016 ('the Rules').

Background

The Committee received submissions from Mr Gilmore on the background to this case. The Registrant is registered on Part 2 of the Register. The Registrant has been registered with the Council since 17 November 2017. She had been working for Limavady Community Development Initiative Limited as a Flexicare Operative since September 2014.

The Committee heard that the offences in question occurred between 08 December 2017 and 11 December 2017, a period of some four days. The offences related to the theft of a post office card and the use of that card to withdraw money from the service user's account.

On 11 December 2017, a family member reported the withdrawals to the police and CCTV footage was obtained. On 19 December 2017, there was a police interview and the Registrant made admissions.

On 12 March 2018 the Registrant appeared in court and pleaded guilty to five charges. The amount taken was £1219.72, which was the entire savings in the service user's account.

On 04 May 2018, the Registrant was sentenced to four months' imprisonment, suspended for 18 months for each offence, with the sentences to be concurrent. The Court ordered the Registrant to pay compensation of £1219.72 which was paid that day and a receipt included in the bundle before the Committee marked Exhibit B.

Finding of Facts

The Registrant admitted the convictions and an agreed Statement of Facts was presented to the Committee as follows:

'I, Sandra McDaid (SCR 6039364), of 33 Ballynarigg Road, Limavady, admit that:

1. I am a registered social care worker, registered with NISCC.
2. I am the person named in the Certificates of Conviction in the hearing bundle which has been prepared for today's hearing and which I have received, before the Fitness to Practise Committee and which are set out at page 11A through to page 20.
3. I confirm that I did not appeal against the convictions or the sentences imposed.
4. The convictions are as follows:
 - (i) Defendant on 08/12/2017, stole POST OFFICE CARD to the value of UNKNOWN AMOUNT or thereabouts belonging to [Service User A], contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.
 - (ii) Defendant on 8th day of December 2017 dishonestly made a false representation, namely, That you were entitled to withdraw cash from [Service User A]'s post office pension account with the intention, by making the representation, to make a gain for yourself or another or to cause a loss to [Service User A] or to expose her to a risk of loss, in breach of section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, contrary to Section 1 of the Fraud Act 2006.
 - (iii) Defendant on 9th day of December 2017 dishonestly made a false representation, namely, that you were entitled to withdraw cash from [Service User A]'s post office pension account with the intention, by making the representation, to make a gain for yourself or another or to cause loss to [Service User A] or to expose her to a risk of loss, in breach of section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, contrary to Section 1 of Fraud Act 2006.
 - (iv) Defendant on 11th day of December 2017 dishonestly made a false representation, Namely, that you were entitled to withdraw cash from [Service User A]'s post office pension account with the intention, by making the representation, to make a gain for yourself or another or to cause loss to [Service User A] or to expose her to a risk of loss, in breach of section 2 the Fraud Act 2006, contrary to Section 1 of the Fraud Act 2006.
 - (v) Defendant on 11th day of December 2017 dishonestly made a false representation, namely, that you were entitled to withdraw cash from [Service User A]'s post office pension account with the intention, by making the representation, to make a gain for yourself or another or to cause loss to

[Service User A] or to expose her to a risk of loss, in breach of section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, contrary to Section 1 of the Fraud Act 2006.

and I admit that I committed the offences listed and pleaded guilty at court to each.

5. I admit that the person against whom the offences were committed was a service user, who is referred to as Service User A.
6. I admit that I was employed at the time of the offences by Limavady Community Development Initiative Ltd as a Flexicare Operative and that at that time I was a registered social care worker as was a requirement for the post and I was providing care to Service User A at the time the offences were committed.
7. I admit that the amount involved was £1219.72 and an order was made by the court for compensation for that amount to be paid.
8. I admit that I was sentenced to imprisonment for a period of 4 months which was suspended for 1 year and 6 months on each offence with the sentences to be concurrent.
9. I admit that the offences occurred during the period between 08/12/17 and 11/12/17 and the amount I took from Service User A's account represented all the savings in the service user's account.'

The facts were found proved by admission.

Fitness to Practise

The Committee heard a submission from Mr Gilmore who invited the Committee to find that the Registrant's practice was currently impaired as a result of her convictions. Mr Gilmore reminded the Committee that impairment has been defined in the Rules as circumstances which call into question the suitability of a registrant to remain on the Register without restriction or at all. He referred the Committee to the Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers which he suggested had been breached at Standard 1: 1.2, Standard 2: 2.1 and 2.11, Standard 5: 5.2, 5.3 and 5.8. Mr Gilmore submitted that the Registrant's actions breached the duty to establish trust and confidence of service users. He suggested that the theft of a bank card and then making the withdrawals to the extent there was no money left in the account is clear evidence of impairment. Mr Gilmore submitted that it is a basic duty of a social care worker to act honestly and, in this case, there is clear evidence of dishonesty. Mr Gilmore suggested that it is important for the Committee to bear in mind that the offences are recent, having occurred within the last 12 months and that the Registrant is still subject to a suspended sentence until November 2019.

The Committee heard evidence from the Registrant. The Committee found the Registrant to be personable. The Committee heard that she enjoys her job as a carer and she tried to answer the questions put to her by the Committee as best she could. However, the Committee felt that she demonstrated a lack of insight and empathy towards the service user in this case.

The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

In considering whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired, the Committee took into account the relevant provision of the Rules, along with the Guidance on Making a Determination of Impaired Fitness to Practise. The Committee first satisfied itself as to the reason for the alleged impairment of fitness to practise. The convictions as admitted in this case prove that the Registrant was convicted of five serious offences of theft and fraud involving a service user in her care.

The Committee had regard to the formulation adopted by Dame Janet Smith in her Fifth Report for the Shipman Inquiry, quoted with approval by Cox J in *CHRE v NMC* and *Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 Admin. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant:

1. Had acted in the past and is liable to act in the future so as to put a service user at unwarranted risk of harm;
2. Had acted in the past and is liable in the future to bring the social care profession into disrepute;
3. Had acted in the past and is liable in the future to act in a manner so as to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the social care profession; and
4. Had acted in the past dishonestly and is liable to act dishonestly in the future.

The Committee accepted the submission of Mr Gilmore that honesty is a fundamental tenet of the social care profession.

The Committee considered whether it is possible to remedy dishonesty. The Committee concluded that in some circumstances, dishonesty could be remediated. The Committee noted that the Registrant accepted her guilt and heard that the Registrant had spoken to her doctor and to her minister to allow her to move forward. The Committee noted that there were a number of supportive testimonials. The Committee heard from the Registrant that she was sorry for what she had done, that she had let herself down and that her actions had impacted on her family and friends. However, the Committee was not satisfied that the Registrant fully grasped the impact of her actions on the service user, the service user's family or the public impression of the social care profession. The Committee took into consideration the fact that the Registrant remains subject to a suspended custodial sentence and concluded that the conduct which led to her convictions has not yet been remediated.

The Committee heard from the Registrant that she would not be caught out in a similar scam in the future. However, the Committee remained concerned that the extremely poor judgement she demonstrated at the time of these offences means that there must remain a risk of repetition and this risk will remain until she is able to demonstrate full insight.

The Committee also had regard to the NISCC Standards of Conduct and Practice for Social Care Workers. In the view of the Committee, the Registrant had breached the following 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;
- 2.6 Being reliable and dependable;

2.11 Not engaging in practices which are fraudulent in respect of use of public or private monies.

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;

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

Finally, the Committee took into account the public interest in this case. The Registrant has been convicted of theft and fraud relating to a service user in her care. The Committee was in no doubt that public confidence in the social care workforce would be seriously undermined if a finding of current impairment was not made.

For these reasons, the Committee is satisfied that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her convictions.

Sanction

The Committee heard a submission from Mr Gilmore on the question of sanction. It heard and accepted the Legal Adviser's advice.

The Committee first considered the mitigating factors and noted that the Registrant:

- Co-operated with NISCC and made admissions at the hearing today;
- Admitted the facts to the police and her employer, and pleaded guilty avoiding the need for a contested hearing;
- Has made expressions of regret;
- Has no previous disciplinary record with NISCC and no previous allegations raised with her employer;
- Provided a number of positive testimonials; and
- Did not want the money for her own use, she was the victim of a scam.

The Committee next turned to consider the aggravating factors and noted that the Registrant:

- Had committed five offences which involved theft, fraud and dishonesty;
- Was guilty of abusing the trust placed in her as a registered social care worker;
- Was sorry but had demonstrated a lack of insight;
- Caused harm to Service User A both in terms of taking all her savings and abusing her trust in the person who provided her care;

- Had committed a serious offence which cannot be justified by becoming involved in a scam on Facebook;
- Had acted in a way which fell far below the standards expected of a registered social care worker.

Warning - the Committee did not consider a Warning was the appropriate or proportionate sanction. The Registrant's actions were serious and could not be considered to be at the lower end of the spectrum. This was not an isolated incident; she withdrew money on four occasions. The wrongdoings were serious and did cause harm to a service user. A Warning would allow the Registrant to work without restriction as a social care worker and without full insight from the Registrant, the Committee could not be satisfied that a Warning would provide adequate protection to the public.

Conditions of Practice Order - the Committee next considered a Conditions of Practice Order. The Committee noted the Indicative Sanctions and Use of Interim Orders: Guidance for Fitness to Practise Committees ('the Guidance') at Paragraph 4.3 which states that conditions may be appropriate in cases involving particular areas of a registrant's performance and where a Committee is satisfied that it is appropriate for an individual to remain on the Register. The Committee has already determined that the Registrant has not demonstrated sufficient insight into her actions and the impact on service users, their families and the profession as a whole. The Committee was not satisfied that appropriate Conditions of Practice could be formulated to meet the dishonesty in this case. The Committee concluded that Conditions of Practice would not therefore provide adequate protection to the public or meet the public interest in this matter.

Suspension Order - the Committee did not consider that a Suspension Order would be an appropriate or proportionate sanction in this case. The Committee determined that this was a very serious case and took into account the Guidance at Paragraph 4.19 which states:

"Suspension from the Register may be an appropriate sanction for impairment which while very serious is not so serious as to justify removal from the Register; for example where there has been an acknowledgment of failings and where a Committee is satisfied that the behaviour is unlikely to be repeated..."

The Committee determined that a Suspension Order would not address the risk of repetition. The Committee considers the Registrant's convictions to be serious, and evidence of behaviour that is fundamentally incompatible with unrestricted registration as a social care worker. The Committee took into account the Registrant's current lack of full insight. The Registrant has provided the Committee with positive testimonials and given evidence before the Committee today, but had failed to satisfy the Committee that she could resolve the cause of her criminal offending during a period of suspension.

Removal Order - the Committee concluded that given the seriousness of the Registrant's impaired fitness to practise, a Removal Order was the appropriate sanction. The Committee determined that the Registrant's actions caused serious harm to a service user. The Committee heard that the Registrant took the entire savings of Service User A. The Committee concluded that this caused more than financial harm. Service User A and her family had the right to place reliance on the integrity of the Registrant and she abused the trust which they placed

in her. The Registrant's actions were dishonest and the Standards state that social care workers must be honest and trustworthy. Whilst the Registrant has said she was sorry, the Committee determined that she had not demonstrated sufficient insight into the harm she caused to the service user and her family. Service User A was vulnerable and had little choice but to be trusting of those who provide her with care. The Committee was in no doubt that the Registrant's actions were a serious breach of the trust which was placed in her. Although the Committee heard that the Registrant did not want the money for her own use, the Committee was satisfied that she was not acting under duress. She was certainly not acting in the interests of Service User A.

The Committee concluded that a Removal Order was the only sanction which would protect the public and meet the public interest in this case. The Committee determined that the reputation of the social care profession would be seriously undermined if a lesser sanction were imposed. The Committee also considered that public confidence in the social care profession would be undermined if a social care worker who admitted stealing £1219.72 from a vulnerable service user were allowed to remain on the Register.

The Committee considered the potential impact of a Removal Order on the Registrant but determined that the safety of service users and the wider public interest was more important than the impact on the Registrant.

The Committee concluded that a Removal Order was the most suitable, appropriate and proportionate sanction in all the circumstances of this case and should be imposed on the Registrant's registration with immediate effect.

The Interim Suspension Order currently in place is revoked with immediate effect.

Legal Advice Given

Application to Admit Hearing Bundle

The procedure has correctly been outlined by Mr Gilmore, presenting on behalf of the Council, namely that Paragraph 12 of Schedule 2 sets out that subject to any advice from the Legal Adviser and the requirements of a fair hearing and are of relevance to the Committee, it can admit such bundle into evidence and I have had the opportunity to review the bundle in advance. I can confirm that it is relevant and both the Council and the Registrant have looked at the bundle and, as no objections have been raised to its contents, I feel it is safe to presume that there is no unfairness to either Party in admitting it into evidence and would suggest that you do so.

Fitness to Practise

I will just give you some brief advice at this stage. So it's my job, at this stage, to give the Committee some advice about the matters which you can properly take into account as you consider the fitness to practise of this Registrant.

So, Mr Gilmore, in his submissions, has already directed you to the definition of fitness to practise as set out within the Rules and also helpfully to Paragraph 24 (3) of Schedule 2, which tells you the things that you should

consider as you decide upon the issue of impairment of fitness to practise and the first one is that you should be satisfied as to the reason for the alleged impairment of fitness to practise. Now we have had admission of the convictions today and the gateway to impairment pleaded within the Particulars of the allegation is conviction. So you are looking at conviction. So the first thing is, are you satisfied that the conviction is the proper gateway to impairment in this case?

Then you have been directed by Mr Gilmore to the Standards and Conduct of Practice and that is again the proper thing to do, but what I would say to you is he has highlighted a number of paragraphs that he thinks are relevant, but that is a matter for you exercising your own independence, skill and judgement to go through and decide whether you think there has been any breach in this case.

Now, so the first stage in the process, as I have said, is to consider whether the gateway to impairment is established.

Then we have got a two-stage process and the second step is to consider whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired and it is well established that panels such as you considering impairment should do so in the present tense, that is to say to determine whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired today.

As set out in the case of The GMC -v- Meadows, the purpose of fitness to practise procedures is not to punish a practitioner for past mistakes but to protect the public against the acts and omissions of those who are not fit to practise. The panel, thus looks forward, not back. However, in order to form a view as to the fitness of a person to practise today it is evident that it will have to take into account the way the person concerned has acted, or failed to act in the past. So that means you should consider whether the Registrant is fit to practise today, but in reaching that decision it is proper to take into account things that she has done in the past.

Mr Gilmore has directed you to the case of CHRE -v- Grant, which is a 2011 case, and I will commend that decision to you and in particular, the comments of Mrs Justice Cox at paragraph 74 when she stated that:

"In determining whether a practitioner's fitness to practise is impaired" -- in that case it was by reason of misconduct, in this case it is by reason of conviction -- "the relevant panel should generally consider not only whether the practitioner continues to present a risk to members of the public in his or her current role, but also the need to uphold professional standards and whether public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances."

It is, therefore, proper for you to take into account the public interest and the wider public interest as part of your deliberations.

Mrs Justice Cox went on to refer to the formulation adopted by Dame Janet Smith in her Fifth Report for the Shipman Inquiry and the test that she formulated as an appropriate test for panels when considering the question of impairment. Mr Gilmore has already taken you through that four point test and again in your deliberations, I think it would be helpful for you to look at that four point test considering the way this Registrant acted in the past and whether she is liable to act in the same way again in the future.

I know as an experienced Committee you will be familiar with Mr Justice Silber's guidance on remediation as set out in the case of Cohen. So that means that when taking into question whether fitness to practise is currently impaired, a Committee such as this should take into account these three questions; whether the conduct which led to the charge is easily remediable, whether it has in fact been remedied and whether it is likely to be repeated. So the issue of remediation, reducing future risk, the risk of repetition, is undoubtedly an important one and one that you will have at the forefront of your mind in your deliberations.

And, finally, it has been pointed out to you that the offences in this case are dishonesty offences and it might be helpful if I directed you to the case of Choudary -v- The GMC, which is a 2017 case, and that case highlights that a finding of impairment does not inevitably flow from a finding of dishonesty. The panel in that case held that the dishonesty had been remediated and the GMC appealed the case.

When dealing with the appeal the court held that when considering impairment a Committee, such as this one, is entitled to contextualise and consider shades of grey in any given instance of dishonesty. A finding of dishonesty need not inexorably lead to a finding of impaired fitness to practise. However, a decision will be open to challenge if it is reached without having demonstrated first consideration was given to all three elements of the overarching objective and that is the overarching objective as set out for the GMC as it was in the Choudary case. But the factors involved in that are protection of the public, public confidence in the profession and the wider public interest in upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour. The judge held that remediation and the likelihood of repetition are important factors when considering current impairment in a dishonesty case, but they must be weighed in the balance taking into account protection of the public, public confidence in the profession and the wider public interest in upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour and they do not themselves mandate a finding of no impairment.

Sanction

It does fall to me to give you as a Committee some advice on the sanctions which you can properly consider, and the approach which you should take towards sanction.

Let me start by reminding you that it is not for the Council to seek to persuade you to take a particular course, nor indeed is it for the Registrant to try and persuade you to take another. Rather, as you approach this task of deciding on the appropriate proportionate sanction, you must do so exercising your own independent judgement to decide what is the appropriate response to the findings that you have made so far.

I must remind you that the purpose of sanction is not to be punitive. It is not to issue a punishment, although it can have a punitive effect. Rather, the purpose of sanction is the protection of service users and the wider public interest. The public interest includes the maintenance and confidence in the social care profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour. As Lord Justice Laws said in the case of Rashid -v- The General Medical Council, and that is a 2007 case, and I think Mr Gilmore has paraphrased it in his own submissions that:

"The panel is centrally concerned with the reputational standing of the profession rather than the punishment of the individual doctor."

Again that equally applies to a social care worker.

You have been referred to and should take into account in your deliberations the Indicative Sanctions Guidance published by the Council and you will know that Paragraph 2.3 and Paragraph 2.4 gives you further guidance in the definition of the public interest.

It is essential that in reaching your decision you apply the principles of proportionality and fairness and you weigh these public interest factors against the interests of the Registrant.

Again Paragraph 2.6 of the Guidance sets out that:

"The principle of proportionality requires that the consequences of the sanction, which a Committee imposes, must not be disproportionate to the harm for which the sanction is intended to protect the public and the service users. The interests of the public and service users have to be weighed against those of the Registrant."

In making your decision you should take into account the mitigating and aggravating factors and a non-exhaustive list of the types of factors you may wish to consider is set out in Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of the Guidance.

You have already outlined the sanctions available and I don't intend to do so again unless you would like me to. But as pointed out already, you should take each of the sanctions that are available starting with the least restrictive sanction and only working up the scale of restrictiveness if the option you are considering is not proportionate, or sufficient, to meet the fitness to practise concern that you have already identified.

As Mr Justice Collins said in the case of Giele -v- GMC, and that's a 2005 case, you should decide whether the sanction is right for the misconduct in question only after considering a lesser sanction first.

You must, I should remind you, give reasons for your decision and you should set out why you have chosen a particular sanction and why you have rejected any other.

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.

P. P. M. Stewart

Committee Manager

28 September 2018

Date