

Social Workers Disciplinary Tribunal

Social Workers Registration Act 2003

[PERMANENT NON-PUBLICATION ORDERS AT [42]]

BEFORE THE SOCIAL WORKERS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

REF **SWDT28/25**

UNDER the Social Workers Registration Act (“the Act”)

IN THE MATTER of a disciplinary charge laid against a social worker
under Part 4 of the Act.

BETWEEN **A PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE appointed**
by the SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BOARD
Applicant

AND **Ella Evans** of Nelson, registered social worker (Regn.
No. 1530393)
Practitioner

HEARING Penalty, AVL, 22 June 2026

REPRESENTATIVES Ms E Mok for the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC)
Ms M Henaghan and Ms G Guy – for the respondent

Tribunal C Garvey (Chair), S Jarvis, I Nemani, R Sheppard, F Wilson

Tribunal Hearing Officer Ms Latchman

Decision on Penalty, Costs and Permanent Non-Publication
Dated: 30 June 2026

Introduction

1. The Tribunal conducted a liability hearing on the papers on 31 March 2026 and issued its decision on liability on 13 April 2026.¹ For reasons that are set out in that decision, the Tribunal found Ms Evans guilty of professional misconduct for the following conduct, in breach of the Code of Conduct²:
 - a. continuing to provide informal support to a vulnerable recent former client, Ms B, and commencing a personal relationship that coincided with the end of Ms Evans' employment as a social worker at [REDACTED] in May 2022 and without her employer's knowledge; and
 - b. allowing Ms B to reside on her property immediately following the termination of the formal social worker-client relationship; and
 - c. failing to inform her new employer of the relationship with Ms B (and in so doing, failing to seek supervision and support in relation to that relationship); and
 - d. continuing to provide support and allow Ms B to reside at her property despite being aware of Ms B's deteriorating mental health, and engaging in inappropriate and unprofessional communication with Ms B by messaging and in person, including engaging in a verbal altercation in the presence of Ms B's child; and
 - e. responding inappropriately and unprofessionally to Ms B when she laid a complaint with Ms Evans' former employer and the Social Workers Registration Board (Board); and
 - f. telling Ms B's partner that she would make a Report of Concern to Oranga Tamariki when there was no proper basis to do so.

¹ *Professional Conduct Committee v Evans* SWDT 28/25, 13 April 2026.

² *Social Workers Registration Board Code of Conduct*, 14 March 2016.

2. Following the liability decision, the Tribunal received written penalty submissions from the parties together with supporting information from Ms Evans as to professional development and her financial circumstances. The penalty hearing was convened by AVL on 22 June 2026. Ms Evans gave a statement and answered questions from the Tribunal, and both counsel made oral submissions.
3. For the reasons set out in the liability decision the Tribunal considered the respondent's professional misconduct to be serious. The Tribunal gave careful consideration to both cancellation of registration or suspension of Ms Evans' practising certificate, but for the reasons set out below makes the following orders pursuant to s 83 of the Social Workers Registration Act 2003 (the Act):
 - a. Censure. This is to reflect the fundamental importance that the Tribunal places on the maintenance of professional boundaries between a social worker and their clients and those close to them, the use of appropriate communication, and reflective practice including the proper use of supervision.
 - b. Conditions for a period of two years:
 - i. that Ms Evans provides a copy of the Tribunal's decisions on liability and penalty to any employer in a social work position; and
 - ii. that Ms Evans engages in external supervision with reporting to the Board every three months for six months then six monthly. The supervisor will receive a copy of the Tribunal's decisions and supervision is to include discussion of the Code of Conduct, in particular professional boundaries, ethical behaviour and the specific requirements of competence and responsibility for professional development under Principle 4 of the Code.³
4. The Tribunal also orders that that Ms Evans pay a contribution to the PCC's costs and to the Board for the conduct of the proceedings. Ms Evans did not seek any non-publication orders.

³ It is not intended that the external supervision replaces any internal supervision provided by Ms Evans' employer.

The Tribunal however made permanent non-publication orders in relation to the names and identifying details of other persons and certain documents produced during the proceedings, as set out at [42] below.

Penalty Principles

5. Once a charge is found proved in whole or in part the Tribunal must consider whether to impose a penalty under s 83 of the Act. Disciplinary proceedings should meet the purposes of the Act, which include ensuring the protection of the public and enhancing the professionalism of social workers.⁴ The Tribunal adopts the penalty principles relevant to disciplinary proceedings set out by the High Court in *Roberts v Professional Conduct Committee* and summarised as follows:⁵
 - a. the protection of the public.
 - b. setting professional standards.
 - c. penalties may have a punitive function, but this is a by-product other than in the case of a fine.
 - d. the rehabilitation of the practitioner, where appropriate.
 - e. penalty should be comparable to those imposed in similar cases.
 - f. the most severe penalties should be reserved for the worst offenders.
 - g. the Tribunal should impose the least restrictive penalty that is appropriate in the circumstances.
 - h. penalty should be fair, reasonable, and proportionate in all the circumstances.
6. A wide range of penalties is available to the Tribunal, and we must consider other penalties before imposing cancellation.⁶ Cancellation of registration should be reserved for cases where it is the only penalty that will meet the purposes of the Act. That is, where no other penalty will protect the public, or reflect the seriousness of the misconduct that has been proved in terms of the social worker's fitness and reflection on professional standards and

⁴ Section 3 Social Workers Registration Act 2003.

⁵ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand*, High Court Wellington, CIV-2012-404-003916 12 December 2012, Collins J.

⁶ Section 83(2) Social Workers Registration Act 2003.

the reputation of the profession, and/or the Tribunal is not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of insight, rehabilitation or rehabilitative prospects to allow a lesser penalty to be imposed.

7. A period of suspension for up to three years may be imposed. Suspension indicates that the social worker is not fit to practise for reasons that may be amenable to remediation. A suspension must be for a purpose, which may include deterrence (where the gravity of the conduct warrants this) and allowing the practitioner time for further reflection and professional development so that they are fit to return to the profession. Suspension should not be imposed simply to punish, and rehabilitation of the practitioner is an important consideration.⁷
8. Other penalties available under s 83 are the imposition of conditions, a fine, censure, and a requirement that the practitioner makes an apology.
9. The parties referred the Tribunal to several cases involving serious breaches of professional boundaries. In *CAC v Austin* the experienced social worker entered into a friendship with a former client from a crisis mental health service, providing him with a bail address and allowing him to reside at her home.⁸ This was not disclosed to Ms Austin's employer, which was considered a failure to manage a potential conflict of interest. Ms Austin also moved to live with the former client in another city for a period of months, and engaged in regular text and phone communication. There was no evidence that there was an intimate relationship, but the charge pleaded an "intense friendship". Ms Austin stopped working as a social worker and allowed her practising certificate to lapse. The Tribunal imposed a censure, and conditions involving two years of external supervision and an assessment of her fitness to return to practise. But-for the fact Ms Austin was not practising for a prolonged period the Tribunal found that it would have imposed a suspension.
10. In *CAC v Surowiez-Leper* the social worker engaged in a close relationship with an elderly former client, from whom she accepted gifts and money including money she obtained on

⁷ *A v Professional Conduct Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2008-404-2927, 5 September 2008, Keane J.

⁸ *CAC v Austin* RSW2/D2/SWDT/2016.

false pretences (ostensibly to help other clients).⁹ The personal relationship was commenced only two days after Ms Surowiez-Leper ceased to be the client's social worker. The Tribunal ordered censure and cancellation and imposed professional development requirements before the practitioner could seek re-registration.

11. In *PCC v Lynch*, the practitioner engaged in conduct that was found to be threatening and harassing towards a former colleague including sending abusive messages by social media and leaving abusive voice mails. Separately Ms Lynch engaged in an inappropriate relationship with a client of her employer involving text messages and phone calls, despite being warned by her employer about boundaries.¹⁰ Significantly, Ms Lynch did not engage with the PCC or in the Tribunal's proceedings and provided no evidence of insight or rehabilitation. The Tribunal did not consider suspension would sufficiently protect the public or enhance the professionalism of social workers and imposed cancellation and censure.

12. In *PCC v Curson* the social worker had a private practise, and at the request of a friend provided social work services to members of the friend's extended family.¹¹ The family was in crisis following the discovery of child pornography on the father's laptop. Mr Curson assisted the father to engage in treatment but also facilitated the disposal of the offending material from his laptop. The Tribunal found that he failed to manage a conflict of interest, blurred professional boundaries, failed to make any records and did not undertake required supervision. The Tribunal accepted that Mr Curson was well-motivated but acted in breach of the Code. He undertook rehabilitative steps ahead of the hearing including engaging in supervision and was cooperative and showed insight. Cancellation was not sought and the Tribunal did not consider the threshold for that was met, nor suspension as it considered the conduct was unlikely to be repeated. Censure and a condition requiring monthly external supervision for 2 years was imposed.

13. Finally, in *Professional Conduct Committee v Burrridge* an experienced social worker employed by Oranga Tamariki was found guilty of professional misconduct in relation to a failure to maintain professional boundaries and manage a conflict of interest with the family

⁹ *CAC v Surowiez-Leper* RSW3/D3/SWDT/2015.

¹⁰ *CAC v Lynch* 03/SWCDT21/15P.

¹¹ *PCC v Curson* 01/08/SWDT, 30 July 2008.

of a young client, in particular, entering into a close relationship with the client's older brother, contacting members of the family after hours and visiting their home, and visiting the brother in prison.¹² The Tribunal found that the conduct reflected adversely on the social work profession, was in breach of the Code of Conduct and endangered the reputation of the profession because of the failure to protect and enhance clients in a vulnerable position. The Tribunal imposed a six-month period of suspension. The Tribunal held that the public required protection from the social worker until it could be assured that she understood her professional and ethical obligations. Censure and conditions requiring professional development were also imposed.

Professional Conduct Committee Submissions

14. The PCC's written and oral submissions were comprehensive and are summarised here. The PCC seeks cancellation as a starting point. Ms Mok submits that while the PCC accepts that Ms Evans was initially well-intentioned, not all of the conduct can be characterised in that way, submitting that the content of the text messages showed an 'active disregard' for Ms B's mental state, and pointing to Ms Evans' conduct when the relationship deteriorated. This includes the verbal altercation captured on video and in front of Ms B's child, and Ms Evans' reaction to 'lash out' when Ms B complained.

15. Addressing the relevant cases, Ms Mok submits that the present circumstances are most analogous to *PCC v Austin* but that the respondent's conduct is more serious. This is because of the length of time Ms B – and also for a period of time her young daughter - lived at the respondent's property; Ms B's deteriorating mental health which was in part due to stressors arising from their living arrangements, and the emotional reliance that Ms Evans allowed Ms B to develop. The PCC submits:

Further, there was no 'social work' aspect to the conduct in *Austin*, whereas here there was some continuation of similar supports for Ms B and the preparation of a safety plan (even though there was no longer a formal social worker/client relationship). That has implications for Ms Evans' social work practice and fitness, including because of the concerning responses she had to Ms B's distress and

¹² *Professional Conduct Committee v Burrridge* D1/SWCDT/T22/20P.

suicide attempts, and the fact Ms Evans' actions led Ms B to believe Ms Evans was still her social worker. Accordingly, a more serious penalty is warranted than *Austin*.

16. The PCC submits that Ms Evans' conduct is also more serious than in *Lynch* and *Surowiez-Leper* because of the adverse impact that the relationship had on Ms B. While Ms Evans was relatively inexperienced, Ms Mok submits that it should have been readily apparent that it was not appropriate to invite Ms B to live on her property or to continue the relationship. The PCC submits that Ms Evans' conduct was 'highly serious', for the reasons following:

- a. that there was no gap between the professional relationship ending and the personal relationship beginning.
- b. that Ms B was vulnerable, and a significant power imbalance persisted.
- c. the boundary breaches were prolonged and varied and not a one-off breach.
- d. the lack of transparency with Ms Evans' employer.
- e. that the respondent 'lashed out' when Ms B made a complaint.

17. The PCC accepts the respondent's remorse. As for rehabilitative steps, Ms Mok submits that there is insufficient specific evidence of this (describing the evidence as 'high level'), such that limited weight can be given and that the Tribunal cannot be satisfied that conditions will be adequate. The PCC is somewhat critical that the first evidence of Ms Evans' reflections on her practice came at the penalty hearing and her 'qualified acceptance' of the charge. This refers to the respondent's submissions at the liability stage that the conduct, if proved, amounted to conduct unbecoming rather than professional misconduct and did not warrant a disciplinary response, based on the categorisation of the relationship with Ms B as an informal and well-intentioned one.

18. The PCC submits that censure and cancellation are the appropriate starting point, but that if the Tribunal considers it can step back from cancellation, an appropriate penalty would

involve censure, suspension for a period of 12 months, and conditions requiring a work plan, external supervision, and a disclosure requirement. With respect to suspension Ms Mok submits that this is not just because of the risk that the PCC says Ms Evans poses (essentially for the reasons at [16] and [17] above) but also to mark the seriousness of the conduct and the maintenance of professional standards.

Respondent Submissions

19. Ms Evans addressed the Tribunal and stated that:

- a. this has been a long and difficult process, made even more challenging and painful by Ms B's death, and she acknowledged the loss to Ms B's family.
- b. her behaviour was unprofessional and breached professional boundaries.
- c. she regrets her actions and not seeking assistance from a senior colleague as the relationship with Ms B deteriorated.
- d. she allowed herself to be driven by her emotional response to the situation.
- e. her intention was to help Ms B.
- f. the community work that she has been doing is transferable back into social work including having supervision and conducting professional client interactions.

20. In response to questions from the Tribunal Ms Evans said that the situation with Ms B was unique, that she was impacted by personal circumstances affecting her mental well-being at the time, that she had just finished her social work training and that she is now clear on what constitutes professional boundaries and the importance of these. Ms Evans stated that the writers of her character references provided to the Tribunal were aware of the nature of the disciplinary charge.

21. Counsel for Ms Evans submits that neither cancellation nor suspension are required, for reasons including that:

- a. the circumstances of the cases reflect a one-off situation that will not happen again, and that Ms Evans was at the time naïve but motivated by good intentions, is ‘fully capable of rehabilitation’, and has worked hard to do so over the past four years;
- b. Ms Evans accepted the charge early on in the proceedings;
- c. Ms Evans has taken rehabilitative steps by engaging in supervision and reflection in her employment in community work (‘social work-adjunct’) roles;
- d. the positive character references from Ms Evans’ managers and supervisors;
- e. Ms Evans has not practised as a social worker since December 2022, and as such she has ‘already more than served such suspension’.

22. The respondent accepts that a censure is appropriate as well as conditions for a period of two years, namely that Ms Evans:

- a. work with an employer in the social work field to implement a plan to assist her to work safely, with the plan to be approved by the Board; and
- b. receive external supervision from a registered social worker approved by the Board with the supervisor to report to the Board every six months regarding Ms Evans’ engagement with supervision. The supervisor must be given a copy of the PCC report and the Tribunal decision; and
- c. provide a copy of the Tribunal’s decision to any prospective employers in the social work profession.

- 23.** The respondent's submissions addressed each of the principles set out in *Roberts* (as outlined above) and emphasised a rehabilitative approach and the submission that there is no need for the protection of the public. Ms Henaghan submits that Ms Evans has reflected, engaged in professional development, and 'believes she is able to support her community in a more professional manner given the development she has experienced' in roles undertaken over the past two or so years.
- 24.** Addressing the comparator cases, Ms Henaghan submits that Ms Evans' conduct is less serious than in *Lynch* and *Surowiez-Leper*, distinguishing the aggravating features present in those cases. In contrast to all of the cases referred to, Ms Evans was inexperienced at the time of the conduct in the charge – with the inference that her breach of professional boundaries was more explicable.
- 25.** Further, Ms Henaghan submits that the Tribunal should take into account the consequences of this matter and any penalty for Ms Evans, including the loss of her social work position, difficulties in obtaining employment in a related field, and the related financial consequences.
- 26.** With respect to insight and rehabilitation, Ms Henaghan highlights the positive character references attesting that Ms Evans has engaged willingly in professional development and regular supervision, is receptive to feedback and that she has consistently acted professionally and maintained professional boundaries. In reference to the PCC's submission that Ms Evans made only a qualified acceptance of the charge and the implications of this for her insight, Ms Henaghan points to Ms Evans' guilty plea and the agreed summary of facts, and notes counsel's responsibility for legal argument regarding the characterisation of the charge.

Findings

- 27.** Having considered the relevant legal principles, the parties' submissions, the evidence from Ms Evans, and comparator cases, the Tribunal is satisfied that a penalty short of cancellation or suspension is appropriate in the present case. This is not to undermine the gravity with

which we view Ms Evans' conduct: the liability decision makes very clear that social workers - no matter how experienced or inexperienced - are expected to be familiar with and comply with the Code of Conduct, to engage in quality supervision, and to understand and maintain appropriate professional boundaries including with former clients and the family members of clients.

28. As above, the Tribunal is required to consider all other available penalties before imposing cancellation, which must be done in the light of any evidence of insight and the practitioner's rehabilitative prospects. Given the time since the subject conduct, the fact that Ms Evans has not practised as a social worker since December 2022, her work in relevant community-based roles, engagement in professional development and supervision, and willingness to work with appropriate conditions on her practise, we consider that a penalty of censure and conditions will meet the purposes of the Act and the established penalty principles.

29. While cancellation or suspension might have been appropriate if Ms Evans had responded differently, those penalties would in our view be solely punitive if now imposed. In this regard, the list of 23 professional development courses or modules that Ms Evans has undertaken since August 2023 appear relevant to social work practise. The character references provided from her manager and supervisor are also very reassuring. As such this is not a case in which a period of suspension is warranted to allow for further time for reflection or professional development to provide reassurance that Ms Evans is fit to practise.

30. The Tribunal does consider that a censure and conditions must be imposed. With respect to the conditions proposed by the parties, the Tribunal considers that it important to add some specificity to the supervision requirement. Conditions will be imposed on the respondent's practising certificate for a period of two years as follows:

- a. that Ms Evans disclose the Tribunal's liability and penalty decisions to a potential employer of her in a social work position.

- b. that Ms Evans' engages in external supervision with reporting to the Board every three months for six months then six monthly. The supervisor will receive a copy of the Tribunal's decisions and supervision is to include discussion of the Code of Conduct, professional boundaries, ethical behaviour and the specific requirements of competence and responsibility for professional development under Principle 4 of the Code. The supervisor should be approved by the Board.

Costs

31. The Tribunal may make orders for costs pursuant to s 83(1)(e) of the Act, in favour of the PCC. The Tribunal may also make an order in favour of the Board for the conduct of the proceedings.¹³ The Tribunal adopts the same approach as adopted in other professional disciplinary settings and as confirmed as the appropriate approach by the High Court in *Brown*.¹⁴ After confirming that the starting point is 50% of reasonable costs, La Hood J outlined these further principles:¹⁵

- a. Costs are highly discretionary and often require an assessment of a wide range of factors.
- b. Costs are not part of penalty. The mitigating features that are relevant to penalty are therefore irrelevant to any reduction in costs.
- c. A 10% reduction will usually reflect the practitioner's co-operation.

32. The PCC seeks an order that Ms Evans' contributes 45% of the costs of the PCC investigation and prosecution of the charge. This is based on the usual starting point of 50%, but allowing for Ms Evans' co-operation with the agreed summary of facts and guilty plea. Ms Mok however submits that no further reduction is required in light of the respondent's approach to the charge and submission that it did not amount to professional misconduct. The Costs

¹³ Section 83(1)(e).

¹⁴ *Professional Conduct Committee appointed by the Medical Council of New Zealand v Brown* [2024] NZHC 990.

¹⁵ Above n 14 at [86] – [93].

Schedule provided by the PCC outline total costs for the investigation and prosecution in the sum of \$41,655.00.

- 33.** The respondent does not challenge the reasonableness of the costs incurred but seeks to make a reduced contribution of 40%. This is on the grounds that a 10% reduction properly reflects the level of Ms Evans' co-operation with the proceedings, her early acceptance of the charge, and her co-operation to enable this matter to be dealt with expediently with a hearing on the papers at the liability stage and an AVL hearing for penalty. Counsel submits that the respondent's approach to the disputed issue of how the relationship with Ms B ought to be characterised should not detract from a 10% reduction being appropriate.
- 34.** While Ms Evans filed a statement of financial means, counsel confirmed that this was intended to be relevant to any consideration of the imposition of a fine but is not relied on for the purposes of seeking a further reduction in costs.
- 35.** The Tribunal is satisfied that it is appropriate to make an order of a 40% contribution to the PCC's costs, in the sum of \$16,662.00. While challenges were raised in the respondent's liability submissions, the respondent was entitled to do so, and to some extent this was necessitated by the pleading of a private social worker-client relationship. Ms Evans did otherwise accept the charge, prepare an agreed summary of facts, and co-operate in this matter being dealt with as expediently as possible for a case involving very serious issues and the obvious potential for a penalty impacting Ms Evans' future ability to practice as a social worker.
- 36.** It is also appropriate that the respondent contributes to the costs of the proceedings incurred by the Board (for the Tribunal proceedings) which are otherwise wholly borne by the profession. The Tribunal's costs relate to the two half-day hearings including preparation, attendance at the hearing and preparation of the written decisions and total \$8,685.00. A 40% contribution will be ordered. Any costs recovery is a matter for the Board and the respondent may deal directly with the Board in the event any arrangement to pay costs over time is sought.

Non-Publication Orders

- 37.** The starting point is that hearings of the Tribunal are public, in the interests of open justice and transparency of the disciplinary proceedings. Pursuant to s 79(2) of the Act the Tribunal may make orders for non-publication if it is satisfied that it is desirable to do so, having regard to the interests of any person (including the privacy interests of a complainant) and to the public interest.
- 38.** We can deal briefly with no-publication in this case and do not consider it necessary to traverse the relevant principles or case law, noting the parties' consent to the orders to be made. Ms Evans has not applied for a permanent non-publication order, a matter which is to her credit. While the other orders made are fairly extensive to protect the privacy of others, the Tribunal considers that this matter can still be published in a way that clearly outlines the relevant misconduct and the reasons for the Tribunal's findings.
- 39.** With regard to Ms B, clearly the privacy interests of Ms B and her family mean an order preventing publication of her name and sensitive health information is desirable. There is also no public interest in members of Ms Evans' family being identified by name.
- 40.** Ms Evans does seek non-publication in favour of her recent employers (one of which was a long but fixed term contract which has ended), and those who provided her character references for the Tribunal. While no submissions were directed to this, the Tribunal is satisfied that there is no obvious public interest in those organisations and people being named given their lack of connection to the proceedings and the absence of any concerns regarding Ms Evans' recent conduct in her employment. Ms Evans also requested that personal health information be suppressed.
- 41.** The final orders for permanent non-publication include additional orders to those set out at [71] of the liability decision. These orders include clarification that the prohibition on publication of text messages extends to those sent by Ms Evans to Ms B (as included in the bundle) as they refer to matters that would disclose sensitive information about Ms B, that the video recording itself is not to be published, and orders arising from Ms Evans' evidence to the Tribunal for the penalty hearing.

42. The Tribunal's permanent non-publication orders are as follows:

- a. The name and identifying details of Ms B.
- b. The name and identifying details of Ms B's partner or former partner and her children.
- c. Sensitive health information relating to Ms B contained in the summary of facts and bundle of documents.
- d. Copies of the text messages between the respondent and Ms B.
- e. The video recording and transcript of the video recording of an interaction between the respondent and Ms B as included in the agreed summary of facts and bundle of documents.
- f. The statement of Ms Evans' financial means and personal health information.
- g. The names of Ms Evans' recent employers including the names of her character referees.
- h. The names and identifying details of Ms Evans' former employers at the time of the subject conduct, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].
- i. The names and identifying details of Ms Evans' family members and others associated with her as referred to in the bundle of documents.

Penalty Orders

43. For the reasons set out above, the Tribunal makes the following penalty orders in reliance on s 83 of the Act:

- a. Ms Evans is censured.
- b. The following conditions are to be placed on Ms Evans' practising certificate:
 - i. that Ms Evans disclose the Tribunal's liability and penalty decisions to a potential employer of her in a social work position.

ii. that Ms Evans' engages in external supervision with reporting to the Board every three months for six months then six monthly. The supervisor will receive a copy of the Tribunal's decisions and supervision is to include discussion of the Code of Conduct, professional boundaries, ethical behaviour and the specific requirements of competence and responsibility for professional development under Principle 4 of the Code. The supervisor should be approved by the Board.

c. Costs in favour of the Professional Conduct Committee in the sum of \$16,662.00.

d. Costs in favour of the Social Workers Registration Board in the sum of \$3,474.00.

44. The parties' attention is drawn to s 88 of the Act, which provides for an appeal to the District Court against the whole or part of the Tribunal's decision or orders by way of a notice of appeal lodged in accordance with the rules of the court within 20 working days after notice of this decision or within any further time as the court allows.

DATED this 30th day of June 2026.



C Garvey
Chairperson
Social Workers Disciplinary Tribunal