

**Nursing and Midwifery Council  
Fitness to Practise Committee**

**Substantive Order Review Hearing  
Tuesday, 2 December 2025**

Virtual Hearing

<b>Name of Registrant:</b>	<b>Mrs Maria Demetriou</b>
<b>NMC PIN:</b>	87Y1667E
<b>Part(s) of the register:</b>	RN1: Registered Nurse – (sub part 1) Adult – Level 1
<b>Relevant Location:</b>	Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire
<b>Type of case:</b>	Misconduct and Lack of competence
<b>Panel members:</b>	Geraldine O'Hare (Chair, Lay member) Donna Green (Registrant member) Robert Marshall (Lay member)
<b>Legal Assessor:</b>	Melissa Harrison
<b>Hearings Coordinator:</b>	Anya Sharma
<b>Nursing and Midwifery Council:</b>	Represented by Zainab Mohamed, Case Presenter
<b>Mrs Demetriou:</b>	Not present and not represented at this hearing
<b>Order being reviewed:</b>	Suspension order (12 months)
<b>Fitness to practise:</b>	Impaired
<b>Outcome:</b>	<b>Striking-Off order to come into effect on immediately in accordance with Article 30 (2)</b>

## **Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing**

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Mrs Demetriou was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Mrs Demetriou's registered email address by secure email on 25 November 2025.

Further, the panel noted that the Notice of Hearing was also sent to Mrs Demetriou's representative at the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) on 25 November 2025.

Ms Mohamed, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Hearing provided details of the substantive order being reviewed, the time, date and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Mrs Demetriou's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Demetriou has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

## **Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Mrs Demetriou**

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mrs Demetriou. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Mohamed who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Mrs Demetriou. She submitted that Mrs Demetriou had voluntarily absented herself.

Ms Mohamed referred the panel to the documentation from Mrs Demetriou's representative at the RCN, which included a letter dated 27 November 2025 setting out the below:

*'Our member will not be attending the hearing nor will she be represented. No disrespect is intended by her non-attendance. [PRIVATE] Our member has received the notice of hearing and is happy for the hearing to proceed in her absence. She is keen to engage with the proceedings. The Registrant's legal representatives will be available by phone should the Panel desire to hear from us. Our contact details are known to the NMC.'*

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Mrs Demetriou. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Mohamed, the written representations from the RCN made on Mrs Demetriou's behalf, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Mrs Demetriou;
- Mrs Demetriou has informed the NMC via her representative at the RCN that she has received the Notice of Hearing and confirmed she is content for the hearing to proceed in her absence;
- Mrs Demetriou's RCN representative has provided written submissions and documentation for the panel's consideration today in lieu of their attendance;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure Mrs Demetriou's attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case as the striking-off order is due to come into effect on 12 December 2025

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Mrs Demetriou.

## **Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private**

At the outset of the hearing, Ms Mohamed informed the panel that the RCN in their written submissions have requested for this hearing to be heard in private:

*This is a case that falls under Rule 19(3) of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (FTP) Rules 2004. In accordance with this rule, hearings may be held, wholly or partly, in private if the Committee is satisfied that this is justified and outweighs any prejudice by the interests of any party or of any third party or by the public interest.*

*We submit that any public interest in this case or any third party interest would not outweigh the need to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the registrant and therefore the parts of the hearing that relate to our member's health should be heard in private.*

Ms Mohamed made a request that parts of this case be held in private on the basis that proper exploration of Mrs Demetriou's case involves reference to her health and personal life. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

The panel determined to go into private session in connection with Mrs Demetriou's health and personal life as and when such issues are raised.

## **Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order**

The panel decided to replace the current suspension order with a striking off order.

This order will come into effect immediately in accordance with Article 30(2) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is an early review of the substantive order originally imposed on 12 May 2023, being held on request of Mrs Demetriou.

This is the third review of a substantive order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 12 May 2023. This was first reviewed on 25 October 2024 when the panel replaced the original conditions of practice order with a suspension order. On 6 November 2025, the order suspension order was reviewed and replaced with a striking-off order due to come into effect on 12 December 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 12 December 2025.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(2) of the Order.

The charges found proved which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

*'That you,*

1. *during your employment with Chapel Street Medical Centre between December 2017 – May 2018 failed to demonstrate the standards of knowledge, skill, and judgement required to practise without supervision as a practice nurse as follows*

- a. *you did not make accurate records in that you:*

- i. *did not label smear samples correctly or at all in respect of:*
  - a) **Patient 1 [PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
  - b) **Patient 2 [PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
  - c) **Patient 3 [PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

d) Patient 7 **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

ii. ...

iii. On or around 30 January 2018 in respect of Patient 8 did not complete the template following a spirometry test. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

iv. On or around 7 February 2018, in relation to Patient 9, commenced nutilis powder without:

a) Recording your rationale for doing so; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

b) Discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

v. On or around 3 April 2018 in respect of Patient 16 did not:

a) asses and/or record your assessment of the risk of heart attack or stroke **[PROVED]**

b) discuss and/or record a discussion with the patient about statins **[PROVED]**

vi. On or around 21 April 2018 having administered a Typhoid vaccine to Patient 19, incorrectly recorded that you had administered a hepatitis A vaccine; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

b. failed to follow safe prescribing practice in that you:

i. on or around 5 January 2018 in relation to Patient 4, increased metformin medication and/or added alogliptin without

a) Assessing the response to an increase in metformin from 4 December 2017 **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

b) recording the response to an increase in metformin from 4 December 2017 **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

- c) ...
  - d) *Ensuring a new blood test had been taken after 4 December 2017* **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
  - e) *Warning Patient 4 of potential side effects of alogliptin* **[PROVED]**
- ii. *on or around 22 December 2017, in relation to Patient 5 started a new medication without:*
- a) *Following the plan already in place;* **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
  - b) *Assessing and/or recording an assessment of the patient's blood sugar diary;* **[PROVED BY ADMISSION – RECORDING ONLY, PROVED ON ASSESSING]**
  - c) *Assessing and/or recording an assessment of the patient's response to gliclazide.* **[PROVED BY ADMISSION – RECORDING ONLY, PROVED ON ASSESSING]**
  - d) *Warning Patient 5 of potential side effects of alogliptin;* **[PROVED]**
  - e) *Discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician.* **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
- iii. *On or around 12 January 2018 in relation to patient 5, increased the dose of alogliptin without:*
- a) *Assessing and/or recording an assessment of whether the patient had any hypoglycaemia;* **[PROVED]**
  - b) *Assessing and/or recording an assessment of the patient's response to gliclazide* **[PROVED]**
  - c) *Warning Patient 5 of potential side effects of alogliptin;* **[PROVED]**
  - d) *Discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician.* **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
- iv. *On or around 16 November 2017, in respect of Patient 10, added a prescription for Relvar Inhaler, without:*

- a) *Recognising that the Revlar Inhaler was a specialist initiation drug; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
  - b) *Removing Symbicort from their prescription; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
  - c) *Providing a dosage instruction; **[PROVED]***
  - d) *Discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician. **[PARTIALLY PROVED – ON RECORDING ONLY]***
  
- v. *on or around 16 March 2018 added a prescription for metformin for Patient 11 without discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
  
- vi. *on or around 22 March 2018 added a prescription for statins for Patient 13 without discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
  
- vii. *on or around 22 March 2018 increased the prescribed dose of sulphonylureas for Patient 14 without discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
  
- viii. *On or around 22 March 2018, in respect of Patient 12:*
  - a) *added a prescription for metformin for without discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician; **[PROVED]***
  - b) *restarted Losartan without:*
    - i) *ensuring the patient had a kidney function test; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
    - ii) *giving advice and/or recording that advice had been given that Losartan can affect kidney function; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
    - iii) *considering, or recording consideration of the patient's liver function test; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
    - iv) *advising the patient to see his GP about the liver function test. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***



- ix. On or around 29 March 2018 in relation to Patient 15, reauthorized warfarin:
  - a) without discussing and/or recording a discussion with a prescribing clinician; **[PROVED – DID NOT RECORD BUT DID HAVE DISCUSSION]**
  - b) ...
  
- x. On or around 4 April 2018 in relation to Patient 17
  - a) Added an overdose of prednisolone to the patient's prescription **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
  - b) Added a duplicate prescription of doxycycline **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
  - c) Did not discuss and/or record discussion with a prescribing clinician in relation to the above **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**
  
- xi. On or around 19 April 2018 recorded a consultation with Patient 18 regarding a depo provera injection and did not discuss and/or record a discussion with the patient about:
  - a) The importance of the timing of the injection **[PROVED]**
  - b) Risk of pregnancy **[PROVED]**
  - c) current contraception **[PROVED]**
  
- xii. ...
  - a) ...
  - b) ...
  
- c. ...
  - i. ...
  - ii. ...
  - iii. ...

2. ...

a. ...

i. ...

ii. ...

b. ...

c. ...

i. ...

ii. ...

3. *during your employment with Ashfield House Surgery 1 October 2018-27 January 2020 failed to demonstrate the standards of knowledge, skill, and judgement required to practise without supervision as a practice nurse as follows*

a. *did not keep accurate records when you:*

i. *Mixed up two patients when sending a cervical smear sample on or around 9 May 2019; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***

ii. *Did not include a valid sample taker code on a cervical smear sample for Patient 27 on or around 18 April 2019 **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***

iii. *Did not include the patient DOB and/or NHS number on a cervical smear sample for Patient 28 on or around 16 May 2019 **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***

iv. *On or around 4 June 2019 having taken a sample from Patient 25*  
a. *incorrectly labelled the vial to say the sample was taken on 3 June 2019; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***

- b. *incorrectly labelled the sample from Patient 26, as being from Patient 25. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
  - v. *In respect of cervical samples you took on 15 August 2019:*
    - a. *did not include a valid sample taker code for Patient 32; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
    - b. *entered an incorrect post code for Patient 31; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
    - c. *entered an incorrect address for Patient 32; **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
  - vi. *In respect of cervical samples you took on or around 15, 19 August and 22 August 2019 used the incorrect request form for Patients 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
  - vii. *Recorded the incorrect manufacturer on influenza vaccination records for Patients 39, 40 and 41. **[PROVED]***
- b. *Did not follow safe medicines administration protocol in that, on 10 June 2019, you administered an out of date Hepatitis B vaccine to Patient 29. **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]***
- c. ...
  - i. ...
  - ii. ...

*AND, in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your lack of competence.*

*That you, a registered nurse:*

4. ...

a. ...

b. Documented that you had given the patient an asthma action plan when you had not; **[PROVED]**

5. Your actions as set out in charges 4a and/or 4b above were dishonest in that you sought to conceal the fact that you had not carried out those actions **[PROVED IN RELATION TO 4B]**

6. Breached patient confidentiality in that:

a. On 5 October 2018, you disclosed Patient 21's appointment to their mother without Patient 21's consent **[PROVED BY ADMISSION]**

b. ...

c. ...

7. ...

8. ...

*AND, in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.'*

The second reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

*The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that, due to the non-attendance and lack of engagement, Mrs Demetriou had not shown any evidence to demonstrate any strengthening of practice or insight into the charges that were found proved. The last reviewing panel also noted that Mrs Demetriou had not demonstrated evidence of developing her skills and knowledge under supervision*

*in accordance with the conditions of practice order and therefore determined that a risk of harm to patients and the public remained.*

*At this hearing, Mrs Demetriou has disengaged with these proceedings since the substantive order was imposed in May 2023. Therefore, the panel does not have any information before it to suggest that Mrs Demetriou has demonstrated an understanding of how her actions put patients at risk of harm. Mrs Demetriou has not demonstrated an understanding of the reasons why what she did was wrong and how this impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession. The panel was therefore unable to determine that Mrs Demetriou has taken any steps to strengthen her practice in light of the lack of evidence and correspondence. For example, she did not provide evidence of any training undertaken or a reflective piece detailing her insight into the impact of her lack of competence and misconduct on patient safety and professional standards.*

*Further, the last reviewing panel determined that Mrs Demetriou was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has not been provided with any evidence to indicate that Mrs Demetriou has made any positive progress since the substantive hearing and, as such, it determined that Mrs Demetriou is still liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved as the risk has not decreased. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.*

*The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. In these circumstances, the panel determined that a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would be concerned about no evidence of progress towards safe and effective practice since the substantive order was imposed.*

*For these reasons, the panel finds that Mrs Demetriou's fitness to practise remains impaired.*

The second reviewing panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

*'The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.*

*The panel then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case and the public protection and public interest issues identified, an order that does not restrict Mrs Demetriou's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances.*

*The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Mrs Demetriou's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original hearing and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to Mrs Demetriou's lack of competence and misconduct. It also noted that Mrs Demetriou had not previously demonstrated evidence of any compliance with the previous substantive conditions of practice order, which, in the panel's view were reasonable and workable conditions, before it was replaced with a substantive suspension order.*

*The panel noted that Mrs Demetriou has not engaged with the NMC since the imposition of the substantive order on 12 May 2023. In addition, the panel took into account that Mrs Demetriou had not acted upon any of the suggestions made by the last reviewing panel as to what a further reviewing panel may be assisted by, including testimonials or a reflective piece.*

*The panel then considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. However, it determined that Mrs Demetriou has had two years to demonstrate*

*strengthened practice and sufficient time to fully reflect on her previous failings which include multiple medication, labelling errors, breach of confidentiality, and dishonesty. The panel was also mindful that there are three separate and consecutive NMC referrals concerning Mrs Demetriou. It considered that considerable evidence would be required to show that Mrs Demetriou no longer posed a risk to the public or the risk of repetition has been negated. Given Mrs Demetriou's disengagement and the lack of information before it, the panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances.*

*The panel's view is that there are fundamental questions about Mrs Demetriou's professionalism, particularly due to her prolonged lack of connection and engagement with the NMC in accordance with the Code. In addition, Mrs Demetriou has made no progress towards addressing the issues relating to her fitness to practise.*

*The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Mrs Demetriou from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.*

*This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 12 December 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1).'*

## **Decision and reasons on current impairment**

The panel has considered carefully whether Ms Demetriou's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's suitability to remain on the register without restriction. The panel took account of the NMC guidance on impairment (DMA-1, 3 March 2025), including the following question as detailed in the guidance:

*‘Can the nurse, midwife or nursing associate practise kindly, safely and professionally?’.*

In considering this case, the panel has carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it has noted the decision of the last panel, this panel has exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel has had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle and the written submissions and corresponding documentation from the RCN sent on behalf of Ms Demetriou. It has also taken account of the submissions made by Ms Mohamed on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Mohamed provided the panel with a background to the case and referred it to the relevant parts of the NMC bundle, including the written decisions of previous panels.

Ms Mohamed set out that this panel today is being invited to undertake an early review of the suspension order currently in place under Article 30(2). She explained to the panel that the RCN are effectively asking the panel to review this case again before the expiry of the order, but this time with additional information that the previous panel at the substantive order review hearing on 6 November 2025 did not have sight of.

Ms Mohamed set out that this panel now have before it new information from the RCN, which includes written submissions on behalf of Mrs Demetriou, witness statements signed by the Mrs Demetriou stating why she does not intend on returning to nursing, [PRIVATE] along with a signed declaration by the Mrs Demetriou.

Ms Mohamed submitted that the NMC’s position with regards to impairment is very clear. She submitted that Mrs Demetriou’s fitness to practise remains impaired, she has not practised as a nurse since 2020, and this panel has not been provided with any evidence to demonstrate that she has addressed the concerns in this case or taken any steps towards remediating the deficiencies in her practice. Ms Mohamed further submitted that this panel has also not been provided with any evidence of reflection or



developed insight. She submitted that in these circumstances, the risk in this case remains high and a finding of impairment is necessary for the protection of the public.

Ms Mohamed submitted that in such a case where there is limited engagement and no real effort made to address the concerns identified, a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would be concerned about the lack of progress towards safe and effective practice since this substantive order was made. She therefore invited the panel to find that Mrs Demetriou's fitness to practice is also impaired on public interest grounds.

Ms Mohamed then addressed the panel in relation to sanction. She submitted that this is a matter entirely for the panel's judgement and invited it to take into account the NMC Sanctions Guidance when making its decision.

Ms Mohamed submitted that this panel may be of the view, despite the information provided by the RCN, that a striking off order is the most appropriate and proportionate order in this case. She submitted that this is not only a case which amounted to a lack of competence but included a breach of confidentiality and a finding of dishonesty, involving 3 separate NMC referrals. She submitted that Mrs Demetriou's failings amounted to an exceptionally low standard of practice, and there are fundamental questions about her professionalism and suitability to remain on the NMC register. Ms Mohamed submitted that the panel may therefore be of the view that the only appropriate and proportionate order in this case is in fact that of a striking off order.

Ms Mohamed set out that this panel has been provided with a letter from the RCN detailing Mrs Demetriou's position. Due to Mrs Demetriou's health, she has decided not to return to nursing, and she is effectively requesting the order to lapse. Ms Mohamed submitted that the rules do allow for the order to lapse upon a finding of impairment where the professional would no longer be on the register, but for the order in place, a reviewing panel can allow the order to expire upon finding impairment. She submitted that if the panel is minded to allow the order to lapse, she will invite the panel to do so under Article 30(4). The panel also has the power to change the length of the order and then allow the order to lapse on expiry of that new date.

Ms Mohamed also invited the panel to consider the recent High Court appeal case of Professional Standard Authority v the NMC and Graham [2025] EWHC 3132 (Admin), where the judge noted the important distinction between exiting the register via lapse with a finding of impairment and a striking of order. The judge noted that the NMC's guidance on when the former may be appropriate and found that the panel had not properly applied this. The judge agreed that the panel had not given adequate consideration of the seriousness of the misconduct, Mr. Graham's failure to demonstrate insight nor engage meaningfully and instead focused too much on his own state of desire to leave the profession.

Ms Mohamed invited the panel to carefully apply the NMC's guidance to the facts of this case and focus on its core underlying objective, which is identifying what is required to protect the public and not just the desires of Mrs Demetriou to leave the register on her own terms. She submitted that all other sanctions are available to the panel and that any sanction imposed must be appropriate and proportionate.

The panel also had regard to the written submissions from the RCN on behalf of Mrs Demetriou.

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Following advice from the legal assessor, Ms Mohamed made further submissions as to the NMC's position. She submitted that it is the NMC's view that this early review has been brought by the RCN to allow for a reconsideration of this case with full information before this panel. Ms Mohamed stressed that it is the NMC's submission that it is trying to be fair to Mrs Demetriou, who was not able to provide the full information to the previous reviewing panels. She submitted that this panel's purpose today is to review the current suspension order, not the striking-off order, as that does not come into effect until 12 December 2025. She submitted that whatever the panel's decision today will replace the decision of the previous reviewing panel.

Ms Mohamed also referred the panel to the case of *R. (on the application of Hill) v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales Court of Appeal (Civil Division) May 22, 2013, WL 2110682*, in particular paragraph 13, which effectively states that rules and guidance cannot cover every particular situation, but where it is not prohibited it is permitted (subject to the proposed procedure being fair), and that is what the NMC seeks to rely on.

Ms Mohamed submitted that ultimately, the suspension order has not expired as of yet, and this panel has been asked to reconsider the case with the full information before it. She submitted that any decision the panel makes today will invalidate the previous decision and be final.

The panel had sight of Mrs Demetriou's signed declaration dated 20 November 2025, which states:

*'I accept that my fitness to practise is currently impaired.*

*I understand that if I were to apply for readmission to the Register, I will be required to demonstrate that I am capable of safe and effective practice and the steps that I have taken to improve my practice and reduce any risks to patients.'*

The panel also had sight of the following from the written submissions provided by the RCN on behalf of Ms Demetriou, in particular:

*...[PRIVATE]. She no longer wishes to retain her PIN, and would like these proceedings to come to a close and to leave the register with dignity*

*...*

*It is submitted that the appropriate action for this panel to take is to allow the Order to lapse. A striking-off order would be solely punitive; unnecessary and disproportionate. The NMC has fulfilled its legitimate role by the proceedings to date. There is nothing further to be gained. The Registrant should be allowed to*

*retire from the profession gracefully, and without being labelled as one who has acted in a way 'fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register' when she has done no such thing.'*

In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance.

The panel considered whether Mrs Demetriou's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Mrs Demetriou had insufficient insight and had disengaged with these proceedings since the substantive order was imposed in May 2023. At this hearing, the panel had sight of and took into account the written submissions and information provided by the RCN on behalf of Mrs Demetriou, which included a signed witness statement and a signed declaration both dated 20 November 2025, where Mrs Demetriou accepts that her fitness to practise is currently impaired and that she does not want or intend to continue practising. The panel also had sight of [PRIVATE].

The panel however considered that it has no new information before it which directly addresses Mrs Demetriou's current fitness to practise, or any steps taken to remediate her nursing practise. This panel has no information before it to suggest that Mrs Demetriou has demonstrated an understanding of how her actions put patients at risk of harm, why what she did was wrong and how this has impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession and the NMC as a regulator.

The panel noted that Mrs Demetriou has not worked as a nurse since 2020. It considered that the seriousness of Mrs Demetriou's failings stemming from three separate and consecutive NMC referrals in this case, as well as a finding of dishonesty. The panel considered that these failings are not easily remediable and noted the absence of any evidence as to any training undertaken, testimonials or a reflective piece from Mrs Demetriou detailing any insight into her lack of competence and misconduct.

Further, the last reviewing panel determined that Mrs Demetriou was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has not been provided with any evidence to indicate that Mrs Demetriou has made any positive progress since the substantive hearing and, as such, it determined that Mrs Demetriou is still liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved as the risk has not decreased. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

For these reasons, the panel finds that Mrs Demetriou's fitness to practise remains impaired.

### **Decision and reasons on sanction**

Having found Mrs Demetriou's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel noted that its powers are set out in Article 30 of the Order. The panel has also taken into account the 'NMC's Sanctions Guidance' (SG) and has borne in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, though any sanction imposed may have a punitive effect.

The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Mrs Demetriou's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The SG states that a caution order may be appropriate where *'the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise and the panel wishes*

*to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen again.'* The panel considered that Mrs Demetriou's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the issues identified. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Mrs Demetriou's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original hearing and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to Mrs Demetriou's misconduct and lack of competence.

The panel has received information that Mrs Demetriou has not practised as a nurse since 2020 and does not intend to return to practise as a nurse. In view of Mrs Demetriou's clear settled intention not to return to nursing, the panel considered that any conditions of practice order would not be workable and would serve no useful purpose.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that Mrs Demetriou has not shown remorse for her misconduct. Further, Mrs Demetriou has not demonstrated any insight into her previous failings. The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Mrs Demetriou no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Mrs Demetriou from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

The panel considered that Mrs Demetriou has not demonstrated any positive change in her insight since the original order was made and her engagement with the NMC has

been limited to the documentation provided in readiness for today's hearing following the striking-off decision made by the previous reviewing panel on 6 November 2025. In the circumstances, the panel is not satisfied that this can be accurately characterised as engagement with the fitness to practice process. The panel carefully considered the updated information provided by Mrs Demetriou in relation to her health but does not consider that the concerns in this case relate solely to matters involving health. In the circumstances, the panel was satisfied that that a striking off order is the appropriate sanction to be imposed in this case.

It is the panel's view that the matter has now reached a stage where there are fundamental questions about Mrs Demetriou's professionalism.

The panel carefully considered the written submissions of the RCN made on Mrs Demetriou's behalf and noted that it is not being disputed that she should no longer remain on the register. The panel noted Mrs Demetriou's request for the order to now lapse. This was considered by the panel in the context of the NMC guidance entitled Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place, REV -2H alongside the case of *PSA v NMC & Graham [2025] EWHC 3132 (Admin)*.

The panel noted that the REV -2H guidance states: *"A panel will allow a professional to lapse with impairment where...a striking off order isn't appropriate"*.

The panel considered that a striking off order is appropriate in the circumstances of this case and subsequently did not consider it appropriate to allow the current order to lapse with a recording of impairment.

The panel noted that the findings made in Mrs Demetriou's case are wide reaching and emanate from 3 discrete referrals. In the absence of Mrs Demetriou being able to demonstrate progress in showing insight and her failure to meaningfully engage with the NMC since the original order was made, the panel was satisfied that public confidence in the professions could not be maintained if Mrs Demetriou was not struck off at this time. In the circumstances of this case, the panel subsequently determined that striking

off is now the only sanction which would be sufficient to maintain professional standards.

This striking-off order will replace the current suspension order with immediate effect in accordance with Article 30(2).

This decision will be confirmed to Mrs Demetriou in writing.

That concludes this determination.