

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Wednesday, 28 January 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:

Violetta Hajjar

NMC PIN:

95B0087O

Part(s) of the register:

Nurses part of the register Sub part 1
RN1: Adult nurse, level 1 (16 February 1995)

Relevant Location:

Hertfordshire

Type of case:

Misconduct

Panel members:

Linda Owen	(Chair, Lay member)
Yousuf Rossi	(Lay member)
Sharon Aldridge-Bent	(Registrant member)

Legal Assessor:

Ben Stephenson

Hearings Coordinator:

John Kennedy

**Nursing and Midwifery
Council:**

Represented by Ben Edwards, Case Presenter

Ms Hajjar:

Not present and unrepresented

Order being reviewed:

Suspension order (6 month)

Fitness to practise:

Impaired

Outcome:

**Suspension order (6 months) to come into effect on 4
February 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)**

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Ms Hajjar was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Ms Hajjar's registered email address by secure email on 29 December 2025.

Mr Edwards, 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 Ms Hajjar'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 Ms Hajjar 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 Ms Hajjar

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Ms Hajjar. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Mr Edwards who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Ms Hajjar. He submitted that Ms Hajjar had voluntarily absented herself.

Mr Edwards submitted that there had been no engagement at all by Ms Hajjar with the NMC in relation to these proceedings and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Ms Hajjar. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Mr Edwards and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to the 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 Ms Hajjar;
- Ms Hajjar has not engaged with the NMC and has not responded to any of the letters sent to her about this hearing;
- Ms Hajjar was not in attendance at the original hearing and had not made contact with the NMC since before the original hearing;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.

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

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to extend the current suspension order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 4 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 6 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 4 July 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 4 February 2026.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

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

'That you, a registered nurse:

1. *On 11 May 2019;*
 - a. ...
 - b. *Failed to administer prescribed medication to Resident B.*
 - c. *Signed Resident B's Medication Administration Record (MAR chart) to indicate that you had administered prescribed medication when you had not.*

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'The panel finds that the residents were put at risk and were at risk of potential physical harm as a result of Ms Hajjar's misconduct. It was of the view that Ms Hajjar's misconduct brought the reputation of the profession into disrepute and breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession.

Regarding insight, the panel considered that Ms Hajjar made no admissions and has not demonstrated an understanding of how her actions put the residents at a risk of harm, and how this impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession.

While Ms Hajjar has communicated with the NMC, she has stated that she will not engage with the regulatory process itself and as far as she is concerned she has done nothing wrong and her practice is safe.

The panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case, namely charges 1b and 1c, is capable of being addressed. Therefore, the panel carefully considered the evidence before it in determining whether or not Ms Hajjar has taken steps to strengthen her practice. However, in the absence of evidence of insight or

strengthened practice there was no evidence that the concerns had been remedied to date.

The panel is of the view that there is a risk of repetition based on the lack of evidence from Ms Hajjar as she has not addressed the medication errors and has not taken steps to strengthen her practice. The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel bore in mind the overarching objectives of the NMC: to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold and protect the wider public interest. This includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing and midwifery professions and upholding the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

The panel was satisfied that, having regard to the concerns raised in this case, the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of current impairment were not made. It was of the view that a reasonable, informed member of the public would be very concerned if, in the particular circumstances of this case, Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise were not found to be impaired and therefore public confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made.

For all the above reasons the panel concluded that Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of misconduct on both public protection and public interest grounds.'

The original 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 to take no action would do nothing to protect the public or maintain confidence in the profession. It would only be appropriate in unusual cases where, in particular, there was no risk to the public.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, an order that does not restrict Ms Hajjar's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances, as the panel has identified a risk to the public. 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 Ms Hajjar's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the misconduct identified.

The panel next considered whether placing conditions of practice on Ms Hajjar'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 took into account the SG, in particular:

- *No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- *Identifiable areas of the nurse's practice in need of assessment and/or retraining;*
- *No evidence of general incompetence;*
- *Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions;*
- *The conditions will protect patients during the period they are in force; and*
- *Conditions can be created that can be monitored and assessed.*

The panel noted that there was no insight demonstrated by Ms Hajjar or willingness to engage with the NMC regulatory process, and there is no evidence that she has reflected on or strengthened her practice. On that basis, it was of the view that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate. The panel was of the view that the reason why the error occurred is unexplained, in part because of the lack of information from Ms Hajjar as to how the episode arose. In the panel's judgement there were no practicable or workable conditions that could be formulated, given the lack of engagement of Ms Hajjar relating to the regulatory process to date.

The panel then went on to consider whether a suspension order would be an appropriate sanction. The SG states that suspension order may be appropriate where some of the following factors are apparent:

- *A single instance of misconduct but where a lesser sanction is not sufficient;*
- *No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- *The Committee is satisfied that the nurse has insight and does not pose a significant risk of repeating behaviour;*

The panel was satisfied that in this case, the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register.

The panel found the seriousness of the case requires at least temporary removal from the register. In light of the lack of engagement so far, the panel could not be assured that the public could be protected in any other way. The panel is conscious that Ms Hajjar has communicated her semi-retired status and expressed her wishes to be removed from the register. That being the case, a period of suspension would give Ms Hajjar an opportunity to make a formal application for agreed removal from the NMC register or reconsider her plans for her career and what she can do to address the failings the panel has found. In considering the appropriateness of a suspension order, the panel noted that this was a single episode of misconduct; the panel did not find any evidence of deep-seated attitudinal issues and there is no evidence of repetition of the behaviour.

The panel did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be appropriate. Taking account of all the information before it, the panel concluded that it would be disproportionate. A striking-off order would not be necessary to protect the public, as this can be achieved by a suspension order. Whilst the panel acknowledges that a suspension may have a punitive effect, it would be unduly punitive in Ms Hajjar's case to impose a striking-off order.

Balancing all of these factors the panel has concluded that a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Ms Hajjar'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. 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, and submissions made by Mr Edwards.

Mr Edwards submitted that the original panel outlined things that Ms Hajjar could do that would assist this reviewing panel, these included:

'Evidence of Continuing Professional Development (CPD); including learning around medicine management and record-keeping; A written reflective piece outlining learning from the incident; Testimonials from a line manager relating to any work undertaken, particularly in a clinical or care environment; and Ms Hajjar's attendance and participation at any future hearing'

Mr Edwards submitted that Ms Hajjar has not engaged with the NMC since before the original substantive hearing, she has not provided any evidence of CPD, there is no reflective piece from Ms Hajjar, no testimonials from her line manager, and she has not engaged with the regulatory process.

Mr Edwards submitted that there has been no information from Ms Hajjar to demonstrate that she is now able to practice kindly, safely, and effectively. He submitted that therefore Ms Hajjar's fitness to practice remains impaired on both public protection and the wider public interest.

Mr Edwards submitted that given the prolonged lack of engagement with the regulatory process, continued failure to attend hearings and failure to provide any information as to

her current impairment, a further suspension order would serve no meaningful, useful purpose. He invited the panel to consider an imposition of a striking off order as being the only appropriate sanction, given the complete lack of engagement by Ms Hajjar and her continued impairment.

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

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 Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the original substantive panel found Ms Hajjar impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds, and that at that time she had not demonstrated any insight or remediation. It noted that there has still been no engagement or information from Ms Hajjar at this hearing. She has not supplied any of the information that the previous panel suggested would be of assistance and she has not made contact with the NMC since the imposition of the order.

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 Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Ms Hajjar'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 Ms Hajjar'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 Ms Hajjar'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 Ms Hajjar'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. In view of Ms Hajjar's lack of engagement, the panel considered that any conditions of practice order would not be workable and 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 Ms Hajjar's misconduct.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Ms Hajjar further time to fully reflect on her previous failings. It considered Ms Hajjar needed to demonstrate a strengthening of practice and insight into her misconduct. The panel concluded that a further 6 months suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Ms Hajjar adequate time to develop her insight and take steps to strengthen her practice.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for the period of 6 months would provide Ms Hajjar with an opportunity to engage with the NMC and demonstrate insight, remediation, and Continuing Professional Development. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

The panel considered the submissions by Mr Edwards in regard to a striking off order. However, it considered the imposition of a striking off order at this time would be unduly punitive. It considered that extending the suspension order would allow Ms Hajjar time to present any evidence at a future reviewing panel. If Ms Hajjar continues to fail to engage with the NMC or provide any information a striking off order may be considered by a future panel.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 4 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of suspension, another panel will review the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order, or it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Evidence of Continuing Professional Development (CPD); including learning around medicine management and record-keeping;
- A written reflective piece outlining insight and learning from the incident;
- Testimonials from a line manager relating to any work undertaken, particularly in a clinical or care environment;
- A statement from Ms Hajjar regarding her intentions to return to nursing practice or otherwise; and
- Ms Hajjar's attendance and participation at any future hearing

This will be confirmed to Ms Hajjar in writing.

That concludes this determination.