

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

**Substantive Meeting
Wednesday, 29 July 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	Alexandru Gabriel Jigoreanu
NMC PIN:	16D0649C
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 Adult Nursing – level 1 (17 April 2016)
Relevant Location:	Leeds
Type of case:	Conviction
Panel members:	Graham Coulston-Herrmann (Chair, Lay member) Jennifer Portway (Lay member) Anne Sharpe (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Angus MacPherson
Hearings Coordinator:	Abigail Addai
Facts proved:	Charge 1
Facts not proved:	N/A
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Sanction:	Striking-Off Order
Interim order:	Interim suspension order (18 months)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Meeting

The panel was informed at the start of this meeting that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Mr Jigoreanu's registered email address by secure email on 24 June 2026.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the allegation, the time, date and the fact that this case should be dealt with at a meeting.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mr Jigoreanu has been served with notice of this meeting in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11A and 34 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

Details of charge

That you, a registered nurse:

- 1) On 27 February 2025 were convicted of: Making an indecent photograph/ pseudo photograph of a child Contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978.

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

Background

The NMC received a referral on 13 February 2025 from Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust ("the Trust") regarding Registered Nurse Mr Jigoreanu. Mr Jigoreanu worked as a specialist Perioperative Practitioner at the Trust but was dismissed from employment on 1 January 2025, following his arrest for distributing an indecent photograph / pseudo-

photograph of a child on the 11 January 2024. The Trust have told the NMC that upon further enquiries with the police, they had been informed that Mr Jigoreanu's bail conditions were to have *"no unsupervised contact with anyone under the age of 18"*.

On the 27 February 2025, Mr Jigoreanu pleaded guilty and was convicted at Leeds Crown Court for the offence of - Make indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child, contrary to sections 1(1)(a) and 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978. Mr Jigoreanu was sentenced to a community order in which certain conditions must be met.

Decision and reasons on facts

The charge concerns Mr Jigoreanu's conviction. The panel was provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Leeds Magistrates Court. The panel had regard to Rule 31(2) of the Rules which provides:

- '31.—** (2) *Where a registrant has been convicted of a criminal offence—*
- (a) a copy of the certificate of conviction, certified by a competent officer of a Court in the United Kingdom (or, in Scotland, an extract conviction) shall be conclusive proof of the conviction; and*
 - (b) the findings of fact upon which the conviction is based shall be admissible as proof of those facts.*

The panel therefore found the charge proved.

Fitness to practise

Having determined that the charge is found proved, the panel then considered whether Mr Jigoreanu's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of his conviction. There is no statutory definition of fitness to practise. However, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's ability to practise safely and effectively without restriction.

Decision and reasons on impairment

The NMC requires the panel to bear in mind its overarching objective to protect the public and the wider public interest. This included the need to declare and maintain proper standards and maintain public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body. The panel has referred to the cases of *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v (1) Nursing and Midwifery Council (2) Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel therefore considered whether in consequence of his conviction, Mr Jigoreanu's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*Impairment*' (Reference: DMA-1 Last Updated:28/01/2026) in which the following is stated:

'Being fit to practise is not defined in our legislation but for us it means that a professional on our register can practise as a nurse midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively without restriction.'

Nurses occupy a position of privilege and trust in society and are expected at all times to be professional and to maintain professional boundaries. Patients and their families must be able to trust nurses with their lives and the lives of their loved ones. To justify that trust, nurses must be honest and open and act with integrity. They must make sure that their conduct at all times justifies both their patients' and the public's trust in the profession.

The panel determined that Mr Jigoreanu's behaviour breached the following sections of The Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives (2018) ('the Code'):

'1 Treat people as individuals and uphold their dignity

To achieve this, you must:

1.5 respect and uphold people's human rights.

16 Act without delay if you believe that there is a risk to patient safety or public protection

To achieve this, you must:

16.3 tell someone in authority at the first reasonable opportunity if you experience problems that may prevent you working within the Code or other national standards, taking prompt action to tackle the causes of concern if you can

17 Raise concerns immediately if you believe a person is vulnerable or at risk and needs extra support and protection

To achieve this, you must:

17.1 take all reasonable steps to protect people who are vulnerable or at risk from harm, neglect or abuse

20 Uphold the reputation of your profession at all times

To achieve this, you must:

20.1 keep to and uphold the standards and values set out in the Code.

20.4 keep to the laws of the country in which you are practising .

20.5 treat people in a way that does not take advantage of their vulnerability or cause them upset or distress.'

In this regard the panel considered the judgment of Mrs Justice Cox in the case of *CHRE v NMC and Grant* in reaching its decision. In paragraph 74, she said:

'In determining whether a practitioner's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct, 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 whether the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances.'

In paragraph 76, Mrs Justice Cox referred to Dame Janet Smith's "test" which reads as follows:

‘Do our findings of fact in respect of the doctor’s misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction, caution or determination show that his/her/their fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that S/He/They:

- a) has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or*
- b) has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or*
- c) has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession; and/or*
- d) ...’*

The panel was of the view that Mr Jigoreanu’s actions in the past engaged the first three limbs of the *Grant* test. It noted that Mr Jigoreanu was in possession of indecent photographs of a child and as such, there is a risk of harm to patients, and in particular to children, should he come into contact with them in his clinical duties.

The panel considered that a member of the public would be dismayed if it failed to find that, in consequence of his actions and his conviction, Mr Jigoreanu’s fitness to practise was not impaired. In these circumstances, Mr Jigoreanu’s actions in the past brought the nursing profession into disrepute.

The panel finds that by his actions and his conviction, Mr Jigoreanu has breached fundamental tenets of the nursing profession, namely practising effectively, preserving safety and promoting professionalism and trust. It considered that these breaches demonstrate deep seated attitudinal concerns which are difficult to put right.

In terms of future risk, the panel had nothing before it to indicate that the risk has been mitigated. In these circumstances, the panel had no alternative but to conclude that there

remains a risk that Mr Jigoreanu will repeat the matters proved, place patients at unwarranted risk of harm, bring the profession into disrepute and breach fundamental tenets.

In determining whether the concerns can be addressed, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance: Insight and strengthen practice (Reference: FTP-16) which reads:

‘When assessing evidence of the nurse, midwife or nursing associate’s insight and the steps they have taken to strengthen their practice, decision makers will need to take into account the following questions:

- *Can the concern be addressed?*
- *Has the concern been addressed?*
- *Is it highly unlikely that the conduct will be repeated?’*

The panel noted that the nature of the offence is such that it would be difficult to remediate, particularly because the panel are not aware of the circumstances which led to Mr Jigoreanu’s conduct. The panel also noted the following from DMA-1:

‘Decision makers will therefore need to consider whether:

- *The conduct or behaviour was by and of itself so serious that a finding of impairment is necessary to maintain the public’s confidence and trust in the professions and to uphold, declare and maintain professional standards.*
- *The conduct or behaviour arose because of a deep seated attitudinal issue that places those receiving care at risk of harm or that undermines public confidence and professional standards.*

Whether these questions are considered separately or together will depend on the particular circumstances of the case, but if either of the above points is met, that will be sufficient to require a finding of impairment.

A finding of impairment based on public confidence or maintaining professional standards is more likely to occur in cases where the conduct breaches a fundamental tenet of the profession as set out in the Code. The following list gives

*examples of conduct that would breach the fundamental tenets of the profession (whether or not it occurs within professional practice). It is **not** an exhaustive list but gives some examples of the types of conduct where a finding of impairment is likely to be required:*

Committing specified criminal offences and other criminal offences that create risks to public confidence and professional standards'

The panel was of the view that, if it did not make a finding of impairment, there would be a risk that those in his care could be harmed. It also noted that Mr Jigoreanu's conviction is "specified" as being particularly serious in that it involved him being in possession of indecent pictures of a child. Following Mr Jigoreanu's conviction, he has not demonstrated that he has any insight, attempted to remediate his behaviour, strengthened his practice or provided any representations to address the concerns raised. Therefore, the panel has nothing before it to show how the risk has been mitigated. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that there is a risk of repetition.

The panel next considered whether a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public interest. In doing so, it had regard to the following sections of DMA-1:

'A finding of impairment on the grounds that the professional's practice needs to be restricted or marked to maintain public confidence in the professions generally, or to uphold professional standards, requires panels to consider whether the substance of the charges found proved, (whether or not the conduct occurred within the professional's clinical practice), means that there would be a risk to the public's confidence in the professions or to professional standards if the professional was permitted to practise without restrictions.

This means that in some cases, a professional's fitness to practise may be impaired even though there is no ongoing risk to the safety of people receiving care from that individual. This is because the proven concerns about their conduct or professional practice by and of themselves, were so serious that a finding of impairment is necessary to maintain the public's confidence in the profession generally and to declare and maintain professional standards.

This will also include (but is not limited to), situations where the professional's conduct, whether inside or outside their professional practice demonstrates a deep-seated attitudinal issue that could put people receiving care at risk of harm or require action to uphold public confidence and professional standards.'

The panel referred to the Guidance in relation to specified offences in FtP-2c1.

'This specified certain sexual offences which involve sexual activity or sexual motivation.... including the taking or sharing of indecent images of children.'

The panel took the above into account and was of the view that Mr Jigoreanu's actions are serious and members of the public and health care professionals, would be appalled to learn that a nurse who had indecent photographs of a child in their possession, were permitted to practise unrestricted. Accordingly, the panel determined that a finding of impairment is required on the grounds of public interest to maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and uphold proper professional standards.

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

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Mr Jigoreanu's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Sanction

The panel has decided to make a striking-off order. It directs the registrar to strike Mr Jigoreanu off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Mr Jigoreanu has been struck off the register.

In reaching this decision, the panel has had regard to all the evidence that has been adduced in this case and had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*The sanctions available*' (Reference: SAN-2 Last Updated: 28/01/2026).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Jigoreanu's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what sanction, if any, it should impose. The panel has borne in mind that any sanction imposed must be appropriate and proportionate and, although not intended to be punitive in its effect, may have such consequences. The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*The sanctions available*' (Reference: SAN-2 Last Updated: 28/01/2026). The decision on sanction is a matter for the panel independently exercising its own judgement.

The panel took into account the following aggravating feature:

- It was a conviction for a sexual offence relating to images involving child sexual abuse or exploitation.

The panel did not identify any mitigating features.

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 next considered a caution order and had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*Caution order*' (Reference: SAN-2b Last Updated: 28/01/2026) in which the following is stated:

'A caution is only appropriate if the Committee has decided there's no risk to the public or to people using services that requires the professional's practice to be restricted. This means the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired

fitness to practise, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again.'

The panel considered that Mr Jigoreanu's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum, and it found that there is a risk to patient and public safety. The panel therefore determined that a sanction that does not restrict Mr Jigoreanu's practise would not protect the public. The panel also determined that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether to place a conditions of practice on Mr Jigoreanu's registration. In considering whether conditions of practice are appropriate, the panel had regard to the factors set out in the NMC Guidance on 'Conditions of practice order' (Reference: SAN-2c Last Updated: 28/01/2026). Having regard to the nature and seriousness of Mr Jigoreanu's conduct and conviction, the panel determined that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The panel considered that there are no relevant, proportionate, workable or measurable conditions that could be formulated to protect patients and to uphold professional standards.

The panel went on to consider whether a suspension order is appropriate in this case. The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*Suspension order*' (Reference: SAN-2d Last Updated: 28/01/2026) in which the following factors as to when a suspension order may be appropriate are set out:

- *'the impairment is very serious but not fundamentally incompatible with continuing to be a registered professional*
- *an outcome less severe than strike-off would still satisfy the over-arching objective.'*

The panel also had regard to the key considerations as set out in the NMC Guidance to weigh up before imposing a period of suspension. It noted the following list of circumstances that may make a suspension order an appropriate sanction:

- *'the charges found proved are at the most serious end of the spectrum and call into question the professional's suitability to continue practising, either currently or at all*

- *while it is possible that the professional could be fit to practise in future, only a period out of practice would be sufficient to allow them to fully strengthen their practice through reflection, the development of their professional skills and / or development of insight and remediation*
- *there is a risk to the safety of people using services if the professional were allowed to continue to practise even with conditions*
- *what went wrong is so serious that public confidence in the profession and professional standards could not be maintained if the professional were able to continue practising without stopping for a period of time*
- *despite the seriousness of what happened, the professional has engaged in the proceedings and has shown at least some meaningful insight which evidences a realistic possibility that they will continue to develop this insight, address their concerns and return to practice.'*

The panel also took into account the NMC Guidance: Sanctions for the highest risk cases (Reference: SAN-4)

'There are some offences we have specified as particularly serious because they raise fundamental questions about the professional's ability to uphold the standards and values set out in the code. If a registrant has been convicted of one of these offences, it is unlikely that any sanction less than strike-off will be appropriate. This is because we do not consider that public confidence could be maintained in the profession if they remained on the register. However, the Committee will still need to consider the facts of the individual case.'

The panel was of the view that Mr Jigoreanu's conduct is serious and fundamentally incompatible with his remaining on the register. As such, it considered that a suspension order would not be sufficient to uphold public confidence in the profession and maintain professional standards due to the seriousness and nature of the facts found proved.

In this particular case, the panel determined that a suspension order would not be a sufficient, appropriate or proportionate sanction.

In considering a striking-off order, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on *'Sanctions for the highest risk cases'* (Reference SAN-4 Last Updated: 28/01/2026) which states:

'Some concerns are particularly serious and are likely to attract the strongest sanctions because they are mostly likely to risk:

- the health and safety of the public*
- public confidence in the profession*
- upholding professional standards.*

The Committee should consider the following aggravating factors (although other aggravating factors may also be present):

- Convictions for sexual offences including those relating to images or videos involving child sexual abuse or exploitation. These offences gravely undermine the public's trust in the professions. Any such conviction makes it highly unlikely the professional can uphold the standards and values set out in the Code.'*

Having regard to all of the above, the panel determined that this case falls within the definition of being a *'highest risk case'*.

The panel had regard to the following considerations as set out in the NMC Guidance entitled *'Striking-off order'* (Reference: SAN-2e Last Updated; 28/01/2026):

- Do the charges found proved raise fundamental questions about their professionalism?*
- Can public confidence in the profession be maintained if the professional is not removed from the Register?*
- Is there any amount of insight and reflection which could keep people receiving care and members of the public safe, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold professional standards?*

- *Is there a realistic prospect that, after suspension, the professional will have gained insight and strengthened their practice such that the risk they pose will have reduced?*

Mr Jigoreanu's actions represent significant departures from the standards expected of a registered nurse and are fundamentally incompatible with his remaining on the register. The panel was of the view that the findings in this particular case demonstrate that Mr Jigoreanu's actions were serious and to allow him to continue practising would undermine public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body.

Balancing all of these factors and after taking into account all the evidence before it, the panel determined that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of a striking-off order. Having regard to the matters it identified, in particular the effect of Mr Jigoreanu's actions in bringing the profession into disrepute by adversely affecting the public's view of how a registered nurse should conduct himself, the panel has concluded that nothing short of this would be sufficient in this case.

The panel considered that this order was necessary to mark the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and to send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standard of behaviour required of a registered nurse.

Interim order

As the striking-off order cannot take effect until the end of the 28-day appeal period, the panel has considered whether an interim order is required in the specific circumstances of this case. It may only make an interim order if it is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the public, is otherwise in the public interest or in Mr Jigoreanu's own interests until the striking-off sanction takes effect.

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

Decision and reasons on interim order

The panel was satisfied that an interim order is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. The panel had regard to the seriousness of the conviction and the facts thereby found proved and the reasons set out in its determination to impose a striking off order for the substantive order in reaching the decision to impose an interim order.

The panel concluded that an interim conditions of practice order would not be appropriate or proportionate in this case, due to the reasons already identified in the panel's determination for imposing the substantive order. The panel therefore imposed an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months to cover the appeal period.

If no appeal is made, then the interim suspension order will be replaced by the substantive striking off order 28 days after Mr Jigoreanu sent the decision of this hearing in writing.

This will be confirmed to Mr Jigoreanu in writing.

That concludes this determination.