

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Monday, 29 June 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant: Violetta Hajjar

NMC PIN: 95B00870

Part(s) of the register: Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1
Adult Nursing – 16 February 1995

Relevant Location: Hertfordshire

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: Michaela McAleer (Chair, lay member)
Graham Woodham (Lay member)
Melanie Lumbers (Registrant member)

Legal Assessor: Melissa Harrison

Hearings Coordinator: Ifeoma Okere

Nursing and Midwifery Council: Represented by Shopna Roy, the Case presenter

Ms Hajjar: Not Present and unrepresented

Order being reviewed: Suspension order (6 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Striking-Off order to come into effect on 4 August 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 27 May 2026.

Ms Roy, 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 was sent to Ms Hajjar's email address which is registered with the NMC, it 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 Ms Roy who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Ms Hajjar. She submitted that Ms Hajjar had voluntarily absented herself.

Ms Roy 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. Ms Roy further submitted that there had been no response to the Notice of Hearing, no application for an

adjournment and that there was a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case because the current suspension order was due to expire. She also submitted that, should the panel make a further order, Ms Hajjar would have the opportunity to seek an early review.

In response to a question from the panel, Ms Roy confirmed that, following service of the Notice of Hearing, the NMC had sent a further email to Ms Hajjar on 22 June 2026 requesting confirmation as to whether she intended to attend the hearing. Ms Roy confirmed that no response had been received.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel decided to proceed in the absence of Ms Hajjar. In reaching this decision, the panel considered the submissions of Ms Roy and the advice of the legal assessor. It had particular regard to the relevant case law, the guidance on proceeding in the absence of a registrant and the overall interests of justice and fairness.

The panel noted that:

- No application for an adjournment had been made by Ms Hajjar;
- Ms Hajjar had not attended the original hearing or the first review hearing and was not represented on either occasion;
- Ms Hajjar had not engaged with the NMC in relation to these proceedings;
- There had been no response to the Notice of Hearing or the subsequent email sent by the NMC on 22 June 2026 requesting confirmation of whether Ms Hajjar would attend the hearing;
- There was no reason to suppose that adjourning the hearing would secure Ms Hajjar's attendance on a future date; and
- There was a strong public interest in the expeditious disposal of this mandatory review before the current suspension order expired.

The panel was satisfied that Ms Hajjar had voluntarily absented herself. In these circumstances, it determined that it was fair, appropriate and proportionate to proceed in her absence.

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 at the end of 4 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

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

The substantive suspension order was due for review on 17 December 2025. However, the review hearing was unable to proceed due to lack of time.

The order was subsequently reviewed on 28 January 2026, when a panel of the Fitness to Practise Committee determined that the Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise remained impaired and imposed a further substantive suspension order for a period of 6 months.

The current substantive suspension order is due to expire at the end of 4 August 2026.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001.

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 first reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'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.'

The first reviewing panel determined the following with regard to 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).'

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 having the skills, knowledge, good health, and good character to do their job safely and effectively. 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Roy on behalf of the NMC. She referred the panel to the determination of the previous reviewing panel, which identified the information that would assist a future reviewing panel, namely evidence of continuing professional development, a reflective piece, testimonials, evidence of strengthened practice and clarification of Ms Hajjar's intentions regarding nursing.

Ms Roy submitted that Ms Hajjar had not complied with any of those recommendations. She had not provided any evidence of continuing professional development, a reflective piece, testimonials from a line manager, or a statement regarding her intentions in relation to nursing. Nor had she attended or participated in the present hearing. Ms Roy reminded the panel that the onus was on Ms Hajjar to demonstrate that her fitness to practise was no longer impaired.

Ms Roy submitted that there was no new information before the panel to demonstrate that Ms Hajjar had reflected upon the concerns or undertaken any training to address the areas of concern. There was no evidence of remediation or reflection and, accordingly, Ms Hajjar remained liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Ms Roy submitted that the panel could not be satisfied that Ms Hajjar would not repeat the misconduct and therefore a finding of continuing impairment remained necessary on the grounds of public protection.

Ms Roy further submitted that a fully informed member of the public would be seriously concerned if a finding of impairment were not made, given the complete absence of reflection or remediation since the substantive order was imposed. Accordingly, she

submitted that Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise also remained impaired on public interest grounds.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor. It bore in mind that its primary function was to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and 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 previous reviewing panel found Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise remained impaired and imposed a further 6-month suspension order to provide her with an opportunity to engage with the regulatory process, develop insight, reflect upon the concerns found proved, strengthen her practice and provide evidence of remediation.

The panel carefully considered what, if anything, had changed since the previous review.

The panel noted that there was no new information before it demonstrating that the concerns identified by both the substantive and previous reviewing panels had been addressed. The panel had received no evidence of continuing professional development, no reflective piece, no testimonials, no evidence of strengthened practice, no evidence of maintained clinical competence and no evidence that Ms Hajjar had taken any meaningful steps to address the concerns identified against her.

The panel recalled that the original misconduct involved medication errors, namely failing to administer prescribed medication correctly and recording medication as having been administered when it had not. The panel considered these to be serious clinical concerns which had the potential to place residents at risk of harm. Members of the public would expect a registered nurse to administer medication correctly and accurately record its administration.

Considering the factors relevant to determining the current impairment as set out in the case of *Cohen [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin)*, the panel acknowledged that the original misconduct was capable of remediation. Indeed, previous panels had considered that a suspension order would provide Ms Hajjar with an opportunity to reflect upon her failings, develop insight, strengthen her practice and demonstrate remediation. However, despite two consecutive six-month periods of suspension, the panel determined that the concerns

had not been addressed and found that there had been no engagement by Ms Hajjar with the regulatory process. As such, the panel could not be satisfied that it was highly unlikely that the conduct will not be repeated.

The panel noted that the only information previously received from Ms Hajjar prior to the substantive hearing, was that she did not intend to engage with the regulatory process because, in her view, she had done nothing wrong and believed her practice to be safe. The panel had received no further communication or evidence to suggest that her position had changed. It considered that there had been no engagement throughout the two six-month periods of suspension and no indication that Ms Hajjar had acted upon the opportunities afforded to her by previous panels.

The panel considered that there had been a complete failure to act on the recommendations of the previous reviewing panel. There had been no evidence of insight, no evidence of reflection, no evidence of remediation and no evidence that Ms Hajjar had strengthened her practice or maintained her professional knowledge and skills. The panel concluded that there had been no progress whatsoever in addressing the concerns identified against her.

In light of the complete absence of engagement and any evidence of remediation, the panel determined that there remained a clear risk that Ms Hajjar was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. It was not satisfied that the risks previously identified by earlier panels had reduced. Accordingly, the panel concluded that a finding of continuing impairment remained necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel also considered the wider public interest. It determined that public confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if a finding of continuing impairment were not made in circumstances where there had been no engagement with the regulatory process, no evidence of insight, no reflection upon the misconduct and no evidence that Ms Hajjar had addressed the concerns found proved. The panel considered that proper professional standards would not be upheld if impairment were no longer found.

For these reasons, the panel determined that Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise remains impaired on the grounds of both public protection and the wider public interest.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Ms Hajjar's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what sanction, if any, should be imposed. In doing so, the panel had regard to the NMC's Sanctions Guidance (SG). It recognised that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have a punitive effect. The panel bore in mind that the primary purpose of any sanction is to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance. The panel applied the principle of proportionality and considered each available sanction in ascending order of seriousness.

The panel first considered whether to take no further action. It concluded that this would be wholly inappropriate given the seriousness of the original misconduct, the continuing finding of impairment and the ongoing public protection concerns. The panel remained satisfied that there continued to be a risk of repetition and that nothing had occurred since the previous review to reduce that risk. The panel determined that taking no further action would fail to protect the public, undermine public confidence in the profession and fail to uphold proper professional standards. It therefore concluded that taking no further action would be neither appropriate nor proportionate.

The panel next considered whether to impose a caution order. It concluded that such an order would also be inappropriate. The panel was satisfied that this case was not at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise. The original misconduct involved serious medication errors, including administering medication incorrectly and recording medication as having been administered when it had not. In addition, Ms Hajjar had demonstrated no insight, no remediation and no engagement with the regulatory process over two consecutive periods of suspension. The panel concluded that a caution order would not adequately address the continuing public protection concerns, would place no restriction on Ms Hajjar's practice and would fail to maintain public confidence in the profession or uphold proper professional standards. It therefore determined that a caution order would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest.

The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be sufficient and appropriate. It reminded itself that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, workable, measurable and capable of being monitored.

The panel acknowledged that the original misconduct was capable of remediation. It also recognised that the clinical concerns identified at the substantive hearing were, in principle, capable of being addressed through reflection, training, supervision and evidence of strengthened practice. However, as no evidence of progress has been provided, the panel determined that this was an indication that Ms Hajjar was resistant to change and that the issue before it had moved beyond the remediability of the original clinical failings to one which now suggested a deep-seated attitudinal problem.

The panel noted that Ms Hajjar had now been afforded two consecutive six-month periods of suspension during which she had been given a clear opportunity to reflect upon the concerns, develop insight, strengthen her practice and demonstrate remediation. The previous reviewing panel had expressly identified the information that would assist a future reviewing panel. Despite this, Ms Hajjar had provided no evidence of continuing professional development, no reflective piece, no testimonials, no evidence of strengthened practice, no statement regarding her future intentions and had not engaged with the NMC or participated in either review hearing.

The panel considered that workable conditions of practice would depend upon Ms Hajjar's willingness to engage with the regulatory process and comply with any restrictions imposed. Ms Hajjar had clearly stated, prior to her substantive hearing, that she did not intend to engage with the regulatory process because she believed she had done nothing wrong. Her subsequent conduct had been entirely consistent with that position. There had been no engagement whatsoever throughout the two periods of suspension and no evidence that her position had changed.

The panel also noted that there was no evidence before it that Ms Hajjar intended to return to nursing. Equally, there was no evidence that she had permanently retired or that she did not intend to practise in the future. In the absence of any engagement or information regarding her current circumstances, the panel was unable to formulate conditions that would be workable, measurable or capable of effective monitoring and enforcement.

The panel therefore concluded that a conditions of practice order would not be workable. It would neither adequately protect the public nor satisfy the wider public interest.

The panel next considered whether to impose a further suspension order.

The panel recognised that both the substantive panel and the previous reviewing panel had concluded that suspension was the appropriate sanction because the original concerns were capable of remediation. However, the panel carefully considered what had occurred since those decisions.

The panel noted that Ms Hajjar had now had two separate six-month periods of suspension during which she had been afforded every opportunity to demonstrate insight, reflection, remediation and strengthened practice. Despite those opportunities, there had been no progress whatsoever. The panel found that there had been no attempt to act upon the recommendations of the previous panels.

The panel accepted that there was no evidence of remorse, no evidence of insight into the seriousness of the misconduct, no evidence of remediation and no evidence that Ms Hajjar had maintained her professional knowledge or skills. There was also no evidence to demonstrate that Ms Hajjar intended to return to safe unrestricted practice.

The panel reminded itself of the Sanctions Guidance concerning deciding between suspension and striking off (SAN-3) last updated 28 January 2026. It noted that registered professionals are under an obligation to cooperate with their regulator. The panel further noted that the guidance makes clear that a suspension order should not ordinarily be used simply to provide a registrant with another opportunity to engage with the fitness to practise process, reflect on their misconduct or develop insight.

The panel also bore in mind that a suspension order must serve a meaningful purpose and should not be allowed to continue indefinitely where there is no realistic prospect that further time will result in remediation.

The panel concluded that another period of suspension would achieve nothing that had not already been attempted. It was satisfied that Ms Hajjar had already been given two meaningful opportunities to remediate and had chosen not to engage with the process. There was nothing before the panel to suggest that a further period of suspension would produce a different outcome.

In all the circumstances, the panel determined that a further suspension order would serve no meaningful purpose and would not represent a proportionate response.

The panel therefore concluded that the only sanction capable of adequately protecting the public, maintaining public confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance was a striking-off order.

The panel noted the Guidance on imposing a striking off order (SAN-2E). In particular, it noted the following:

- It considered that Ms Hajjar's continuing lack of engagement now raises fundamental questions regarding her professionalism. Specifically, the panel noted there had been no engagement with the fitness to practise proceedings and no attempt to remediate the concerns. The panel considered this to be indicative of a resistance to change and a deep-seated attitudinal problem.
- Whilst the original misconduct had been capable of remediation, Ms Hajjar's failure to engage with the regulatory process over a prolonged period meant that the panel could have no confidence that she would comply with future regulatory requirements or demonstrate the insight expected of a registered professional.
- The panel considered that the public confidence in the profession could not be maintained if Ms Hajjar remained on the register having shown no intention of remediation of a fundamental clinical skill. Furthermore, there is no insight or reflection which could be relied upon when considering public safety and confidence, or in upholding professional standards.
- Given there has been no engagement since prior to the substantive hearing, yet with opportunity to do so, the panel could not be satisfied that there is a realistic prospect that Ms Hajjar will gain insight or strengthen her practice such that the risk would have reduced if a further period of suspension were imposed.

The panel determined that a striking-off order was necessary and proportionate in all the circumstances of this case.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely at the end of 4 August 2026, in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001.

This decision will be confirmed to Ms Hajjar in writing.

That concludes this determination.