

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

**Substantive Meeting  
Monday, 23 March 2026**

Virtual Meeting

**Name of Registrant:** Jerry Barrozo

**NMC PIN:** 02B17700

**Part(s) of the register:** Nurses part of the register Sub part 1  
RN1: Adult nurse, level 1 (1 February 2002)

**Relevant Location:** St Martin, Guernsey

**Type of case:** Misconduct

**Panel members:** David Hull (Chair, Lay member)  
Deborah Ann Bennion (Registrant member)  
Matthew Clarkson (Lay member)

**Legal Assessor:** Nigel Ingram

**Hearings Coordinator:** Petra Bernard

**Facts proved:** Charges 1a, and 1b

**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 that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Mr Barrozo's registered email address by secure email on 18 February 2026.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the allegations, the time, date and the fact that this meeting was heard virtually.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mr Barrozo 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) Failed to cooperate with a criminal investigation into allegations of theft of medication and other medical supplies from your workplace in that:
  - a) On 4 September 2024, did not surrender yourself to custody at Guernsey Police Headquarters at 10:00am in accordance with your bail conditions; and/or
  - b) On or about 12 July 2024, left your home in Guernsey to an unknown whereabouts.

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

## **Background**

Mr Barrozo first entered onto the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) register on 1 February 2002 as a registered nurse.

Mr Barrozo was referred to the NMC on 7 August 2024 by the Director of Care Delivery, Princess Elizabeth Hospital, Guernsey (the Hospital) raising concerns about Mr Barrozo.

The charges arose whilst Mr Barrozo was employed by the Hospital as a Band 5 staff nurse on the [PRIVATE] (the Ward). He had been employed by the Hospital since July 2020.

On 10 July 2024, Guernsey Police executed a search warrant at the Hospital's staff accommodation in relation to a separate ongoing investigation. During the Police search, a quantity of prescription medication was found in Mr Barrozo's room and on his person.

Mr Barrozo's name was not shown as the patient for whom the medication had been prescribed. A number of medical supplies including syringes and cannulas were also recovered during the search of Mr Barrozo's room.

Mr Barrozo was arrested on suspicion of possession of controlled drugs and theft however, due to the ongoing building works within the Police custody suite no further enquires were undertaken nor was Mr Barrozo interviewed by Police at this time. He was released from custody on Police bail without any specific conditions attached, other than the requirement to surrender to custody at Guernsey Police Headquarters at 10:00 on 4 September 2024.

Mr Barrozo was suspended by the Hospital on 10 July 2024.

On 12 July 2024 Mr Barrozo left Guernsey. He had indicated to the Police that he had booked a return trip to the Philippines, however, did not identify that it was imminent.

On 17 July 2024, the Hospital undertook a local investigation into the allegations of theft of medication and medical supplies. During the investigation the Hospital confirmed that some of the medication was prescribed to a patient who had been on the ward under Mr Barrozo's care.

Mr Barrozo admitted, via email, to intentionally taking some of the medication from the ward. However, he claimed much of the medication and medical supplies were taken accidentally as he had a habit of putting items in his uniform pockets and forgetting to remove them at the end of the shift.

Mr Barrozo tendered his resignation from his position with the Hospital during the investigation process.

On 4 September 2024 Mr Barrozo failed to present himself to Guernsey Police in breach of his bail conditions. Guernsey Police have advised that they will not proceed with any further investigation into the allegations unless Mr Barrozo returns to Guernsey. If Mr Barrozo should decide to return to Guernsey, a marker has been placed on his Guernsey Police file to identify the Breach of Police bail for officers to take the appropriate action.

Mr Barrozo has not engaged with the NMC at all, his mobile number is no longer in service and there have been no responses to the NMC from his emails.

### **Decision and reasons on facts**

In reaching its decisions on the disputed facts, the panel took into account all the documentary evidence in this case together with the written representations made by the NMC.

The panel was aware that the burden of proof rests on the NMC, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, namely the balance of probabilities. This means that a fact

will be proved if a panel is satisfied that it is more likely than not that the incident occurred as alleged.

The panel had regard to the written statements of the following witness on behalf of the NMC:

- Witness 1: Police Sergeant of the Island Of Guernsey Police

Before making any findings on the facts, the panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor. It considered the documentary evidence provided by the NMC.

The panel noted that whilst there are a number of references to Mr Barrozo's dishonest behaviour, dishonesty is not particularised in the charge for its consideration on facts.

The panel then considered the disputed charge and made the following findings.

### **Charge 1a and 1b**

That you, a registered nurse:

- 1) Failed to cooperate with a criminal investigation into allegations of theft of medication and other medical supplies from your workplace in that:
  - a) On 4 September 2024, did not surrender yourself to custody at Guernsey Police Headquarters at 10:00am in accordance with your bail conditions; and/or
  - b) On or about 12 July 2024, left your home in Guernsey to an unknown whereabouts.

**This charge is found proved in its entirety.**

In reaching its decisions on the facts, the panel took into account all the documentary evidence before it, including: the fact of the referral received by the NMC dated 7

August 2024; the signed witness statement of Witnesses 1 dated 23 December 2025; Guernsey Police Occurrence Enquiry Log Report; Guernsey Police Bail Conditions signed by Mr Barrozo on 10 July 2024; File note of Guernsey Police of meeting with Mr Barrozo and responses received from Mr Barrozo.

The panel had regard to the witness statement of Witness 1, which states:

*'We are unable to conclude our investigations as we believe that the registrant left the Island of Guernsey on 12 July 2024. He then returned on 16 July 2024, leaving on the same day. His whereabouts are unknown. Further details can be found in the occurrence enquiry log (OEL) report ...*

*On 4 September 2024, Mr Barrozo failed to answer police bail.'*

The panel was satisfied that the source documentation shows that Mr Barrozo was required to have surrendered to Police bail and failed to do so. The panel had sight of the Police Bail Conditions detailing the terms of his conditions, the time and date that he should surrender and that he had signed this document which indicated his acknowledgment of the time and date for his return to the specified Police Station.

The panel had regard to the follow-up information from the Police and noted that Mr Barrozo did not present himself within the allotted time. The panel further noted that in the 'Police Look Out Report', Mr Barrozo is to be arrested on sight if he was to ever cross the Guernsey border, in relation to his failure to answer Police bail, the allegation of theft, as well as other outstanding alleged criminal matters.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Barrozo was aware he was being investigated and subject to bail conditions and was under an obligation to cooperate with the criminal investigation into allegations of theft of medication and other medical supplies from his workplace. He failed to comply with the Police Bail conditions, did not surrender to custody and left his home address without notifying the required authorities. The panel therefore finds this charge proved.

## **Fitness to practise**

Having reached its determination on the facts of this case, the panel then moved on to consider, whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct and, if so, whether Mr Barrozo's fitness to practise is currently impaired. 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.

The panel, in reaching its decision, has recognised its statutory duty to protect the public and maintain public confidence in the profession. Further, it bore in mind that there is no burden or standard of proof at this stage and it has therefore exercised its own professional judgement.

The panel adopted a two-stage process in its consideration. First, the panel must determine whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct. Secondly, only if the facts found proved amount to misconduct, the panel must decide whether, in all the circumstances, Mr Barrozo's fitness to practise is currently impaired as a result of that misconduct.

## **Representations on misconduct and impairment**

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the case of *Roylance v GMC (No. 2)* [2000] 1 AC 311 which defines misconduct as a 'word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances.'

The NMC invited the panel to take the view that the facts found proved amount to misconduct. The panel had regard to the terms of 'The Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses, midwives and nursing associates 2015' (the Code) in making its decision.

In written submissions provided to the panel, the NMC identified the following specific, relevant standards in the Code where the NMC say Mr Barrozo's actions amounted to misconduct:

***'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.*

*20.2 act with honesty and integrity at all times, treating people fairly without discrimination, bullying or harassment.*

*20.3 be aware at all times of how your behaviour can affect and influence the behaviour of other people.*

*20.4 keep to the laws of the country in which you are practicing*

*20.8 act as a role model of professional behaviour for students and newly qualified*

*nurses, midwives and nursing associates to aspire to*

***23 Cooperate with all investigations and audits***

*This includes investigations or audits either against you or relating to others, whether individuals or organisations...'*

The NMC submitted that the concerns in this case are serious and relate to multiple instances of dishonesty by theft of medication and medical supplies. The dishonesty behaviour is directly linked to Mr Barrozo's professional practice and was an abuse of his position.

The NMC's position is that the allegations in this case involve a lack of cooperation with the Police's investigation into allegations of theft of medication and other medical supplies. Further, failing to cooperate with a criminal investigation suggests an attitudinal issue. The conduct involves a serious departure from the standards expected of a registered nurse and the facts are sufficiently serious to constitute misconduct.

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 accepted the advice of the legal assessor. This included reference to *Roylance and Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v (1) Nursing and Midwifery Council (2) and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) and Dame Janet Smith's test as set out in the Fifth Report from The Shipman Enquiry.

### **Decision and reasons on misconduct**

When determining whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct, the panel had regard to the terms of the Code.

The panel was of the view that Mr Barrozo's actions did fall significantly short of the standards expected of a registered nurse, and that Mr Barrozo's actions amounted to a breach of the Code, as identified by the NMC.

The panel appreciated that breaches of the Code do not automatically result in a finding of misconduct. However, the panel was of the view that Mr Barrozo was a registered nurse who was under investigation for matters of dishonest behaviour and allegedly taking medications and medical equipment from his workplace. The panel determined that Mr Barrozo was under a professional duty and obligation to cooperate with the investigation, however he fled Guernsey and did not return to answer to Police Bail.

The panel was of the view that the allegations have the potential to create a risk of harm to patients as they are linked to Mr Barrozo's clinical practice at his place of work. The panel determined that patients in need of the prescribed medication and medical supplies that Mr Barrozo had allegedly stolen, would not have had access to them as and when required. The panel determined that Mr Barrozo's course of conduct is a serious departure and did fall significantly short of the standards expected of a registered nurse and the facts are sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.

The panel determined that Mr Barrozo's actions had the potential to undermine the confidence and trust placed in the nursing profession, the wider public and the NMC as regulator.

The panel found that Mr Barrozo's actions did fall seriously short of the conduct and standards expected of a nurse and amounted to misconduct.

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

The panel next went on to decide if as a result of the misconduct, Mr Barrozo'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. 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.

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 found the three limbs a), b) and c) in *Grant* to be engaged in this case.

The panel had seen no evidence to show that Mr Barrozo's conduct had been remediated and was of the view that repetition of his past actions could put patients at risk of potential harm. The panel determined that taking medications and medical equipment from his workplace was serious and brings the profession into disrepute. Further, not engaging in the investigation process, failing to answer to Police bail and fleeing the jurisdiction are also serious matters.

The panel was of the view that honesty is the bedrock of the nursing profession and integrity is of equal importance to a nurse. The panel took account of passages from the local internal investigation which demonstrated that Mr Barrozo had possession of

medicines and medical supplies for more than four years. The panel noted Mr Barrozo's explanation for the missing items however it determined that as he has fled the country it cannot be satisfied with his explanation as it has not been subject to further enquiry or investigation.

The panel considered whether any remedial steps have been taken by Mr Barrozo. The panel could not identify any steps, given that fact that he has not surrendered to Police Bail. The panel determined that Mr Barrozo's conduct is therefore highly likely to be repeated.

The panel finds that patients were put at risk of harm as a result of Mr Barrozo's dishonest conduct by taking medicines and medical supplies from the ward which were for the treatment of patients. Mr Barrozo's misconduct had breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute. The panel was satisfied that confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if its regulator did not find charges relating to dishonest conduct extremely serious.

Regarding insight, the panel considered whether Mr Barrozo's conduct is easily remedied. The panel was of the view that his conduct could not be easily remedied as there has been no insight from him into the charges, merely answers to questions and his reasons for his behaviour. Mr Barrozo has not demonstrated an understanding of how his actions put the patients at a risk of harm or an understanding of why what he did was wrong and how this impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession.

The panel determined that there was nothing to suggest from the evidence before it that Mr Barrozo had taken any steps to strengthen his practice. Additionally, the panel took into account that there was no reflective piece provided Mr Barrozo.

The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground of public protection.

The panel bore in mind that 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 determined that a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is required. The panel determined that members of the public would be shocked if they were to learn that a nurse had acted dishonestly by taking medications and medical equipment from their workplace. Additionally, members of the public would be shocked to learn that a member of the nursing profession under Police investigation for these matters, who was required to surrender to Police bail, had failed to answer to that bail and had in fact absconded. The panel concluded that failing to mark such misconduct with a finding of impairment would undermine public confidence in the profession and the NMC as its regulator. The panel, therefore, concluded that a finding of impairment was also in the wider public interest.

In addition, the panel concluded that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore also finds Mr Barrozo's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

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

## **Sanction**

The panel has considered this case carefully and has decided to make a striking-off order. It directs the registrar to strike Mr Barrozo off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Mr Barrozo 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.

### **Representations on sanction**

The panel noted that in the Notice of Meeting, dated 18 February 2026, the NMC had advised Mr Barrozo that it would seek the imposition of a striking-off order if it found Mr Barrozo's fitness to practise currently impaired.

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

Having found Mr Barrozo'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 features:

- Abuse of a position of trust
- Conduct which deliberately or recklessly puts people receiving care at risk of suffering harm
- Deliberate breaches of the Code
- A pattern of misconduct over a period of time

The panel also took into account the following mitigating features:

- No reported patient harm

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 Barrozo'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 Barrozo's practice 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 Barrozo'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 Barrozo's conduct, 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 on 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 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.’*

Whilst the panel acknowledge that the risks identified could be managed by Mr Barrozo being temporarily removed from the register, it considered that it 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. The panel had seen no evidence that Mr Barrozo’s conduct had been remediated and concluded there was a risk of repetition of his past actions which could put patients at risk of potential harm.

Further, given Mr Barrozo's absence of engagement, no insight, lack of remorse, together with no evidence of any steps taken to address the risks identified, the panel considered that there is no realistic possibility that he would address the concerns to such a level where he could return to practise safely. Therefore, the panel determined that a suspension order would not be a sufficient, appropriate or proportionate sanction given the deep-seated attitudinal issues in this case.

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). 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?*

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 found that Mr Barrozo's actions were significant departures from the standards expected of a registered nurse, and are fundamentally incompatible with him remaining on the register. The panel was of the view that the findings in this particular case demonstrate that Mr Barrozo'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 during this case, 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 Barrozo's actions in bringing the profession into disrepute by adversely affecting the public's view of how a registered nurse should conduct themselves, 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.

This will be confirmed to Mr Barrozo in writing.

### **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 Barrozo's own interests until the striking-off sanction takes effect. The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

### **Representations on interim order**

The panel took account of the representations made by the NMC.

*'If a finding is made that Mr Barrozo's fitness to practise is impaired on a public protection and public interest basis and a striking order imposed, the NMC invites the panel to impose an 18-month interim suspension order to be imposed on the basis that it is necessary for the protection of the public and otherwise in the public interest. This is because any sanction imposed by the panel would not come into immediate effect but only after the expiry of approximately 28 days*

*after the sending of the decision letter or after any appeal is resolved. If an interim order were not imposed and Mr Barrozo lodged an appeal, he would be able to practise unrestricted until the conclusion of the appeal.'*

The panel 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 facts found proved and the reasons set out in its decision 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. The period of this order is for 18 months to allow for the possibility of an appeal to be made and concluded.

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

That concludes this determination.