Nursing and Midwifery Council
Fitness to Practise Committee

Substantive Order Review Hearing
Tuesday, 17 November 2026

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Julie Clare New
NMC PIN:	07B0167E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub part 1 RNA: Adult Nursing (Level 1) - 20 April 2007 RNLD: Learning Disabilities Nursing – 20 April 2007
Relevant Location:	Oxfordshire
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Richard Weydert-Jacquard (Chair, Registrant member) Callum Lamont (Lay member) Roisin Ann Toner (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Oliver Wise
Hearings Coordinator:	Hannah Luedke
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Sylvia Opoku, Case Presenter
Mrs New:	Not present and unrepresented
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (6 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	**Suspension order (6 months) to come into effect at the end of 25 December 2026**

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Mrs New was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Mrs New's registered email address by secure email on 7 October 2026.

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

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

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

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

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Mrs New

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mrs New. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Opoku who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Mrs New.

Ms Opoku drew the panel's attention to the email from Mrs New dated 10 November 2026 stating that Mrs New would not be attending the hearing and is content for the hearing to proceed in her absence. Ms Opoku submitted that therefore Mrs New had voluntarily absented herself and that there is no reason to believe that an adjournment of today's hearing would secure Mrs New's attendance at a future hearing.

Ms Opoku submitted that, as this is a mandatory review of the current order which is due to expire on 25 December 2026, there is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of this case, and it is therefore fair and appropriate for the hearing to proceed in the absence of Mrs New.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Mrs New. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of case presenter, the correspondence from Mrs New dated 10 November 2026, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. The main considerations were:

- Mrs New has informed the NMC that she has received the Notice of Hearing and confirmed she is content for the hearing to proceed in her absence;
- Mrs New has provided a written statement for the purpose of today's hearing;
- No application for an adjournment has been made by Mrs New;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date;
- This is a mandatory review of the current suspension order as it is scheduled to expire on 25 December 2026; 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 Mrs New.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to confirm the current suspension order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 25 December 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 nine months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 27 August 2025. This was reviewed on 19 May 2026 and the suspension order was extended for a further six months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 25 December 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 30 July 2020, you:

a) Erased and/or altered one or more entries in the Controlled Drug Book
b) Forged signature on the Controlled Drug Book
c) …..
d) Forged signature on T Mar Chart
e) Administered controlled drugs without having a witness present.

2) …..

a) …..
b) …..

3) On one more than one occasion between 07 February 2022 and 09 February 2022, you administered Haloperidol to a patient that was no longer prescribed the medication.

4) …

5) *On 03 March 2022, did not update care plans properly by using another patient's name in the care plan.*

6) *On 09 March 2022, did not record incidents in patient's notes.*

7) *On one or more occasions between 27 March 2021 and 09 March 2022, you did not attend to monitor and attend to distressed patient under your care.*

8) *Your conduct at charges 1 and/or 3 and/or 4 was dishonest, in that you intended to cover up care and medication administration errors.*

9) *….*

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:

'The panel noted that the original panel found that you had not demonstrated sufficient insight. At this hearing the panel acknowledged that you have engaged with these proceedings and attended this hearing. However, your insight into your serious misconduct, particularly the dishonesty, is limited. The panel recognised that you maintain your denial with respect to the dishonesty matters which you are entitled to do so. However, you have not shown, given the findings of the substantive panel, that you have acquired sufficient insight into those findings. The panel decided that you have not demonstrated that you know and understand why your misconduct has been found proven.

In its consideration of whether you have taken steps to strengthen your practice, the panel took into account that you have undertaken some training courses, including:

- *Medication Supporting and Assisting dated 21 August 2025*
- *Safeguarding Adults dated 29 August 2025*
- *Infectious Disease Control and Prevention dated 5 November 2025*
- *Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Essentials dated 31 August 2025*
- *Skin integrity and Pressure Ulcers dated 27 August 2025*

The panel did not see evidence as to how you applied this training in your current role and its impact on your practice.

The panel further noted that the training certificates do not directly address the duty of candour which go to the concerns identified at the substantive hearing

The last reviewing panel determined that you were liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has heard that you are currently working as a care assistant and you are hoping to return to nursing practice in the future. The panel accepted the positive testimonial from your manager but noted that they are not a registered nurse and the document did not include specific examples of your safe practice or an awareness of the fitness to practise proceedings.

The panel considered three supervision notes dated 10 February 2026, 28 April 2026 and 8 May 2026. It noted that they do not address the core concerns in this case or evidence sufficient strengthened practice. It noted that one supervision record documents a further medication error in your current role which you reported appropriately.

The panel identified a number of positive matters today. You attended the hearing, gave evidence to the panel, and have made efforts to keep up to date with clinical practice. You have also provided a testimonial from a colleague who has spoken positively about your contribution in the organisation for which you work. However, overall, the panel found that you have not demonstrated that you have focused sufficiently on the findings of the last panel. Consequently, you have not taken effective steps to

demonstrate that you have understood the seriousness of the misconduct found, strengthened your practice in the relevant areas, and developed sufficient insight into the findings made by the last panel.
In light of this, this panel determined that you are liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the ground 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 your fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

'The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow you further time to fully reflect on the previous panel's findings including your dishonesty. It considered that you need to gain a full understanding of how the dishonesty of one nurse can impact upon the nursing profession as a whole and not just the organisation that the individual nurse is working for.

The panel concluded that a further 6 month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford you adequate time to further develop your insight and take steps to strengthen your practice. It would also give you an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals to attest to your honesty and integrity in your workplace assignments since the substantive hearing.

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. This period of time would provide you with an opportunity to demonstrate sufficient insight and strengthened practice. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 25 June 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:

- *A reflective piece demonstrating insight into the finding of dishonesty made against you*
- *Evidence of more recent and in depth training particularly in relation to medication administration and the duty of candour*
- *Reflection on the impact of your training and how you would apply this in your practice*
- *A reference from a current employer, preferably a registered nurse, who is aware of these NMC proceedings*
- *Evidence that demonstrates your readiness to return to safe nursing practice'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mrs New's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as the ability of a professional on our register to practise as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively 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, including the NMC bundle and a written statement from Mrs New. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Opoku on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC).

Ms Opoku took the panel through the background of the case and referred it to the relevant pages in the panel.

Ms Opoku submitted that the previous reviewing panel found that Mrs New had demonstrated insufficient insight into the dishonest misconduct found proved at the substantive hearing. She submitted that the updated reflective piece dated 29 September 2026 in front of the panel today showed a complete absence of reflection on the misconduct charge and therefore demonstrated a lack of insight by Mrs New.

Ms Opoku further submitted that at the previous review, the panel found that Mrs New's training record was not sufficiently focused on the specific concerns raised at the substantive hearing, and was therefore insufficient to demonstrate a strengthening of Mrs New's practice. She submitted that Mrs New had not provided any further evidence on having completed any training on medication administration or the duty of candour, nor any testimonials from her current employer demonstrating a strengthened practice.

Ms Opoku submitted that Mrs New's misconduct was serious and in the absence of any evidence of her strengthened insight and practice, a risk of repetition remains on both public protection and public interest grounds.

Ms Opoku submitted that it was the NMC's position that a further suspension order would be a proportionate and appropriate sanction.

The panel 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 Mrs New's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel took into account the new information before it, including Mrs New's reflective statement dated 29 September 2026.

It had particular regard to the recommendations made by the previous reviewing panel which stated:

> *'Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:*
>
> - *A reflective piece demonstrating insight into the finding of dishonesty made against you*
> - *Evidence of more recent and in depth training particularly in relation to medication administration and the duty of candour*
> - *Reflection on the impact of your training and how you would apply this in your practice*
> - *A reference from a current employer, preferably a registered nurse, who is aware of these NMC proceedings*
> - *Evidence that demonstrates your readiness to return to safe nursing practice'*

While Mrs New had provided the panel with an updated reflective statement, the panel determined that Mrs New had shown a complete lack of insight into the dishonesty charge found proved, including the impact it had on patients, the nursing profession, the wider public and the regulator. The panel determined that while the reflective statement showed intent by Mrs New to practise as a nurse again, it did not include any evidence that the concerns raised at the substantive hearing had been addressed. For example, the reflective statement did not include any evidence on Mrs New's ability to maintain accurate records or to administer medication safely.

The panel further determined that Mrs New had not provided any evidence of having conducted further training into relevant areas such as the duty of candour, medication administration and good record keeping. As no such evidence was before the panel, it also could not draw any conclusions about how such training would have informed Mrs New's practice and prevented any similar failings from occurring again.

The panel also considered that despite Mrs New currently being employed in the healthcare sector, she had not taken this opportunity to provide the panel with references from a manager, a registered nurse or another person acting on behalf of Mrs New's employer.

The panel found that there was a disconnect between the seriousness of the misconduct found proved at the substantive hearing and the steps taken by Mrs New to address these concerns. The panel determined that Mrs New had not advanced her insight or strengthened her practice in a meaningful way since the last review despite having clear guidance on what practical steps to take.

The panel was concerned that Mrs New had not taken the opportunities to engage with the recommendations made by the previous panels to provide evidence of strengthening her practice and developing insight directly related to the misconduct found proved. The panel was concerned that should Mrs New continue to fail to reflect, that this may be indicative of a deep-seated attitudinal issue which would be incompatible with her continued registration as a nurse.

Due to lack of insight into the misconduct and a lack of meaningful progress to demonstrate a strengthening of practice, the panel determined that a risk of repetition remains. Accordingly, the panel determined that Mrs New's fitness to practise remains impaired on public protection grounds.

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 a finding of continuing impairment was necessary to maintain public confidence and to send a clear message to the public and the profession about the importance of engaging with

regulatory proceedings and demonstrating insight into matters affecting fitness to practise. As Mrs New has not demonstrated this to a sufficient degree, the panel concluded that a reasonable and informed member of the public would be deeply concerned to learn that Mrs New might be no longer impaired. Therefore, the panel determined that Mrs New's fitness to practise also remains impaired on public interest grounds.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mrs New'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 guidance on sanctions 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, as this outcome does not provide for any checks and balances to be made on any progress Mrs New may or may not make.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Mrs New's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The NMC guidance titled 'Caution order' (SAN-2b, last updated 28 January 2026) states that a caution order may be appropriate where *'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 Mrs New'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. Furthermore, as this sanction also does not provide for any checks and balances to be made on any progress

Mrs New may or may not make, the panel determined that this would be an unrealistic and disproportionate sanction.

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

The panel next considered the extension of the current suspension order.

It was of the view that a continuation of the suspension order would allow Mrs New another opportunity to fully reflect on her previous dishonesty and failings. It considered Mrs New's need to gain a full understanding of how the dishonesty of one nurse can impact upon the nursing profession as a whole, as well as patients, the wider public and the regulator. The panel concluded that a further 6 month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Mrs New adequate time to further develop her insight and take steps to strengthen their practice directly in relation to the concerns found proved. It would also give Mrs New an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals to attest to her honesty and integrity in her workplace assignments, as well as her ability to maintain accurate records and to administer medication safely and competently.

The panel was deeply concerned by Mrs New's failure to provide evidence of her strengthened practice and insight to date. It determined that should Mrs New continue to fail to meaningfully engage with these proceedings, this may point to deep-seated attitudinal issues which would be fundamentally incompatible with Mrs New remaining on the register.

The panel determined that at this point, 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 a further period of 6 months. This would provide Mrs New with an opportunity to engage with the NMC and to provide evidence of her compliance with this panel's recommendations, as outlined below.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 25 December 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:

- A reflective piece demonstrating insight into the finding of dishonesty made against Mrs New and the impact it has had on patients, her place of work at the time, the nursing profession and the wider public;

- Evidence of more recent and in-depth training, particularly in relation to medication administration, good record-keeping and the duty of candour, including details of the content and number of hours of training, as well as training certificates;

- Reflection on the impact of Mrs New's training, how she has already applied this in her practice and how she would apply it in the future;

- A reference from a current employer, preferably a registered nurse, who is aware of these NMC proceedings, discussing Mrs New's medication administration and record keeping; and

- Evidence that demonstrates Mrs New's readiness to return to safe nursing practice, including a detailed reflection on her previous failings, what steps she has taken to put them right and what measures she has put in place to prevent them from recurring.

This will be confirmed to Mrs New in writing.

That concludes this determination.