

General Pharmaceutical Council

Fitness to Practise Committee

Review Hearing

Remote videolink hearing

3 November 2025

Registrant name:	Sheree Danielle Ward
Registration number:	5102690
Part of the register:	Pharmacy Technician
Type of Case:	Misconduct
Committee Members:	Neville Sorab (Chair) Esosa Osakue (Registrant member) Joanna Bower (Lay member)
Committee Secretary:	Evie Davies
Registrant:	Not present and not represented
General Pharmaceutical Council:	Represented by Ayshe Sevdan, Case Presenter
Order being reviewed:	Suspension (6 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Removal
Interim Measures:	Suspension

This decision including any finding of impairment and sanction is an appealable decision under *The General Pharmaceutical Council (Fitness to Practise and Disqualification etc. Rules) Order of Council 2010*. Therefore, this decision will not take effect until 1 December 2025 or, if an appeal is lodged, once that appeal has been concluded. However, the interim suspension set out in the decision takes effect immediately and will lapse when the decision takes effect or once any appeal is concluded.

Particulars of Allegation found proved at the Principal Hearing

You, a Registered Pharmacy Technician, whilst working at HMP Five Wells Pharmacy ("the pharmacy"), 301 Doddington Road, Wellingborough, NN8 2NX

- 1. Between around mid-January 2023 to around early-mid February 2023 exchanged letters of a personal and / or romantic nature with a patient of the pharmacy ("Patient A") in circumstances where:*
 - a. You knew or ought to have known that Patient A was a vulnerable patient of the pharmacy in that he was a prisoner.*
- 2. Failed to report your interactions with Patient A to your employer and/or the superintendent pharmacist and/or HMP Five Wells.*

By reason of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

Documentation

Document 1- Council hearing bundle

Document 2- Council skeleton

Document 3- Registrant's email to the Council dated 18 September 2025

Document 4- Proof of Service bundle

Document 5- Proceeding in absence bundle

Document 6- Notice of Hearing dated 27 October 2025

Document 7- Egress report

Document 8- Email exchanges between the Registrant and the Council from 23 October 2025 to 27 October 2025

Document 9- Screenprint of email to Registrant

Introduction

1. This is the written determination of the Fitness to Practise Committee at the General Pharmaceutical Council (“the Council”).
2. The hearing is governed by *The Pharmacy Order 2010* (“the Order”) and *The General Pharmaceutical Council (Fitness to Practise and Disqualification etc. Rules) Order of Council 2010* (“the Rules”).
3. The statutory overarching objectives for these regulatory proceedings are:
 - a. To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public;
 - b. To promote and maintain public confidence in the professions regulated by the Council; and
 - c. To promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of those professions.
4. The Committee also has regard to the guidance contained in the Council’s *Good decision making: Fitness to practise hearings and outcomes guidance* as revised March 2024.
5. At a Review Hearing the Committee must decide whether the Registrant’s fitness to practise remains currently impaired and, if so, what should be the appropriate outcome. If the Committee find that the Registrant’s fitness to practise is no longer impaired the current order will lapse on expiry.

Service of Notice of Hearing

6. The Committee has seen a letter dated 27 October 2025 from the Council headed “*Notice of Review Hearing*” addressed to the Registrant at her email address. The Council has seen an email from the Registrant to the Council dated 24 October 2025 stating “*I’m happy for the council to serve me any documents via email.*” The Committee has seen evidence that the Registrant has opened the Egress email with the Notice of Hearing sent by the Registrant and the Registrant has confirmed by email that she had opened the Notice of Hearing. The Committee was satisfied that there had been good service of the Notice in accordance with Rules 3 and 17.

Proceeding in the absence of the Registrant

7. The Registrant was not in attendance at the hearing, nor was she represented. On behalf of the Council, Ms Sevdan submitted that the hearing should proceed in the absence of the Registrant on the basis that good service has been made upon the Registrant, an adjournment would unlikely result in the Registrant’s attendance in future, and that the Registrant has provided a written email *in lieu* of her attendance at the hearing dated 18 September 2025. The email sets out:

“Hope you’re well. In reference to the upcoming hearing I would like to request to leave the register as soon as possible, in the hope that they allow me to do so when it has concluded.

In terms of a contribution to the hearing, if you are able to please provide them with the following statement:

Following my suspension from the register I would like to request that I be permitted to voluntarily remove myself permanently. I recognise the severity of my transgression and have made steps to understand why this happened and how to prevent it recurring. Having spent a substantial amount of my working life exclusively in pharmacy I have decided it is not in my interest to continue in the industry. By no means am I stating it is anyone else’s fault than mine that what happened transpired, but the feeling of alienation from my peers in healthcare settings led me to finding more rapport with prisoners than other pharmacy technicians. Not only that but following the determination being published I was dismissed from my latest position in pharmacy. I no longer have any desire to pursue any kind of position in or around pharmacy and I wish to put this part of my life behind me.”

8. Furthermore, the Committee is in receipt of an email from the Registrant to the Council dated 27 October 2025, which sets out: *“I wont be attending”*.
9. The Committee decided to proceed in the absence of the Registrant for the following reasons:
 - a. The Committee found good service of Notice.
 - b. The Registrant has expressly absented herself from the hearing.
 - c. There was no information to suggest an adjournment would result in the Registrant’s attendance in future.
 - d. There are public protection concerns in this case and a public interest in the case being considered prior to the expiry of the outcome of suspension imposed at the principal review hearing.

Hearing history

- Principal Hearing (7-9 April 2025) – Suspension (6 months)
- The current suspension is due to expire on 7 November 2025.

Principal Hearing

10. The Principal Committee, sitting on 7-9 April 2025 found proved the allegations set out above and found that the Registrant’s fitness to practise was impaired.

11. At the Principal Hearing, the Registrant admitted allegations 1 and 2. By the application of Rule 31(6), the admitted factual allegations, which were all in this matter, were found proved.
12. When finding the Registrant's fitness to practise impaired, the Principal Hearing Committee identified:
 - a. that the Registrant has shown some insight, given:
 - i. She has admitted to the allegations; and
 - ii. She has reflected upon the impact of her actions on Patient A, other prisoners, her colleagues and the pharmacy profession.
 - b. however, the Principal Hearing Committee considers that the Registrant's insight is not complete, given:
 - i. There is limited reflection into why she responded and engaged with Patient A for two-and-a-half weeks.
 - ii. There is limited reflection as to what she would have done if she had not been caught; i.e. how she would have ended the letter exchange.
 - iii. Although she has said that she is no longer in contact with the demographic of prisoners, she has not reflected upon how she would currently maintain boundaries with any patient.
 - iv. No insight was provided as to why she did not raise the letter exchange to the appropriate prison staff members.
 - c. the Principal Hearing Committee considered that the Registrant has not completed any remediation, given:
 - i. Although she has completed level 3 safeguarding training, which would have made the Registrant aware of boundaries, the allegations still occurred.
 - ii. The Registrant has not supplied the Committee with any training which goes towards the allegations or towards the upkeep of her pharmacy practice.
 - iii. REDACTED
13. Consequently, the Principal Hearing Committee considered that the Registrant's conduct or behaviour:
 - a. may be repeated, which presents an actual or potential risk to patients or to the public.
 - b. might bring the profession of pharmacy into disrepute in the future.

- c. might breach one of the fundamental principles of the pharmacy profession in the future.
 - d. might breach one of the fundamental principles of the pharmacy profession in the future.
- 14. The Principal Hearing Committee considered the Registrant's fitness to practise to be impaired on the personal element and in the wider public interest, namely maintaining public confidence in the pharmacy profession and upholding professional standards.
- 15. Turning to outcome, the Principal Hearing Committee concluded that neither taking no action nor a warning would be sufficient to protect the public or meet the wider public interest of maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
- 16. The Principal Hearing Committee considered whether conditional registration would adequately protect the public but concluded that no relevant or proportionate conditions could be formulated to mitigate risk from the Registrant repeating her misconduct. Further, the Principal Hearing Committee considered that conditions would not adequately meet the wider public interest of maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
- 17. Accordingly, the Principal Hearing Committee concluded that the only sanction sufficient to protect the public was a suspension order. The Principal Committee concluded that the correct period was for 6 months to mark the seriousness of the Registrant's actions, namely:
 - a. exchanging letters of a personal and / or romantic nature with Patient A, a vulnerable patient of the pharmacy; and
 - b. failing to report her interactions with Patient A to her employer and/or the superintendent pharmacist and/or HMP Five Wells.
- 18. The Principal Hearing Committee indicated that a review Committee would likely be assisted by:
 - a. A submission of a reflective piece in which the Registrant covers:
 - i. why she responded and engaged with Patient A for two-and-a-half weeks.
 - ii. what she would have done if she had not been caught; i.e. how she would have ended the letter exchange.
 - iii. why she did not raise the letter exchange to the appropriate prison staff members.
 - iv. how she would currently maintain boundaries with any patient.
 - b. That she undertakes, and provides evidence of, relevant training in the following areas:

- i. Safeguarding; and
 - ii. General, up-to-date pharmacy technician practice.
- c. REDACTED
- d. Character witness references reflecting how the Registrant is behaving in the workplace, in particular her interaction with vulnerable patients. More weight is likely to be given to any reference by those referees who know of the allegations.

Current position

19. A Case Administrator from the Council has provided a witness statement signed and dated 29 September 2025 which sets out that the Registrant confirmed by email on 12 September 2025 that she had been compliant with the suspension.

Submissions

20. On behalf of the Council, Ms Sevdan made the following submissions:
- a. The Registrant provided a statement to the Council on 18 September 2025. In that statement, she has acknowledged the “*severity of [her] transgression*” and states that she has made steps to understand why this happened and how to prevent it from recurring. She does not, however, elaborate on those steps, nor address the points suggested by the Principal Hearing Committee. The Registrant has also not provided any evidence of having undertaken the remediation activities suggested by the Principal Hearing Committee, nor evidence of engagement with her GP or a mental health practitioner. The Council notes the following, which may provide some context and explanation as to why the Registrant has not addressed the points raised by the Principal Hearing Committee:
 - i. the Registrant states that she has left the pharmacy profession and that she no longer has any desire to pursue any kind of position in or around pharmacy;
 - ii. the Registrant states that she was dismissed following the publication of the Principal Hearing determination; and
 - iii. the Registrant wishes to voluntarily remove herself from the Council’s register (and appears to be under the misapprehension that this Committee can approve such a request at the PHR).
 - b. The Council accepts that, in circumstances where the Registrant has been dismissed from her role as a pharmacy technician as a result of the misconduct, undertaking further training and obtaining character references reflecting how she is behaving in the workplace may not have been feasible or achievable. In any event, these activities were suggestions, not conditions, made by the Principal

Hearing Committee and the Registrant's failure to engage in these activities should not, in and of itself, support a finding of current impairment.

- c. The Council also accepts that, in circumstances where the Registrant appears to be under the misapprehension that this Committee may use the PHR forum to consider an application for voluntary removal, she may not have considered addressing the matters set out by the Principal Hearing Committee in her reflection piece to be necessary. To that end, the Council reiterates that the Registrant is not legally represented and is navigating these proceedings as a self-represented party.
 - d. Notwithstanding the above, the Council remains mindful that the remediation efforts evidenced by the Registrant are limited to one brief reflection piece, which focusses primarily on the Registrant's desire to remove herself from the Register. No further evidence of insight or remediation has been provided to the Council or indeed, the Committee. In those circumstances, the Council does not consider that the Registrant has sufficiently demonstrated that the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment through misconduct have been addressed. Therefore, the Registrant has not, on the Council's submission, discharged the burden imposed on her.
 - e. This is not a case where the Council considers the Registrant's misconduct to be so egregious that, looking forward, the Registrant is not fit to practise. Indeed, the Council considers the misconduct to be remediable, should the Registrant wish to do so. However, on the evidence presently available, the Council does not consider there to be a sufficient basis for this Committee to depart from the Principal Hearing Committee's conclusion that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired.
 - f. Should the Committee agree with the Council's submission that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired, it is open to the Committee to impose a further suspension to allow the Registrant additional time to complete some or all of the remediation activities suggested by the Principal Hearing Committee and/or any other activities which may demonstrate remediation and insight. However, in circumstances where the Registrant has not completed any of the suggested remediation activities to date and has expressed a clear desire not to pursue a career in or around pharmacy, the Council considers it unlikely that the imposition of a further suspension would achieve any meaningful outcome.
 - g. The Committee may, alternatively, consider removing the Registrant's entry from the Council's register. The Council considers this to be the more appropriate outcome in circumstances where the Registrant has expressed, in unequivocal terms, that she does not wish to continue in the profession and, therefore, would likely have little incentive to prove her fitness to practise by way of remediation efforts at a further PHR.
21. The Registrant did not provide any written submissions, other than those set out at paragraph 7 above, nor attended to provide oral submissions.

Decision

22. The Committee considered whether the Registrant's fitness to practise remains impaired. The Committee has taken into account all of the documentation before it, and the submissions on behalf of the Council.
23. The Committee recognised and applied the following guidance in *Abrahaem v GMC [2008] EWHC 183*:

"...the review has to consider whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment through misconduct have been sufficiently addressed to the Panel's satisfaction. In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments."
24. The Committee found the Registrant's current fitness to practise to still be impaired on the basis that:
 - a. The Committee has not seen any further insight from the Registrant to develop her limited insight from the Principal Hearing.
 - b. The Committee has not seen any evidence of remediation from the Registrant, including that proposed by the Principal Hearing Committee, as set out in paragraph 18 above.
25. Consequently, the Committee considered that the Registrant does not have insight, and has not remediated her practice. The Registrant's return to practice, unrestricted, would place patients at risk of harm. Furthermore, the Committee considered the Registrant's fitness to practise to be impaired in the wider public interest, namely maintaining public confidence in the pharmacy profession and upholding professional standards.
26. The Committee went on to consider an appropriate and proportionate outcome in the circumstances.
27. The Committee considers that the Registrant's limited insight and a lack of evidence of remediation, makes taking no action or imposing a warning insufficient to protect the public, and therefore, inappropriate.
28. The Committee considered that the imposition of conditions would not be appropriate and proportionate to mitigate any risks posed to patients or in the wider public interest, given:
 - a. no workable conditions could be formulated while the Registrant remained without insight, or remediation to her practice; and

- b. given her indication that she no longer wishes to be a pharmacy technician, there could be no confidence that she would comply with any conditions.
- 29. The Committee next considered whether the continuation of a suspension would be appropriate and proportionate to mitigate any risks posed to patients or in the wider public interest. The Committee considered it would not, given:
 - a. the Registrant's indication that she no longer wishes to be a pharmacy technician or engage in any pharmacy regulated activity; and
 - b. the Registrant's consistent message that she no longer wishes to be part of the profession, has no wish to engage to engage with this process, and that the continuation of these proceedings is taking an adverse toll on her REDACTED.
- 30. In light of the above, the Committee found that removal from the register is the only appropriate and proportionate outcome. The Committee therefore directs that the Registrant be removed from the Council's Register.

Interim Measures

- 31. Ms Sevdan made an application for an interim measure of suspension to be imposed on the Registrant's registration, to take effect from today's date, pursuant to Article 60 of the Pharmacy Order 2010, pending the coming into force of the Committee's substantive order. She submitted that an interim measure would be consistent with the substantive order imposed by the Committee. The Registrant was not present to comment on the application.
- 32. In considering Ms Sevdan's application, the Committee took account of its decision to remove the Registrant from the register will not take effect until 28 days after the Registrant is formally notified of the outcome, or until any appeal is concluded.
- 33. The Committee has found that the Registrant is still impaired and there remains a risk to the public, and in the wider public interest, should the Registrant be permitted to return to work unrestricted. It accepted the submissions of Ms Sevdan that his unrestricted registration would risk public protection.
- 34. The Committee is satisfied that it is therefore appropriate for an interim measure to be in place prior to the taking effect of the substantive order.
- 35. The Committee has therefore imposed an interim measure of suspension from today's date, pending the coming into force of the substantive order.
- 36. This concludes the determination.