



ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY
SURGEONS DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE
INQUIRY RE:

MISS ABBIE TOWN RVN

DECISION OF DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

The Charge

That, being registered in the Register of Veterinary Nurses:

1. On 2 July 2008 at the Huddersfield Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of theft (shoplifting), contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968, more particularly theft on 24 June 2008 of confectionary and beauty products to the value of £16.84 belonging to Asda Stores Ltd., in relation to which offence, on 16 July 2008, at the Huddersfield Magistrates' Court, you were sentenced to a 12 month community order with a 12 month supervision requirement and were ordered to pay costs of £60;
2. On 24 December 2008, you committed the offence of using threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, with intention to cause fear or provocation of violence, contrary to section 4(1)(a) of the Public Order Act 1986, in relation to which offence, on 8 June 2009 at the Bradford Crown Court, you were convicted following a guilty plea, and were given a 12 month conditional discharge;
3. On 15 January 2010, at the Huddersfield Magistrates' Court, you were convicted,

following a guilty plea, of theft (shoplifting) contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968, more particularly theft on 23 December 2009 of clothing and accessories to the value £85.12 belonging to Primark, in relation to which offence you were sentenced to a 12 month community order with an unpaid work requirement of 40 hours days, and ordered to pay costs Of £60;

4. On 24 March 2010 at the Calderdale Magistrates' Court you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of breaching the community order imposed on 15 January 2010, more particularly by failing, without reasonable excuse, to attend unpaid work sessions on 23 January 2010 and 28 February 2010, in relation to which offence you were sentenced to 10 further hours of unpaid work to be added to the original community order of January 2010;
5. In the Bradford Crown Court, on 10 January 2011, you were sentenced to nine months' imprisonment, suspended twelve months, in relation to the following, namely:
 - a affray, contrary to section 3 of the Public Order Act 1986 (offence date 28 November 2009), with regards to which offence you were convicted on 24 November 2010; and
 - b handling stolen goods, contrary to section 22(1) of the Theft Act 1968 (offence date 19 March 2010), with regards to which offence you were convicted on 7 December 2010;
6. On 17 August 2011, at the Wakefield Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of theft (shoplifting) contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968 (offence date 16 August 2011), in relation to which offence you were sentenced to a community order, with a curfew requirement and electronic tagging; and, with regards to the fact that you had committed an offence during the course of a suspended sentence, you were ordered to continue with a supervision requirement, together with the curfew requirement and electronic tagging imposed above;
7. On 19 January 2012, at the Calderdale Magistrates' Court you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of:
 - a theft (shoplifting) contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968, more particularly theft on 3 December 2011 of a sandwich to the value of £2.00 and a bottle of milk to the value of £1.34, both belonging to One Stop Shop; and
 - b committing an offence during the course of a suspended sentence;

in relation to which offences, on 23 February 2012, at the Bradford Crown Court you were sentenced to 28 days' imprisonment;

8. On 16 August 2012, at the Leeds District Magistrates' Court, you were convicted,

following a guilty plea, of failing to surrender to custody, more particularly in that you failed without reasonable excuse to surrender to custody at Leeds Magistrates' Court, having been released on bail on 29 July 2012 at a West Yorkshire Police station, in relation to which offence you were fined £70 and directed to pay a victim surcharge of £15;

9. On 23 August 2012, at the Leeds District Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of theft (shoplifting) contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968, more particularly theft on 8 August 2012 of clothing to the value of £65.00 belonging to JD Sports, in relation to which offence you were fined £70 and directed to pay a victim surcharge of £15 and £85 in costs;
10. On 10 October 2012, at the Leeds District Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of resisting or obstructing a police officer, contrary to section 89(2) of the Police Act 1996 (offence date 28 July 2012) and given a conditional discharge for six months, which, on 11 February 2013 at the Kirklees Magistrates Court, was revoked and instead you were sentenced to a community order;
11. On 31 December 2012, at the Kirklees Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of theft contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968, more particularly, theft on 9 December 2012 at Yates Bar, King Street, Huddersfield, of a handbag and contents to the value of approximately £600, belonging to EV, in relation to which offence, on 11 February 2013 at the Kirklees Magistrates Court you were sentenced to a community order with an activity requirement and directed to pay compensation of £300;
12. On 2 January 2013, you committed the offence of theft (shoplifting) contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968, more particularly theft of a Topic bar to the value of £0.72 belonging to Newstrack Newsagents, in relation to which offence, on 28 August 2013, at the Kirklees Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, were given a conditional discharge and ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £15;
13. On 16 January 2019, at the West Yorkshire Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of resisting or obstructing a police officer (offence date 25 December 2018), contrary to section 89(2) of the Police Act 1996, more particularly in that you wilfully obstructed a Police Sergeant in the execution of his duty, in relation to which offence you were fined £40 and directed to pay a victim surcharge of £30 and £85 in costs
14. In May 2020, you committed offences as follows, in relation to which, on 26 August 2020, at the West Yorkshire Magistrates' Court, you were convicted following a guilty plea:
 - a On 19 May 2020, theft (shoplifting) contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968, more particularly theft on 19 May 2012 of items of alcohol to the value of £190

belonging to Sainsbury's, in relation to which you were given a conditional discharge and ordered to pay compensation of £190, a victim surcharge of £22 and £85 in costs; and

- b On 29 May 2020, theft (shoplifting) contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968, more particularly theft on 29 May 2012 of items of alcohol to the value of £91 belonging to Sainsbury's, in relation to which you were given a conditional discharge; and

15. On 17 November 2020, at the West Yorkshire Magistrates' Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of theft (shoplifting) contrary to section 1 of the Theft Act 1968;

AND it is alleged that the above convictions at charges 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and/or 15, whether individually or in any combination, render you unfit to practise as a registered veterinary nurse;

AND/OR it is alleged that, in relation to the matters set out above at charges 2 and/or 12 and/or 14(i) and/or 14(ii), whether individually or in any combination, you are guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.

During its final deliberations, the Committee noted a typographical error regarding the dates of the offences in Charge 14(i) and (ii) in that there was a reference to 2012 when the correct year, as made clear from the Memorandum of Conviction, was 2020. The Committee considered this and decided that, on the basis of the Respondent's admissions, and the Memorandum of Conviction, it was fair to note this typographical error, and proceed on the basis that the correct year of the offences was 2020, according to the understanding of both parties and indeed the Committee, since the commencement of the hearing.

Preliminary Issues

Application for privacy

1. The Respondent applied for anonymisation, so that she would not be identified in any publication of the Committee's decision.

[REDACTED]

2. Ms Curtis, on behalf of the College, stated that there was no objection to those parts of the hearing referring to the [REDACTED] being heard in private, and that that was the usual approach of disciplinary committees to such matters. Ms Curtis objected to the entirety of the hearing taking place in private,

or for the Respondent's name to be anonymised, on the basis that there were no exceptional circumstances in this case which were necessary to wholly derogate from the principle of open justice.

3. Ms Curtis referred to the general rule encapsulated in Rule 21 of the Veterinary Surgeons and Veterinary Practitioners Disciplinary Committee (Procedure and Evidence) Rules 2004 ("the 2004 Rules"), (which applies by virtue of Rule 13 of the Veterinary Nurse Conduct and Discipline Rules (2014), along with the rules and procedures of the Disciplinary Committee in general). Ms Curtis also referred to extracts from the Disciplinary Committee Manual (November 2022) including paragraphs 105-108, 110-111, Article 6(1) of the European Convention on Human Rights, as well as a number of authorities.
4. Ms Curtis submitted that the principle of open and transparent justice was clear, attested to in both criminal and civil law and procedure, and was a part of the public interest in transparent disciplinary proceedings open to public scrutiny. Ms Curtis submitted that the burden is on the party seeking a derogation from that principle to persuade the Committee that it is necessary according to exceptional circumstances. Ms Curtis reminded the Committee that the matter of the Respondent's convictions were already in the public domain. Ms Curtis submitted that the GP letter relied on by the Respondent fell far short of demonstrating compelling reasons [REDACTED]
5. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor who, within her advice, referred to the cases of V & T & Anor [2014] EWHC 3432, Lu v SRA [2022] EWHC 1729 and MXM v GMC [2022] EWHC 817 (Admin).
6. The Committee considered the matter. Rule 21 of the 2004 Rules sets out the general rule that hearings shall be in public, although a Committee may derogate from this if it would appear to be in the interests of justice. The Committee has a discretion to hear matters in private, and also anonymise the identity of the Respondent, noting that there was no discretion to deliver its findings or judgments in private. The Committee also took into account the importance of the rule of open justice, in that the general rule was that the hearing should be in public. It could hear matters in private, as a matter of its discretion, taking into account Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (right to respect for private and family life).
7. Taking all the circumstances into account, the Committee did not find that there were any exceptional circumstances which would justify anonymisation. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] However, in this regard the Committee took into account that the case before the Committee revolved around a number of convictions and criminal offences which led to conditional discharges which were previously in the public domain by virtue of being dealt with by the criminal courts. [REDACTED]

8. The letter from the Respondent's GP expressed that potentially a public decision of this Committee would have a [REDACTED] impact on the Respondent which would go beyond the normal stress that might be expected to result from regulatory proceedings. Further, the GP highlighted a number of health issues which formed a context to that opinion. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] That level of detail was not set out in the GP's report. In any event, the Committee was not satisfied that the GP's letter was sufficient to meet the threshold of exceptional circumstances in this case.
9. The Committee therefore did not accede to the Respondent's application.
10. However, the Committee determined that any reference to [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] any other particularly personal information would be dealt with in private.

Background

11. The Respondent is a registered veterinary nurse (RVN) . Prior to her registration as a RVN, the Registrant was convicted of a number of criminal offences. In addition, the Respondent committed a number of criminal offences which resulted in a conditional discharge. The Charges are set out in the Charge above. All convictions were spent prior to the Respondent registering as a RVN.

The Committee's findings of fact

12. The Committee was aware that the College must prove its case on the facts to the requisite standard, namely that the Committee is satisfied so that it is sure on each head of charge.
13. The Respondent admitted all the factual charges.
14. The Committee read the Inquiry bundle which contained the Memoranda and/or Certificates of Convictions for the convictions and offences at Charges 1, Charge 2, Charge 3, Charge 4, Charge 5, Charge 7, Charge 8, Charge 9, Charge 10, Charge 11, Charge 12, Charge 13, Charge 14, The Committee saw the Police National Computer (PNC) entries which set out the offences at Charge 6, and 15. The Committee read the written submissions of Ms Curtis on the facts.
15. The Committee accepted that the certified copy of the certificates of conviction was proof of the convictions to which they related , pursuant to Rule 23.3(a) of the 2004 Rules"). Taking account all of the evidence, and the fact that the Respondent admitted all the facts, the Committee found all the factual allegations proved.

The Committee's decision on

- i. whether the convictions render the Respondent unfit to practise as a RVN; and
- ii. whether in relation to the matters set out in Charges 2 and/or 12 and/or 14(i) and/or 14(ii), the Respondent is guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.

16. The Committee took into account Ms Curtis' submissions, which included reference to her written submissions. Ms Curtis submitted that the matters to be decided by the Committee were for its own judgment and that there was no standard of proof to be applied. With regard to conviction cases, the Committee should examine the nature and circumstances of the offences as well as the aggravating and mitigating features relating to the nature and circumstances of the convictions. Ms Curtis reminded the Committee that with regard to disgraceful conduct, this was conduct that fell far short of what was expected of the member of the profession. Ms Curtis reminded the Committee that personal mitigation was not relevant at this stage. Ms Curtis informed the Committee that the Respondent was not under an obligation to disclose the convictions to the RCVS because they were spent but had done so formally in June 2025 prior to joining the register of veterinary nurses. She was informed by the RCVS that if she joined, the matters would be referred to the RVN Preliminary Investigation Committee (PIC). The Registrant joined the register on 26 June 2025. The matters were then forwarded to the Disciplinary Committee.

17. The Respondent had submitted a personal statement and letters to the RCVS contained in the Inquiry bundle and in her own bundle.

18. She also gave evidence under affirmation at this stage of the hearing.

19. The Respondent told the Committee that she was responsible for all her actions and did not seek to excuse them. However, she told the Committee of difficulties

[REDACTED]

She spoke of associating with people who had been in care, who were also associates of her then partner, and she began committing criminal offences. The Respondent referred to the fact that most of the offences were dishonesty offences and she told the Committee that she had lost everything

[REDACTED]

20. The Respondent told the Committee that she felt for the victims of her offences and felt remorse. She matured,

[REDACTED] the Respondent wished to turn her life around

[REDACTED]

21. The Respondent stated that the convictions at Charges 13, 14 and 15 occurred because [REDACTED] and she relapsed in her offending, which she regrets.
22. The Respondent explained that she had always wanted to be a veterinary surgeon when growing up. She considered that this was not possible at her age, but considered that being a RVN was possible. She contacted the RCVS in August 2021 to ask for advice and spoke to a member of staff about her convictions, who gave her advice by telephone and email and told her that there was a possibility of a disciplinary hearing if she did apply to join the register. She considered it worth the risk. The Respondent told the Committee that although she was not under an obligation to tell the RCVS about the convictions because they were spent, she explained she chose to because she felt they should be discussed. One of her duties as a professional was to act with honesty and integrity, and she stated that she did that from the start with the RCVS. The Respondent stated that being a member of a profession had led her to take responsibility and understand herself more due to reflecting on the matters, and that being a part of the profession had made her a better person. She had worked to rebuild trust and uphold her professional standing. She expressed her dedication to the profession, having undertaken a degree, and was aiming to undertake a masters degree. She wished to develop her knowledge and gain skills and asked the Committee to consider the person she was today, not the person she used to be.
23. The Committee was aware that some of the Respondent's evidence, as set out above, related to matters or events which had occurred since the criminal offending and some of the evidence related to personal mitigation which was not relevant at this stage. The Committee was advised about this by the Legal Assessor and as a result the Committee did not take into account such material at this stage.

The Committee's decision on whether convictions (as set out in Charges 1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13 and 15) render the Respondent unfit to practise as an RVN

24. The Committee took into account the relevant parts of the Respondent's evidence, as explained above, as well as Ms Curtis' submissions. The Respondent did not accept that her convictions rendered her unfit to practice as a RVN.
25. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor. The Committee noted that whether the convictions render the Respondent unfit to practise is a matter for the Committee's independent judgment, and that there is no burden of proof on either party.
26. The Veterinary Nurse Conduct and Discipline Rules 2014 provide:

"13. The Veterinary Nurse Disciplinary Committee shall adopt, with any necessary modifications, the rules and procedures of the Disciplinary Committee."

27. The Committee took into account paragraph 25 of the Disciplinary Committee Sanctions Guidance (the 2020 Guidance) which states:

"A conviction may be related to professional or personal behaviour and whether it renders a respondent veterinary surgeon unfit to practice is a matter of judgment for the Disciplinary Committee. Behaviour unconnected with the practice of veterinary

surgery can cause concerns about the protection of animals or the wider public interest”.

28. The Committee took into account the Code of Professional Conduct for Veterinary Nurses (the Code) which states:

“6.5 Veterinary nurses must not engage in any activity or behaviour that would be likely to bring the profession into disrepute or undermine public confidence in the profession.”

29. The Code also refers to honest and integrity as principle of practice.

30. The Committee considered the nature and circumstances of the offences, as well as the aggravating and mitigating factors relating to the circumstances of the convictions. It took into account that these were spent convictions which occurred several years prior to registration. The Committee considered each conviction separately.

31. The Committee took into account the following aggravating factors:

- i. dishonesty
- ii. financial gain
- iii. sustained pattern of criminal offending.

32. The Committee took into account the following mitigating factors:

- i. no actual harm or risk of harm to any animal or human
- ii. no concerns raised about the Respondent’s competence or quality of her practice.

33. Eight of the Charges relate to convictions for dishonesty. The convictions in Charges 1, 3, 7, 9 and 15 were for theft (shoplifting). Charge 6 relates to a further conviction for theft. Charge 11 related to theft of a handbag and contents worth £600 belonging to an individual. A part of the conviction in Charge 5 relates to handling stolen goods. These instances of dishonesty, were individually serious matters, and struck at the heart of the fundamental tenet of honesty in the profession and would undermine public confidence in the profession.

34. The conviction in Charge 6 for theft was an offence committed during the course of a suspended sentence. The conviction in Charge 7 for theft was also committed during the course of a suspended sentence, and led to a sentence of imprisonment for 28 days. These aspects aggravated the seriousness of the convictions.

35. Part of the conviction in Charge 5 relates to affray which is a public order offence. The Committee conclude that this behavior in public was a serious matter which would undermine public confidence in the profession. In addition, the conviction in Charge 5 led to the imposition of a nine month sentence of imprisonment suspended for 12 months, which aggravated its seriousness and the impact on public confidence in the profession.

36. Charge 4 involved a conviction for breach of a community order, namely failing to attend two unpaid work sessions on two occasions in January and February 2010. This was a breach of a legal requirement to comply with a court order. The conviction in Charge 8 was an offence of failing to surrender to custody, and again, a breach of a legal requirement to comply with bail. Such behaviour undermined the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.
37. Charges 10 and 13 relate to convictions for resisting or obstructing a police officer. Such behaviour in failing to comply with an officer of the law also undermined public confidence in the profession.
38. The Committee took the view that each Charge was serious, and brought the profession into disrepute. To find otherwise would undermine public confidence in the profession and fail to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
39. The Committee concluded that each Charge referred to above, both individually and in combination, rendered the Respondent unfit to practise as a RVN.
40. The Committee took into account the relevant parts of the Respondent's evidence, as explained above, as well as Ms Curtis' submissions. The Respondent did not accept that the matters in Charges 2, 12 and/ or 14 meant that she was guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.
41. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor.
42. The Committee took into account the 2020 Guidance. The Committee noted that it was entitled to take into account the aggravating and mitigating factors in the case provided they did not amount to personal mitigation. The question of whether conduct amounts to disgraceful conduct in a professional respect is a matter of judgement for the Committee, and not a matter of a burden or standard of proof. The Committee must consider whether the matters found proved fell far below the required standards in the circumstances in question, such that they reach the required level of seriousness to constitute disgraceful conduct.
43. The Committee took into account the Code which states:

“6.5 Veterinary nurses must not engage in any activity or behaviour that would be likely to bring the profession into disrepute or undermine public confidence in the profession.”
44. The Code also refers to honesty and integrity as a principle of practice.
45. The Committee took the view that the Respondent had breached the above provisions of the Code, albeit prior to her admission to the register. The Committee was mindful that not every breach of the Code meant that the conduct in question necessarily constituted disgraceful conduct.

46. In considering whether the conduct amounted to disgraceful conduct in a professional respect the Committee had regard to the public interest which includes protecting the health and welfare of animals, maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
47. The Committee considered whether each charge, either individually or in combination, could amount to disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.
48. The Committee took into account the following aggravating factors:
- i. dishonesty
 - ii. financial gain
 - iii. sustained pattern of criminal offending.
49. The Committee took into account the following mitigating factors:
- i. no actual harm or risk of harm to any animal or human
 - ii. no concerns raised about the Respondent's competence or quality of her practice.
50. Charge 2 related to a conviction for a public order offence, namely using threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, with intention to cause fear or provocation of violence. Such conduct fell far below the standards expected of a member of the profession and undermined public confidence in it. The Committee concluded that this conduct fell so far below the standards expected as to constitute disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.
51. Charge 12 related to a conviction for theft (shoplifting) of confectionary. Charge 14 related to two instances of theft of alcohol on two occasions. This dishonest conduct in both Charges struck at the heart of the fundamental tenet of dishonesty and undermined public confidence. The Committee concluded that this conduct fell so far below the standards expected as to constitute disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.
52. The Committee considered that the Respondent's actions in all the Charges both individually, and in combination, fell far short of what was expected in the circumstances, and decided that they constituted disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.

Decision on Sanction

53. The Committee had in mind that the decision to impose a sanction is for its own independent judgment. The Committee took into account the Disciplinary Committee Sanction dated August 2020. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor.`

54. The primary purpose of the available sanctions is not to punish but:

- i. to protect the welfare of animals, and the public
- ii. to maintain public confidence in the profession; and
- iii. to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct

55. The Committee was aware that any sanction imposed must be proportionate to the nature and extent of the conduct and to the maintenance of appropriate standards expected of members of the veterinary nursing profession. The Committee must weigh the seriousness of the professional misconduct and the need to protect animals, the public and the public interest with and against the interests of the Respondent. No greater sanction should be imposed than is absolutely necessary. As stated in the 2020 Guidance there was also the issue of a deterrent effect of sanction which should be considered.

56. Accordingly, in its deliberations the Committee considered the available sanctions in reverse order of seriousness.

57. The Committee took into account the following aggravating factors:

- i. dishonesty;
- ii. financial gain;
- iii. sustained pattern of criminal offending.

The Committee took into account the following mitigating factors:

- i. no actual harm or risk of harm to any animal or human;
- ii. no concerns raised about the Respondent's competence or quality of her practice.
- iii. demonstration of insight into the criminal offending, and remorse;
- iv. positive character testimonials;
- v. difficult personal circumstances at the time of the offending;
- vi. subsequent efforts to avoid repetition of criminal offending;
- vii. frank personal statement provided to the RCVS prior to registration;
- viii. significant lapse of time since the last criminal offence.

58. Ms Curtis informed the Committee that the Respondent was registered with the College since June 2025 and that there were no previous regulatory findings against her.

59. The Committee had before it the Respondent's bundle which included her personal statement and a number of character testimonials., including that relating to her current employment as a RVN. The Committee also considered the Respondent's correspondence with the RCVS in the Inquiry bundle. At this stage, the Committee took into account the parts of the Respondent's evidence dealing with personal mitigation, events since the offences, and her attempts to address her personal difficulties,

- [REDACTED]
60. The Committee took into account the Respondent's efforts to change her life, and listened to her evidence regarding her motivation to be a RVN. She told the Committee of her efforts to work hard, and obtain her degree. The Committee took into account that her offending had ceased in 2020, and that it had occurred several years prior to registration. She expressed remorse in her evidence for her criminal offending.
61. In answer to Committee questions as to how she may be in a better position to deal with significant life events, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The Committee considered that this information demonstrated a willingness to receive help and steps taken to ensure her wellbeing was addressed.
62. In answer to Committee questions, the Respondent stated that while she had told her university about her convictions, she had not told her employer about her convictions or this hearing process. When asked about this she stated that she had asked for a general testimonial, and would deal with her employer when she returned to work after this hearing. She stated that she had not been obliged to tell them. The Committee considered whether this caused it concern about her openness and honesty.
63. In its considerations, it took into account that there was no information before it that she had misled her employer, in that there was no information about what, if anything, she had been asked by them to tell them, for example at the time of application. In addition, these convictions were spent. Furthermore, the Committee took into account the Respondent's evidence that as early as 2021 she had approached the RCVS for advice about her convictions, prior to starting her studies and registration and while she had been preparing to enter the profession, speaking on the telephone and receiving emailed advice from a named member of staff. She took the view that even though the convictions were spent and she was not obliged to inform the College, she still wished to be open about them. She reported them in June 2025 prior to registration. She was made aware that there was a risk that a disciplinary hearing would result, but she proceeded regardless with her studies and her seeking employment as a RVN. The testimonial from the Respondent's university, provided by the Head of Veterinary Nursing and dated 14 May 2025, state that the Respondent "disclosed a criminal conviction to us with openness and honesty". The Committee, having taken all this into account, did not have concerns about the Respondent's integrity or openness. It also demonstrated a level of insight into the seriousness of her offending and a desire to acknowledge it and move forwards from it. In all the circumstances the Committee concluded the Respondent had demonstrated a significant level of insight into her offending, and had taken remedial steps.
64. The Committee considered the testimonials and character references which attest to the Respondent's hard work, maturity and diligence. The undated testimonial from her

employer, provided by the Clinical Nurse Manager, attests to her ability to build a strong rapport with colleagues and clients, and a genuine interest in learning, her positive attitude and enthusiasm. The Committee considered that these were indicators of steps taken to address the concerns arising out of the criminal offending, and a determination to work hard at her chosen career.

65. In light of the insight shown, the steps taken to address the concerns arising out of the offending, and the determination to progress, which has been demonstrated, the Committee considered that the risk of repetition of the offending behaviour was minimal.
66. The Committee first considered whether to take no further action. It took into account the 2020 Guidance which states that in certain cases, the Committee may consider that a finding that a practitioner is guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect or that a conviction renders a practitioner unfit to practise is sufficient to protect animals and the wider public interest. As such, there may be no need for a reprimand or warning as to future conduct and the Committee may decide to close the case with no further action.
67. This was not a case involving any risk to animals. The risk of repetition of the offences is deemed by the Committee to be minimal. The Committee therefore considered the demands of the public interest, namely the need to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process. These offences pre-date her decision to pursue her career as a RVN.
68. The Committee took into account the significant insight and remediation shown, and the minimal risk of repeating the behaviour which led to the criminal offences. The last criminal offence took place in 2020, there has been no repetition, and the offences are spent. The Respondent has been open and honest with the RCVS since prior to her registration, a fact which was in fact acknowledged in a letter from the RCVS to the Respondent dated 24 June 2025, in which it is stated that the Registrar "noted the [REDACTED] circumstances that provide your explanation for your offending." The Committee, having heard the case, considered that these circumstances were a significant feature and explanation in this case.
69. In all the circumstances, the Committee was not satisfied that the public interest required a sanction to protect it. The Committee decided that the demands of the public interest were adequately marked and served by the findings already made that the convictions rendered the Respondent unfit to practise and that she had been guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.
70. As a result, the Committee decided that it would be appropriate and proportionate to impose no further action in this case.
71. The Committee did go on to consider a reprimand or warning as to future conduct, but did not consider this was appropriate or proportionate. Such a sanction would, in the

Committee's judgment, be superfluous, particularly because of the current significant levels of insight into what the Respondent had done wrong some years ago, prior to her entry onto the RCVS register, and also taking into account the [REDACTED] circumstances which were a context to the matters under consideration.

72. The Committee therefore decided to close this case with no further action.

73. That concludes this determination.

DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

4 JUNE 2026