

Claim No: CO/2025/2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION  
ADMINISTRATIVE COURT  
*Master Gidden*  
BETWEEN:

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AUTHORITY FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

**Appellant**

and



(1) HEALTH AND CARE PROFESSIONS COUNCIL  
(2) VERA NNADOZIE

**Respondents**

---

**CONSENT ORDER**

---

UPON the parties having agreed these terms and the statement of reasons as set out in the Schedule

AND UPON neither party being either a child or protected party and the appeal not being an appeal from a decision of the Court of Protection

BY CONSENT

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 1 The appeal be allowed and the decision of the First Respondent's Conduct and Competence Committee (the CCC) on 27 March 2019 be quashed and the matter remitted to the CCC for redetermination in accordance with the contents of the Schedule.
- 2 The First Respondent shall pay the Appellant's reasonable costs of the appeal, to be subject to detailed assessment if not agreed.

We consent to an order on the above terms:

Dated this 6<sup>th</sup> day of September 2019

*Fieldfisher*

Fieldfisher  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Free Trade Exchange  
37 Peter Street  
Manchester  
M2 5GB

Ref: HB3/RL7/UK01-065086-00035/79753608 v2  
Solicitors for the Appellant

*BDB Pitmans LLP*

BDB Pitmans LLP  
50 Broadway  
London  
SW1H 0BL

Ref: HEF/RJL/098763.0429  
Solicitors for the First Respondent



Ms Vera Nnadozie  
19 Morris Road  
Dunstable  
LU6 1FG

Second Respondent

ADMINISTRATIVE COURT OFFICE

04 OCT 2019  
*M R GIDDEN*

M R GIDDEN  
MASTER OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COURT

*By the Court*

## SCHEDULE

- 1 The Second Respondent is a registered social worker.
- 2 In a decision on 27 March 2019 in fitness to practise proceedings FTP55022, the CCC determined that the facts of the allegation against the Second Respondent were not proved.
- 3 The Appellant appealed the decision on the following grounds:  
  
*Ground 1 — the failure on the part of the HCPC to formulate appropriate charges against the registrant reflecting the evidence of dishonesty constitutes a "serious procedural or other irregularity" in the circumstances of this case.*  
  
*Ground 2 — the failure on the part of the HCPC to formulate charges relating to breach of confidentiality that accurately reflected the evidence and alleged misconduct constitutes a further "serious procedural or other irregularity" in the circumstances of this case.*  
  
*Ground 3 — the decision of the IC not to refer particulars 1(a) and 1(b) on the basis that there was no realistic prospect of impairment in relation to those charges was flawed (wrong in law?), and constitutes a "serious procedural or other irregularity" as provided for by CPR 52.21, in the circumstances of this case [sic].*  
  
*Ground 4 — The failure by the Conduct and Competence Committee to discharge its duty as a panel of enquiry by seeking information from the HCPC and/or adjourning the substantive hearing of its own motion constitutes a "serious procedural or other irregularity", as provided for by CPR 52.21, in the circumstances of this case.*
- 4 The First Respondent accepts that the decision was not sufficient for the protection of the public, within the meaning of s.29(4) of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002, and that the decision should be quashed and the matter remitted to a fresh panel of the CCC for redetermination of fact, misconduct, impairment and sanction.
- 5 Subject to an acknowledgement by the parties that the evidence for the allegation referred to at paragraph 34(a) of the Grounds of Appeal is not clear, it is agreed that the First Respondent will formulate a fresh set of allegations which reflect the concerns raised in Grounds 1 and 2 of the Grounds of Appeal. The fresh set of allegations shall remedy omissions identified by the Appellant and shall include particulars in relation to (a) breach of confidentiality having regard to the matters identified by the Appellant in paragraphs 44 to 46 of the Grounds of Appeal, and (b) dishonesty having regard to the matters identified by the Appellant in paragraphs 34 to 38 of the Grounds of Appeal (with the exception of the allegation referred to at paragraph 34(a)).