

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Tuesday, 18 November 2025**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	Linda Craymer
NMC PIN:	07K0199E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse - Adult Sub Part 1 RNA, Registered Nurse – Adult (25 June 2008)
Relevant Location:	Hampshire
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	David Hull (Chair, lay member) Karen Shubert (Registrant member) Peter Cowup (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	John Donnelly
Hearings Coordinator:	Franchessca Nyame
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (9 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect on 2 January 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Meeting

The panel noted at the start of this meeting that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Ms Craymer's registered email address by secure email on 6 October 2025.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 10 November 2025 and inviting Ms Craymer to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Ms Craymer 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 (the Rules).

Decision and reasons on review of the current order

The panel decided to impose a striking-off order. This order will come into effect at the end of 2 January 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 3 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 4 December 2024. It was subsequently reviewed on 21 February 2025 when it was extended for another 9 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 2 January 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 1 January 2022 failed to give Resident 1 the correct dose of Morphine sulphate by administering 10mg/1ml instead of 1.25mg-2.5mg as prescribed.*
- 2) *On 1 January 2022 failed to accurately record the correct dose of Midazolam administered by the GP to Resident 1, by recording 10mg had been administered when the actual dose administered was 2.0mg.*
- 3) *On 2 February 2022 inaccurately recorded Resident 2 had been given their evening medication when they had not by pre-signing and/or completing the MAR chart.*
- 4) *On 2 February 2022 failed to discard Residents 2's medication by leaving it on the trolley and not disposing of it straight away.*
- 5) *On 27 April 2022 recorded Resident '3s insulin prescription on the ATLAS system as 20 units.*
- 6)...
- 7)...
- 8) *On 6 May 2022 administered Resident 3, with 5mg/2.5ml of morphine instead of the prescribed amount of 2.5mgs/1.25ml.*
- 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 Ms Craymer had insufficient insight. At this hearing, today's panel has received no evidence of reflection from Ms Craymer as recommended by the original panel.

The original panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being addressed by Ms Craymer through a reflective piece which demonstrates her developed insight into her failings and the impact her actions had on the profession and its reputation and public confidence in the profession. Today's panel noted that she has not provided any evidence of training to strengthen her nursing practice.

The original panel determined that Ms Craymer was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has received no information to alter this assessment. In light of this, this panel determined that Ms Craymer is liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds 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 was of the view that an informed member of the public would be concerned to learn that a registrant, in these particular circumstances, was allowed to practice unrestricted. 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 Ms Craymer's fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

'...The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Ms Craymer'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 took into consideration Ms Craymer's lack of engagement, and that she would unlikely to engage with the conditions imposed on her nursing practice .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 Ms Craymer's misconduct.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Ms Craymer further time to fully reflect on her previous failings. The panel concluded that a further nine months suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Ms Craymer adequate time to further develop her insight and take steps to strengthen their practice. It would also give Ms Craymer an opportunity to engage meaningfully with the NMC.

The panel did go onto consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate. The panel took into consideration that Ms Craymer has had a three month suspension order and that this may not be a sufficient period of time for Ms Craymer to remediate her misconduct. The panel concluded that it would be disproportionate in these circumstances to impose a striking off order at this stage.

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 nine months would provide Ms Craymer with an opportunity to engage with the NMC to provide evidence of her insight and strengthened practice. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel considered carefully whether Ms Craymer's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's ability to practise kindly, safely and professionally. In considering this case, the panel carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it noted the decision of the last panel, this panel exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it included the NMC bundles.

The panel heard and 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 Ms Craymer's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Similar to the previous reviewing panel, this panel had no evidence of reflection, insight, professional development or strengthened practice before it from Ms Craymer. The panel was mindful that the persuasive burden is on Ms Craymer to prove that her fitness to practise is not currently impaired, and it noted she did not follow the recommendations of the previous panel and failed to discharge her burden. As such, the panel determined that the risk of repetition and, in turn, the risk of harm remains.

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

The panel bore 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 to maintain

public confidence in the profession and the NMC as a regulatory body, and to uphold standards.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Ms Craymer 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 Sanctions Guidance' (SG) 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.

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 Ms Craymer's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The SG states that a caution order may be appropriate where *'the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen again.'* The panel considered that Ms Craymer'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.

The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Ms Craymer'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 had no evidence before it to suggest that Ms Craymer would comply with conditions due to her complete lack of engagement. It therefore concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted Ms Craymer has been subject to a suspension order for a total of 12 months and has yet to engage with the NMC, demonstrate any insight into her failings or take any steps to strengthen her practice. The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Ms Craymer no longer posed a risk to the public, which the panel did not have. The panel also had regard to NMC guidance 'REV-2h: Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place' which states:

'While Suspension Orders and Conditions of Practice Orders can be varied or extended, they are not intended to exist indefinitely.'

For the above reasons, the panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances.

The panel also noted the following from NMC guidance REV-2h:

'Cases where striking off is likely to be appropriate include when:

- *the professional has shown limited engagement and/or insight,*
- *...*
- *the professional has otherwise made no or negligible progress towards addressing issues with their fitness to practise.'*

The panel considered the above and determined that both apply in this case. The panel concluded that it was necessary to take action to prevent Ms Craymer from practising in the future and that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 2 January 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Ms Craymer in writing.

That concludes this determination.