

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Tuesday, 25 November 2025**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Colleen Newlands
NMC PIN:	19C0529O
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub part 1 Adult Nursing (March 2019)
Relevant Location:	Buckinghamshire
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Paul Grant (Chair, lay member) Elisabeth Fairbairn (Registrant member) Bryan MacFarland (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Ben Stephenson
Hearings Coordinator:	Catherine Blake
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Neair Maqboul, Case Presenter
Mrs Newlands:	Not present and not represented at the hearing
Order being reviewed:	Conditions of practice order (2 years)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Order to lapse upon expiry in accordance with Article 30 (1), namely 26 December 2025

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Mrs Newlands was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to her registered email address by secure email on 24 October 2025.

Further, the panel noted that the Notice of Hearing was also sent to Mrs Newland's representative at the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) on 24 October 2025.

Ms Maqboul, 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 Newlands' right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Newlands 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 Newlands

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mrs Newlands. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Maqboul who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Mrs Newlands. She referred the panel to the email received from Mrs Newlands' representative on 3 November 2025:

'Please note that Ms Newlands will not be attending the hearing, nor will they be represented. No disrespect is intended by their non-attendance.'

Ms Maqboul submitted that Mrs Newlands had voluntarily absented herself.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Mrs Newlands. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Maqboul, the representations made on Mrs Newlands' behalf, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to any relevant case law, the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Mrs Newlands;
- Mrs Newlands has informed the NMC through her representative at the RCN that she has received the Notice of Hearing and confirmed she is content for the hearing to proceed in her absence;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date; 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 Newlands.

Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private

At the outset of the hearing, Ms Maqboul made a request that this case be held partly in private on the basis that proper exploration of Mrs Newland's case may involve reference to [PRIVATE]. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

The panel determined that the hearing would be held in public, however it would go into private session if matters relating to [PRIVATE] are raised in order to protect her privacy.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to allow the current conditions of practice order to lapse upon expiry.

This order will come into effect at the end of 26 December 2025 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 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 28 November 2022. The order was reviewed on 16 November 2023 and the order was replaced with a conditions of practice order for a period of two years.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 26 December 2025.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

The charges found proved by way of admission which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

'That you, a Registered Nurse;

1. Whilst employed at Salveo Care on 6 March 2020;

- a. Administered Resident D's medication to Resident C;*
- b. Failed to inform Colleague A of the medication error in a timely manner;*
- c. Told Colleague B that you had given Resident C new medication or words to that effect;*
- d. Failed to ensure that Resident C was monitored for side effects of the wrong medication;*
- e. Told Colleague B you would sort out the MAR for Resident C or words to that effect.*

2. *Your actions in charges 1)b) and or 1)c) and or 1)d) and or 1)e) where dishonest in that you were seeking to cover up the fact you had given Resident C the wrong medication.*
3. *Whilst employed at Eastleigh Care Home;*
 - a. *On 12 June 2020 failed to sign confirmation that paracetamol had been administered to a Resident;*
 - b. *On 12 June 2022 pre potted medication for multiple residents on the same tray;*
 - c. *On 17 July 2020 left medication on side table after signing to confirm that it had been administered;*
 - d. *On 26 August 2020 administered resident B's medication to Resident A.*

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, at the substantive hearing, found that you demonstrated a limited but developing insight. At this hearing, this panel concluded that you have demonstrated more insight regarding your dishonesty. The panel considered your reflective piece and concluded that you are no longer impaired with regard to your dishonesty.

With regard to your strengthened practice, the panel considered the certificates of training you provided. However, the panel also considered that you have not worked in a patient-facing role since the suspension order, and you have not been able to demonstrate strengthened practice. The panel noted that you are currently not working in a nursing role but concluded that the risks to patients remain in absence of strengthened practice.

The original panel determined that you were liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel concluded there has been no remediation regarding

your past impairment involving medication administration. Therefore, this panel determined that you remain 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 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 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 your 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 a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the continuing levels of risk.

The panel considered substituting the current suspension order with a conditions of practice order. Despite the seriousness of your misconduct, your reflective statement shows sufficient insight regarding your dishonesty. The panel concluded that one area of concern remains, namely medication administration. The panel determined that conditions could be formulated to address this concern. The panel

also considered your employer's willingness to support you if conditions were imposed upon your practice.

The panel was satisfied that it would be possible to formulate practicable and workable conditions that, if complied with, may lead to your unrestricted return to practice and would serve to protect the public and the reputation of the profession in the meantime.

The panel decided that the public would be suitably protected as would the reputation of the profession by the implementation of the following conditions of practice:

'For the purposes of these conditions, 'employment' and 'work' mean any paid or unpaid post in a nursing, midwifery or nursing associate role. Also, 'course of study' and 'course' mean any course of educational study connected to nursing, midwifery or nursing associates.

- 1. If you are working in a role requiring medication administration, you must not administer medication unless directly supervised by another registered nurse until you are assessed as competent to do so independently by a Band 6 nurse or above.*

You must provide the NMC with a copy of the assessment within 14 days of being deemed competent.

- 2. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are working by:*
 - a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment.*
 - b) Giving your case officer your employer's contact details.*
- 3. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are studying by:*

- a) *Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting any course of study.*
 - b) *Giving your case officer the name and contact details of the organisation offering that course of study.*
4. *You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:*
- a) *Any organisation or person you work for.*
 - b) *Any agency you apply to or are registered with for work.*
 - c) *Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).*
 - d) *Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.*
 - e) *Any current or prospective patients or clients you intend to see or care for on a private basis when you are working in a self-employed capacity.*
5. *You must tell your case officer, within seven days of your becoming aware of:*
- a) *Any clinical incident you are involved in.*
 - b) *Any investigation started against you.*
 - c) *Any disciplinary proceedings taken against you.*
6. *You must allow your case officer to share, as necessary, details about your performance, your compliance with and / or progress under these conditions with:*
- a) *Any current or future employer.*
 - b) *Any educational establishment.*
 - c) *Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mrs Newlands' 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 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 the written submissions from Mrs Newlands' representative. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Maqboul on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Maqboul briefly summarised the background to this case. She reminded the panel that the substantive order was originally made by Consensual Panel Determination (CPD), and that for a CPD to take place the registrant must accept the charges against them.

Ms Maqboul submitted that Mrs Newlands' fitness to practise remains impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds. She submitted that Mrs Newlands has been unable to comply with the conditions of practice, and therefore has not been able to demonstrate safe practice.

Ms Maqboul submitted that Mrs Newlands' registration is only active due to the substantive order currently in place. She referred the panel to the written submissions made on Mrs Newlands' behalf:

[PRIVATE]

The Registrant's PIN expired on 31 March 2021, and she has not paid a registration fee since.

She would lapse from the NMC Register but for the ongoing fitness to practice proceedings, under which she has been made subject to a substantive order.

The Registrant [PRIVATE] no longer wishes to retain her PIN. She would like these proceedings to come to a close.

In light of the above, we invite the Panel to allow the Registrant's substantive conditions of practice to expire.'

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 Mrs Newlands' fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Mrs Newlands had developing insight and was no longer impaired with regard to dishonesty. At this hearing the panel considered that it has not seen any evidence to suggest that her level of insight has diminished in this respect, however it has seen no further evidence of insight into the concern of medication administration.

In its consideration of whether Mrs Newlands has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that she is not working in a clinical environment, and that it has seen no recent evidence of additional training. Accordingly, the panel concluded that there is no evidence that Mrs Newlands has strengthened her practice.

The last reviewing panel determined that Mrs Newlands was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has seen no new information to suggest that this is no longer the case. The panel noted the new information that Mrs Newlands left a non-clinical role in March 2025 [PRIVATE]. In light of this, this panel could not be satisfied that Mrs Newlands has addressed the concerns with her practice. 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 determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mrs Newlands' 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 had regard to its previous findings on impairment in coming to this decision. It bore in mind that its primary purpose is to protect the public and maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and the NMC as its regulator. In this case, there is no evidence that Mrs Newlands has remediated the concerns with her practice such that she could practise unrestricted, and no evidence that she is willing or able to address these concerns.

The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.

Next, in considering whether a caution order would be appropriate in the circumstances, the panel took into account the SG, which 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.'* Given the continued risk of repetition the panel concluded that a caution order would not adequately protect the public.

The panel next considered whether imposing a further conditions of practice order on Mrs Newlands' registration would still be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel considered that conditions of practice should only be considered if the concerns with a registrant's practice are likely to be resolved in a reasonable period of time. The panel considered Mrs Newlands has indicated that she does not wish to return to nursing, and that there is no realistic prospect that she will be able to return to practise under

conditions within a reasonable time period. Accordingly, the panel determined that further conditions of practice would not be appropriate.

While the panel noted there was originally a finding of dishonesty, and that a suspension or striking-off could be appropriate, it noted the decision of the previous panel that Mrs Newlands was no longer impaired in respect of the dishonesty. Therefore, today's panel was of the view that to impose a suspension order or a striking-off order would be unduly punitive. The panel noted the NMC Guidance REV-2h 'Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place'. This guidance identifies circumstances where it may be appropriate to allow a substantive order to lapse with impairment. Issues to be considered in this regard include:

- the professional would no longer be on the register but for the order in place
- the panel can no longer conclude that the professional is likely to return to safe unrestricted practice within a reasonable period of time
- a striking off order isn't appropriate

All these issues apply in the present case. The panel therefore decided to allow the order to lapse upon expiry.

The substantive conditions of practice order will be allowed to lapse at the end of the current period of imposition, namely the end of 26 December 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This will be confirmed to Mrs Newlands in writing.

That concludes this determination.