

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

**Substantive Hearing
Monday, 13 October 2025 – Friday, 17 October 2025**

Nursing and Midwifery Council
2 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London, E20 1EJ

Name of Registrant:	Lisa Joy Lecour
NMC PIN:	01K1092O
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse: Adult - Sub part 1 December 2001
Relevant Location:	Kent
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Rachel Merelie (Chair, Lay member) Margaret Marshall (Registrant member) Alison Hayle (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Charlene Bernard
Hearings Coordinator:	Elizabeth Fagbo
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Selena Jones, Case Presenter
Miss Lecour:	Not present and not represented at the hearing
Facts proved:	Charges 1a, 1b, 2, 3, 4 and 5
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Sanction:	Striking-off order
Interim order:	Interim suspension order (18 months)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Lecour was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing letter had been sent to Miss Lecour's registered address by recorded delivery and by first class post on 11 September 2025.

Ms Jones, 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 allegation, the time, dates and venue of the hearing and, amongst other things, information about Miss Lecour's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Lecour has been served with the Notice of Hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Miss Lecour

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Miss Lecour. It had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Jones who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Miss Lecour. She submitted that Miss Lecour had voluntarily absented herself.

Ms Jones referred the panel to an email from Miss Lecour to the NMC dated 10 October 2025 which stated the following:

‘...I thought I had made it abundantly clear . I no longer wanted to be contacted by the nmc, that I would consider it harassment...’

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel noted that its discretionary power to proceed in the absence of a registrant under the provisions of Rule 21 is not absolute and is one that should be exercised ‘*with the utmost care and caution*’ as referred to in the case of *R v Jones (Anthony William)* (No.2) [2002] UKHL 5.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Miss Lecour. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Jones, the email from Miss Lecour, dated 10 October 2025, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to the factors set out in the decision of *R v Jones* and *General Medical Council v Adeogba* [2016] EWCA Civ 162 and had regard to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- Miss Lecour has stated that she does not wish to engage with the NMC in an email dated 10 October 2025;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date;
- 4 witnesses are scheduled to give live evidence;
- Not proceeding may inconvenience the witnesses, their employers and, for those involved in clinical practice, the patients/clients who need their professional services;
- The charges relate to events that occurred in 2023;
- Further delay may have an adverse effect on the ability of witnesses to accurately recall events; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious disposal of the case.

There is some disadvantage to Miss Lecour in proceeding in her absence. Although the evidence upon which the NMC relies was sent to her at her registered address, she has made no formal response to these charges. She will not be able to challenge the evidence relied upon by the NMC in person and will not be able to give evidence on her own behalf. However, in the panel's judgement, this can be mitigated. The panel can make allowance for the fact that the NMC's evidence will not be tested by cross-examination and, of its own volition, can explore any inconsistencies in the evidence which it identifies. Furthermore, the limited disadvantage is the consequence of Miss Lecour's decisions to absent herself from the hearing, waive her rights to attend, and/or be represented, and to not provide evidence or make submissions on her own behalf.

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Miss Lecour. The panel will draw no adverse inference from Miss Lecour's absence in its findings of fact.

Details of charge (as amended)

That you, a registered nurse:

1. Posted the following comments on your workplace's News Feed for employees:

- a. On 5 June 2023:

Pride ???

*Pride month is a disgrace When we do we get rewards for pride
straight ??? Keep your sexuality to yourselves*

Why do lgbqbt get a month of pride , disgraceful that we give people exploiting their sexuality more attention than say: our veterans are OAPS, our teachers nurses doctors ???

Keep you sexual preferences to yopurselves we are sick of this being shoved in our face

b. On 23 March 2023, the following on an article about Ramadan:

Sorry the point of Fasting is not to be given special treatment or consideration. To even mention this I find disturbing

2. On or around 28 September 2023, at the end of your disciplinary hearing said words to the effect of *'wait wait, I'm so glad the gay mafia is alive and well'*
3. On or around 19 September 2023 in an emails to Colleague A, said *'have you noticed all this equality and inclusion woke business, why isn't it called LGBTQ(S). More heterosexual people helped the gay communities gain their human rights and recognition than actual gays. There is no S because the exploitation of LGBT pride month is divisive and a diversion'*
4. Your conduct at charge 1(a) and/or 2 and/or 3 were discriminatory on grounds of sexual orientation
5. Your conduct at charge 1(b) was discriminatory on grounds of religion.

AND in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

Decision and reasons on application to amend the charge

The panel heard an application made by Ms Jones, on behalf of the NMC, to amend the wording of charge 1a.

The proposed amendment was to correct the date of charge 1a. It was submitted by Ms Jones that the proposed amendment would more accurately reflect the evidence. She submitted that this is a procedural amendment and there is no prejudice or injustice to Miss Lecour as a result of this amendment. Further, Ms Jones submitted that this amendment is just in all the circumstances.

“That you, a registered nurse:

1. Posted the following comments on your workplace’s News Feed for employees:

a. On ~~15~~ **5** June 2023:

Pride ???

*Pride month is a disgrace When we do we get rewards for pride
straight ??? Keep your sexuality to yourselves*

*Why do lgbqbt get a month of pride , disgraceful that we give people
exploiting their sexuality more attention than say: our veterans are
OAPS, our teachers nurses doctors ???*

*Keep you sexual preferences to yopurselves we are sick of this being
shoved in our face*

And in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.”

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor and had regard to Rule 28 of ‘Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004’, as amended (the Rules).

The panel was of the view that such an amendment, as applied for, was in the interest of justice. The panel was satisfied that there would be no prejudice to Miss Lecour and no injustice would be caused to either party by the proposed amendment being allowed. It was therefore appropriate to allow the amendment, as applied for, to ensure accuracy.

Background

The charges arose whilst Miss Lecour was employed as a registered nurse by the HCRG Care Group (the Group).

She was referred to the NMC on 30 June 2023 by the Group. It is alleged that Miss Lecour posted offensive and inappropriate comments in relation to sexuality on the Group’s News Feed.

During the Group’s internal investigation Miss Lecour admitted to writing these comments.

It was found that Miss Lecour had previously written an inappropriate comment on the Group’s News Feed, in response to a positive article raising awareness about Ramadan.

Decisions and reasons on facts

In reaching its decisions on the facts, the panel took into account all the oral and documentary evidence in this case together with the submissions made by Ms Jones on behalf of the NMC.

The panel has drawn no adverse inference from the non-attendance of Miss Lecour.

The panel was aware that the burden of proof rests on the NMC, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, namely the balance of probabilities. This means that a fact will be proved if a panel is satisfied that it is more likely than not that the incident occurred as alleged.

The panel heard live evidence from the following witnesses called on behalf of the NMC:

- Witness 1: Clinical Service Manager at the HCRG Care Group
- Witness 2: Head of Communications at the HCRG Care Group
- Witness 3: Head of Integrated Discharge Services (seconded to HCRG Care Group for 15 hours per week)
- Witness 4 (Colleague A): Operational Lead for the Care Coordination Centre, Phlebotomy and Podiatry Services at the HCRG Care Limited

Before making any findings on the facts, the panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor. It considered the witness and documentary evidence provided by the NMC.

The panel then considered each of the charges and made the following findings.

Charge 1a)

1. "Posted the following comments on your workplace's News Feed for employees:

- a. On 5 June 2023:

Pride ???

*Pride month is a disgrace When we do we get rewards for pride
straight ??? Keep your sexuality to yourselves*

*Why do lgbqbt get a month of pride , disgraceful that we give people
exploiting their sexuality more attention than say: our veterans are
OAPS, our teachers nurses doctors ???*

*Keep you sexual preferences to yopurselves we are sick of this
being shoved in our face."*

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account a screenshot of the '*all news approval queue*' for the Group's intranet dated 5 June 2023 and written by '*Lisa Lecour*' with the wording as detailed in the charge.

In the Disciplinary hearing meeting minutes, dated 16 June 2023, Miss Lecour confirmed that she had written these comments:

*'...Can you confirm that you wrote the comments on the intranet as
shown in this screenshot?...'*

‘...LL [Miss Lecour] confirmed yes, comments she was shown as a screen shot were the comments she had made...’

This was also confirmed by Miss Lecour in the investigation interview dated 29 June 2023.

The panel were satisfied that Miss Lecour had written the words outlined in charge 1a.

The panel then went on to consider the word *‘posted.’* The panel noted that the screenshot included the words *‘pending approval’* in its heading. As described in the written evidence of Witness 1 the post was only seen by the communications team who screened articles and flagged this post for investigation under a breach of the social media policy.

The panel also took into account Miss Lecour’s comment in the Disciplinary hearing meeting minutes, dated 16 June 2023:

‘...LL [Miss Lecour] added here, who else would have seen my comment as it was not published, adding she was not able to remove the comment once sent...’

However, the panel was satisfied that even though the statement written by Miss Lecour did not go live on the Group’s intranet it was her intention to share her views on the workplace’s News Feed.

The panel were satisfied that Miss Lecour had posted the comment outlined in charge 1a on the Group’s workplace’s News Feed for employees on 5 June 2023.

Therefore, the panel found charge 1a proved.

Charge 1b)

1. “Posted the following comments on your workplace’s News Feed for employees:

b. On 23 March 2023, the following on an article about Ramadan:

Sorry the point of Fasting is not to be given special treatment or consideration. To even mention this I find disturbing.”

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account the screenshot of this comment written by ‘*Lisa Lecour*’, dated 23 March 2023.

The panel also took into account the written statement and oral evidence of Witness 2. Witness 2 stated that in order to access the workplace News Feed, the website would require a personal log in and password which would have automatically generated the senders name on their posts. The panel considered it to be more likely than not that the post showed the author to be Miss Lecour because she had used her own log in and password to generate the comment.

The panel noted the written evidence of Witness 2 that the comment:

‘...was made available to all staff who were looking at the article and comments. All staff, around 5000, were able to see this comment...’

The panel accepted the evidence of Witness 2 and was satisfied that Miss Lecour had posted the comment in charge 1b to the Group's workplace News Feed on 23 March 2023. Therefore, it found charge 1b proved.

Charge 2)

2. "On or around 28 September 2023, at the end of your disciplinary hearing said words to the effect of '*wait wait, I'm so glad the gay mafia is alive and well*'."

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account the written and oral evidence of Witness 4. It also took into account the letter from the Group dated 2 October 2023 formally confirming the outcome of the disciplinary hearing held on 28 September 2023 (the Outcome Letter).

The panel took into account the contemporaneous record of the minutes in which the comment was made. The minutes stated:

'...At the end of the meeting, we gave Lisa the outcome and she was gracious but just before the meeting ended, she pointed her finger at the screen ... and said, "Wait, wait. I'm so glad the gay mafia is alive and well."...'

The panel noted that the minutes of this disciplinary meeting were signed by Witness 4 and the note taker. Witness 4 confirmed the comment in her witness statement and her oral evidence stating that she was shocked when the comment was made as it appeared "*out of the blue*."

The panel also noted the following in the Outcome Letter:

‘...Following confirmation , you said ‘ wait wait, I’m so glad the gay mafia is alive and well’...’

The panel noted that there was no evidence before it to suggest that Miss Lecour had appealed the Group’s decision following the disciplinary hearing or disputed that she made the comment outlined in charge 2.

Therefore, the panel found charge 2 proved.

Charge 3)

3. “On or around 19 September 2023 in an emails to Colleague A, said *‘have you noticed all this equality and inclusion woke business, why isn’t it called LGBTQ(S). More heterosexual people helped the gay communities gain their human rights and recognition than actual gays. There is no S because the exploitation of LGBT pride month is divisive and a diversion’.*”

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account an email chain between Miss Lecour and Witness 4 (Colleague A), where Miss Lecour stated the following on 19 September 2023:

‘...Have you noticed all this equality and inclusion woke business, why isn’t it called LGBTQ(S)? More heterosexual people helped the gay communities gain their human rights and recognition than actual gays . There is no S because this exploitation of LGBT pride MONTH is divisive and a diversion...’

The panel took into account the following from the Disciplinary hearing meeting minutes, dated 28 September 2023:

‘...In the 19th of Sept email you added further reference to LGBTQ – do you think this was appropriate based on the reason for the disciplinary hearing?’

[Witness 4] added to this question stating, at the beginning of this meeting you said you had reflected and understood your actions were wrong but then 9 days ago you sent an email to me [Witness 4] that contained inappropriate questioning of LGBTQ...’

Witness 4 (Colleague A) confirmed in her oral evidence that the email which is referred to in the disciplinary minutes was the comment in the email outlined in the charge dated 19 September 2023.

The panel also took into account the Outcome Letter from the Group dated 2 October 2023.

‘...On the 19th September 2023, you sent an email ... and included a further inappropriate comment ‘Have you noticed all this equality and inclusion woke business, why isn’t it called LGBTQ(S). More heterosexual people helped the gay communities gain their human rights and recognition than actual gays. There is no S because the exploitation of LGBT pride month is divisive and a diversion...’

The panel had no evidence before it to suggest that Miss Lecour had appealed or challenged the Group’s decision following the disciplinary hearing. Therefore, it determined that Miss Lecour had sent this email to Witness 4 (Colleague A) on 19 September 2023 and found charge 3 proved.

Charge 4)

4. “Your conduct at charge 1(a) and/or 2 and/or 3 were discriminatory on grounds of sexual orientation.”

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel first considered the meaning of the words ‘*discrimination*’ and ‘*discriminatory*’. It took into account the definition of discrimination outlined in the Equality Act 2010. Given the wording of the charges 4 and 5 the panel also considered dictionary definitions of the word discriminatory from the Cambridge and the Oxford English dictionaries and were guided by these definitions in its finding of the facts.

Cambridge dictionary:

‘...treating a person or group differently from and usually worse than other people, because of their race, gender, sexuality, etc...’

Oxford dictionary:

‘...Making or showing an unjust or prejudicial distinction between different categories of people, especially on the grounds of ethnicity, sex, age or disability...’

The panel considered charge 4 in relation to each of charges 1a, 2, and 3.

In regard to charge 1a, the panel noted that Miss Lecour stated in her email to the NMC dated 7 March 2024 that *‘if you look at the comment i wrote it said pride MONTH was disgusting not Gay people were disgusting. I defend my right to my opinion.’*

The panel looked closely at the wording in the post of 5 June 2023.

The panel noted the statements '*keep your sexual preferences to yopurselves [sic]*' and '*sick of this being shoved in our face.*' It was of the view that the statements suggest that Miss Lecour's post was unjust and prejudicial toward the LGBTQ community and was discriminatory in nature. In saying that the LGBTQ community should keep their sexual preferences to themselves the post advocated treating them less favourably than others on the grounds of sexuality. Therefore, the panel determined that the comments made by Miss Lecour were discriminatory in nature.

In regard to charge 2, the panel looked closely at the words '*gay mafia.*' The panel was of the view that Miss Lecour referring to the LGBTQ community, a specific protected group/characteristic, as the '*gay mafia*' in her comment was discriminatory and a member of the LGBTQ community would feel prejudice when reading that comment.

In regard to charge 3, the panel looked closely at Miss Lecour's email dated 19 September 2023.

The panel was of the view that although the comment was confusing, the overall impact of it is offensive, unacceptable and may be considered as discriminatory to members of the LGBTQ community.

The panel therefore found charge 4 proved.

Charge 5)

5. "Your conduct at charge 1(b) was discriminatory on grounds of religion."

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account Miss Lecour's comment on 23 March 2023, following an article about Ramadan.

The panel took into account the definitions of discrimination and discriminatory as considered in charge 4. It also took into account the written statement and the oral evidence of Witness 2.

During Witness 2's oral evidence the panel asked what the original article had said. Witness 2 stated that whilst she did not have the details of the article, the post related to Ramadan and was made specifically to raise awareness about colleagues fasting, and for colleagues to be considerate of those participating.

Miss Lecour's comment appeared in response to an article raising awareness regarding Ramadan and the impact of fasting on those observing it and their colleagues. She stated that people should not receive special treatment for fasting during Ramadan and said that *'to even mention this I find disturbing.'*

The panel determined that Miss Lecour's view that it was *'disturbing'* to bring the observance of Ramadan to the attention of colleagues when the purpose of the article was to ensure that colleagues were mindful of the impact of fasting, shows a prejudicial, discriminatory attitude to people on the basis of religion.

The panel therefore found charge 5 proved.

Fitness to practise

Having reached its determination on the facts of this case, the panel then moved on to consider whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct and, if so, whether Miss Lecour's fitness to practise is currently impaired. There is no statutory definition of fitness to practise. However, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's ability to practise kindly, safely and professionally.

The panel, in reaching its decision, has recognised its statutory duty to protect the public and maintain public confidence in the profession. Further, it bore in mind that there is no burden or standard of proof at this stage and it has therefore exercised its own professional judgement.

The panel adopted a two-stage process in its consideration. First, the panel must determine whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct. Secondly, only if the facts found proved amount to misconduct, the panel must decide whether, in all the circumstances, Miss Lecour's fitness to practise is currently impaired as a result of that misconduct.

Submissions on misconduct

Ms Jones invited the panel to take the view that the facts found proved amount to misconduct.

Ms Jones referred the panel to the terms of 'The Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives 2015' (the Code) in making its decision. She identified the specific, relevant standards which the NMC suggest had been breached by Miss Lecour and amounted to misconduct.

Ms Jones submitted that Miss Lecour's conduct in the charges found proved appear to relate to Miss Lecour's way of thinking and her comments were based around her core beliefs. She referred the panel to a comment made by Miss Lecour in the Disciplinary Investigation meeting of 16 June 2023 where it was stated that '*On coming to the UK*' Miss Lecour '*was shocked by the UK's open sexuality.*' Also, in the same meeting Miss Lecour stated that '*her intention was to share her opinion and not be malicious.*'

Ms Jones submitted that Miss Lecour expressed her views on different occasions and in different ways but that she still unapologetically holds these views. Ms Jones highlighted that in the Disciplinary Investigation meeting, when Miss Lecour was questioned as to

whether she considered her comments to be inappropriate and offensive she said, *'No. if they are offended that's there offensive[sic].'* Ms Jones also pointed the panel to an email thread between Miss Lecour and the NMC, dated 8 February 2024 where Miss Lecour stated that *'...I ... have explained that lgbt are not disgusting but the over the top media blitz of gay pride month was and is and will always be shamefully disgusting in my opinion...'*

Ms Jones submitted that Miss Lecour has not reflected on the impact that her views could have had on her colleagues, has not demonstrated that she no longer holds those views, and has not engaged in any training to remedy her way of thinking. Therefore, Ms Jones submitted that Ms Lecour's mindset has not changed despite the allegations having arisen years ago. She submitted that Miss Lecour's behaviour is attitudinal, which is harder to remediate and therefore Miss Lecour is likely to repeat the same behaviour in the future. Further, Ms Jones submitted that Miss Lecour's conduct was a serious departure from the expected standards of a registered nurse and fell far short of what would be proper conduct.

Ms Jones submitted that Miss Lecour's behaviour in the charges proved was a departure from good and safe professional practice and constitutes serious misconduct.

Submissions on impairment

Ms Jones moved on to the issue of impairment and addressed the panel on the need to have regard to protecting the public and the wider public interest. This included the need to declare and maintain proper standards and maintain public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body. This included reference to the case of *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v (1) Nursing and Midwifery Council (2)* and relevant NMC Guidance.

Ms Jones submitted that taking into account all the circumstances of the case, the serious nature of the misconduct, and the lack of remediation, the panel should find that Miss

Lecour has brought the profession into disrepute. Ms Jones submitted that Miss Lecour has breached fundamental tenets of the profession, and she failed to uphold the reputation of the profession at all times.

Ms Jones submitted that there is no evidence before the panel at present that Miss Lecour has been able to remediate the concerns identified in the charges. She submitted that Miss Lecour's insight is also limited and therefore, the panel cannot be satisfied that there is no risk of Miss Lecour repeating the misconduct identified if she was permitted to practise.

Ms Jones submitted that a finding of impairment is required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold proper professional standards. She submitted that public confidence in the profession and the NMC as its regulator would be undermined if such behaviour were not marked as unacceptable. Ms Jones invited the panel to find that Miss Lecour's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor which included reference to a number of relevant judgments. These included: *Roylance v General Medical Council* (No 2) [2000] 1 A.C. 311, *Nandi v General Medical Council* [2004] EWHC 2317 (Admin), *General Medical Council v Meadow* [2007] QB 462 (Admin), *Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin), and *Cohen v GMC* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin).

Decision and reasons on misconduct

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the case of *Roylance v General Medical Council* which defines misconduct as a 'word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances.' It also had regard to the case of *Nandi v General Medical Council*.

The panel also took into account the NMC's Guidance on Misconduct FTP-2a last updated on 6 June 2025, specifically that on discrimination.

When determining whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct, the panel had regard to the terms of the Code.

The panel was of the view that Miss Lecour's actions did fall significantly short of the standards expected of a registered nurse, and that Miss Lecour's actions amounted to a breach of the Code. Specifically:

'...Promote professionalism and trust

You uphold the reputation of your profession at all times. You should display a personal commitment to the standards of practice and behaviour set out in the Code. You should be a model of integrity and leadership for others to aspire to. This should lead to trust and confidence in the profession from patients, people receiving care, other health and care professionals and the public.

20 Uphold the reputation of your profession at all times

To achieve this, you must:

20.1 *keep to and uphold the standards and values set out in the Code*

20.2 *...treating people fairly and without discrimination, bullying or harassment*

20.3 *be aware at all times of how your behaviour can affect and influence the behaviour of other people*

20.7 *make sure you do not express your personal beliefs (including political, religious or moral beliefs) to people in an inappropriate way*

20.8 *act as a role model of professional behaviour for students and newly qualified nurses, midwives and nursing associates to aspire to*

20.10 *use all forms of spoken, written and digital communication (including social media and networking sites) responsibly, respecting the right to privacy of others at all times...*

The panel appreciated that breaches of the Code do not automatically result in a finding of misconduct. In assessing whether the charges found proved amounted to misconduct, the panel considered the charges individually and cumulatively, taking into account the circumstances of the case as a whole.

The panel was of the view that the conduct of Miss Lecour in the charges found proved was sufficiently serious in nature and would meet the threshold for misconduct.

The panel found that Miss Lecour's comments were discriminatory in nature, offensive, prejudicial and unjust. The panel was of the view that Miss Lecour's comments on the Group's News Feed could have had negative effects on her colleagues who may have questioned Miss Lecour's attitude towards them and thereby impeded them in their work at the Group, potentially impacting the quality of care patients receive.

The panel determined that individually and cumulatively, Miss Lecour's actions would be considered deplorable by fellow practitioners, thereby damaging the trust that they and the public place in the profession.

The panel found that Miss Lecour's actions did fall seriously short of the conduct expected of a nurse and she failed in her duty to uphold the standards and values of nursing and amounted to misconduct.

Decision and reasons on impairment

The panel next went on to decide if as a result of the misconduct, Miss Lecour's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to NMC Guidance at DMA-1, last updated on 3 March 2025, which states:

‘The question that will help decide whether a professional’s fitness to practise is impaired is:

“Can the nurse, midwife or nursing associate practise kindly, safely and professionally?”

If the answer to this question is yes, then the likelihood is that the professional’s fitness to practise is not impaired.’

Nurses occupy a position of privilege and trust in society and are expected at all times to be professional and to maintain professional boundaries. Patients and their families must be able to trust nurses with their lives and the lives of their loved ones. To justify that trust, nurses must be honest and open and act with integrity. They must make sure that their conduct at all times justifies both their patients’ and the public’s trust in the profession.

In this regard the panel considered the judgment of Mrs Justice Cox in the case of *CHRE v NMC and Grant* in reaching its decision. In paragraph 74, she said:

‘In determining whether a practitioner’s fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct, the relevant panel should generally consider not only whether the practitioner continues to present a risk to members of the public in his or her current role, but also whether the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances.’

In paragraph 76, Mrs Justice Cox referred to Dame Janet Smith's “test” which reads as follows:

‘Do our findings of fact in respect of the doctor’s misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction, caution or determination show that his/her/ fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that S/He:

- a) *has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or*
- b) *has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or*
- c) *has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession; and/or*
- d) *...*

In considering the first limb of the *Grant* test the panel noted that there is no evidence before it that Miss Lecour's conduct resulted in any harm to colleagues or patients. However, when a professional on the register engages in discriminatory behaviours, the possible consequences are far-reaching. Members of the public may experience less favourable treatment, or they may feel reluctant to access health and care services in the first place. Discrimination has a profound effect on those who experience it and when nursing colleagues experience this from a fellow nurse it can affect teamwork and individual performance and through this the quality of care that patients receive. Hence the panel took the view that discriminatory behaviour has the potential to lead to a risk of harm to patients. Further, if Miss Lecour were to repeat her misconduct colleagues could be impacted leading to patients being negatively affected. On this basis, the panel determined that limb 'a' of the *Grant* 'test' was engaged.

The panel determined that Miss Lecour's misconduct had breached fundamental tenets of the nursing profession in that she failed to uphold the standards expected of nurses in expressing her discriminatory views. She brought the nursing profession's reputation into disrepute. Miss Lecour's behaviour demonstrates a failure to treat people fairly and

respectfully without discrimination regardless of her personal opinions. The panel determined that limbs 'b' and 'c' in the above *Grant 'test'* were also engaged in this case.

The panel was of the view that the misconduct in this case took place over a period of time and evidenced deep seated attitudinal issues which are inherently difficult to put right. Miss Lecour's email to the NMC on 24 November 2023 stated that she had '*reflected long and hard about this careless comment... On the surface it appears to be an angry email at the lgbt community.*' However, there was no evidence before the panel to suggest that Miss Lecour had an understanding of why her comments and behaviours were discriminatory. She showed no appreciation of how her comments could have negatively impacted colleagues or the patients in their care, or how she would handle the situation differently in the future. Miss Lecour also expressed limited remorse even when pressed. Miss Lecour had also chosen not to attend the hearing to provide any insight. The panel determined that it had no evidence to suggest that Miss Lecour has taken any steps to remediate the concerns.

The panel was of the view that there is a risk of repetition due to Miss Lecour's lack of insight, limited remorse or any evidence of remediation. This case involves deep seated attitudinal concerns which are difficult to remediate through retraining.

The panel determined that should Miss Lecour repeat her actions in the future there would be a risk of harm to patients. On the basis of all the information before it, the panel decided that there is a risk to the public if Miss Lecour were permitted to practise without restriction. The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground of public protection.

The panel bore in mind the overarching objectives of the NMC; to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold and protect the wider public interest. This includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing profession and the NMC as regulator. The panel bore in mind that undermining public confidence in the profession could result in people declining to use the services of registered nurses.

The panel concluded that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore also finds Miss Lecour's fitness to practise impaired on the ground of public interest. A member of the public in possession of all the facts in this case would be deeply concerned if a finding of impairment was not made. There would be public expectation that the regulator would act in a case of this nature in order to uphold public confidence in the nursing profession. The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground of public interest.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Miss Lecour's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Sanction

The panel has considered this case very carefully and has decided to make a striking-off order. It directs the registrar to strike Miss Lecour off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Miss Lecour has been struck-off the register.

In reaching this decision, the panel has had regard to all the evidence that has been adduced in this case and had careful regard to the Sanctions Guidance (SG) published by the NMC.

Submissions on sanction

Ms Jones informed the panel that in the Notice of Hearing, dated 11 September 2025, the NMC had advised Miss Lecour that it would seek the imposition of a striking-off order if it found Miss Lecour's fitness to practise currently impaired.

Ms Jones suggested the following aggravating factors in this case:

- Miss Lecour showed no meaningful remorse
- Limited insight and remediation

Ms Jones also suggested the following possible mitigating factors:

- No actual harm caused to patients
- Longevity of Miss Lecour's career and no evidence of previous regulatory concerns

Ms Jones submitted that making no order or imposing a caution order would be inadequate given the finding of current impairment. She submitted that imposing a conditions of practice order would also be inadequate as there are no conditions that can be put in place to maintain public confidence in the profession.

Ms Jones referred the panel to an email dated 6 February 2024 where Miss Lecour stated:

'...I plan on retiring and not practicing as 48 years is enough but do not want to leave with a bad mark but to be honest I know I'm a good nurse if a bit burnt out...'

Ms Jones also referred to an email dated 10 October 2025 from Miss Lecour to the NMC:

'...With all due respect, I have absolutely no respect for the NMC. I have said this for 10 of the 24 years I have worked for the NHS. ... I thought I had made it abundantly clear. I no longer wanted to be contacted by the NMC...'

Ms Jones submitted that at present it appears that Miss Lecour has no intention of undertaking remediation. She submitted that Miss Lecour has not demonstrated any insight, remorse, or remediation and has not provided any evidence of any training course

undertaken in relevant areas. Ms Jones submitted that public confidence in the profession and the regulator would be diminished if Miss Lecour were permitted to practise without restriction.

Further, Ms Jones submitted that Miss Lecour's misconduct is fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register, and that a striking-off sanction is the necessary and proportionate sanction in this case.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor with particular regard to the SG at SAN-1, SAN-2 and SAN-3e.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Lecour's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what sanction, if any, it should impose in this case. The panel has borne in mind that any sanction imposed must be appropriate and proportionate and, although not intended to be punitive in its effect, may have such consequences. The panel had careful regard to the SG. The decision on sanction is a matter for the panel independently exercising its own judgement.

The panel took into account the following aggravating features:

- Miss Lecour's lack of insight into the failings. Miss Lecour did not look objectively at what she had done or recognise what went wrong. Nor did she recognise the impact of her behaviour on others which could have an impact on quality of care. She did not understand how she could act differently in the future.
- Miss Lecour did not understand her professional duty as a registered nurse not to express her personal beliefs inappropriately.
- No evidence of a meaningful apology or remorse.

- Not a single incident.

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 and public interest issues identified, an order that does not restrict Miss Lecour'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 Miss Lecour's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order 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 impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether placing conditions of practice on Miss Lecour's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated, given the nature of the charges in this case. The misconduct identified in this case involved instances of discriminatory behaviour, which were evidence of deep-seated attitudinal concerns that cannot be easily addressed through retraining. The panel concluded that the placing of conditions on Miss Lecour's registration would not adequately address the seriousness of this case or the attitudinal concerns. It was also of the view that conditions would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest.

The panel then went on to consider whether a suspension order would be an appropriate sanction. The SG states that a suspension order may be appropriate where some of the following factors are apparent:

- *A single instance of misconduct but where a lesser sanction is not sufficient;*
- *No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- *No evidence of repetition of behaviour since the incident;*
- *The Committee is satisfied that the nurse or midwife has insight and does not pose a significant risk of repeating behaviour;*

The panel were of the view that this was not a single incident of misconduct, it was conduct repeated over a period of time. This was despite Miss Lecour receiving warnings and having the opportunity to change her behaviour. The panel took the view that Miss Lecour's actions reflected deep seated attitudinal concerns. The panel also took into account that it had no evidence of meaningful insight or remorse with regard to the charges; therefore, it found a risk of repetition.

The conduct, as highlighted by the facts found proved, was a significant departure from the standards expected of a registered nurse. The panel noted that the serious breach of the fundamental tenets of the profession evidenced by Miss Lecour's actions is fundamentally incompatible with Miss Lecour remaining on the register.

In this particular case, the panel determined that a suspension order would not be a sufficient, appropriate or proportionate sanction.

Finally, in looking at a striking-off order, the panel took note of the following paragraphs of the SG:

- *Do the regulatory concerns about the nurse or midwife raise fundamental questions about their professionalism?*

- *Can public confidence in nurses and midwives be maintained if the nurse or midwife is not removed from the register?*
- *Is striking-off the only sanction which will be sufficient to protect patients, members of the public, or maintain professional standards?*

Miss Lecour's actions were significant departures from the standards expected of a registered nurse, and are fundamentally incompatible with her remaining on the register. Miss Lecour made it clear in her email of 10 October 2025 to the NMC that she had no respect for the NMC as a regulatory body. The panel was of the view that Miss Lecour's actions raised fundamental questions about her professionalism and her willingness to uphold the standard and values of the Code. To allow her to continue practising would undermine public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body.

Balancing all of these factors and after taking into account all the evidence before it during this case, the panel determined that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of a striking-off order.

The panel considered that this order was necessary to mark the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and to send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standard of behaviour required of a registered nurse.

This will be confirmed to Miss Lecour in writing.

Interim order

As the striking-off order cannot take effect until the end of the 28-day appeal period, the panel has considered whether an interim order is required in the specific circumstances of this case. It may only make an interim order if it is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the public, is otherwise in the public interest or in Miss Lecour's own interests until the striking-off sanction takes effect.

Submissions on interim order

The panel took account of the submissions made by Ms Jones. She submitted that the NMC is seeking the imposition of an interim suspension order to cover any appeal period until the substantive suspension order takes effect.

Ms Jones submitted that given the seriousness of the charges found proved, an interim suspension order is necessary on the grounds of public protection and is also otherwise in the wider public interest.

Decision and reasons on interim order

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel was satisfied that an interim order is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. The panel had regard to the seriousness of the facts found proved and the reasons set out in its decision for the substantive order in reaching the decision to impose an interim order.

The panel concluded that an interim conditions of practice order would not be appropriate or proportionate in this case, due to the reasons already identified in the panel's determination for imposing the substantive order. The panel therefore imposed an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months in order to protect the public and the wider public interest to cover the 28-day appeal period and the duration of any appeal should Miss Lecour decide to appeal against the panel's decision.

If no appeal is made, then the interim suspension order will be replaced by the substantive striking-off order 28 days after Miss Lecour is sent the decision of this hearing in writing.

That concludes this determination.

This will be confirmed to Miss Lecour in writing.