

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

**Substantive Meeting
Thursday, 1 April 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant: Petros Mouskafidis

NMC PIN: 16D0763C

Part(s) of the register: Nurses part of the register Sub part 1
RN1: Adult nurse, level 1

Relevant Location: Northern Ireland

Type of case: Conviction

Panel members: George Duff (Chair, Lay member)
Charlotte Cooley (Registrant member)
Matthew Clarkson (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Jayne Wheat

Hearings Coordinator: Tyra Andrews

Facts proved: Charges 1

Facts not proved: None

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Sanction: **Striking-off order**

Interim order: **Interim suspension order (18 months)**

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Meeting

The panel was informed at the start of this meeting that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Mr Mouskafidis' registered email address by secure email on 3 March 2026.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the allegation, the time, date and the fact that this meeting was heard virtually.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mr Mouskafidis 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', as amended (the Rules).

Details of charge

That you, a registered nurse:

1. On 8 May 2024 were convicted for the following offence:

Defendant on the 2nd day of November 2021 intentionally exposed your genitals intending that someone would see them and be caused alarm or distress contrary to Article 70 of The Sexual Offences (Northern Ireland) Order 2008

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

Decision and reasons on facts

The charge concerns Mr Mouskafidis' conviction and, having been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction dated 20 March 2025, the panel finds that the facts are found proved in accordance with Rule 31 (2). These state:

- ‘31.—** (2) *Where a registrant has been convicted of a criminal offence—*
- (a) *a copy of the certificate of conviction, certified by a competent officer of a Court in the United Kingdom (or, in Scotland, an extract conviction) shall be conclusive proof of the conviction; and*
 - (b) *the findings of fact upon which the conviction is based shall be admissible as proof of those facts...’*

Background

The Nursing and Midwifery Council (‘the NMC’) opened a referral about you on 24 April 2025 under Article 22(6) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001.

This referral resulted in an investigation by the NMC, which identified the regulatory concern set out below.

The regulatory concern is:

1. Conviction: in that you received a conviction for the following offence: On the 2nd day of November 2021 intentionally exposed your genitals intending that someone would see them and be caused alarm or distress to Article 70 of The Sexual Offences (Northern Ireland) Order 2008.

This regulatory concern relates to an incident summarised in police documentation which stated:

‘Victim states that on the 02/11/2021 at 1935hrs she was walking up the Woodvale road Belfast, towards the Ardyone roundabout with her friend and her dog. Another dog walker was coming in the opposite direction so she went to cross to the other side of the road.

The suspects vehicle has then stopped to let her cross the road. Once across the road, the same vehicle then pulled up beside victim. The male inside the vehicle then put is interior light on. As the victim looked inside the car, she noticed that the

male had got his penis out of his trousers and was making a masturbation motion with his penis in his right hand, and making eye contact with the victim while carrying out this action.

The victim was distressed and quickly walked on back across the road to tell her friend what she had witnessed. The vehicle then drove on up the Woodvale road towards the Ardoyne roundabout and down the Crumlin road.'

The incident resulted in Mr Mouskafidis receiving a criminal conviction on 8 May 2024.

Fitness to practise

Having announced its findings on the facts, the panel then considered whether, on the basis of the facts found proved, Mr Mouskafidis' fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of Mr Mouskafidis' conviction.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor which included reference to a number of relevant judgments. This included: *Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin).

Decision and reasons on impairment

The panel next went on to decide if as a result of the conviction, Mr Mouskafidis' fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*Impairment*' (Reference: DMA-1 Last Updated:28/01/2026) in which the following is stated:

'Being fit to practise is not defined in our legislation but for us it means that a professional on our register can practise as a nurse midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively without restriction.'

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 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/their fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that She/He/They:

- 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...'*

The panel finds that the public was put at risk and acknowledged that the victim (a member of the public) experienced emotional harm and distress as a result of Mr

Mouskafidis' actions which then led to his conviction. Mr Mouskafidis' conviction had breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute.

The panel bore in mind that Mr Mouskafidis is on the sexual offenders register for a period of 5 years and has been convicted of a sexual offence in the criminal court.

The panel consider Mr Mouskafidis' actions suggest a deep-seated attitudinal issue. Mr Mouskafidis has not engaged with the NMC and the panel found that he has not demonstrated an understanding of how his actions impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession or acknowledged how his actions caused emotional distress to a member of the public. The panel had no information before it to show that Mr Mouskafidis has demonstrated any insight into his actions and his conviction or taken any steps to remediate his actions.

On the basis that there is no evidence before the panel to show that Mr Mouskafidis has demonstrated any insight, reflection, remorse or remediation, the panel is of the view that there is a risk of repetition and risk to the public. The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel bore in mind that the overarching objectives of the NMC are to protect, promote and maintain the health safety and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold/protect the wider public interest, which includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing and midwifery professions and upholding the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is also required. The panel considered that the conviction for a sexual offence is extremely serious and is a specified offence within the NMC guidance. It considered that Mr Mouskafidis' conduct is capable of seriously damaging public confidence in the nursing profession. In circumstances where sexual misconduct resulted in a conviction, confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made. The panel therefore determined that a finding of impairment is also necessary on public interest grounds.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Mr Mouskafidis' 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 Mr Mouskafidis off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Mr Mouskafidis 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 regard to the NMC Guidance on Sanction including SAN-2, SAN-3 and SAN-4.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Representations on sanction

The panel noted that in the Notice of Meeting, dated 3 March 2026, the NMC had advised Mr Mouskafidis that it would seek the imposition of a striking-off order if it found Mr Mouskafidis' fitness to practise currently impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Mouskafidis' fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what sanction, if any, it should impose. 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 decision on sanction is a matter for the panel independently exercising its own judgement.

The panel took into account the following aggravating features:

- Predatory behaviour - Mr Mouskafidis initially drove past the victim but then drove back up to them and carried out the actions outlined in the charge.
- Pre-meditated behaviour.
- Mr Mouskafidis was driving to his place of work at the Care Home and was wearing his uniform at the time of the incident.
- Absence of any insight.

The panel could not identify mitigating features upon review of the evidence before it.

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.

The panel next considered a caution order and had regard to the NMC Guidance on ‘*Caution order*’ (Reference: SAN-2b Last Updated: 28/01/2026) in which the following is stated:

‘A caution is only appropriate if the Committee has decided there’s no risk to the public or to people using services that requires the professional’s practice to be restricted. This means the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again.’

The panel considered that Mr Mouskafidis’ actions and conviction was not at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise, and it found that there is a risk to public safety. The panel therefore determined that a sanction that does not restrict Mr Mouskafidis’ practise would not protect the public. The panel also determined that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether to place a conditions of practice on Mr Mouskafidis’ registration. In considering whether conditions of practice are appropriate, the panel had regard to the factors set out in the NMC Guidance on ‘*Conditions of practice order*’ (Reference: SAN-2c Last Updated: 28/01/2026).

The panel found that there are deep-seated attitudinal concerns raised in Mr Mouskafidis' conduct. There is no evidence of engagement from Mr Mouskafidis regarding NMC proceedings. Having regard to the nature and seriousness of Mr Mouskafidis' conduct, the panel determined that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The panel considered that there are no relevant, proportionate, workable or measurable conditions that could be formulated to protect the public, maintain confidence and to uphold professional standards, especially in light of the fact that Mr Mouskafidis is subject to registration on the Sex Offenders Register for 5 years from 8 May 2024.

The panel went on to consider whether a suspension order is appropriate in this case. The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*Suspension order*' (Reference: SAN-2d Last Updated: 28/01/2026) in which the following factors on when a suspension order may be appropriate are set out:

- *'the impairment is very serious but not fundamentally incompatible with continuing to be a registered professional*
- *an outcome less severe than strike-off would still satisfy the over-arching objective.'*

The panel also had regard to the key considerations as set out in the NMC Guidance to weigh up before imposing a suspension. It noted the following list of circumstances that may make a suspension order an appropriate sanction:

- *'the charges found proved are at the most serious end of the spectrum and call into question the professional's suitability to continue practising, either currently or at all*
- *while it is possible that the professional could be fit to practise in future, only a period out of practice would be sufficient to allow them to fully strengthen their practice through reflection, the development of their professional skills and / or development of insight and remediation*
- *there is a risk to the safety of people using services if the professional were allowed to continue to practise even with conditions*
- *what went wrong is so serious that public confidence in the profession and professional standards could not be maintained if the professional were able to continue practising without stopping for a period of time*

- *despite the seriousness of what happened, the professional has engaged in the proceedings and has shown at least some meaningful insight which evidences a realistic possibility that they will continue to develop this insight, address their concerns and return to practice.'*

Whilst the panel acknowledged that the risks identified could be managed by Mr Mouskafidis being temporarily removed from the Register, it considered that it would not be sufficient to uphold public confidence in the profession and maintain professional standards due to the seriousness and nature of the facts found proved. Given Mr Mouskafidis' lack of engagement, no evidence of any insight and lack of remorse, the panel considered that there is no realistic possibility that he would address the concerns to such a level where he could return to practise safely. The panel considered it inappropriate that Mr Mouskafidis would be subject to the Sex Offenders Register requirements once the period of suspension was complete.

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

In considering a striking-off order, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*Sanctions for the highest risk cases*' (Reference SAN-4 Last Updated: 28/01/2026). [set out panels reasons] Having regard to all of the above, the panel determined that this case falls within the definition of being a '*highest risk case*'.

The panel had regard to the following considerations as set out in the NMC Guidance entitled '*Striking-off order*' (Reference: SAN-2e Last Updated; 28/01/2026):

- *Do the charges found proved raise fundamental questions about their professionalism?*
- *Can public confidence in the profession be maintained if the professional is not removed from the Register?*
- *Is there any amount of insight and reflection which could keep people receiving care and members of the public safe, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold professional standards?*

- *Is there a realistic prospect that, after suspension, the professional will have gained insight and strengthened their practice such that the risk they pose will have reduced?*

The panel found that the facts of the sexual offence are extremely serious and resulted in a member of the public suffering from emotional distress. It was satisfied that Mr Mouskafidis' actions in the charge found proved would raise fundamental questions around his professionalism. The panel found that Mr Mouskafidis has not shown any evidence of insight. It further determined that Mr Mouskafidis has not engaged with the NMC, therefore undermining any realistic prospect that he could gain insight and strengthened practice to reduce the risk identified.

Mr Mouskafidis' actions were significant departures from the standards expected of a registered nurse, and are fundamentally incompatible with him remaining on the register. The panel was of the view that the findings in this particular case demonstrate that Mr Mouskafidis' actions were serious and to allow him 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. Having regard to the matters it identified, in particular the effect of Mr Mouskafidis' actions in bringing the profession into disrepute by adversely affecting the public's view of how a registered nurse should conduct himself, the panel has concluded that nothing short of this would be sufficient in this case.

The panel noted the hardship such an order will inevitably cause Mr Mouskafidis. However, this is outweighed by the serious nature of the conviction and public interest in protecting patients, upholding the reputation of the profession and upholding proper standards for nurses.

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 Mr Mouskafidis' own interests until the striking-off sanction takes effect. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Decision and reasons on interim order

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 fact 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 as it was necessary to protect the public and is in the public interest.

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

This will be confirmed to Mr Mouskafidis in writing.

That concludes this determination.