

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Thursday, 9 April 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant: Georgina Ruth Parry

NMC PIN: 91Y0616E

Part(s) of the register: Registered Nurse
Adult Nursing – 3 July 1994

Relevant Location: England

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: James Carr (Chair, lay member)
Ivan McGlen (Registrant member)
John Marley (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Ben Stephenson

Hearings Coordinator: Elizabeth Fagbo

Nursing and Midwifery Council: Represented by Megan Verity, Case Presenter

Mrs Parry: Present and represented by Ben Edwards
instructed by the Royal College of Nursing (RCN)

Order being reviewed: Conditions of practice order (12 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Striking-Off order to come into effect on 17 May 2026
in accordance with Article 30 (1)**

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

At the outset of the hearing, Mr Edwards, on your behalf, made a request that this case be held partially in private [PRIVATE]. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

Ms Verity, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), indicated that she did not oppose the application.

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 to go into private session as and when [PRIVATE].

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to replace the current conditions of practice order with a striking off order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 17 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the fourth review of a substantive conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 14 April 2022. This was reviewed on 6 April 2023 when the panel decided to confirm the substantive conditions of practice order for another 12 months. The order was reviewed on 3 April 2024 and 14 April 2025 where the condition of practice order was further extended for 12 months on each occasion.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 17 May 2026.

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

The charge found proved which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order was as follows:

‘That you, a registered nurse, while employed as a Deputy Manager:

- 1. On one or more occasions between approximately May 2020 and 21 August 2020 slept on duty.*

...

And, by reason of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.’

The third reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

‘The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Ms Parry had developing insight. At this hearing the panel found that Ms Parry’s insight has improved but that it is still developing. Ms Parry has not yet demonstrated an understanding of how her actions put patients at risk of harm, an understanding of why what she did was wrong and how this impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession and how she would handle the situation differently in the future.

In its consideration of whether Ms Parry has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel considered the training that Ms Parry has undertaken. The panel determined that although Ms Parry has taken positive and active steps to strengthen her practice, the trainings were not specifically relevant to remediating the previous misconduct. The panel also noted that Ms Parry has not yet had the opportunity to demonstrate strengthened practice relating to the concerns in a clinical environment as a nurse. The panel had regard to Ms Parry’s representation that she is actively looking for an employment and that she is keen to practice as a nurse.

The last reviewing panel determined that Ms Parry was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. There is no relevant evidence before today's panel to demonstrate that the risk of repetition has been diminished. The panel again noted that Ms Parry has not been working as a registered nurse and is therefore unable to provide evidence of complying with the conditions of practice order. [PRIVATE]. This panel determined that Ms Parry 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 determined that, in this case, not restricting Ms Parry's practice would undermine the public interest. Thus, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

The panel also acknowledge that Ms Parry has conceded to her continuing impairment.

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

The third 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 Ms Parry'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 Parry'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 imposing a further conditions of practice order on Ms Parry's 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 determined that it would be possible to formulate appropriate and practical conditions which would address the failings highlighted in this case. The panel accepted that Ms Parry has been unable to comply with conditions of practice due to their current employment status and [PRIVATE] but is engaging with the NMC, actively trying to get a suitable employment, the personal circumstances are being resolved and is willing to comply with any conditions imposed.

The panel was of the view that a further conditions of practice order is sufficient to protect patients and the wider public interest, noting as the original panel did that there was no evidence of general incompetence and no deep-seated attitudinal problems. In this case, there are conditions could be formulated which would protect patients during the period they are in force.

The panel was of the view that to impose a suspension order or a striking-off order would be wholly disproportionate and would not be a reasonable response in the circumstances of Ms Parry's case given that she has been engaging with the proceedings and that she has provided reasons as to why she has not remediated the previous misconduct.

In considering the length of time by which to extend the conditions of practice order, the panel noted that this is the third review of an order first imposed on 14 April 2022. Since that time, the order has been twice extended, and Ms Parry has not worked as a registered nurse. The panel took into account the authority of Annon v NMC which addressed the question as to whether a conditions of practice order could be continued indefinitely. The panel noted that, in certain circumstances, the wider public interest and the interest of the registrant can be addressed by the imposition of a time limit on an order.

It is the panel's view that, in extending the present condition of practice order, the time may be imminent so that the next reviewing panel may consider a different sanction which includes the powers of suspension and strike-off.

Whilst the panel acknowledged that the process of imposing a conditions of practice order cannot continue indefinitely, the panel had regard to the recent change in circumstances of Ms Parry and her efforts to secure employment within the nursing profession. The panel decided that a period of 12 months will allow Ms Parry sufficient time to obtain employment as a registered nurse and thereafter to take steps to strengthen her practice and to work without further incident.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of 12 months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 17 May 2025. It decided to impose the following conditions which it considered are appropriate and proportionate in this case:

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. *You must limit your nursing practice to a single substantive employer (which should not be an agency).*
2. *You must not be the registered nurse in charge of any shift.*
3. *You must ensure that you are supervised any time you are working. Your supervision must consist of working at all times on the same shift as, but not always directly observed by, a registered nurse.*
4. *You must provide quarterly reports to the NMC from your line manager or supervisor setting out the standard of your conduct and your clinical performance with particular regard to sleeping on duty.*
5. *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.*
6. *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.*
7. *You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:*
 - a) *Any organisation or person you work for.*
 - b) *Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).*
 - c) *Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.*
 - d) *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.*

8. *You must tell your NMC 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.*

9. *You must allow your NMC 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.*

The period of this order is for 12 months.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 17 May 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of the order, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well Ms Parry has complied with the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order or any condition of it, it may confirm the order or vary any condition of it, or it may replace the order for another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- *Mrs Parry's attendance at the next review hearing and her continued engagement with the NMC.*
- *Clear evidence of steps taken to return to clinical practice or what Ms Parry's future plans are.*
- *Testimonials from a supervisor in a clinical setting.*

- *Updated reflective piece demonstrating her understanding of how her previous misconducted negatively impacted herself, patients, her colleagues and the reputation of the nursing profession.*
- *Information on relevant training undertaken in relation to professional standards and evidence of successful completion.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether your fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as the ability of a professional on our register to practise as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively without restriction. 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 your responses. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Verity on behalf of the NMC. She referred to the NMC Guidance REV-2a last updated on 30 August 2024, and *Abrahaem v NMC* [2008] EWHC 183 (Admin) at [23]. She also referred the panel to your reflective piece dated 8 April 2026 contained in your registrant bundle.

Ms Verity submitted that the panel may consider that there is a lack of evidence, in relation to training and development relating to professional standards as requested by the last panel. She submitted that it is a matter for the panel as to whether it finds you currently impaired.

Ms Verity submitted that if the panel consider that you are currently impaired, then it must go on to consider what sanction, if any, should be imposed. She referred the panel to the previous panel decision which acknowledged that a conditions of practice order cannot be continued indefinitely. She submitted that it is a matter for the panel to consider which order is proportionate given the circumstances of this case.

The panel also had regard to submissions from Mr Edwards on your behalf. He submitted that you accepted that you are currently impaired. He submitted that you have not worked as a nurse since the imposition of this order and have not been able to demonstrate compliance with the current conditions that are in place, which you acknowledge. Mr Edwards submitted that prior to moving to Scotland you maintained working in the medical sector, by undertaking the role of a care worker, which you wish to return to soon.

Mr Edwards submitted that your understanding and insight into the failings is developing and has significantly developed since the last review hearing. He referred to your reflective piece and [PRIVATE]. Mr Edwards submitted that this has impacted your ability to apply for jobs and comply with the current conditions of practice order, which you intend to do once you are able to. He submitted that this time period has allowed you to reflect on your actions that led to the referral to the NMC and the impact on patients, colleagues, and the nursing profession. Mr Edwards submitted that you have been engaging with the process, albeit you have not been able to work in a nursing role. You have reflected and considered your actions which shows that you are determined to move forward, develop and improve to ensure you are able to practise safely and effectively.

Mr Edwards submitted that since the last review, although you have not provided any documentation, you have attempted to maintain your knowledge and understanding within the nursing profession. He told the panel that you are required to complete your mandatory training on a yearly basis and will undertake that training when it expires. You have also been reading articles from the British Medical Journal and Medscape, are a part of a platform for professionals, and are keeping up to date with managing conditions, research and education.

Mr Edwards submitted that you accept that the conditions of practice order had been extended by a period of 12 months on previous occasions. He submitted that extending the order by longer than 12 months would allow you effective time to apply for roles and to undertake further training. Mr Edwards told the panel that an extended period of the conditions or practice order for 18 months may be appropriate as you are aware that this is essentially your last chance and you have taken the comments made by the previous reviewing panel seriously.

Mr Edwards invited the panel to impose a further conditions of practice order. He submitted that this is the most appropriate sanction to impose a further conditions of practice order, rather than a more severe sanction such as a suspension order or a striking off order.

Mr Edwards also referred the panel to the NMC Guidance on lapse with impairment. Mr Edwards stated that if the panel concluded that conditions of practice were not appropriate then lapse of impairment would be appropriate.

The panel 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 your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that you had developing insight. At this hearing the panel had no evidence that your insight has developed any further, sufficient to keep people receiving care and members of the public safe, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold professional standards. The panel took into account your current personal circumstances and your reflective statement. It was of the view that the reflective piece did not demonstrate an understanding of why your actions were wrong, how they put vulnerable patients at risk of harm, or how the reputation of the nursing profession could have been negatively impacted as a result of your actions. Nor did the reflection highlight any strategies you have developed in order to avoid the misconduct reoccurring in the future.

In its consideration of whether you have taken steps to strengthen your practice, the panel took into account that you have not practised as a registered nurse since the imposition of the conditions of practice order. It also took into account that you are currently facing difficult personal circumstances affecting your ability to apply for job roles. The panel also noted the submission of Mr Edwards in that you have continued to make an effort to engage in relevant reading and research, in order to keep your training up to date.

However, the panel had no evidence before it to support this or to demonstrate that you have strengthened your practice in any way. The panel also concluded that the British Medical Journal document referenced by Mr Edwards was not relevant to the areas requiring reflection and insight and that there were other accessible documents which would be far more relevant. You failed to evidence how your learning from Medscape linked to your current impairment or your future practice.

The panel therefore determined that you are liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved and consequently there remains a significant risk of harm to the public. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the ground 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.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found your 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 and the lack of insight. 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, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again.’* The panel considered that your 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 your 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 bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original hearing, the conditions have been in place since 2022 and most recently confirmed in April 2025. The panel noted that the previous panel listed evidence that a future reviewing panel would be assisted by which was as follows:

‘...Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- *Mrs Parry’s attendance at the next review hearing and her continued engagement with the NMC.*
- *Clear evidence of steps taken to return to clinical practice or what Ms Parry’s future plans are.*
- *Testimonials from a supervisor in a clinical setting.*
- *Updated reflective piece demonstrating her understanding of how her previous misconducted negatively impacted herself, patients, her colleagues and the reputation of the nursing profession.*
- *Information on relevant training undertaken in relation to professional standards and evidence of successful completion...’*

The panel concluded that your failure to engage with the requests of previous panels would make a conditions of practice order inappropriate in the circumstances. The panel was provided no clear evidence of a return to clinical practice or what your future plans are. The panel considered that the document provided by you on 8 April 2026 did not address the previous panels guidance that you should produce a reflective piece

demonstrating your understanding of how her previous misconduct negatively impacted you, your patients, your colleagues and the reputation of the nursing profession, nor did you provide any evidence of training focused on professional standards.

Although the panel concluded that it was able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately protect the public it concluded that since you have provided no evidence to demonstrate that you understand the seriousness of your misconduct, the impact on patients and public confidence over the last four years it is not appropriate to continue to do so. The panel took into account the relevant case law of *Annon v NMC* [2017] EWHC 1879 Admin which addresses that a conditions of practice order cannot be continued indefinitely.

The panel next considered imposing a suspension order. The panel was of the view that your misconduct was capable of being remediated in any job role, as it related to sleeping on duty rather than a clinical issue. However, it determined that you have not shown any remediation for your misconduct despite having been placed on a conditions of practice order for four years and being provided with guidance from panels on what would assist a future panel. Further, it was of the view that you have demonstrated very limited insight into your misconduct and have not provided any evidence of strengthened practice. The panel was of the view that considerable evidence and reflection would be required to show that your misconduct has been remedied and despite having ample opportunity to demonstrate remediation, you have failed to do so. For these reasons the panel was not satisfied that you no longer pose a risk to the public.

In these circumstances the panel determined that a period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose.

The panel acknowledged that a striking-off order was not the sanction bid put forward by the NMC, however, it was of the view as an independent panel, it needed to consider all of the facts before it, including the previous panel's decision and the relevant NMC guidance. The panel concluded that there was no evidence before it to demonstrate that you are moving towards returning to unrestricted practice. By failing to demonstrate sufficient reflection and remediation on the significance of the charge proven this raises fundamental questions about your professionalism. The panel acknowledged your personal

circumstances. It also noted that whilst you are currently not working, there have been periods of time where you have continued to work. Therefore, it was of the view that it [PRIVATE] have wholly and significantly impacted your ability to produce the documents suggested by the previous panel. The panel concluded that the confidence in the profession would not be maintained if you were not removed from the register.

The panel considered NMC guidance in relation to lapse with impairment. When considering that guidance the panel concluded that this was a case where there had been a clear lack of progress.

The panel were sympathetic to [PRIVATE] described within your reflection, character reference and articulated by Mr Edwards. However, the panel concluded that these issues would not have stopped you from providing an appropriate reflection.

The panel further considered the guidance which states that Strike off is appropriate 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 concluded that lapse with impairment was not appropriate as it had no evidence before it that your personal life issues could be attributable wholly or in significant part to matters outside your control.

In light of this conclusion the panel determined that a striking-off order was the only appropriate outcome.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 17 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.