

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing  
Thursday, 2 April 2026**

Virtual Hearing

**Name of Registrant:** Miss Heather Elisabeth Taylor

**NMC PIN:** 16B2518E

**Part(s) of the register:** Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1  
Adult Nursing – May 2016

**Relevant Location:** Staffordshire

**Type of case:** Misconduct/Conviction

**Panel members:** Isabelle Parasram (Chair, Lay member)  
Radica Hardyal (Registrant member)  
Michaela McAleer (Lay member)

**Legal Assessor:** Oliver Wise

**Hearings Coordinator:** Anya Sharma

**Nursing and Midwifery Council:** Represented by Naa-Adjeley Barnor, Case Presenter

**Miss Taylor:** Not present and unrepresented

**Order being reviewed:** Suspension order (3 months)

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired

**Outcome:** **Striking-Off order to come into effect on expiry of the suspension order on 12 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1)**

## **Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing**

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Taylor was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Miss Taylor's registered email address by secure email dated 2 March 2026.

Ms Barnor, 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 is satisfied that any previous concerns regarding an incorrect email address for Miss Taylor being used have since been resolved by use of Miss Taylor's correct registered email address.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Hearing provided details of the substantive order being reviewed, the time, date and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Miss Taylor'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 Taylor has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

## **Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Miss Taylor**

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Miss Taylor. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Barnor who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Miss Taylor. She submitted that Miss Taylor had voluntarily absented herself and referred the panel to a call log on 1 April 2026 where the NMC case officer was unable to get in touch with Miss Taylor via phone call, and an email

sent on 1 April 2026 to Miss Taylor enquiring as to whether she will be in attendance at today's hearing.

Ms Barnor submitted that there had been no engagement at all by Miss Taylor with the NMC in relation to these proceedings and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Miss Taylor. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Barnor and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. The main considerations were:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Miss Taylor;
- Miss Taylor has not engaged with the NMC and has not responded to any of the letters sent to her about this hearing;
- Miss Taylor has not provided the NMC with details of how she may be contacted other than her registered email address;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Miss Taylor.

### **Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order**

The panel decided to replace the current suspension order with a striking off order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 12 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the second review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 9 January 2026. This was reviewed on 12 February 2026, where the suspension order was reviewed and confirmed for a further 3 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 12 May 2026.

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

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

*'That you, a registered nurse:*

- 1) On 24 January 2023 were convicted at Telford Magistrates' Court of driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 75 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit on 13 December 2022.*
- 2) On 13 December 2022, intended to attend your work shift under the influence of alcohol.*
- 3) Failed to disclose you were charged with the offence set out in charge 1 above to your employer between 13 December 2022 and 25 January 2023.*
- 4) Your actions at charge 3 lacked integrity in that you failed to inform your employer in a timely manner that you had been charged with a criminal offence.'*

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

*'The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Taylor's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the*

*NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's suitability to remain on the register 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Hands on behalf of the NMC.*

*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 Miss Taylor's fitness to practise remains impaired.*

*The panel determined that limbs a, b and c of the Grant test remains engaged.*

*The panel noted that Miss Taylor had demonstrated some insight at the early stages of the process in 2023, as she had self-referred herself to the NMC and entered a guilty plea to the charges in court. Further, Miss Taylor had informed an interim order panel in February 2023 the steps she had taken then to address the concerns: had investigated courses, had reflected, and was then taking a break to 'strengthen herself'. The panel further noted that the burden was on Miss Taylor in this regard and noted that there was no updated information before it as to what Miss Taylor's insight is at this current time.*

*The panel noted that Miss Taylor had demonstrated early engagement at the initial stages when she self-referred herself to the NMC. However, it noted the continuing duty on registrants to stay in contact with the NMC about matters relevant to their registration and Miss Taylor's lack of engagement with the regulatory process. The panel noted that it has been three years since Miss Taylor last engaged, albeit recognising that it remained unclear what if any communication she may have received in relation to this process between February 2023 and 22 January 2026*

*given the use by the NMC of an email address other than the one currently on the register for her.*

*In its consideration of whether Miss Taylor has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel determined that there was no evidence before it from Miss Taylor of strengthening of practice or any recent reflection.*

*The panel determined that due to the potential ongoing risk to the public in the context of an imminent lapse of the order, and complications in relation to communication identified at the beginning of this hearing arising from the NMC's failure over an unknown period between February 2023 and January 2026 to use Miss Taylor's registered email address, and in fairness to Miss Taylor and the regulator, another proper review of this case is required.*

*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 the misconduct in this case is serious relating to a conviction for drink driving and want of integrity in relation to its non-disclosure, and that a member of the public would be concerned to learn Miss Taylor were permitted to practice unrestricted, therefore a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.*

*For these reasons above, the panel finds that Miss Taylor's fitness to practise remains impaired.'*

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

*'Having found Miss Taylor's 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 disagreed with the NMC that an aggravating feature should include Miss Taylor's lack of engagement with the regulatory process in January 2025 and since, due to the communication issues noted above.*

*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 also considered allowing the order to lapse with a finding of impairment, however, determined that this was not appropriate at this stage.*

*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 Miss Taylor'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 Taylor's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the issues identified. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.*

*The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Miss Taylor's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original hearing and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel was mindful that that there had been no clinical concerns raised about Miss Taylor's practice and given Miss Taylor's lack of engagement there were no reasons to suggest that she would comply. The*

*panel determined that there were no workable conditions of practice that could be formulated that would adequately address the concerns relating to Miss Taylor's misconduct and conviction and suitably protect the public and the wider public interest.*

*The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It determined that there was no evidence before it today to demonstrate that Miss Taylor addressed the regulatory concerns or has sufficiently reflected on her actions and the impact it may have had on patient safety or the nursing profession. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Miss Taylor further time to demonstrate that she has fully reflected on her previous conviction and her related misconduct. The panel concluded that a further three months suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Miss Taylor adequate time to further develop her insight and take steps to address the regulatory concerns. It would also give Miss Taylor an opportunity to approach past and current colleagues to attest to her honesty and integrity in her workplace assignments since the substantive hearing.*

*The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined that imposing a suspension order for a period of three months would provide Miss Taylor with an opportunity to engage with the NMC, obtain testimonials and references to support her case and to provide evidence of compliance with the suggestions put forward by today's panel. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.*

*The panel determined that a strike-off order at this stage would be unfair and disproportionate. Given that the panel is trying to mitigate any unfairness to Miss Taylor, and whilst strike-off is an option, it would be in fairness to her in allowing this period of time to engage with the regulator and these proceedings. However, this is an option available to the next panel to consider if there is a continuation of lack of engagement from Miss Taylor.*

*The panel noted that Miss Taylor can request for an early review in order that she can attend and/or provide further evidence to support her case.*

*This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely at the end of 12 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).*

*Before the end of the period of suspension, another panel will review the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order, or it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order.*

*Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:*

- *Miss Taylor's attendance and engagement with the regulatory process;*
- *A thorough and detailed reflective statement using a recognised reflective model that demonstrates Miss Taylor's:*
  - *insight into her misconduct and conviction;*
  - *its impact on her profession and the wider public;*
  - *what she has done differently since her conviction in January 2023;*
- *Testimonials relating to Miss Taylor's integrity from either paid or unpaid work in the last three years; and*
- *An attendance certificate for drink drive and rehabilitation course.'*

## **Decision and reasons on current impairment**

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Taylor's 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Barnor on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Barnor provided the panel with a background to the case and referred it to the relevant parts of the bundle, including the written decisions of the previous panels. Mr Barnor also invited the panel to take into account the NMC Guidance Standard reviews of substantive orders before they expire (reference REV-2a) and Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place (reference REV-2h) in its consideration of whether Miss Fiske remains impaired.

Ms Barnor also referred the panel to the case of *Abrahaem v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 183 (Admin)*, which sets out that there is a persuasive burden today on Miss Taylor to demonstrate that her past failings have been remedied, which can be done through compliance with the previous panel's recommendations, for example attendance and engagement with the regulatory process, and a thorough and detailed reflective statement demonstrating insight and steps taken since the conviction to address the concerns and three testimonials relating to her integrity.

Ms Barnor submitted that it is for Miss Taylor to satisfy the panel that she has sufficiently addressed the findings of the previous panels. She submitted that the panel will note that Miss Taylor has not provided any evidence for the panel's consideration today. Ms Barnor informed the panel that Miss Taylor is currently suspended, so she cannot work as a nurse, and the NMC has not heard from Miss Taylor since February 2023. She submitted that the panel will see from the NMC on-tables bundle that calls to Miss Taylor's registered phone number do not connect, and post that has been sent to her registered postal address has been returned. Ms Barnor told the panel that, the NMC has also identified an additional address for Miss Taylor through a tracing agent, but despite this, attempts to get in contact with Miss Taylor have remained unsuccessful.

Ms Barnor submitted that in the absence of any evidence from Miss Taylor over the last three years, the panel may be minded to find that she has not shown any insight into her failings or the seriousness of her past misconduct and conviction, and there has been no remediation. She submitted that the concerns are serious and the position today has not

changed since the substantive meeting in January 2025 and the last review hearing in February 2026.

Ms Barnor submitted that without evidence of adequate insight and remediation, the risk of harm and repetition remain, Miss Taylor's fitness to practise remains impaired on the basis of public protection and public interest.

Ms Barnor then addressed the panel in relation to sanction. She submitted that given the seriousness of the case and the risk presented, and in the absence of any engagement from Miss Taylor to provide evidence of remediation and insight, the panel may take the view that revoking the order, allowing it to lapse on expiry or imposing a caution order would be inappropriate. She submitted that the regulatory concerns in this case are not at the lower end of the spectrum and involve serious misconduct and a conviction which puts the public at a risk of harm and breaches fundamental tenets of the profession.

Ms Barnor submitted that when considering the NMC's Guidance on condition of practice orders (Reference SAN-2c), the panel may take the view that imposing a conditions of practice order would neither be appropriate or proportionate. She submitted that as identified by the previous panel, with nothing from Miss Taylor before this panel to persuade it that the risk in this case has been reduced, there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated to address the public interest and public protection concerns. Ms Barnor submitted that Miss Taylor's lack of engagement with this process strongly suggests that she would not engage with conditions of practice if they were imposed and therefore they are not workable.

Ms Barnor submitted that it is also open to the panel to impose a further period of suspension. She submitted however that when the panel considers the NMC Guidance at SAN 2-d in respect of sanctions available, the panel may take the view that this is not suitable.

Ms Barnor submitted that there is an ongoing risk to the public given the lack of remediation and insight, and temporary removal is not the only way to manage the risk in this case. She submitted that the panel may also consider that given the lack of progress made by Miss Taylor thus far, the panel may come to the conclusion that it is now

unrealistic that she will return to unrestricted practice in the near future. Ms Barnor invited the panel to consider the purpose of a suspension order and whether that purpose can be achieved if a suspension order is again imposed.

Ms Barnor then referred the panel to the NMC Guidance Deciding between suspension and strike-off (reference SAN-3), which states that it is unlikely that a professional will try to address the concerns, then it may not be appropriate for them to be suspended in the hope that they will eventually return to practice. The guidance also says that if a registrant has failed to engage with the fitness to practise process, it usually will not be appropriate to use a suspension order as a means of giving them a last chance to either engage, reflect or show insight. Ms Barnor submitted that this is precisely the situation that we find ourselves in today.

Ms Barnor submitted that the next option for the panel to consider is a striking-off order. She submitted that the panel may find that Miss Taylor continues to show no insight into her failings and the seriousness of the conviction and past misconduct, and she has not provided any evidence of effective steps taken to reduce the risk of repetition. She submitted that the previous panel and the original panel found that the misconduct and conviction were not fundamentally incompatible with ongoing registration. However, Miss Taylor has made no efforts to remediate or to demonstrate insight. Ms Barnor submitted that as a result, this panel may conclude that the circumstances now raise fundamental questions about Miss Taylor's professionalism. In those circumstances, a striking-off order is now the only sanction that would be sufficient to protect patients and members of the public and it is also required to maintain professional standards.

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 Ms Taylor's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Miss Taylor lacked insight. At this hearing the panel noted that there has been no engagement from Miss Taylor. It had no evidence before it of any insight into the concerns which led to the current order, no evidence of remediation, and no evidence that Miss Taylor has taken any steps to strengthen her practice or address the underlying concerns. The panel considered that the lack of engagement over such an extended period represented a deterioration in Miss Taylor's position, in that there has been a prolonged absence of any meaningful progress.

In the absence of any new information from Miss Taylor, the panel remains in the same position as previous panels, namely that there is no basis upon which it can conclude that the regulatory concerns in this case have been addressed. The panel was particularly concerned that it had no evidence to demonstrate that Miss Taylor had developed insight into her misconduct or conviction-related concerns, nor any evidence to show that any risk identified previously had been reduced.

The panel was of the view that in the absence of any evidence of insight or remediation, the risk identified by previous panels remains. The panel had no information before it which would allow it to conclude that Miss Taylor's fitness to practise is no longer impaired. It found that there remains a risk to the public and that Miss Taylor remains liable to bring the profession into disrepute and to breach fundamental tenets of the profession. The panel also remained concerned in relation to the charge involving lack of integrity, namely the failure to inform her employer in a timely manner that she had been charged with an offence.

The panel concluded that there was no evidence that the concerns had been addressed at all. It was of the view that Miss Taylor has not taken advantage of the opportunities afforded to her by the existing suspension order, as there is no evidence that she has engaged in any process of reflection, rehabilitation, or remediation.

In these circumstances, the panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and

upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. The panel was of the view that public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in circumstances where Miss Taylor has failed to engage and has provided no evidence of progress or remediation.

The panel therefore determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

### **Decision and reasons on sanction**

Having found Miss Taylor's 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. The panel has taken into account the NMC Guidance on Removal from the register where there is a substantive order in place (reference REV-2h). The panel has concluded that to take no action would not accord with this guidance as it would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case and the complete lack of engagement following the first substantive decision. 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 Miss Taylor'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, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again'* The panel considered that Miss Taylor's misconduct and conviction 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 Miss Taylor's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable, relevant and workable. The panel bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original hearing and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to Miss Taylor's misconduct and conviction.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that Miss Taylor's lack of engagement has demonstrated a lack of sufficient remorse for her misconduct. Further, Miss Taylor has not demonstrated any insight into her previous failings. The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Miss Taylor no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances.

The panel then went on to consider a striking-off order. It was mindful that this is the most serious sanction available and should be imposed only where no lesser sanction would be sufficient. However, the panel concluded that this is now the case. It considered that Miss Taylor has been given sufficient opportunity to engage and remediate but has failed to do so. There has been no engagement for a prolonged period, no evidence of insight, no evidence of remediation, and no indication that Miss Taylor intends to take steps to resolve the concerns or return to safe and unrestricted practice. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that a further suspension order would serve only to delay a final outcome without any realistic prospect of a change in circumstances by Miss Taylor.

The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Miss Taylor from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 12 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Miss Taylor in writing.

That concludes this determination.