

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

**Substantive Meeting
Thursday 13 August 2026**

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

Name of Registrant:	Keira Burton
NMC PIN:	13F1345E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 Adult Nursing – (September 2013) Nurse Independent / Supplementary Prescriber – (August 2021)
Relevant Location:	Lancashire
Type of case:	Conviction
Panel members:	Konrad Chrzanowski (Chair, Lay member) Julia Briscoe (Registrant member) Ian Hanson (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Richard Ferry-Swainson
Hearings Coordinator:	Charis Benefo
Facts proved:	Charges 1, 2, 3 and 4
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 noted at the start of this meeting that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Miss Burton's registered email address by secure email on 7 July 2026.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the allegations. It advised Miss Burton that a panel of the Fitness to Practise Committee at a Notice of Referral Meeting on 3 July 2026 had decided to refer this matter to a substantive meeting. The Notice of Meeting indicated that the substantive meeting would be held on or after 11 August 2026.

Details of charge

That you, a registered nurse:

- 1) On 18 July 2024 were convicted of conspire to bring/throw/convey a List 'A' prohibited article into/out of a prison
- 2) On 18 July 2024 were convicted of conspire to bring/throw/convey a List 'B' prohibited article into/out of a prison
- 3) On 18 July 2024 were convicted of being concerned in the supply of a controlled drug Class B – Cannabis
- 4) On 18 July 2024 were convicted of being concerned in the supply of a controlled drug Class B – Other

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

Background

Miss Burton was admitted to the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) register as a Registered Adult Nurse on 3 September 2013.

Miss Burton was referred to the NMC on 22 December 2023 by Spectrum Community Health – CIC through whom she was employed as an Advanced Nurse Practitioner working within the Primary Care Team at HM Prison Preston (HMP Preston).

Miss Burton was convicted on 18 July 2024 for the following offences:

1. Conspire to bring/throw/convey a List 'A' prohibited article into/out of a prison
2. Conspire to bring/throw/convey a List 'B' prohibited article into/out of a prison
3. Concerned in the supply of a controlled drug Class B – Cannabis
4. Concerned in the supply of a controlled drug Class B – Other

In his sentencing remarks, the judge described the background to the criminal offence. Miss Burton was one of 13 defendants who were convicted regarding the conveyance and onward supply of cannabis, spice, ketamine, phones and SIM cards into HMP Preston and HM Prison Lancaster Farms between July 2023 and April 2024. Miss Burton's involvement in the arrangement was for a period of over four months.

Miss Burton was arrested on her last day at work in December 2023 and had [PRIVATE] 16.4 grams of cannabis resin [PRIVATE]. At home and within her car, Miss Burton had a stash of items ready for transit into prison: phones, SIM cards, £600 in cash, tobacco and a pair of shoes with a hollowed apartment within the innersoles.

Miss Burton was sentenced at Preston Crown Court on 21 March 2025 to a custodial sentence of 20 months.

Decision and reasons on facts

The charges concern Miss Burton's conviction and, having been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction, the panel determined that the facts are found proved in accordance with Rule 31 (2) and (3). 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.*
- (3) The only evidence which may be adduced by the registrant in rebuttal of a conviction certified or extracted in accordance with paragraph (2)(a) is evidence for the purpose of proving that she is not the person referred to in the certificate or extract.'*

The panel also took into account and gave considerable weight to the sentencing remarks of the trial judge dated 21 March 2025.

In addition, the panel had regard to the *'Agreed removal admissions form'* completed and signed by Miss Burton on 8 September 2025, on which she indicated her admission to the regulatory concerns against her. It also noted Miss Burton's undated written statement, which was provided in support of her application for agreed removal from the NMC register.

Fitness to practise

Having announced its findings on the facts, the panel then considered whether, on the basis of the facts found proved, Miss Burton's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her conviction. There is no statutory definition of fitness to practise. However, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's suitability to remain on the register unrestricted.

Representations on impairment

The NMC requires the panel to bear in mind its overarching objective to protect 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.

In the '*Agreed removal admissions form*' completed and signed by Miss Burton on 8 September 2025, she indicated her admission that her fitness to practise is currently impaired. The panel also took into account Miss Burton's written statement, which set out her reflections on the conviction.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor which included reference to a number of relevant judgments. These included: *Council for the Regulation of Health Care Professionals v General Dental Council & Fleischmann* [2005] EWHC 87 (Admin), *PSA v General Dental Council & Naveed Patel* [2024] EWHC 243 (Admin), *Cohen v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) and *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v (1) Nursing and Midwifery Council (2) Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin).

Decision and reasons on impairment

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

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the NMC guidance on '*Impairment*' (reference: DMA-1) 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. 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 S/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*
- d) has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.'*

The panel determined that limbs a), b) and c) are engaged in this case.

The panel noted that, as a registered nurse working in a prison, Miss Burton smuggled illegal drugs and the material used to facilitate their manufacture and onward supply into the prison, placing inmate patients who could have used them at risk of harm. It therefore found that Miss Burton acted so as to put patients at unwarranted risk of harm.

The panel determined that Miss Burton's criminal behaviour brought the nursing profession into disrepute, because fellow practitioners and members of the public, knowing the full facts of this case, would be appalled by her behaviour. It also found that Miss Burton had undermined the high standards expected of registered nurses and breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession, which included acting in the best interests of people at all times, preserving safety and keeping to the laws of the country in which she was practising.

The panel had regard to the factors set out in the case of *Cohen v General Medical Council* but noted from the legal assessor's advice that such considerations carried less weight in non-clinical cases where there were broader public interest matters to be considered.

The panel took into account the sentencing remarks of the judge, where he stated:

'In mitigation, it is said that you have thrown away a wonderful career and that you accept that you have brought shame on yourself and your family. [PRIVATE]. You are [PRIVATE] with no previous convictions. You have written me an intelligent and articulate letter in which you express your heartfelt remorse and it is said that you are desperately sorry for what you have done. I accept your contrition and I accept your insight. There are references from colleagues and friends who speak highly of you.

...

You have, in fact, rehabilitated yourself, but I keep coming back to your position in prison and the part that you played in this conspiracy and the onward supply was often done whilst you, Miss Burton, were engaged in your clinical duties. Your role

in prison was to help vulnerable people, not to furnish them with poison that would accelerate their decline. In your articulate letter to me, you said yourself as follows: "I have always been very aware of the chronic conditions of people from deprived parts of society as well as the substance abuse issues and health complications that could come with this" ...'

The panel noted that the judge, who had seen all of the evidence in the criminal trial, was satisfied that Miss Burton was not likely to repeat the conduct which led to the conviction.

The panel also considered Miss Burton's written statement, which stated:

'I take full responsibility for my actions in this crime and fully understand that my behaviour and poor choices, whether through coercion or not, gave the NMC no option but to suspend my registration. After 20 months outside of healthcare I have fully accepted that I have lost a career that I loved and worked extremely hard for, for many years. In over a decade within the NHS I have never had a single complaint or issue raised about my practice prior to this, something which my professional and character references provided in January 2024 confirm.

...

I deeply regret my actions and that I have tarnished an otherwise perfect career and have associated the NMC with my actions, but I have also accepted that I will never again work within healthcare. As I have mentioned I am now 18 months into a new career completely away from the nursing industry and have gained promotion in this role and this is something I will be continuing to pursue in the future.'

Regarding insight, the panel was satisfied that Miss Burton had taken full responsibility and shown sincere remorse for her actions that led to the conviction. Further, Miss Burton demonstrated how her actions put patients at risk of harm, why what she did was wrong and how this impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession. The panel noted that Miss Burton has rehabilitated herself and entered a new career outside of the nursing profession, where she appears to be doing well and intends to continue in that industry. The panel therefore determined that Miss Burton had provided substantial insight regarding her offending behaviour.

In light of this, the panel was satisfied that Miss Burton is not liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm, bring the medical profession into disrepute or breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession.

In all the circumstances, having considered the judge's sentencing remarks and Miss Burton's written statement, the panel was of the view that there is no risk of repetition or risk to patient safety in this case. The panel therefore determined that a finding of impairment is not necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel then carefully considered whether Miss Burton's fitness to practise is impaired in the public interest.

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 took into account the NMC guidance on '*Impairment*' (reference: DMA-1), which states that:

'A professional's fitness to practise will only be impaired on public safety grounds if they pose an ongoing risk of harm to those receiving care from the professional (and/or their families) and/or to colleagues...

...

A finding of impairment on the grounds that the professional's practice needs to be restricted or marked to maintain public confidence in the professions generally, or to uphold professional standards, requires panels to consider whether the substance of the charges found proved, (whether or not the conduct occurred within the professional's clinical practice), means that there would be a risk to the public's confidence in the professions or to professional standards if the professional was permitted to practise without restrictions.

...

A finding of impairment based on public confidence or maintaining professional standards is more likely to occur in cases where the conduct breaches a fundamental tenet of the profession as set out in the Code. The following list gives examples of conduct that would breach the fundamental tenets of the profession (whether or not it occurs within professional practice). It is not an exhaustive list but gives some examples of the types of conduct where a finding of impairment is likely to be required:

- ...
- *Committing specified criminal offences and other criminal offences that create risks to public confidence and professional standards'*

The panel also took into account the NMC guidance on '*Directly referring specified offences to the Fitness to Practise Committee*' (reference: FTP-2c-1), which describes an example of a serious specified offence as:

'serious drug-related offences'

The panel concluded that the offences in this case were, indeed, serious drug-related offences that breached the fundamental tenets of the profession and were, therefore, so serious that a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is likely to be required.

In light of the fact that Miss Burton has yet to complete her sentence, the panel had in mind the case of *Council for the Regulation of Health Care Professionals v General Dental Council & Fleischmann*, referred to by the legal assessor, where it was stated that:

'as a matter of general principle, where a registrant had been convicted of a serious criminal offence, they should not be permitted to resume their practice until they had satisfactorily completed their sentence. The rationale for this principle is not that it can serve to punish the practitioner whilst serving their sentence, but that good standing in the profession must be earned if the reputation of the profession is to be maintained.'

The panel was reminded by the legal assessor that this is a general principle and not a rule and each case should be decided on its own merits. However, the panel was satisfied that the general principle applied in this case, as Ms Burton has been convicted of a serious criminal offence, as detailed above, and she has yet to complete her custodial sentence.

The panel noted the sentencing remarks of the judge when he stated:

'You have, in fact, rehabilitated yourself, but I keep coming back to your position in prison and the part that you played in this conspiracy and the onward supply was often done whilst you, Miss Burton, were engaged in your clinical duties. Your role in prison was to help vulnerable people, not to furnish them with poison that would accelerate their decline. In your articulate letter to me, you said yourself... and yet you chose to ignore that for a period of over four months, and it is with regret that I find it is simply too serious to suspend.'

The panel considered that the public interest in this matter is very high. It considered that reasonable well-informed members of the public and fellow practitioners would be appalled and confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in a case where a registered nurse had been convicted for being involved in the conveyance and onward supply of drugs and prohibited articles in and out of a prison where she provided care to inmates.

On this basis, the panel determined that a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is required to mark the profound seriousness of Miss Burton's conviction, uphold proper professional standards and maintain public trust and confidence in the nursing profession. It therefore found Miss Burton's fitness to practise impaired on public interest grounds.

Sanction

The panel considered this case very carefully and decided to make a striking-off order. It directs the registrar to strike Miss Burton off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Miss Burton 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 *'The sanctions available'* (reference: SAN-2).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Representations on sanction

The panel noted that in the Notice of Meeting, dated 7 July 2026, the NMC had advised Miss Burton that it would seek the imposition of a striking-off order if the panel found her fitness to practise currently impaired.

The panel also bore in mind Miss Burton's written statement, which stated:

'Ultimately, I just want to be removed from the register now, whether that is through agreed removal or being struck off from the register...'

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Burton's 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 panel had regard to the NMC guidance on *'The sanctions available'* (reference: SAN-2). 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 Burton abused of a position of trust.
- Miss Burton's conduct recklessly put people receiving care at risk of suffering harm.
- Miss Burton deliberately breached 'The Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives 2015' (the Code).
- There was a pattern of offending behaviour over a period of time.
- The vulnerability of the people receiving care.

- Miss Burton's behaviour was premeditated.

The panel also took into account the following mitigating feature:

- Miss Burton has demonstrated genuine remorse and developed insight.

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) 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 Miss Burton's conviction was not at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise. It determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public interest issues identified, a sanction that does not restrict Miss Burton's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. 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 Miss Burton's 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). Having regard to the nature and seriousness of Miss Burton's conviction, the panel determined that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The panel also noted Miss Burton's indication that she 'want[s] to be removed from the register now, whether that is through agreed removal or being struck off from the register' and her acceptance that she 'will never again work within

healthcare'. The panel considered that there are no appropriate, relevant, proportionate or workable conditions that could be formulated to adequately address the seriousness of this case and meet the public interest.

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) 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 determined that neither of these factors are engaged in this case.

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.'

The panel considered that Miss Burton's temporary removal from the register would not be sufficient to uphold public confidence in the profession and maintain professional standards due to the seriousness and nature of the conviction. Despite Miss Burton's substantial insight, remorse and the lack of a risk of repetition, the panel considered that her drug-related offences are at the most serious end of the spectrum and call into question her suitability to continue practising at all.

In such circumstances, 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), which states:

'The Committee's purpose isn't to punish professionals in addition to criminal sentencing. Because of this a criminal sentence isn't always a reliable guide to how the conviction affects the professional's fitness to practise. Personal circumstances or mitigation are less likely to affect sanction than in the criminal court, because the Committee is focussed on how a sanction will protect the public.'

While findings of fact in the criminal courts amount to proof of those facts, the Committee will need to consider separately how those facts may impact on (among other considerations):

- *the quality of care given*
- *what they say about the professional's attitude and ability to practise safely and effectively going forward*
- *the likely effect that they would have on the public's confidence in the profession.*

The Committee will have to decide the risks the behaviour represents to the protection of the public by considering all the information before it, as well as our cautions and convictions and misconduct guidance.

There are some offences we have specified as particularly serious because they raise fundamental questions about the professional's ability to uphold the standards and values set out in the code. If a registrant has been convicted of one of these offences, it is unlikely that any sanction less than strike-off will be appropriate. This is because we do not consider that public confidence could be maintained in the profession if they remained on the register. However, the Committee will still need to consider the facts of the individual case.'

The panel also bore in mind the NMC guidance on '*Directly referring specified offences to the Fitness to Practise Committee*' (reference: FTP-2c-1), which describes an example of a serious specified offence as:

'serious drug-related offences'

The panel noted its conclusion that Miss Burton's conviction related to serious drug related offences that raised fundamental questions about her ability to uphold the standards and values set out in the Code. The panel determined that any sanction less than a striking-off order would not be appropriate because public confidence in the profession would not be maintained if Miss Burton remained on the register. 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):

- *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 considered that the regulatory concerns in this case are serious and raise fundamental questions about Miss Burton's professionalism as a registered nurse. Whilst it recognised the high degree of insight in this case, the panel determined that allowing Miss Burton to remain on the register would undermine public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body. It was of the view that members of the public and other practitioners would be most concerned to learn that Miss Burton acted in the way that she did, was convicted and received a sentence of imprisonment.

In his sentencing remarks, the judge said that *'these conspiracies and the substantive offences, which concern the onward supply of this contraband represent a sustained, well-organised and highly lucrative operation. It is well understood that the supply of drugs, phones and SIM cards into the prison estate has a seriously insidious and corrosive effect upon the management of the prison estate and the rule of law generally and thus it requires condign punishment.'* He said that at the trial, *'I heard evidence from a drugs officer that the sums of money that can be commanded for illegal drugs in custody are five to 10 times greater than those that can be realised outside the prison estate. Spice, for example, is a particularly pernicious and addictive drug which poses a threat to inmates and officers alike.'*

The judge also referred to the fact that Miss Burton was *'plainly besotted'* with one of the co-defendants and *'counting down the days'* to his release. He said that various of the co-defendants regarded Miss Burton as a *'cash cow for this family enterprise'* and that whilst Miss Burton had expressed some initial reservations, these appeared to have *'quickly evaporated.'* He added that Miss Burton appeared to *'enjoy the thrill of smuggling these items'* into her place of work. The judge also referred to messages between Miss Burton and some of the co-defendants that demonstrated the frequency with which phones and

drugs, mainly cannabis, were conveyed into the prison and the careful preparation carried out to prevent detection by the authorities and their dogs.

In such circumstances, the panel concluded that Miss Burton's actions represented a significant departure from the standards expected of a registered nurse and are fundamentally incompatible with her remaining on the register.

Balancing all of these factors and after taking into account all the evidence before it during this case, the panel concluded that a striking-off order is the only sanction which will be appropriate, proportionate and sufficient to declare and maintain professional standards. Having regard to the matters it identified, in particular the effect of Miss Burton's actions in bringing the profession into disrepute by adversely affecting the public's view of how a registered nurse should conduct herself, the panel has concluded that nothing short of this would be sufficient in this case.

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 Burton 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 Burton's 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 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 had found that a striking-off order was the only appropriate sanction in order to meet the public interest. In such circumstances, it would be inconsistent for the panel to conclude that an interim order was not required to cover the appeal period.

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 to ensure that Miss Burton cannot practise unrestricted before the substantive striking-off order takes effect. This will cover the 28 days during which an appeal can be lodged and, if an appeal is lodged, the time necessary for that appeal to be determined.

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

That concludes this determination.