

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Wednesday, 19 August 2026**

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

Name of Registrant:	Agnes Cobbina
NMC PIN:	69Y0860E
Part(s) of the register:	Nursing, Sub part 2 RN2, Registered Nurse - Adult (30 May 1969)
Relevant Location:	London
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Anne Ng (Chair, lay member) Vickie Glass (Registrant member) Lorraine Chalk (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Oliver Wise
Hearings Coordinator:	Adaobi Ibuaka
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect end of 6 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1)

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 Ms Cobbina's registered email address by secure email on 9 July 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 17 August 2026 and inviting Ms Cobbina to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Ms Cobbina has been served with notice of this meeting in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11A and 34 of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 (as amended) (the Rules).

Decision and reasons on review of the current order

The panel determined to impose a striking-off order. This order will come into effect at the end of 6 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 5 September 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 6 October 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 3 April 2020, in respect of Resident A,
 - a. Failed to communicate effectively the seriousness of Resident AM's condition in the 999 call to London Ambulance Service ('LAS').
 - b. Failed to notify the LAS of the worsening condition of Resident AM.
 - c. Failed to monitor Resident AM's condition with sufficient regularity or at all.
 - d. Failed to administer cardiopulmonary resuscitation ('CPR') in the absence of a do not attempt cardiopulmonary resuscitation ('DNAR') order.
 - e. Failed to recognise in a timely manner that Resident AM's condition had become critical.

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

The original substantive panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

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

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the NMC Fitness to Practise Library, and the judgment of Mrs Justice Cox in the case of CHRE v NMC and Grant, particularly paragraphs 74 and 76.

The panel finds that Resident AM was put at risk and was potentially caused physical harm as a result of Ms Cobbina's misconduct. Ms Cobbina's misconduct had breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute.

Regarding insight, the panel considered that Ms Cobbina has not been in contact with the NMC since 2022 when she informed that she is no longer working and is unlikely to seek to return to work given her age.

The panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being addressed. However, given the lack of any strengthening of practice, or of developed insight the panel was not satisfied that it has been addressed. Therefore, the panel is of the view that there is a risk of repetition and that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

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

The panel determined that a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is required because a reasonable person would expect a registered nurse to be able to perform the required monitoring of a resident in a critical condition to the highest standard of care and would be concerned by Ms Cobbina's actions and lack of action.

In addition, the panel concluded that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore also finds Ms Cobbina's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

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

The original substantive panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel next considered whether placing conditions of practice on Ms Cobbina'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 took into account the SG, in particular:

- *No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*

- *Identifiable areas of the nurse or midwife's practice in need of assessment and/or retraining;*
- *No evidence of general incompetence;*
- *Potential and willingness to respond positively to retraining;*
- *The nurse or midwife has insight into any health problems and is prepared to agree to abide by conditions on medical condition, treatment and supervision;*
- *Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions;*
- *The conditions will protect patients during the period they are in force; and*
- *Conditions can be created that can be monitored and assessed.*

The panel is of the view that although many of these factors are present in this case there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated, given that Ms Cobbina has not engaged with the NMC since 2022 and that she has indicated she will not return to nursing practice.

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

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

The panel was satisfied that in this case, the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register, and Ms Cobbina had shown some insight.

The panel considered that this was not an attitudinal concern but a single instance of misconduct that occurred at a highly stressful and uncertain period for nurses.

It did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate but, taking account of all the information before it, and of the mitigation provided, the panel concluded that it would be disproportionate. Whilst the panel acknowledges that a suspension may have a punitive effect, it would be unduly punitive in Ms Cobbina's case to impose a striking-off order.

Balancing all of these factors the panel has concluded that a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel considered that this order is 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.

The panel determined that a suspension order for a period of 12 months was appropriate in this case to mark the seriousness of the misconduct.

At 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:

- A reflective piece from Ms Cobbina addressing each of the concerns the panel identified*
- A statement on Ms Cobbina's intentions on returning to nursing practice*

This will be confirmed to Ms Cobbina in writing.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Ms Cobbina'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.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor, who advised that there was an evidential burden on Ms Cobbina to provide evidence that her fitness to practise was no longer impaired.

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 Cobbina's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel took into account the findings of the original substantive panel and considered whether there had been any material change in circumstances since the substantive meeting. In its consideration of whether Ms Cobbina had developed her insight and taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel also took into account what the original substantive panel stated would assist this reviewing substantive panel.

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

- *A reflective piece from Ms Cobbina addressing each of the concerns the panel identified*
- *A statement on Ms Cobbina's intentions on returning to nursing practice'*

The panel has not received any new evidence from Ms Cobbina and noted that she has not engaged with the NMC or the fitness to practise process since 2022. The panel considered that in the absence of evidence, insight, remorse or remediation, Ms Cobbina 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, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Ms Cobbina'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 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 Cobbina'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 Ms Cobbina'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 placing conditions of practice on Ms Cobbina'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 meeting and Ms Cobbina's lack of engagement. It concluded that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate, nor would it 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 Ms Cobbina's misconduct.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that Ms Cobbina has not demonstrated remorse for her misconduct. Further, Ms Cobbina has not demonstrated any insight into her previous failings. The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Ms Cobbina no longer posed a risk to the public. However, Ms Cobbina has not provided any evidence or engaged with the NMC since the imposition of her 12 months suspension order. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances.

The panel gave very serious consideration as to whether it would be appropriate to allow Ms Cobbina's registration to lapse with a finding of impairment. It considered Ms Cobbina's age and her unblemished career of 60 years, before the incident which led to her suspension. The panel further considered the serious nature of the charges found proved, which require a more serious sanction in order to adequately protect the public and uphold public confidence in the nursing profession and the NMC as its regulator. Therefore, the panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Ms Cobbina 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 6 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Ms Cobbina in writing.

That concludes this determination.