

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

**Substantive Meeting
Wednesday, 12 August 2026**

2 Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London, E20 1EJ

Name of Registrant:	Kim Tracy Edmans
NMC PIN:	84E0973E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 Adult Nursing (Level 1) – 6 September 1998 Registered Nurse – Sub Part 2 Adult Nursing (Level 2) – 3 July 1986
Relevant Location:	Plymouth
Type of case:	Conviction
Panel members:	Susan Thomas (Chair, Lay member) Kamaljit Sandhu (Lay member) Deepa Leelamany (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Juliet Gibbon
Hearings Coordinator:	Ifeoma Okere
Facts proved:	Charge 1
Facts not proved:	N/A
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Sanction:	Striking-off order
Interim order:	Interim suspension order (18 months)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Meeting

The panel was informed at the start of this meeting that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Mrs Edmans' registered email address by secure email on 6 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 allegation, and that meeting would take place on or after 10 August 2026.

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

Details of charge

That you, a registered nurse:

1. On 6 May 2025 were convicted of permitting the use of premises for supplying Class A drugs, contrary to section 8(b) of the Schedule 4 to the misuse of Drugs At 1971

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

Decision and reasons on facts

The charge concerns Mrs Edmans' conviction for an offence of permitting the use of premises for supplying Class A drugs and, having been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction, the panel finds that the fact of the conviction 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.'*

In addition, the panel had regard to the following documentary evidence on behalf of the NMC:

- Certificate of Conviction relating to Mrs Edmans' conviction at Plymouth Crown Court on 6 May 2025; and
- Judge's Sentencing Remarks dated 22 August 2025.

The panel received no written representations from Mrs Edmans.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Pursuant to Rule 31(2), a certificate of conviction is conclusive proof of the conviction. Having regard to the Certificate of Conviction, the panel therefore found the charge proved.

Background

Mrs Edmans is a registered nurse. The regulatory concern arises from her conviction at Plymouth Crown Court on 6 May 2025 for permitting premises to be used for the supply of

Class A controlled drugs, namely Psilocybin (magic mushrooms), contrary to section 8(b) of and Schedule 4 to the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.

The conduct underlying the conviction occurred between March 2020 and August 2023. Mrs Edmans was the occupier of premises which she knowingly permitted or suffered to be used for the supply of Psilocybin.

The sentencing remarks record that the operation of supplying the drugs was being undertaken by Mrs Edmans' son. The sentencing judge stated that, although Mrs Edmans had spoken of turning a blind eye to what was taking place, she knew what her son was doing and had taken some of the material to the post box.

Mrs Edmans pleaded guilty to the offence on 6 May 2025, on the day of the trial. On 22 August 2025, she was sentenced to 20 months' imprisonment, suspended for two years, together with two years' supervision and 20 rehabilitation activity requirement days.

Fitness to practise

Having reached its decision on facts, the panel then considered whether, on the basis of the facts found proved, Mrs Edmans' 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 ability to practise safely and effectively without restriction.

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. The panel has referred to the cases of *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v (1) Nursing and Midwifery Council (2) Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin)*.

Mrs Edmans did not provide any written representations in relation to impairment.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

This included reference to a number of relevant judgments. These included *GMC v Meadow [2007] QB 462*, *Cohen v GMC [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, Mrs Edmans' fitness to practise is currently impaired.

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

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

Nurses occupy a position of privilege and trust in society and are expected at all times to be professional. 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.

The panel considered the judgment of Mrs Justice Cox in the case of *CHRE v NMC and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin)* 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" in the 5th report of the Shipman inquiry 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) ...'*

The panel considered that limbs (b) and (c) of the test in Grant were engaged. It determined that, by virtue of her conviction, Mrs Edmans had brought the nursing profession into disrepute and had breached a fundamental tenet of the profession. The panel considered the conviction to be serious and that Mrs Edmans' conduct represented a serious departure from the standards expected of a registered nurse.

The panel did not consider limb (a) to be engaged. It noted that there were no patients involved in the conduct underlying Mrs Edmans' conviction and that the conduct took place outside of her work setting. There was no evidence before the panel that patients had been put at harm or at risk of harm as a result of the conviction. The panel therefore considered that the concerns in this case related principally to public confidence in the

profession and the maintenance of proper professional standards, rather than patient safety.

Regarding insight, the panel noted that Mrs Edmans had not engaged with the NMC throughout the regulatory proceedings and that there was no evidence before it demonstrating any insight into her conduct. The panel had no updated information from Mrs Edmans concerning her current circumstances and no evidence demonstrating that she understood the impact of her offending behaviour and subsequent conviction upon the reputation of the nursing profession.

In its consideration of whether Mrs Edmans had taken steps to address the concerns, the panel noted that there was no evidence before it of remediation. It had received no reflective piece or other evidence from Mrs Edmans demonstrating that she had taken steps to address the conduct which resulted in her conviction. In light of her lack of engagement, the panel was unable to determine that the concerns had in fact been remedied.

The panel considered whether the conduct was remediable and whether there remained a risk of repetition. It considered that the conduct could arguably be remediable, but there was no evidence before it that it had been remedied. In the absence of engagement, insight or evidence of remediation, the panel could not be satisfied that it was highly unlikely that the conduct would be repeated in the future.

However, the panel did not determine that a finding of impairment was necessary on the grounds of public protection. It noted that patient safety had not been an issue in this case and that there was no evidence that patients had been placed at risk of harm. The panel instead considered that the seriousness of the conviction raised significant concerns in relation to public confidence and professional standards.

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 and protect the wider public interest, which includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper professional standards for members of the profession.

The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of impairment on public interest grounds was required. It considered Mrs Edmans' conviction to be very serious as it concerned Class A drugs, and her conduct had brought the nursing profession into disrepute and breached the professional standards expected of a registered nurse. The panel determined that public confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in these circumstances. It further considered that a finding of impairment was necessary to declare and uphold proper professional standards. The panel considered that Mrs Edmans had, by virtue of her conviction, seriously crossed the line of acceptable professional conduct.

The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of impairment on public interest grounds was required.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Edmans' fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Sanction

The panel has considered this case very carefully and has decided to make a striking-off order. It directs the registrar to strike Mrs Edmans off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Mrs Edmans has been struck-off the register.

In reaching this decision, the panel has had regard to all the evidence that has been provided in this case and had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*The sanctions available*' (Reference: SAN-2 Last Updated: 28/01/2026).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

This included reference to the case of *Council for the Regulation of Health Care Professionals v General Dental Council and Fleischmann* [2005] EWHC 87 (Admin).

Representations on sanction

The panel noted that in the Notice of Meeting, dated 6 July 2026, the NMC had advised Mrs Edmans of the sanctions available to the panel in the event that it found her fitness to practise currently impaired and that it would be seeking a striking-off order.

The panel received no written representations from Mrs Edmans in relation to sanction. It noted that Mrs Edmans had not engaged with the NMC proceedings and had provided no information regarding her insight, remorse or remediation.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mrs Edmans' 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 Last Updated: 28/01/2026). The decision on sanction is a matter for the panel independently exercising its own judgement.

The panel took into account the following aggravating features:

- the seriousness of the criminal conviction, which concerned a Class A controlled drug;
- Mrs Edmans' failure to engage with the NMC fitness to practise process; and
- the absence of evidence of insight, reflection or remorse.

The panel considered that serious drug-related offences are identified in the NMC guidance as particularly serious and that convictions of this nature raise fundamental questions about a registrant's ability to uphold the standards and values expected of a registered nurse.

The panel also took into account the following mitigating feature:

- Mrs Edmans pleaded guilty to the offence, albeit on the day of trial.

The panel noted that the guilty plea had attracted limited credit because of the stage at which it was entered.

The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.

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

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

The panel considered that Mrs Edmans’ conviction was not at the lower end of the spectrum. It was a serious criminal conviction concerning Class A drugs and the panel had already determined that her conduct had brought the profession into disrepute and breached a fundamental tenet of the profession. Accordingly, the panel determined that a caution order would not be sufficient to maintain public confidence in the profession or uphold proper professional standards.

The panel next considered whether to place a conditions of practice on Mrs Edmans’ registration. In considering whether conditions of practice are appropriate, the panel had regard to the factors set out in the NMC Guidance on ‘*Conditions of practice order*’ (Reference: SAN-2c Last Updated: 28/01/2026). The panel determined that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate. The conduct underlying Mrs Edmans’ conviction occurred outside the workplace and did not concern identifiable deficiencies in her clinical practice that could be addressed through conditions. Further, given Mrs Edmans’ lack of engagement with the regulatory process, the panel had no assurance that she would engage with or comply with any conditions imposed. The panel therefore considered that there were no relevant, proportionate, workable or measurable conditions that could be formulated to address the concerns and uphold professional standards.

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

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

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

- *‘the charges found proved are at the most serious end of the spectrum and call into question the professional’s suitability to continue practising, either currently or at all*
- *while it is possible that the professional could be fit to practise in future, only a period out of practice would be sufficient to allow them to fully strengthen their practice through reflection, the development of their professional skills and / or development of insight and remediation*
- *there is a risk to the safety of people using services if the professional were allowed to continue to practise even with conditions*
- *what went wrong is so serious that public confidence in the profession and professional standards could not be maintained if the professional were able to continue practising without stopping for a period of time*
- *despite the seriousness of what happened, the professional has engaged in the proceedings and has shown at least some meaningful insight which evidences a realistic possibility that they will continue to develop this insight, address their concerns and return to practice.’*

Whilst the panel acknowledged that the risks identified could be managed by temporarily removing Mrs Edmans from the Register, it considered that a suspension order would not be sufficient to uphold public confidence in the profession and maintain professional standards, given the seriousness and nature of the conviction. The panel noted that Mrs Edmans had received a 20-month

custodial sentence, suspended for two years, and remained subject to that criminal sentence. It considered that the sentence itself was indicative of the seriousness of the offending.

The panel also had regard to the principle in *Council for the Regulation of Health Care Professionals v General Dental Council and Fleischmann* [2005] EWHC 87 (Admin), namely that, in general, a professional should not be permitted to practise before completing a sentence imposed for a serious criminal offence. The panel recognised, however, that this did not automatically require permanent removal from the register and that it was still required to determine the proportionate sanction in Mrs Edmans' particular circumstances.

The panel determined that a suspension order of up to 12 months would not be sufficient. It considered the serious nature of the conviction, the involvement of Class A drugs, the breach of a fundamental tenet of the profession and the significant public interest in maintaining confidence in and upholding standards of the nursing profession. The panel also had no evidence of current insight, reflection or remediation from Mrs Edmans as a result of her complete lack of engagement.

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

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

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

- *Do the charges found proved raise fundamental questions about their professionalism?*

- *Can public confidence in the profession be maintained if the professional is not removed from the Register?*
- *Is there any amount of insight and reflection which could keep people receiving care and members of the public safe, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold professional standards?*
- *Is there a realistic prospect that, after suspension, the professional will have gained insight and strengthened their practice such that the risk they pose will have reduced?*

The panel determined that Mrs Edmans' conviction raised fundamental questions about her professionalism. It considered that a serious conviction involving Class A drugs was fundamentally at odds with the standards and values expected of a registered nurse.

The panel further determined that public confidence in the nursing profession could not be maintained if Mrs Edmans remained on the register. It took into account the seriousness of the offence and the custodial sentence imposed, albeit suspended, together with the need to declare and uphold proper professional standards.

In relation to insight and reflection, the panel had no evidence of current insight before it. Mrs Edmans had provided no reflective statement, evidence of remorse or evidence of remediation and had not engaged with the NMC proceedings. Consequently, the panel had no evidence upon which it could conclude that a period of suspension would result in Mrs Edmans developing sufficient insight or addressing the concerns.

The panel therefore considered that there was no evidential basis upon which it could identify a realistic prospect that, following a period of suspension, Mrs Edmans would have developed sufficient insight and addressed the concerns such that she could return to unrestricted practice.

Mrs Edmans' offending behaviour that led to her conviction was a significant departure from the standards expected of a registered nurse and is fundamentally incompatible with her remaining on the register. The panel was of the view that Mrs Edmans' conduct was so serious that to allow her to continue practising would undermine public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body.

Balancing all of these factors and after taking into account all the evidence before it during this meeting, the panel determined that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of a striking-off order. Having regard to the matters it identified, in particular the effect of Mrs Edmans' conduct 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 a striking-off order 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 Mrs Edmans in writing.

Interim order

As the striking-off order cannot take effect until the end of the 28-day appeal period, the panel 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 Mrs Edmans' own interests until the striking-off sanction takes effect.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Representations on interim order

The panel noted that there were no representations from Mrs Edmans in relation to an interim order, as she had not engaged with the NMC proceedings.

Decision and reasons on interim order

The panel was satisfied that an interim order was otherwise in the public interest. In reaching this decision, the panel had regard to the seriousness of Mrs Edmans' conviction and the reasons set out in its decision for imposing the substantive striking-off order.

The panel considered that it would be inconsistent with its substantive decision to permit Mrs Edmans to practise unrestricted during the 28-day appeal period. In particular, it had regard to the seriousness of the criminal conviction involving Class A drugs, the fact that Mrs Edmans remained subject to a suspended custodial sentence, and the need to maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and uphold proper professional standards. The legal assessor had advised the panel that Mrs Edmans remained subject to her criminal sentence and referred to the principle that, in general, a professional should not be permitted to practise before completing a sentence imposed for a serious offence.

The panel concluded that an interim conditions of practice order would not be appropriate or proportionate in this case, for the reasons already identified in its determination for imposing the substantive order. In particular, the concerns arose from conduct outside the workplace and were not capable of being adequately addressed by workable conditions of practice. The panel had also received no assurance, given Mrs Edmans' lack of engagement, that she would comply with any conditions imposed.

The panel therefore imposed an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months to cover the appeal period. It considered that an interim suspension order was necessary to maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and uphold proper professional standards pending the substantive striking-off order taking effect.

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

That concludes this determination.