

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Thursday, 20 August 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Christopher Hinch
NMC PIN:	01E0438E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse - Sub part 1 Adult Nursing - 8 May 2004
Relevant Location:	Derbyshire
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Oluwasola Falola (Chair, registrant member) Yusuf Deerow (Lay member) Hazel Walsh (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Nigel Ingram
Hearings Coordinator:	Grace Sharp
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Alejandra Tascon, Case Presenter
Mr Hinch:	Present and represented by Miranda Lickert, instructed by Crucible Chambers
Order being reviewed:	Conditions of practice order (6 months)
Fitness to practise:	Not Impaired
Outcome:	Order to lapse upon expiry in accordance with Article 30 (1), namely 24 September 2026

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to revoke the current conditions of practice order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 24 September 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the third review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 9 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 10 October 2025. This was reviewed on 25 June 2025 where the suspension order was replaced with a conditions of practice order for 9 months and reviewed again on 19 February 2026 where the panel decided to vary the conditions of practice order.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 24 September 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:

'1. ...

2. On the nightshift 07 - 08 June 2022, whilst working at '[PRIVATE]' you were abusive and/or rude and/or uncaring and/or dismissive towards one of more residents under your care in that you

a. Closed or threatened to close Resident B's bedroom door

b. Called Resident B 'a baby' or words to that effect

c. Told Resident B that Resident B was 'wasting your time' or words to that effect

d. Removed Resident B's call bell/buzzer from them and /or placed Resident B's call bell/buzzer such as it was not accessible to them

e. Pushed medication in to Resident B's mouth

f. Threatened to unplug one or more resident's call bell/buzzer(s)

3. On the nightshift 08-09 June 2022, whilst working at '[PRIVATE]', after Resident D had suffered a fall, you 'drag lifted' them from the floor

4. [By admission] On 09 June 2022 whilst working at '[PRIVATE]', recorded in medical notes in relation to Resident E 'seattled well. all care needs met' (sic) but Resident E had passed away on 08 June 2022

5. ...'

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

'In its consideration of whether you have taken steps to strengthen your practice, the panel took into account that you have complied with the recommendations suggested by the last panel. It noted that you have not been able to comply with the conditions of practice as you have been unable to secure a post as a registered nurse in the care home sector which you have worked in as a nurse for the last 20 years. The panel noted that you have made numerous applications to care homes without result. In this regard, the panel considered that it is not your fault that you have been unable to comply with the conditions of practice order. It also noted that you have kept in contact with the NMC.

The panel noted the positive testimonials from your colleagues and the certificate showing that you have completed a course relevant to your nursing practice and that you are in the process of completing another course. The panel noted that you have worked as a Health Care Assistant and you have undertaken other roles in the healthcare environment since the imposition of the substantive order. The panel

considered that you have provided persuasive evidence that you have strengthened your practice in the limits of your current conditions of practice order.

The panel therefore determined that you have taken significant steps to strengthen your practice.

The panel then considered your insight. It noted that the last reviewing panel found that you had developing insight. At this hearing the panel noted the full and detailed reflection you have provided which details the previous roles you have undertaken since the imposition of the substantive order and what you have learnt from these roles. It also noted the steps you have shown through your personal development plan. The panel therefore concluded that you have now shown sufficient insight into your actions.

The panel considered that despite the insight and steps to strengthen your practice being sufficient, you have unfortunately not been able to demonstrate your ability to work safely and effectively as a registered nurse. Therefore, the panel was not satisfied that the risk of repetition has been sufficiently reduced.

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

The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on the ground of the wider public interest is not required because of the sanctions already imposed and the significant steps you have taken to strengthen your practice together with the insight you have shown. A well informed member of the public would consider that after 18 months of being subject to a substantive order in respect of your misconduct is sufficient to meet the wider public interest.

For these reasons, the panel finds that your fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

‘The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the public protection concerns identified.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict your practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances.

The panel next considered whether imposing a varied conditions of practice order on your registration would still be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable.

The panel determined that it would be possible to formulate appropriate and practical conditions which would address the public protection concern highlighted in this case. The panel accepted that you have been complying with current substantive conditions of practice order to the extent possible and you have been engaging with the NMC.

The panel was of the view that a varied conditions of practice order is sufficient to protect patients.

The panel agreed with the first reviewing panel that to impose a suspension order or a striking-off order would be wholly disproportionate and would not be a reasonable response in the circumstances of your case.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of six months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 24 March 2026. The panel considered that six months would be sufficient for you to secure a nursing post and provide evidence of your compliance with these conditions.

The panel agreed with the submissions of Mr Olphert that conditions 2 and 3 are an exact duplication and so removed condition 3. The panel then considered that condition 9 has made it unworkable for you to find employment as a registered nurse in a care home setting. The panel is satisfied that a condition requiring direct or indirect supervision is not proportionate or workable in this case.

The panel was of the view that condition 11 imposing a requirement to meet with your line manager or supervisor on a monthly basis would afford you adequate clinical supervision to ensure that you are practising safely and effectively in a nursing capacity. However, the panel considered that a mentor would not be sufficient because of the removal of any direct or indirect supervision requirements, and so it would be necessary for these meetings to be conducted by your line manager or supervisor.

It decided to impose the following conditions which it considered are appropriate and proportionate in this case:

‘For the purposes of these conditions, ‘employment’ and ‘work’ mean any paid or unpaid post in a nursing, midwifery or nursing associate role. Also, ‘course of study’ and ‘course’ mean any course of educational study connected to nursing, midwifery or nursing associates.

- 1. You must limit your nursing practice to one substantive employer.
 - a) If the substantive employer is an agency you must work in each clinical placement in a continuous period for no longer than three months**
- 2. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are working by:
 - a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment.**

b) *Giving your case officer your employer's contact details.*

3. *You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:*

- a) *Any organisation or person you work for.*
- b) *Any agency you apply to or are registered with for work.*
- c) *Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).*
- d) *Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.*
- e) *Any current or prospective patients or clients you intend to see or care for on a private basis when you are working in a self-employed capacity*

4. *You must tell your case officer, within seven days of your becoming aware of:*

- a) *Any clinical incident you are involved in.*
- b) *Any investigation started against you.*
- c) *Any disciplinary proceedings taken against you.*

5. *You must allow your case officer to share, as necessary, details about your performance, your compliance with and / or progress under these conditions with:*

- a) *Any current or future employer.*
- b) *Any educational establishment.*
- c) *Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions.*

6. *You must keep a Self-reflective practice profile*
 - a) *The profile must include a reflection on the nursing care you have provided to patient against the nature of the charges found proved. This should focus on the elements related to the code of practice in the panel's determination at the substantive hearing.*
 - b) *Your ongoing training and development in supporting you in clinical practice.*
 - c) *You must work with your line manager or supervisor to update your personal development plan (PDP). Your PDP must address your previous concerns about your behaviour and communication with patients.*
 - d) *You must send it to the panel before the next review.*

7. *You must meet with your line manager or supervisor on a monthly basis to ensure that you are making progress towards aims set in your personal development plan (PDP), which include:*
 - a) *Meeting with your line manager or supervisor at least every month to discuss your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP.*
 - b) *You must send a report from your line manager or supervisor setting out any examples of good practice directly observed by your manager or supervisor prior to and NMC review hearing or meeting.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether your fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as the ability of a professional on our register to practise as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively without restriction. In considering this case, the panel has carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it has noted the decision of the last panel, this panel has exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel has had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle and your bundle containing reflections, testimonials and certificates of training undertaken. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Tascon on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Tascon first took the panel through the background of the case and the previous substantive order reviews.

Ms Tascon submitted that the persuasive burden rests with the registrant to satisfy the panel that they have fully acknowledged why their past professional performance was deficient. She invited the panel to consider the evidence of your engagement since the previous review, including evidence of insight, remediation, strengthened practice and compliance with the conditions of practice order.

Ms Tascon submitted that the NMC's position at this review was neutral in relation to the appropriate order. She submitted it is a matter for the panel to determine whether your fitness to practice remains impaired.

The panel also had regard to submissions from your representative, Ms Lickert.

Ms Lickert submitted that you have demonstrated that the conditions of practice order is no longer necessary. It was emphasised that you do not rely simply on the passage of time, but on the work that you have undertaken during the period of restriction to demonstrate that you are fit to practise.

Ms Lickert acknowledged that at the previous review, there had been insufficient evidence of recent employment to demonstrate safe practice. However, since that review, you have continued to seek nursing employment and have been unable to secure a patient-facing nursing role whilst subject to the conditions of practice order. Ms Lickert submitted that this has limited the opportunities available to you to demonstrate your practice.

Ms Lickert submitted that you have continued to develop your skills and knowledge. Since March 2026, you have been working for a new employer and that your role, whilst not patient facing, requires you to promote safe, compassionate and effective patient care. Ms Lickert directed the panel to the testimonial from your manager that provides evidence of your professionalism, willingness to support clinical teams and focus on patient care.

Ms Lickert also referred to the training certificates contained within the bundle and your continued voluntary work at a food bank, where you have provided support and signposted individuals to appropriate services. It was submitted that this demonstrated your continued commitment to caring for and supporting others despite the restrictions on your nursing practice.

It was further submitted that there has been a clear trajectory of improvement throughout the regulatory process. Your original suspension order had subsequently been replaced by conditions of practice, and the level of restriction had progressively reduced. In particular, the previous panel had removed the requirement for one-to-one supervision, concluding that it was no longer necessary. Ms Lickert submitted that this demonstrated that the concerns had progressively reduced and that the current order had now served its protective purpose.

Ms Lickert submitted that you have demonstrated a sustained period without further concerns in your employment and that the original misconduct had been found to be isolated against a career of more than 20 years. It was submitted that, when considered alongside the evidence of strengthened practice, positive managerial evidence and your continued development, the risk of repetition was now sufficiently low that a finding of impairment was no longer justified.

Finally, Ms Lickert reminded the panel that the purpose of regulatory proceedings is not to punish the registrant but to protect the public. Where the panel is satisfied that the risk has

reduced sufficiently and that restrictions are no longer necessary, it was submitted that the conditions of practice order should be revoked.

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance.

The panel considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel carefully considered the submissions made by both Ms Tascon and Ms Lickert, and all of the evidence before it.

The panel identified a number of significant positive developments since the previous review. It noted that you have remained dedicated and committed to returning to the register and have engaged consistently with the NMC throughout the regulatory process. The panel was satisfied that you have complied with the conditions of practice order and have undertaken the work suggested by previous panels.

The panel was reassured by the evidence of your continued developing insight. The previous panel had been satisfied that you had demonstrated sufficient insight and that the risk of repetition was low. This panel found no evidence before it to suggest that this position had changed. Rather, you had continued to demonstrate an understanding of your responsibilities and the importance of maintaining safe and compassionate care.

The panel considered your current employment and other activities. Although you have not returned to direct nursing practice, you have secured employment in a role connected to nursing, where you provide training and education to nurses and student nurses. The panel considered this evidence relevant to the maintenance and development of your professional knowledge and skills. It was particularly reassured by the evidence that you advocate for good patient care and recognise the impact that the training you provide may have on patients.

The panel also gave significant weight to the testimonials provided, which it considered to be positive and supportive of your professionalism, character and approach to patient

care. The panel noted the evidence of your continued volunteering and considered that this demonstrated your commitment to providing holistic support and care to others.

The panel was mindful that the original concerns arose from isolated events and that there had been no further concerns or allegations raised against you during the period in which you have been subject to regulatory restrictions. It considered this together with your compliance with the conditions of practice order, your engagement with the NMC, your employment, evidence of training undertaken, and the evidence of insight to be persuasive evidence of progress.

This panel was satisfied that there had been substantial work undertaken since the original substantive hearing and that the concerns identified in the original proceedings had been sufficiently addressed. The panel was satisfied that you have taken appropriate steps to maintain your knowledge and skills despite not having returned to nursing practice, and that there was no new evidence to suggest an increased risk of repetition or risk of harm.

Having considered the progress made by you, your compliance with the existing conditions, the positive evidence of your current activities and demonstrated insight, this panel determined that you are now not liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment not 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, that public confidence in the nursing profession would not be undermined and that a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is not required.

For these reasons, the panel finds that, although your fitness to practise was impaired at the time of the incidents, given all of the above, your fitness to practise is not currently impaired.

In accordance with Article 30(1), the substantive conditions of practice order will lapse upon expiry, namely the end of 24 September 2026.

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.