

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

**Substantive Meeting
Friday, 21 August 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	Pradeep Cheruveliltheekkethil Radhakrishnapillai
NMC PIN:	25A06450
Part(s) of the register:	Nurses Part of the Register, Sub Part 1 RNA: Adult Nurse, Level 1 (16 January 2025)
Relevant Location:	Bedford
Type of case:	Conviction
Panel members:	Anne Ng (Chair, lay member) Vickie Glass (Registrant member) Lorraine Chalk (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Oliver Wise
Hearings Coordinator:	Adaobi Ibuaka
Facts proved:	Charge 1 in its entirety
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 that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Mr Radhakrishnapillai's registered email address by secure email on 14 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, the time, dates and the fact that this meeting was to be heard virtually.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mr Radhakrishnapillai 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 5 June 2025 at Luton Magistrates Court were convicted of the following:
 - a) On 28 April 2025 at Luton in the County of Bedfordshire assaulted Person A by beating her contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.
 - b) On 28 February 2025 at Luton in the County of Bedfordshire, assaulted Person A by beating her contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.
 - c) On 29 March 2025 at Luton in the County of Bedfordshire assaulted Person A by beating her contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.

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

Background

The incidents charged arose whilst Mr Radhakrishnapillai was employed as a registered nurse by Bedford Hospital NHS Trust (the Trust).

The Trust referred Mr Radhakrishnapillai to the NMC on 7 May 2025, in relation to concerns raised to the police that he had been violent and controlling towards his wife (Person A). The violence included beating, strangulation, coercion, a threat to kill Person A [PRIVATE].

Mr Radhakrishnapillai appeared at Luton Magistrates Court on 5 June 2025 and pleaded not guilty. Following the trial, he was found guilty and was released on conditional bail to appear for sentencing at Luton Magistrates Court on 16 July 2025.

On 16 July 2025, Mr Radhakrishnapillai was sentenced to 20 weeks custodial sentence and handed a 5 year restraining order in relation to Person A and their home address.

Decision and reasons on facts

The charge concerns Mr Radhakrishnapillai's conviction and, having been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction, the panel finds 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.'*

Fitness to practise

Having made its determination on the facts, the panel then considered whether, on the basis of the facts found proved, Mr Radhakrishnapillai's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of Mr Radhakrishnapillai's 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 invited 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 accepted the advice of the legal assessor who advised the panel to have regard to the case of *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v (1) Nursing and Midwifery Council (2) Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) (*Grant*).

Decision and reasons on impairment

The panel next went on to decide if as a result of the conviction, Mr Radhakrishnapillai'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 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 and to maintain professional boundaries. 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 be honest and open and 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 *Grant* in reaching its decision. At 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.'

At 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 fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that s/he:

- 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 finds limbs a – c of the *Grant* test engaged. The panel finds that whilst patients were not put at risk of harm and were not caused physical and emotional harm as a result of Mr Radhakrishnapillai's conviction, there is a potential for harm in the future. The panel found that Person A suffered physical and emotional harm and this was witnessed by three vulnerable young children who were potentially caused emotional harm. The panel determined that Mr Radhakrishnapillai's conviction breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute.

The panel had regard to the police witness statement of Person A, dated 29 April 2025:

'I have been married to [Mr Radhakrishnapillai] for 10 years and we have 3 young children together. Our marriage was initially ok, and we got along fine but however his behaviour started to change and [PRIVATE], he would become aggressive, this will regularly happen when he is not working. He would argue with me for no reason and blames me for his problems...

...On MONDAY 28th April 2025 at about 8:15a.m. I was getting my 3 sons ready to go to school, one of my sons had opened up the door and he was surprised as [Mr Radhakrishnapillai] was standing outside my front door... He states that he had done nothing wrong and in reply I have told him that I do not want to talk to him and reminded him that he has bail conditions. He told me he does not have any bail conditions as they have not been extended and that they have expired, I had told him that they are not expired and that he needs to leave the flat, but he refused and that he was there to see the kids.'

The panel considered that Mr Radhakrishnapillai has not demonstrated insight or remorse into his actions, and has not made any attempts to remediate the concerns. It considered that when Mr Radhakrishnapillai was on police bail and had a Domestic Violence Protection Order (DVPO), both of which he breached, demonstrating little regard for his legal responsibilities. The panel further considered that the convictions had nothing to do with Mr Radhakrishnapillai's clinical skills, but were attitudinal in nature. It determined that given the lack of accountability, remediation and insight from Mr Radhakrishnapillai, and

that this was a pattern of violent behaviour over a period of time; there was still a risk that he could be liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided 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 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 determined that in this case, a finding of impairment on public interest grounds was required. The panel was of the view that a well-informed member of the public would be very concerned and horrified if no finding of impairment were made in light of Mr Radhakrishnapillai's convictions, especially given the nature of the convictions pertaining to: assaulting Person A by beating her contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 on 28 February 2025, 29 March 2025 and 28 April 2025 at Luton in the County of Bedfordshire.

Furthermore, it determined that confidence in the profession, and the NMC as their regulator, would be diminished and standards of nursing undermined, if no finding of impairment were to be made. Therefore, the panel concluded that a finding of impairment was required on the ground of public interest.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Mr Radhakrishnapillai's 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 Mr Radhakrishnapillai off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Mr Radhakrishnapillai 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 Last Updated: 28/01/2026).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor, who referred the panel to the NMC sanctions guidance.

Representations on sanction

The panel noted that in the Notice of Meeting, dated 14 July 2026, the NMC had advised Mr Radhakrishnapillai that it would seek the imposition of a striking-off order if it found Mr Radhakrishnapillai's fitness to practise currently impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Radhakrishnapillai'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 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 factors:

- Deliberate breaches of the Code;
- A pattern of behaviour over a period of time;
- Absence of insight;
- Premeditated behaviour, in that Mr Radhakrishnapillai went back to the family home breaching police bail and DVPO;
- Predatory, coercive and controlling behaviour;
- Offence committed whilst on police bail;
- Violent actions and behaviour witnessed by vulnerable young children.

The panel determined that there were no mitigating factors in this case.

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 Mr Radhakrishnapillai’s misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum, and it found that there is a risk to patient and public safety. The panel therefore determined that a sanction that does not restrict Mr Radhakrishnapillai’s practice would not protect the public. 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 order on Mr Radhakrishnapillai’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 Last Updated: 28/01/2026). The panel considered that the concerns do not relate to Mr Radhakrishnapillai’s clinical practice or competence and so there are no identifiable areas of practise for retraining. However, there was evidence of a deep seated attitudinal issue. The panel had regard to its findings about Mr Radhakrishnapillai’s insight and to the nature and seriousness of Mr Radhakrishnapillai’s conduct, which involved domestic abuse in front of three vulnerable children, [PRIVATE]. The panel determined that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The panel considered that there are no relevant,

proportionate, workable or measurable conditions that could be formulated to protect patients and to 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.'*

The panel considered that the charges found proved by way of Mr Radhakrishnapillai's conviction, were serious and called into question his suitability to continue practising at all.

The panel considered that it would not be sufficient to uphold public confidence in the profession and maintain professional standards due to the seriousness and nature of the conviction. Given Mr Radhakrishnapillai's lack of insight, lack of remorse, together with his failure to accept and acknowledge [PRIVATE], the panel considered that there is no realistic possibility that he would address the concerns to such a level where he could return to practise safely. The panel determined that the serious breach of the fundamental tenets of the profession evidenced by his convictions is fundamentally incompatible with Mr Radhakrishnapillai remaining on the register.

In this case, 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 Last Updated: 28/01/2026). The panel had 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 took into account that Mr Radhakrishnapillai had already served his 20 weeks custodial sentence. However, the panel found that the charges found proved by way of his conviction, raised fundamental questions about his professionalism. It determined that

public confidence in the profession would not be maintained if Mr Radhakrishnapillai was not removed from the Register.

The panel was satisfied that there was not a realistic prospect that Mr Radhakrishnapillai would gain insight after a period of suspension where he has had a significant time to gain insight, demonstrate remorse and remediate his actions already.

The panel determined that Mr Radhakrishnapillai's actions were significant departures from the standards expected of a registered nurse, and are fundamentally incompatible with him remaining on the register. The panel was of the view that the findings in this particular case demonstrate that Mr Radhakrishnapillai's actions were serious and to allow him 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 case, 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 Mr Radhakrishnapillai's actions in bringing the profession into disrepute by adversely affecting the public's view of how a registered nurse should conduct himself, 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 Mr Radhakrishnapillai 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 Mr Radhakrishnapillai's own interests until the striking-off sanction takes effect.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Decision and reasons on interim order

The panel was satisfied that an interim order is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise 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 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 due to allow time for the appeal period before the striking-off order comes into effect

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

That concludes this determination.