

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Monday, 16 February 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant: Lorraine Hill

NMC PIN: 73D1349E

Part(s) of the register: Nurses part of the register Sub part 2
RN2: Adult nurse, level 2 - May 1975

Relevant Location: Sunderland City

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: Isabelle Parasram (Chair, lay member)
Elizabeth Coles (Registrant member)
Caroline Ross (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Emma Boothroyd

Hearings Coordinator: Audrey Chikosha

Order being reviewed: Suspension order (6 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Striking-Off order to come into effect on 9 April 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 Hill's registered email address by secure email on 13 January 2026 which was returned undelivered.

The panel also had regard to the Royal Mail 'Track and trace' printout which showed the Notice of Meeting was delivered to Ms Hill's registered address on 14 January 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 16 February 2026 and inviting Ms Hill 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 Hill 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 proceeding in the absence of Ms Hill.

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Ms Hill and the NMC. It had regard to Rule 21 and heard the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel noted that there had been no engagement by Ms Hill with the NMC in relation to these proceedings and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that adjourning and referring this case to a hearing would secure her attendance. Furthermore, the panel bore in mind the strong public interest in the expeditious review of this order prior to its expiry on 8 April 2026.

The panel noted that the NMC has made all reasonable efforts to give Ms Hill the opportunity to provide representations and was satisfied that there would be no unfairness in proceeding in the absence of Ms Hill.

The panel also considered whether on the information before it, it could make decisions on the charges without the assistance of submissions from a case presenter on behalf of the NMC. It was determined that it had sufficient information to review Ms Hill's current impairment and review this order in the absence of both the NMC and Ms Hill.

Decision and reasons on review of the current order

The panel decided to replace the suspension order with a striking-off order. This order will come into effect at the end of 8 April 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 6 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 8 September 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 8 April 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 8 and 9 February 2020 did not escalate Resident A's concerns about their NIPPY machine by;*
 - a. *Failing to read Resident A's care plan [PROVED]*
 - b. *Failing to check the Nippy machine tubing [PROVED]*
 - c. *Failing to use the on-call system [PROVED]*

2. *On 9 February 2020 did not take observations and or escalate concerns following Resident A's fall [PROVED]*

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'The panel found limbs a, b and c, as set out above, to be engaged in this case. It considered that as a result of Ms Hill's misconduct, namely her failing to read the care plan, to check the NIPPY machine and tubing, to escalate concerns via the on-call system and to take observations following Resident A's fall, Ms Hill caused Resident A significant harm and exposed other residents in her care to a risk of significant harm. The panel found these omissions breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and brought its reputation into disrepute.

Regarding insight, the panel determined that Ms Hill has shown limited insight. While the panel acknowledged that Ms Hill made some admissions during internal processes, it considered that she did not demonstrate any meaningful reflection or acceptance of responsibility for her actions. The panel also noted that Ms Hill has not engaged from the NMC proceedings and has provided no evidence of remorse, remediation or a recognition of the seriousness of her failings.

The panel considered the case of Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) and was satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being addressed. However, there was no evidence before the panel to show that Ms Hill has taken steps to strengthen her practice, such as training, reflection or seeking supervision. In the absence of such steps, the panel determined that there remains a risk of repetition of the misconduct. The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground 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 was otherwise in the public interest. It determined that members of the public would be gravely concerned if a nurse who failed to escalate clinical concerns, did not take observations and failed to act in accordance with the Code were permitted to practise without restriction.

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 Hill's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

' ...

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 panel was satisfied that the factors listed above were applicable in this case. The panel noted that while Ms Hill has demonstrated limited insight,

there was no evidence of attitudinal concerns or repeated misconduct. The panel also considered her lengthy nursing career without previous regulatory history. In these circumstances, the panel concluded that the misconduct, though serious, was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register.

The panel did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate. It reminded itself that this is the most serious sanction, reserved for cases where there is a persistent lack of insight, deep-seated attitudinal issues or misconduct fundamentally incompatible with continued registration. The panel determined that Ms Hill's case did not meet this threshold. It concluded that while there was limited insight and no evidence of remediation, her conduct taken in the context of a long and otherwise unblemished career, could properly be marked by a suspension order. Balancing all of these factors the panel has concluded that a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel noted the hardship such an order will inevitably cause Ms Hill. However this is outweighed by the public interest in this case.

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 6 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 addressing the Registrant's failings found proved and their impact on patients, colleagues and the wider profession;*

- *evidence of professional development or training, particularly in relation to safe use of clinical equipment and escalation of concerns;*
- *evidence of a review and understanding of the NMC Code; and*
- *testimonials or references demonstrating professional conduct in any employment or voluntary role.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Ms Hill's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC defines it as whether a professional on the register can 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 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. It noted that the charges found proved in this case are serious and resulted in actual harm to a patient. The panel had no evidence before it to demonstrate that Ms Hill has since strengthened her practice or reflected on the misconduct.

The panel had before it a list of recommendations from the original panel which Ms Hill was told would assist a reviewing panel. Ms Hill has not provided today's panel with any of the recommended evidence. The panel noted that Ms Hill has not engaged with these proceedings and bore in mind that the burden is on Ms Hill to demonstrate she is no longer impaired. Given the lack of engagement, insight, and any evidence to undermine the findings of the original panel, today's panel determined that there remains a risk of harm

and risk of repetition of the misconduct. It therefore determined that a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground 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 Hill's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Ms Hill'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 and let the order lapse upon expiry but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the finding of impairment and public protection concerns in this 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 Hill'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 and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen again.'* The panel considered that Ms Hill'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 a conditions of practice on Ms Hill'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 hearing and concluded that a conditions of practice order would not 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 Hill's misconduct.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. Ms Hill has not demonstrated any insight into her misconduct. The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Ms Hill no longer posed a risk to the public.

The panel bore in mind the NMC Guidance (REV-2A) on standard reviews of substantive orders which states:

'If the panel concludes that continuing or imposing a conditions of practice order or suspension order is unlikely to result in the professional returning to safe unrestricted practice within a reasonable period of time, it should ensure that the professional is removed from the register.'

The panel noted it had no evidence of strengthened practice, reflection or remediation since the allegations arose in 2020 and charges found proved in September 2025. It noted that Ms Hill is only on the register as a result of this substantive order and has not demonstrated any willingness to engage with these proceedings or address the misconduct in six months since the sanction was imposed nor in the five years since the concerns arose. The panel therefore determined that a further period of suspension is unlikely to result in Ms Hill returning to safe and effective practice within a reasonable period of time.

In reaching its decision on imposing a striking-off order, the panel took into account NMC Guidance (REV-2h) on Removal from the register when a substantive order is in place which reads:

'This guidance is intended to help substantive order review panels decide what action to take where

- *a professional hasn't addressed outstanding fitness to practise concerns, and*
- *continuing/imposing a conditions of practice order or suspension order is unlikely to mean the professional will return to safe unrestricted practice within a reasonable period of time.*

There is a persuasive burden on the professional at a substantive order review to demonstrate that they have fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments¹.

*While Suspension Orders and Conditions of Practice Orders can be varied or extended, **they are not intended to exist indefinitely**. In time the professional must be allowed to practise without restriction or they must leave the register. It is neither in the interests of the public nor the professional's own interests that they are kept in limbo'*

In line with the above guidance, the panel considered the following:

'The panel can impose a striking off order, removing the professional from the register. At a substantive order review, the panel will take into account both the concerns themselves and the professional's conduct since they were sanctioned. The panel will ask:

- *Are there now fundamental questions about the nurse, midwife or nursing associate's professionalism?*
- *Can public confidence in nurses, midwives and nursing associates now be maintained if the nurse, midwife or nursing associate is not struck off from the register?*
- *Is striking-off now the only sanction which will be sufficient to protect patients, members of the public, or maintain professional standards?*

For example, a reviewing panel could impose a striking off order if the professional has shown they clearly lack insight, pose a risk of repeating the behaviour, or their conduct suggests harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems.

Cases where striking off is likely to be appropriate include when:

- the professional has shown limited engagement and/or insight,*
- the professional has breached a substantive order; or*
- the professional has otherwise made no or negligible progress towards addressing issues with their fitness to practise.'*

The panel also took into account NMC Guidance on Deciding between suspension and strike off (SAN-3) which reads:

'Determining the proportionate sanction is often difficult when the Committee is deciding between a suspension or a striking-off order. In such cases, the Committee should:

- ...*
- ...*
- Consider the professional's insight and attitude to addressing the concerns, and whether it is realistically possible that these will change positively during the suspension period. If it is unlikely the professional will try to address the concerns, there may not be appropriate for them to be suspended in the hopes that they will eventually return to practice.*
- Professionals are under an obligation to cooperate with their regulator. Where professionals have failed to engage with the fitness to practise process, it won't usually be appropriate to use a suspension order as a means of giving them a 'last chance' to engage, reflect or show insight.'*

The panel noted that given Ms Hill has not engaged with the NMC, demonstrated insight into the misconduct or made any progress towards addressing the concerns in this case. The panel determined that there has been sufficient time for Ms Hill to provide evidence of the above or engage with the NMC and demonstrate a willingness to return to safe practice. The panel was therefore of the view that there was no realistic prospect of Ms Hill addressing the concerns and returning to safe practice in a reasonable period of time.

The panel bore in mind that it is not in the public interest or a professional's interests to remain on the register indefinitely when they are not fit to practise and that public confidence in the professions is more important than the fortunes of any individual member.

As such, the panel determined that a striking-off order is the appropriate sanction to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 8 April 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Ms Hill in writing.

That concludes this determination.