

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing**

**Thursday, 8 January 2026**

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

**Name of Registrant:**

**Nsa Ita**

**NMC PIN:**

**95D0061O**

**Part(s) of the register:**

Registered Nurse – Sub part 1  
RN1: Adult Nurse (Level 1) – 12 April 1995  
P405: Special and Intensive Care of the Newborn – 16 September 1999

**Relevant Location:**

**Staffordshire**

**Type of case:**

**Lack of Competence**

**Panel members:**

Sharon Laurence (Chair, Lay member)  
Julia Briscoe (Registrant member)  
Kate Richards (Lay member)

**Legal Assessor:**

**Justin Gau**

**Hearings Coordinator:**

**Bethany Seed**

**Nursing and Midwifery  
Council:**

Represented by Harry Garside, Case Presenter

**Miss Ita:**

Present and unrepresented at this hearing

**Order being reviewed:**

**Suspension order (12 months)**

**Fitness to practise:**

**Impaired**

**Outcome:**

**Suspension order (6 months) to come into effect on 13 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)**

## **Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order**

The panel decided to confirm the current suspension order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 13 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the second review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 12 January 2024. This was reviewed on 7 February 2025, and a further 12-month suspension order was imposed.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 13 February 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, between 04 February 2019 and 05 May 2019, whilst working in a supernumerary capacity:*

*1. On or around 20 March 2019, during a morning shift:*

*a. failed to feed a baby, who had vomited overnight, within a reasonable period of having been instructed to do so.*

*b. failed to make any/any accurate record of how many feeds the baby referred to at charge 1a had taken.*

*c. shouted 'make your mind up' and/or whispered 'for Christ's sake' in response to a colleague who was talking through the creation of a feeding plan or shouted/whispered words to that effect.*

*2. ...*

3...

4. On 22 April 2019:

- a. drew up IV antibiotics in a manner which did not comply with the principles for aseptic non-touch technique.
- b. inaccurately suggested that 0.6ml in a 5ml syringe was a different amount when drawn up in a 1ml syringe.
- c. repeatedly asked a colleague to sign off your IV competency after they had told you they were not satisfied you had sufficient competence to be signed off.

5. On 23 April 2019, used a neopuff on a baby when there was no clinical need to do so.

6. On one or more occasions failed to respond to monitor alarms and/or turned off monitor alarms without ascertaining why they had alarmed.

7. On an unknown date(s):

- a. gave pre-term formula milk to a baby who was full-term.
- b. required repeated prompting to document in a baby's special care chart.
- c. failed to record hourly observations of cannula line pressure, despite being instructed to do so.
- d. inaccurately recorded that a baby had experienced desaturations when they had not.

8. Failed to engage constructively with feedback from colleagues.

*AND, in the light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct at charge 1c and/or 4c and/or your lack of competence in respect of the remaining charges.*

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

*'The panel noted that the original panel found that you 'lack insight'. At this hearing the panel noted that you stated that the allegations and findings made against you were untrue and did not happen. The panel found that you have demonstrated no insight into the effect the charges found proved have on colleagues, patients and the profession. The panel also found that you have no insight regarding the regulatory concerns. The panel also were of the view that, while you may maintain your denial of the charges found proved, it is still possible to demonstrate insight in these circumstances.*

*The panel further found that you have very little insight regarding what specific personal development you require, particularly as you have been out of practice for so long.*

*The panel found that you remain of the belief that colleagues were against you, and that you currently pose a significant risk to very vulnerable patients.*

*The panel took into account that you have not taken steps to remediate or strengthen your practice. The panel also found that, despite stating that you have gone online to undertake reading, you were unable to provide any evidence of this or even tell the panel what you had read.*

*The panel further found that you have not engaged substantially with the recommendations of the previous panel, and were unable to assist the panel when asked how you could practise safely, professionally and kindly.*

*The original panel determined that you were liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has heard no new information with the exception of your written witness statement in which you wrote:*

*[the] decisions and reasons for the suspension were wrong and unfair:*

- *No credible evidence available to support the allegations e.g. Medical notes*
- *No internal investigation done*
- *No incident report done'*

*The panel found that your continued denial of the charges demonstrates your lack of reflection.*

*The panel also were of the view that your written witness statement in which you wrote:*

*'I reiterate that the allegations made against me did not happen. Based on all the above facts, I would like the panel not to grant any further punishment'*

*There is further evidence that you are unable to demonstrate any remediation, as well as your oral evidence given when asked repeatedly by the panel regarding professional development and remediation. In light of this, this panel determined that you are 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, given the breadth of concerns regarding lack of competence (including basic aspects of nursing practice) and the very vulnerable nature of the patients, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required in order to maintain public confidence in the profession.*

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

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

*'The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order on your 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 your lack of competence due to your lack of insight, and noted that you have demonstrated a reluctance to undergo training or accept feedback. The panel also were of the view that in addition to a period of work in 2019 you have only worked one nursing shift in 14 years, and so any conditions imposed would be so onerous that they would be tantamount to a suspension order and thus unworkable.'*

*The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow you further time to fully reflect on your previous failings. The panel concluded that a further suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford you adequate time to develop your insight and take steps to strengthen your practice.*

*The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for the period of 12 months. This would provide you with an opportunity to use this time to seek employment in the healthcare sector (but not as a registered nurse) if you wished to and improve your practice. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.*

*The panel would like to remind you that this order will prevent you from practising as a registered nurse but does not prevent you from seeking other employment within a healthcare sector.'*

### **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 Nursing and Midwifery Council ('NMC') has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's ability to practise kindly, safely and professionally. 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Mr Garside on behalf of the NMC.

Mr Garside outlined the background of the case. He invited the panel to impose a further 12-month period of suspension. He drew the panel's attention to the previous panel's determination, in particular its recommendations for what may assist a future panel. He submitted that since these recommendations were made, you have not provided any further information for a reviewing panel to consider.

Mr Garside submitted that there is no new information before this panel, and that there had been engagement from you to the NMC since the last review. He submitted that in the absence of any further information regarding your level of insight, or steps you have taken to strengthen your practice, there remains a risk of repetition of the conduct found proved. Therefore, he submitted that you remain impaired at this time and that a further 12-month period of suspension is the necessary and proportionate sanction.

The panel also had regard to your submissions. You explained that you had tried to provide the information recommended by the previous panel but there had been numerous obstacles. You told the panel that you had been applying for jobs but that once you disclosed that you were subject to a substantive order, you were unsuccessful. You also

told the panel that you could not provide employment references as you have not been working as a Registered Nurse for several years.

You told the panel that you had done some of the regular training courses, but they did not provide you with certificates. You further explained that many training courses you researched required payment, which would have been too expensive for you. You told the panel that you wanted to come to this hearing to explain the obstacles you have faced since the last hearing. You told the panel that you have tried to get work within the healthcare sector, but that many places you have applied to told you to go back to nursing. You stated that you have found a few organisations that offer support with return to practice courses for nurses in your position, which has been the nearest possible option available to you to return in the future.

You told the panel that this case is not straightforward, and you provided a summary to the panel. You explained that the original referrer in your case had no evidence of the allegations against you. You told the panel that you were not supported in your previous role, and that the referral to the NMC was based on false allegations. You explained that at the original hearing, you were unrepresented and did not provide witnesses to support your case that the allegations were false. You stated that the hearing was unfair, and that no one listened to you. You told the panel that you could not understand how working in another non-registered role would help you improve your practice as a nurse. You said it is a matter for the panel to determine whether you require restriction on your practice.

In response to panel questions, you told the panel that last year you applied to three universities for return to practice courses, but you were rejected because your PIN was still active. You stated that you have researched some more courses this year, and that some of the institutions have indicated that they can support you appropriately. You stated that you learnt about this just before Christmas and so have not yet applied. You stated that the NMC has previously told you not to apply for a return to practice course, and to focus on getting relevant work experience, although you were unable to draw this panel's attention to where that was included in the documentation before it. You clarified that you applied to four roles and sent them your CV, but that you were told to return to nursing. In respect of your continuing professional development in the last year, you clarified that you

completed some non-certification, free training on topics such as hand hygiene, aseptic non-touch technique and medication dispensing procedures.

You told the panel that you inquired about working in a charity shop, but you considered that this would not demonstrate any improvement in your nursing skills. You told the panel that a return to practice course would take from three months to one year to complete. You were asked whether you would consider a non-registered role in the healthcare sector to improve your nursing skills, and you stated that initially you were open to these roles, but you had received too many rejections. You stated that as long as you are subject to restrictions on your practice by the NMC, an employer in the healthcare sector will not employ you. You also said that your lack of references is a barrier to getting a job in the healthcare sector. You then stated that obtaining a non-registered role in the healthcare sector would not assist you in demonstrating improvement in your nursing skills.

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 noted that the last reviewing panel found that you had very little insight. At this hearing, the panel considered that it has heard no new information regarding your current level of insight. The panel considered that you have not addressed your competency and ability to practise safely, kindly and professionally in a reflective piece or in your submissions today. In its consideration of whether you have taken steps to strengthen your practice, the panel noted that it had no new information regarding any steps you have taken to strengthen your practice. The panel acknowledged that you have attended the hearing today, however it bore in mind that you have not provided any of the documentation suggested by the previous panel. This panel also considered that your submissions were inconsistent and unsubstantiated by independent evidence.

The last reviewing panel determined that you were liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has heard no new information that the risk of repetition has been mitigated. If anything, the panel considered that in the absence of any meaningful insight or strengthened practice, the level of risk may have increased. In light of this, this panel determined that you remain 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 considered that a member of the public would be seriously concerned if a finding of impairment was not made in this case, given the absence of insight and strengthened practice. 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 your fitness to practise remains impaired.

### **Decision and reasons on sanction**

Having found your fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel was reminded by the legal assessor that it did not have the power to strike you off the NMC register, but that a future panel would have this power due to the elapse of the two-year period from the initial sanction imposed on your registration. The panel 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 your 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 your conduct 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 your 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 of the view that given your lack of insight, lack of strengthened practice and that you have not worked as a Registered Nurse in several years, it could not formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to your lack of competence.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow you further time to fully reflect on your previous failings. It considered that you need to gain a full understanding of how any competency issues in a nurse's practice can impact upon colleagues, patients and the wider public. The panel considered that you have stated that you intend to complete a return to practice course which was not previously available to you. The panel considered that a period of suspension would give you ample time to apply and at least begin a return to practice course, or to find work in the healthcare sector, so you could provide independent, substantiated evidence to a reviewing panel of your improved competencies.

The panel was of the view that a further period of suspension would afford you time to take meaningful steps to improve your insight into the competency issues found proved, and your nursing practice generally. The panel concluded that a further six-months suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response. It would also give you an opportunity to approach past and current colleagues, to attest to your character and

competence in any workplace assignments since the substantive review hearing. This panel did not have the power to consider a striking-off order given that you have not been suspended for a period of two years. The panel noted that a future reviewing panel will have this option available to it.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for the period of six-months, which it considered to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 13 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before 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:

- Evidence of steps taken to begin a return to practice course, and evidence from a course provider of your inductions and progress on the course;
- Evidence of steps taken to gain employment in the healthcare sector;
- A reflective piece from you demonstrating your insight into how a lack of competence impacts on patients, colleagues and the profession;
- References and testimonials from any employer or voluntary workplace and others who are able to comment on your practice and/or character (you can work within the healthcare sector as long as it is not a requirement of the post that you are a registered nurse); and
- A record of your self-directed online learning and Professional Development and copies of any relevant training certificates.

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.