

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing  
Wednesday, 14 January 2026**

**Virtual Hearing**

<b>Name of Registrant:</b>	Mohamad Kanu
<b>NMC PIN:</b>	07A0015C
<b>Part(s) of the register:</b>	RN1: Registered Nurse – (Sub part 1) Adult Nursing (Level 1) – 9 January 2007
<b>Relevant Location:</b>	Braddan, Isle of Man
<b>Type of case:</b>	Misconduct
<b>Panel members:</b>	Wayne Miller (Chair, lay member) Steven Brennan-Collis (Registrant member) Mark Allison (Lay member)
<b>Legal Assessor:</b>	Paul Hester
<b>Hearings Coordinator:</b>	Catherine Blake
<b>Nursing and Midwifery Council:</b>	Represented by Susan Jean, Case Presenter
<b>Mr Mohamad:</b>	Not present and not represented at the hearing
<b>Order being reviewed:</b>	Suspension order (6 months)
<b>Fitness to practise:</b>	Impaired
<b>Outcome:</b>	<b>Suspension order (6 months) to come into effect on 19 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)</b>

## **Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing**

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Mr Kanu was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Mr Kanu's registered email address by secure email on 15 December 2025.

Mrs Jean, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Hearing provided details of the substantive order being reviewed, the time, date and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Mr Kanu's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in his absence.

The panel noted that the spelling of Mr Kanu's name is different in his registered email address to how it is spelled on the register. The panel made efforts to confirm that the NMC has received email correspondence from Mr Kanu via his registered email address and so were satisfied that it is correct. It was satisfied that the email correspondence was sent to the appropriate email address.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mr Kanu has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

The panel noted that the Rules do not require delivery and that it is the responsibility of any registrant to maintain an effective and up-to-date registered address.

## **Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Mr Kanu**

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mr Kanu. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Mrs Jean who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Mr Kanu.

Mrs Jean submitted that there had been no engagement at all by Mr Kanu with the NMC in relation to these proceedings and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure his attendance on some future occasion.

Mrs Jean submitted that Mr Kanu had voluntarily absented himself.

Further, the panel noted that an email invitation containing the hearing link was sent to Mr Kanu's registered email address by the Hearings Coordinator on 13 January 2026. No response has been received.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Mr Kanu. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Mrs Jean, the representations from Mr Kanu, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Mr Kanu;
- Mr Kanu has not engaged with the NMC and has not responded to any of the letters sent to him about this hearing;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure his attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Mr Kanu.

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

The panel decided to extend the current suspension order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 19 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of six months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 18 July 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 19 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:*

*While employed by Harbour Suite between 8 May 2023 and 20 June 2023:*

- 1) *On or about 26 May 2023 gave Chlordiazepoxide to a patient instead of Paliperidone.*
- 2) *Following the incident in charge 1 above,*
  - a) *Did not inform the patient that you had administered incorrect medication for a period of approximately 2-3 hours*
  - b) *Did not complete an incident report.*
- 3) *Your actions at charges 2 a) and/or 2 b) demonstrated a lack of candour in that you failed promptly to inform the patient of*

*the medication error and/or ensure that it was recorded as a medication incident.*

[...]

- 8) *On an unknown date, did not carry out a risk assessment and/or establish whether one had already been carried out, prior to allowing a patient to go on leave.*
- 9) *On an unknown date prior to 4 July 2023:*
  - a) *Asked Patient A for their contact number*
  - b) *Offered to meet with Patient A after their discharge.*
- 10) *Your action at charge 9 above was in breach of professional boundaries.*

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

*'The panel recognised that as set out in Mr Kanu's NMC context form and reflective accounts, personal factors may have had an impact at the time of the incidents. However, this was only made known to colleagues at the time of the termination of his contract.*

*'Regarding insight, the panel considered that Mr Kanu has shown limited insight in his reflective accounts. The panel determined, that whilst Mr Kanu has developing insight, it is clear from his reflective account and the NMC context form that he has not yet developed sufficient good insight to demonstrate that he will not repeat the matters of concern.*

*'The panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being addressed. Mr Kanu's behaviour did not demonstrate a deep-seated attitudinal*

*problem, and he appeared open to training and guidance. The panel carefully considered the evidence before it in determining whether or not Mr Kanu has taken steps to strengthen his practice. The panel took into account that Mr Kanu has completed reflections and has shown some awareness of what he needed to remedy and articulated some steps he would take to address the issues, however, he has not provided sufficient detail of any further training or learning he would undertake.*

*'The panel concluded that limbs a), b) and c) of the Grant test were engaged in this case. The panel finds that vulnerable patients and members of the public were put at risk and there was serious potential risk of harm as a result of Mr Kanu's misconduct. The panel determined that Mr Kanu's misconduct had breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession, as demonstrated by the breaches of the Code, and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute.*

*'The panel was not satisfied that Mr Kanu can practice safely as he put vulnerable patients and members of the public at risk of harm. It noted that there was no evidence before it about what Mr Kanu is currently doing. The panel concluded that although Mr Kanu has shown some insight, there remains a real risk of repetition. Therefore, it 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; 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 on public interest grounds is required to uphold proper professional standards and maintain public confidence in the profession. It determined that given the findings of misconduct, the public would lack confidence in Mr Kanu's ability to practise safely and effectively.*

*'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 Mr Kanu's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.*

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

The original 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 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 Mr Kanu'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 Mr Kanu'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 placing conditions of practice on Mr Kanu'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 took into account the SG, in particular:*

- Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions.*

*'The panel is of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated, given the nature and gravity of the charges in this case. It determined that conditions are not sufficient to manage the risks identified.*

*'Furthermore, the panel concluded that the placing of conditions on Mr Kanu's registration would not adequately address the seriousness of this case and would not protect the public and maintain confidence in the profession.*

*'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:*

- *No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- *No evidence of repetition of behaviour since the incident;*

*'The panel was satisfied that in this case, the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register. It found that Mr Kanu has shown awareness of the seriousness of the misconduct, is open to learning and further training and the panel was satisfied there was no evidence of deep-seated attitudinal issues.*

*'It did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate but, taking account of all the information before it, the panel concluded that it would be disproportionate. Whilst the panel acknowledges that a suspension may have a punitive effect, it would be unduly punitive in Mr Kanu's case to impose a striking-off order.*

*'Balancing all of these factors the panel has concluded that a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.'*

## **Decision and reasons on current impairment**

The panel has considered carefully whether Mr Kanu's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's suitability to remain on the register 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Mrs Jean on behalf of the NMC. She submitted that there has been no communication with the NMC by Mr Kanu since the sanction was imposed. Mrs Jean submitted that, without any evidence of training, or an updated reflection, the panel could not be satisfied of Mr Kanu's fitness to practice. She invited the panel to find that Mr Kanu's fitness to practice remains impaired.

Mrs Jean submitted that, this being the first review of the substantive order, the panel may consider a further period of suspension appropriate. She submitted that this would ensure the public remains protected, and also allow Mr Kanu time to re-engage with the NMC and demonstrate remediation.

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 Mr Kanu's fitness to practise remains impaired. It bore in mind that the persuasive burden is on Mr Kanu to demonstrate whether he is fit to practise.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Mr Kanu had developing insight and reflection into his conduct. At this hearing, the panel has seen no update from Mr Kanu and no new information as to his current levels of insight and reflection.

In its consideration of whether Mr Kanu has taken steps to strengthen his practice, the panel took into account the decision of the original panel that the misconduct in this case is capable of being addressed. Today's panel has seen no information from Mr Kanu regarding any steps taken in the last six months to strengthen his practice.

The original panel determined that Mr Kanu was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has not seen any new information to suggest that the risk of repeating the behaviour has changed since this decision was made. In light of this, today's panel could not be satisfied that Mr Kanu was now not liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing 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 the ground of public interest is also required.

For these reasons, the panel finds that Mr Kanu's fitness to practise remains impaired.

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

Having found Mr Kanu'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 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 Mr Kanu'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 Mr Kanu'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 Mr Kanu'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 given Mr Kanu's lack of engagement. Accordingly, the panel could not be satisfied of Mr Kanu's willingness to engage with conditions of practice, and so determined it would not be an appropriate sanction.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Mr Kanu further time to fully reflect on his previous failings. The panel concluded that a further six-month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Mr Kanu adequate time to further develop his insight and take steps to strengthen his practice. It would also give Mr Kanu an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals to attest to his good 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 that to impose a suspension order for the period of six months would provide Mr Kanu with an opportunity to re-engage with the NMC. It considered this 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 19 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:

- Mr Kanu's attendance at any future review hearing.
- [PRIVATE].
- Evidence of completing training around medicines management, the appropriate completion of patient records, and risk assessments.
- Evidence of completing training in understanding the principles relating to the reporting of incidents, duty of candour and professional boundaries.
- Written reflections with specific regard to duty of candour and professional boundaries.
- Any relevant testimonials.

This will be confirmed to Mr Kanu in writing.

That concludes this determination.