

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Thursday, 29 January 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	Muhammad Mir
NMC PIN:	21B0286E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 RNA Adult Nurse – July 2021
Relevant Location:	Huddersfield
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Judith Webb (Chair, lay member) Rosalyn Mloyi (Registrant member) Margaret Jolley (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Paul Housego
Hearings Coordinator:	Catherine Acevedo
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (3 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Suspension order (12 months) to come into effect at the end of 23 March 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 Mr Mir's registered email address by secure email on 22 December 2025.

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 26 January 2026 and invited Mr Mir 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 Mr Mir 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 review of the current order

The panel decided to impose a suspension order for a period of 12 months. This order will come into effect at the end of 23 March 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 3 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 21 November 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 23 March 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 26 June 2022, failed to maintain professional boundaries in that you:

a) Contacted Person A by text message/and or telephone calls without clinical justification using Person A's confidential personal information.

b) Made a personal visit to the home address of Person A.

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 determined that there was a risk of unwarranted patient harm and determined that due to the lack of engagement from Mr Mir since August 2023, there is nothing before the panel to suggest that the risk does not remain in the future. The panel noted that while Mr Mir has expressed remorse, it considered there to be minimal insight and therefore were not content that the risk no longer remains. The panel also noted that he has demonstrated an attitudinal problem which could extend to risk to patients and their families.

The panel determined that Mr Mir has used confidential information for nonclinical purposes and in doing so, has in the past brought the nursing profession into disrepute. The panel noted that there has been limited insight into these actions and Mr Mir has disengaged with the NMC since August 2023, which raised concerns of his potential risk of repetition in the future.

The panel determined that Mr Mir had breached and is liable to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession, in particular the duty to maintain professional boundaries. The panel determined that his professionalism was called into question due to his actions and that due to his minimal insight the panel could not be satisfied that he would not repeat such actions in the future.

The panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being remedied, despite its serious nature. The panel therefore carefully considered the evidence before it in determining whether or not Mr Mir has taken steps to strengthen his practice. The panel determined that while he has shown a level of remorse and insight into the impact of his actions, there is insufficient evidence at present to show that he has taken steps to remedy them. The panel could not be satisfied that the concerns have been remedied as Mr Mir has shown extremely limited insight and has not engaged with the NMC since August 2023. The panel determined that Mr Mir has not provided any evidence of strengthening of practice, which could include reflective pieces and proof of undertaking relevant training.

The panel noted that the evidence before it contains a testimonial from Mr Mir's employer, dated 13 March 2024, however considered that this was brief, contained little detail and at the time of the meeting was over 19 months old.

Further, the panel found that there is a risk of repetition based on the fact it has no evidence before it to show that the concerns have been remedied and therefore consider that there is a risk that the actions will be repeated in the future. 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; 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 public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore also finds Mr Mir's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

‘The panel next considered whether placing conditions of practice on Mr Mir’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:

- *No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- *Identifiable of the nurse, midwife or nursing associates practice in need of assessment and/or retraining;*
- *Potential willingness to respond positively to retraining;*
- *Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions;*
- *Conditions could be created that can be monitored and assessed.*

The panel is of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated, given the nature of Mr Mir’s misconduct.

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 Committee is satisfied that the nurse or midwife has insight and does not pose a significant risk of repeating behaviour;*

On balance, while the panel considered evidence of Mr Mir’s insight to be limited, it noted that he had acknowledged his actions promptly at a local level and repeated that acknowledgment later to the NMC. The panel also took into account that it had no evidence before it of any repeated referrals or concerns

regarding Mr Mir's conduct from the date of these charges to this meeting. It considered however that Mr Mir had not provided sufficient evidence that his conduct had been remedied and that he had strengthened his practice.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Mir's misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with his remaining on the register.

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 Mir'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.

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 3 months with a review, 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 the provision of the following, at least 2 weeks prior to the review date:

- *Evidence from Mr Mir of full written reflections regarding his breach of professional boundaries and the impact it had on Person A and Person A's family, the nursing profession, his employer and the regulator*

- *Evidence of strengthened practice, e.g. certificates of training relating to the regulatory concerns*
- *Up to date testimonials from Mr Mir's present employer(s)*
- *A report completed by Mr Mir's line manager/employer regarding his maintenance of professional boundaries in the workplace.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mr Mir's fitness to practise remains impaired. There is no statutory definition of fitness to practise. The panel however took account of the NMC guidance on impairment (DMA-1, 27 February 2024), which suggests the question the panel should ask itself is:

'Can the nurse, midwife or nursing associate practise kindly, safely and professionally?'

The panel has had regard to all of the documentation before it.

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 Mir's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that Mr Mir has not provided any evidence of developing insight into concerns about professional boundaries thereby strengthening his practice. He has not engaged with any of the recommendations made by the substantive meeting panel. The panel also noted that Mr Mir has not engaged with the NMC since August 2023.

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 Mir's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Mr Mir had minimal insight and therefore it was not content that the risk no longer remains. That panel also noted that he has demonstrated an attitudinal problem which could extend to risk to patients and their families. Today's panel had no information before it to suggest a material change in the circumstances. In light of this, it determined, in the absence of any evidence of improved insight and strengthened practice, there remains a risk of repetition of the matters 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, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Mir'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 Mir'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 Mir'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 Mir'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 meeting 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, as this was not a clinical issue.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Mr Mir further time to fully reflect on his previous failings. It considered Mr Mir needed to gain a full understanding of how his breach of professional boundaries impacted negatively on Person A and Person A's family, the nursing profession, his employer and the regulator. The panel concluded that a further 12 month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Mr Mir adequate time to develop full insight and take steps to strengthen his practice. It would also give Mr Mir an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals to attest to his professionalism in the workplace since the substantive meeting.

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 which would provide Mr Mir with an opportunity to 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 23 March 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of suspension, another panel will review the order. At the review, 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 from Mr Mir of full written reflections regarding his breach of professional boundaries and the impact it had on Person A and Person A's family, the nursing profession, his employer and the regulator
- Evidence of strengthened practice, e.g. certificates of training relating to the regulatory concerns
- Up to date testimonials from Mr Mir's present employer(s)
- A report completed by Mr Mir's line manager/employer regarding his maintenance of professional boundaries in the workplace.
- Mr Mir's intentions about future practice.

Mr Mir should note that should he consider that he can demonstrate full insight before the expiry of this suspension order he can apply for an early review of the order, and ask for the suspension to end.

Mr Mir should also be aware that if he does not provide the reviewing panel with the information suggested above the panel reviewing his suspension from practice as this order comes to an end may decide to strike him off the register.

This decision will be confirmed to Mr Mir in writing.

That concludes this determination.