

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing  
Monday 6 July 2026**

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

|                                       |                                                                                                                                                    |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Name of Registrant:</b>            | <b>Nsa Ita</b>                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>NMC PIN:</b>                       | 95D0061O                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Part(s) of the register:</b>       | Registered Nurse – Sub part 1<br>RN1: Adult Nurse (Level 1) – 12 April 1995<br>P405: Special and Intensive Care of the Newborn – 16 September 1999 |
| <b>Relevant Location:</b>             | Staffordshire                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Type of case:</b>                  | Lack of Competence                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Panel members:</b>                 | Clara Cheetham (Chair, lay member)<br>Robert Pragnell (Lay member)<br>Aries Maximus Ogbuokiri (Registrant member)                                  |
| <b>Legal Assessor:</b>                | John Donnelly                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Hearings Coordinator:</b>          | Khatra Ibrahim                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Nursing and Midwifery Council:</b> | Represented by Assad Badruddin, Case Presenter                                                                                                     |
| <b>Miss Ita:</b>                      | Present and unrepresented at this hearing                                                                                                          |
| <b>Order being reviewed:</b>          | Suspension order (6 months)                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Fitness to practise:</b>           | Impaired                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Outcome:</b>                       | <b>Striking-Off order to come into effect at the end of 13 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1).</b>                                      |

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

The panel decided to replace the current suspension order with a striking off order.

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

This is the third 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. On 8 January 2026, the reviewing panel decided to impose a further 6-month suspension order.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 13 August 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 second reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

*'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.'*

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

*'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.'*

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

This panel has considered carefully whether your fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as the ability of a professional on our register to 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, and responses from you. It has taken account of the submissions made by Mr Badruddin, on behalf of the NMC. He took the panel through the background of the case, and submitted that your fitness to practise remains impaired on the grounds of public protection and in the wider public interest.

Mr Badruddin referred the panel to the documents before it, and submitted that the original substantive panel determined that you were not open to feedback, and that you lacked insight and there was no evidence of strengthening of practice. He took today's panel through the recommendations provided by the original substantive panel, and submitted that you had not provided any additional meaningful evidence to the previous reviewing panels, and that you had remained of the view that you were not at fault at the time.

Mr Badruddin submitted that the last reviewing panel imposed a 6 month suspension order, and had noted that for this panel, in the absence of any further information, the sanction of a striking off order is now available.

Mr Badruddin referred the panel to documents provided by you, specifically information in relation to an attempt to complete a Return to Practice Course; you had applied to a university but were refused due to your ongoing suspension order. He also referred the

panel to your reflective piece dated 6 July 2026, in particular he drew the panel's attention to:

*'Evaluation:*

*It was a big set up, a deliberate attempt to destroy my career*

*The case is too long*

*'My case;*

- *Was not an ideal situation*
- *I was not aware of the allegations*
- *No internal investigation was done*
- *There was no evidence*
- *The case is too long because there was no evidence'*

Mr Badruddin submitted that you have continued to demonstrate no insight into your conduct, and that you have further failed to show any remorse. He also submitted that you have not been in nursing practice since the original referral in 2019. He submitted that since the imposition of the substantive suspension order, you have not acknowledged your failings or how they have impacted upon the public protection and confidence in the nursing profession.

Mr Badruddin referred the panel to NMC guidance Rev-2a. He invited the panel to impose a striking off order as you have failed to accept the concerns which led to the referral, and subsequently the imposition of the current suspension order. He submitted that a conditions of practice order would not be workable, proportionate or appropriate at this time, in light of the charges found proved at the substantive hearing and your continuing lack of insight and insufficient attempts at strengthening your practice. In regard to a suspension order, Mr Badruddin submitted that a further period of suspension would serve no real purpose nor meet the wider public interest.

You gave evidence under oath.

You told the panel that the evidence from the NMC was incorrect in regard to the charges put to you. You said that you had informed the Hospital when you started employment that you required further training in some areas. You said to the panel that you understand that

there is a certain standard and quality expected in nursing skills in order to deliver safe care to patients.

You told the panel that you wish to leave what happened in the past and look forward. You said that since the last review in January 2026, you have been attempting to ensure you carried out further training. You also said that since the last review, you have participated in IT training and other online training to maintain and improve your skills. You have completed online training in basic nursing skills, including drug and mathematic calculations, incubator and resuscitation and aseptic technique. You did not have any evidence of these training courses or any other self-directed learning to provide to the panel.

You told the panel that through your recent employment in a Digital Inclusion Project Fair, you have been able to demonstrate that you work collaboratively with others and have given advice to the public on accessing health services, and that this demonstrates safe clinical practice. You told the panel that you currently work in a voluntary capacity, approximately two days a week. You referred the panel to a testimonial from your current manager in this role, which stated that you have been;

*‘supporting residents as they developed their digital skills and confidence’.*

You told the panel that in regard to public protection, you have been able to develop your skills and work in a team. You said you are committed to nursing, do not believe you are a risk to the public, and that if you were a current risk you would not have been able to carry out your current role.

You further referred the panel to the Return to Practice Course communications between yourself and Kingston University on 26 May – 9 June 2026. You said that the University asked for further details, and as you were in the process of collating the requested information, the University emailed you to inform you that it was not able to offer you an interview due to the current suspension order.

In regard to your fitness to practise, you acknowledged that at the time of commencing employment in 2019, you were aware that you needed to refresh your skills and sought out

an employer that you believed would support you to do so. You stated that during the three months of your employment, there was no incident and no concerns were raised with you. It was only when a referral was made to the NMC that you say you became aware of the alleged conduct. You said that if you had done what was alleged, your employer would not have allowed you to remain working. You told the panel that you have studied and worked hard to become a nurse, and that you cannot think of anything else to fill the gap if you were further restricted from nursing practice and/or removed from the register.

You told the panel that you have applied for a number of entry level healthcare roles, including that of a phlebotomist and a position in clinical research. You also applied for a role at a GP practice that you felt was more in line with your skillset, but you found that your data was being “sold” to third parties, so you decided not to go ahead with it. You did not provide any documentation to the panel in relation to any employment applications you have made.

Mr Badruddin asked you if you believe your fitness to practise remains impaired. You stated that it is not, and that you wish to return to work, although you accept that you need to refresh your clinical skills, but that this could be done through a Return to Practice course. You said that in regard to patient safety, no babies were harmed in your care, and that the referral was solely made to destroy your career.

In response to Mr Badruddin’s questions, you said that you would like to develop and strengthen your nursing practice by completing a Return to Practice Course at a University, but you have not been able to confirm the clinical placement required.

Mr Badruddin submitted to the panel that there is a lack of insight by you, several clinical concerns and no remorse. He maintained that as your fitness to practise remains impaired on the grounds of public protection and the wider public interest, the most appropriate order is that of a striking off order.

The panel 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 determined that there has been no material change in this regard and that there remains a lack of remorse and acknowledgement of the concerns found against you. The panel also noted that although you have remained engaged with the process, you have provided little evidence to demonstrate steps you have taken to strengthen your practice.

The panel acknowledged that you have provided a certificate to show completion of an Advanced Cardiac Life Support course, but that this does not specifically address your previous failings. It noted that there is no other evidence of any other training or self-directed learning by you. Although it is a positive step that you have been working in a voluntary capacity, it is in a non-clinical role and further noted that, when questioned by the panel, you did not accept that any clinical role other than that of a registered nurse would assist you in returning to unrestricted practice. With regard to your recent reflective piece, notwithstanding your right to maintain your denials of the original allegations, the panel concluded that there has been no progress in terms of your insight or understanding of the seriousness of the concerns found against you, the risks to patients and public confidence, the need to engage with constructive criticism, as well as the impact on your colleagues. Consequently, the panel determined that there remains a risk of repetition should your practice not be restricted at this time.

The panel was of the view that, despite some limited efforts, you have not acted on the recommendations of the previous reviewing panels, which were clearly outlined to you. There has been no evidence of developing insight, very limited reflection on your past conduct, and limited evidence that you have strengthened your practice or maintained your professional knowledge and skills. The panel concluded that there had been very limited progress in addressing the concerns identified against you.

The last reviewing panel determined that you were liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Although you have attempted to apply to a Return to Practice Course, this would not be appropriate whilst you are continuing to show very limited insight into the past concerns. The panel found that you had applied to the Return to Practice Course as a prerequisite for you to work as a registered nurse. Whilst such a course might address some of the clinical concerns previously identified, there was nothing to suggest that your decision to do so is demonstrative of the recognition of your past action on public confidence, patients or the wider nursing profession. The 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 also considered the wider public interest. It determined that public confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if a finding of continuing impairment were not made in circumstances where there had been no evidence of insight, no reflection upon the previous conduct and have not addressed the concerns found proved. It therefore determined that proper professional standards would not be upheld if impairment were no longer found.

For these reasons, the panel determined that your fitness to practise remains impaired on the grounds of both public protection and the wider public interest.

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

Having found your 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 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, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again'* The panel considered that your 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 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.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel found that you have not shown strengthening of practice. Further, you have not demonstrated insight into your previous failings. The panel was of the view that even 7 years on from the original concerns, the amount of pro-active engagement necessary from you to demonstrate that you no longer pose a risk to the public is such that the panel has no confidence that this can be achieved. It therefore determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent you from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest at this stage was a striking-off order.

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

This decision will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.