

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Tuesday, 21 July 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Rashida John
NMC PIN:	06L0111O
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Adult RN1 – 19 December 2006
Relevant Location:	Slough
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Wayne Miller (Chair, lay member) Corinne Foy (Registrant member) Marilyn Norman (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Richard Tyson
Hearings Coordinator:	Yvonne Temah
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Sylvia Opoku, Case Presenter
Mrs John:	Present, unrepresented and assisted by an interpreter
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (3 months)
Fitness to practise:	Not Impaired
Outcome:	Order to lapse upon expiry in accordance with Article 30 (1), namely 28 August 2026

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to allow the order to lapse upon expiry of the current order at the end of 28 August 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 three months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 30 April 2026.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 28 August 2026.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

The charges found proved by way of admission which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

'That you, a registered nurse,

1. On the nightshift commencing 28 June 2023, in relation to six residents,

a) Failed to check,

i. Blood pressure.

ii. Pulse.

iii. Temperature.

iv. Oxygen saturations.

b) Inaccurately recorded,

i. Blood pressure.

ii. Pulse.

iii. Temperature.

iv. Oxygen saturations.

2. Your conduct at charge 1(b) was dishonest in that you knew you had not conducted resident observations and you intended to mislead anyone reading the resident records to believe that you had.

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

The substantive panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'In relation to limb (a), on whether patients were put at unwarranted risk of harm, in the past, as a result of your misconduct, the panel noted Ms McMahon's statement that no actual harm was caused to any resident as a result of your actions. However, the panel considered that your actions did place residents at an unwarranted risk of harm. The panel considered that, by falsifying observations, other practitioners (such as GPs) would rely on these observations, and these records would inform them in determining the correct medical approach to the residents. The panel determined that, by falsifying these records, you placed residents at an unwarranted risk of harm.

In relation to limbs (b) and (c), in respect of the past, the panel considered that honesty and integrity are fundamental elements of nursing practice, and your misconduct in these areas did bring the nursing profession into disrepute.

In respect of limb (d), concerning dishonesty, the panel was satisfied that this limb is engaged, given its findings on facts.

The panel took into account that impairment is a forward-looking exercise, and it considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired.

The panel next considered whether you are liable, in the future, to place patients at unwarranted risk of harm, to bring the nursing profession into disrepute or breach one of the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession, following Grant. In reaching its decision, the panel also considered the principles derived from Cohen, namely:

- *Whether the concern is easily remediable;*

- *Whether it has in fact been remedied; and*
- *Whether it is highly unlikely to be repeated.*

On whether the concerns are easily remediable, the panel considered that some of your misconduct concerned your clinical practice, but some of the concerns were also attitudinal in nature (such as dishonesty). The panel was satisfied that the clinical concerns were remediable, with sufficient training. In respect of the dishonesty, the panel considered the NMC Guidance, 'Sanctions for the highest risk cases' (SAN-4). Within it, under the header, 'Cases involving dishonesty', the guidance stated:

'Not all dishonesty is equally serious. Generally, the forms of dishonesty which are most likely to require consideration of striking-off will involve (but are not limited to):

- *deliberately breaching the professional duty of candour by covering up when things have gone wrong, especially if this could cause harm to people receiving care*
- *misuse of power*
- *personal or financial gain from a breach of trust*
- *direct risk to people receiving care*
- *premeditated, systematic or longstanding deception.*

Dishonest conduct will generally be less serious in cases of:

- *one-off incidents*
- *spontaneous conduct*
- *no direct personal gain*
- *incidents outside professional practice.'*

Based on the guidance above, the panel was satisfied that, whilst your dishonesty did relate to your clinical practice, it is on the lower end of seriousness. The panel bore in mind that the dishonesty related to your conduct over one night shift, and did not involve direct personal gain,

misuse of power or breach of trust. The panel was satisfied that the dishonesty concerns are remediable in this case.

In relation to whether the concerns have, in fact, been remedied, the panel considered your apology made throughout this hearing, and the remorse you have expressed. The panel considered that you made full admissions to the charges, and you have acknowledged the impact your actions had on patients, colleagues and upon the wider nursing profession. The panel also considered that you indicated that you have addressed the underlying issues regarding your health, and that you continue to be aware of your general wellbeing. The panel also bore in mind that you were open with your employer regarding these proceedings and the charges you were facing.

The panel also had sight of the relevant training you have undertaken since the incidents, which included:

- *Communication, dated 18 October 2024;*
- *Lone Working, dated 24 April 2025;*
- *Recording Information, which included record keeping, dated 16 November 2024; and*
- *Wellbeing in the Workplace, dated 16 November 2024.*

Further, the panel had sight of the Performance Review, dated 1 May 2025, as well as the Performance Management Review, dated 1 April 2025, provided by your current employer, which indicated that you are currently practising safely as a registered nurse. The review referred to you as a 'dedicated and professional nurse, who demonstrates a clear passion for her role' and that you are 'open to learning and consistently seeks guidance when uncertain'. The panel also noted the reference from your employer, dated 17 June 2024, which referred to you being well spoken of, and that you are a 'well-respected and honest individual who maintains professional conduct in the workplace'. The panel noted that there have been no further concerns raised regarding your practice since the incidents.

Taking all the above into account, the panel was satisfied that you have sufficiently remediated the clinical concerns identified. The panel considered that you have undertaken relevant training in the clinical areas of concern, and you have since been working unrestricted for a period of almost three years with no further issues.

In respect of dishonesty, the panel considered that you are open and honest regarding these proceedings to your employer, and it bore in mind your submissions, which detailed your apology and recognition of the impact of your actions on patients, colleagues and the wider nursing profession. The panel considered that you fully accept your misconduct, and you have not sought to blame others for your actions. The panel also considered that no further concerns have been raised regarding your honesty and integrity, and you appear committed to the management of your health and wellbeing, and to maintaining professional standards in your practice more generally. The panel also noted that your insight further developed throughout this hearing, and it considered that the Fitness to Practise process has allowed you to further reflect on your misconduct. The panel considered that there has been no evidence of any repetition of the misconduct.

Based on the above, the panel next considered whether your misconduct is likely to be repeated. The panel bore in mind that you have sufficiently remediated the concerns, and you have since been practising with no further issues. In these circumstances, the panel was satisfied that there is a low risk of you repeating your misconduct.

Accordingly, the panel determined that you are not liable to repeat your misconduct. The panel found that your fitness to practise is not impaired on public protection grounds.

The panel next considered whether a finding of impairment is necessary on public interest grounds. The panel bore in mind that the overarching

objectives of the NMC, namely 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 well-informed member of the public, apprised with the information before this panel, would expect the misconduct, which involved dishonesty in a clinical setting, to make finding of impairment. Whilst the panel acknowledged that the dishonesty in these circumstances is on the lower end of seriousness, it determined that public confidence in the nursing profession would be seriously undermined if no finding of impairment was made to mark your misconduct. The panel therefore determined that a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is also necessary, to maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and uphold the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that your fitness to practise is currently impaired on public interest grounds only.'

The substantive panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel went on to consider whether a suspension order is appropriate in this case. The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on 'Suspension order' (SAN-2d) in which the following factors on when a suspension order may be appropriate are set out:

- 'the impairment is very serious but not fundamentally incompatible with continuing to be a registered professional*
- an outcome less severe than strike-off would still satisfy the over-arching objective.'*

The panel also had regard to the key considerations as set out in the NMC Guidance to weigh up before imposing a suspension. It noted the following

list of circumstances that may make a suspension order an appropriate sanction:

- ...
- *while it is possible that the professional could be fit to practise in future, only a period out of practice would be sufficient to allow them to fully strengthen their practice through reflection, the development of their professional skills and / or development of insight and remediation*
- ...
- *what went wrong is so serious that public confidence in the profession and professional standards could not be maintained if the professional were able to continue practising without stopping for a period of time*
- *despite the seriousness of what happened, the professional has engaged in the proceedings and has shown at least some meaningful insight which evidences a realistic possibility that they will continue to develop this insight, address their concerns and return to practice.'*

Bearing in mind the guidance above, the panel considered that it is possible for you to be fit to practise in the future, and a time period out of practice would allow you time to fully reflect and develop your insight into your dishonest conduct.

Further, the panel was satisfied that dishonest conduct, whilst on the lower end of seriousness, is still sufficiently serious that the public confidence in the profession could only be maintained if your practice was temporarily restricted. The panel bore in mind that you no longer pose a risk to the public, but it considered that a temporary restriction on your practice 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.

In considering this, the panel was also satisfied that the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with you remaining on the register, and the panel concluded that a striking-off order would be disproportionate and punitive in light of your engagement and developing insight.

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 may cause you, particularly in light of you currently working as a registered nurse. However, this is outweighed by the public interest in this case. The panel determined that a suspension order for a period of three months was appropriate in this case to mark the seriousness of the misconduct.

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:

- Your continued engagement with the NMC and attendance at a future hearing;*
- Written reflective piece evidencing your full insight into your dishonest conduct and its impact on the public interest and the profession; and*
- Evidence of up-to-date and relevant training, including training on professional ethics and record keeping.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

Today's 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 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Opoku on behalf of the NMC. She reminded the panel that this was the first review of a substantive suspension order and that the persuasive burden rested on you to demonstrate that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

Ms Opoku referred the panel to the findings of the substantive panel, which determined that your clinical concerns had been significantly remediated and that you no longer posed a risk to the public. However, the substantive panel concluded that your insight into your dishonest conduct was not yet fully developed and found your fitness to practise impaired on public interest grounds only. A three-month suspension order was imposed to allow you further time to reflect and develop your insight.

Ms Opoku stated that today's panel now had before it an updated reflective piece, evidence of relevant training and your written evidence addressing the recommendations of the substantive panel, including further reflection on your dishonest conduct, its impact on the profession and public confidence, and the application of your learning to strengthen your practice.

Ms Opoku adopted a neutral position, submitting that it was a matter for the panel to determine whether you had demonstrated sufficient further insight and remediation to discharge the persuasive burden and establish that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired. If the panel found that impairment remained, it should proceed to consider sanction in accordance with the NMC's Sanctions Guidance.

The panel also had regard to your oral evidence under oath with the assistance of the interpreter. You stated that you accept full responsibility for your misconduct and expressed genuine remorse for your actions. You acknowledged that your conduct fell below the professional standards expected of a registered nurse and recognised that honesty and integrity are fundamental tenets of the profession. You submitted that you

now understand the impact your dishonest conduct had on patients, colleagues, public confidence and the reputation of the nursing profession.

You submitted that you have taken meaningful steps to strengthen your practice during the period of suspension. You referred the panel to your updated reflective statement and evidence of professional development, including training on advance care planning, record keeping, confidentiality, consent, the Mental Capacity Act, safeguarding, equality, diversity and inclusion, and human rights. You stated that this learning has strengthened your understanding of professional accountability, accurate record keeping and the importance of practising in accordance with the Code.

You submitted that these proceedings had been a significant learning experience. You invited the panel to find that you had developed meaningful insight, strengthened your practice and that the risk of repetition is now low.

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.

When asked about your insight, reflection and the steps you have taken since the substantive hearing, you accepted that your actions had undermined public confidence in the nursing profession and expressed remorse for your misconduct. You described the proceedings as a difficult and humbling experience and explained that you had reflected extensively on your actions and the importance of honesty, integrity and professional accountability.

You told the panel that you had completed the training referred to in your reflective statement and explained how it had strengthened your understanding of professional standards, accurate record keeping and practising in accordance with the Code. You confirmed that, whilst your son-in-law had assisted you with the wording of your reflective statement, the reflections, learning and views expressed within it were entirely your own.

You also confirmed that you had complied with the suspension order and had not undertaken any nursing practice during the period of suspension. You explained that you had informed your agency of your suspension and would not return to nursing until permitted to do so by the NMC. You concluded by expressing your sincere apology, asking the panel to take into account your insight, remorse, learning and long nursing career when reaching its decision.

The panel considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the substantive panel concluded that your insight into your dishonest conduct was not yet fully developed and found your fitness to practise impaired on public interest grounds only.

At this hearing the panel carefully considered your updated reflective statement, your oral evidence and evidence of remediation. It was mindful throughout that English was not your first language and therefore took care to assess the substance of your evidence, rather than the language or terminology you used to express it. The panel was satisfied that you were able to convey genuine insight into your misconduct and its consequences.

The panel noted that you had complied fully with the suspension order and had engaged positively with the regulatory process. It was satisfied that you had undertaken the professional development recommended by the substantive panel, including training in record keeping, duty of candour, consent, safeguarding, equality and diversity, inclusion and human rights. Whilst the training had been completed online over a relatively short period, the panel was satisfied that it was relevant to the concerns in this case and had assisted you in developing your understanding of honesty, integrity and professional accountability.

The panel attached particular weight to your oral evidence. It found that you demonstrated genuine remorse and openly acknowledged that your conduct had fallen below the standards expected of a registered nurse. When questioned, you accepted that your actions had the potential to undermine public confidence in the nursing profession and recognised that members of the public must be able to trust nurses to act honestly and

with integrity. The panel accepted that your evidence demonstrated meaningful reflection and a genuine appreciation of the seriousness of your misconduct.

The panel also noted that you had been transparent with your employer regarding your regulatory position and had not undertaken any nursing practice during the period of suspension. It was satisfied that you had complied fully with the restrictions placed upon you and regarded this as further evidence of your commitment to acting professionally and in accordance with regulatory requirements.

The panel acknowledged that there remained limited evidence explaining the circumstances which led to the misconduct itself. However, it concluded that this did not outweigh the significant evidence of remorse, insight and remediation presented at this review. The panel was satisfied that you had reflected meaningfully on your actions, had strengthened your understanding of professional standards and had demonstrated a commitment to maintaining honesty and integrity in your future practice.

In its consideration of whether you have taken steps to strengthen your practice, the panel noted that you had undertaken relevant professional development. The panel was satisfied that you had reflected on this learning and demonstrated an improved understanding of honesty, integrity, professional accountability and accurate record keeping. It accepted that you had used the period of your suspension constructively to strengthen your practice and was committed to applying this learning in your future practice.

The panel noted that the evidential burden is upon you to persuade it that your fitness to practise is no longer currently impaired. The panel decided that you have discharged that burden and there is sufficient evidence that you can now practise safely and effectively as a nurse without restriction.

Accordingly, the panel determined that you are not liable to repeat your misconduct. This panel agreed with the substantive panel that your fitness to practise is not impaired on public protection grounds.

The panel next considered whether a finding of impairment is necessary on public interest grounds. The panel bore in mind that the overarching objectives of the NMC, namely 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 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 acknowledged the seriousness of your misconduct, which involved dishonesty in a clinical setting. However, it was satisfied that you had fully complied with the suspension order, engaged positively with the regulatory process, undertaken relevant professional development and demonstrated meaningful insight into the impact of your actions on patients, colleagues, the profession and public confidence. The panel also found that you had strengthened your practice and that the risk of repetition was low.

The panel considered that the three-month suspension order marks the seriousness of your misconduct and maintains public confidence in the profession. Having regard to your insight, remediation and low risk of repetition, the panel concluded that a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would not consider a further finding of impairment necessary. It was therefore satisfied that public confidence in the profession and proper professional standards would be upheld without a finding of current impairment.

For these reasons, the panel finds that, although your practise was impaired at the time of the substantive hearing, given all of the above, your fitness to practise is not currently impaired.

In accordance with Article 30(1), the substantive suspension order will lapse upon expiry, namely the end of 28 August 2026.

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.