

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Monday, 13 July 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Mohamad Kanu
NMC PIN:	07A0015C
Part(s) of the register:	RN1: Registered Nurse – (Sub part 1) Adult Nursing (Level 1) – 9 January 2007
Relevant Location:	Braddan, Isle of Man
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Christine Nwaokolo (Chair, lay member) Aries Maximus Ogbuokiri (Registrant member) Robert Fish (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Alice Robertson Rickard
Hearings Coordinator:	Ekaette Uwa
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by James Holloway, Case Presenter
Mr Kanu:	Not present and unrepresented
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (six months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect at the end of 19 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

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 11 June 2026.

Mr Holloway, 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 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.

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.

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 Mr Holloway who invited the panel to continue in your absence. He submitted that Mr Kanu had voluntarily absented himself.

Mr Holloway 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.

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 Mr Holloway and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to any 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;
- The panel also took into account the additional email communications sent to Mr Kanu on 25 June 2026 and 10 July 2026 together with the monitoring and compliance officer's record of two attempted telephone calls on 10 July 2026. Whilst this additional communications were not necessary to establish valid service, they reinforced the panel's conclusion that reasonable steps had been taken to bring the hearing to Mr Kanu's attention and to facilitate his attendance;
- 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 replace the current suspension order with a striking off order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 19 August 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 6 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 18 July 2025. This was reviewed on 14 January 2026 and the panel decided to extend the suspension order for a further period of 6 months.

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

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 first reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'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.'

The first reviewing 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 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.*
- Any update from Mr Kanu regarding his current health and circumstances.*
- 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.'*

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 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 previous panels, 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 Holloway. He submitted that the misconduct in this case was capable of remediation. However, there was no evidence before the panel today that any meaningful remediation has taken place.

Mr Holloway submitted that since the substantive order was imposed in July 2025, and subsequently reviewed in January 2026, Mr Kanu has provided no updated reflective piece, no evidence of relevant training, no testimonials and no information demonstrating that he has strengthened his practice.

Mr Holloway submitted that the previous reviewing panel had identified evidence that would assist a future panel and despite being afforded a further six-month period in which to address those deficiencies, none of that evidence has been provided.

He invited the panel to find that Mr Kanu's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Turning to sanction, Mr Holloway submitted that taking no further action, imposing a caution order or a conditions of practice order would be inappropriate in the circumstances.

Mr Holloway referred the panel to the relevant guidance. He submitted that Mr Kanu has been subject to a suspension order for approximately 12 months and that the position before the panel is materially unchanged. He submitted that the statutory power to impose a striking off order is available to the panel and stated that ultimately, whether to impose a

further suspension order or striking off order is a matter for the panel's independent judgment.

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.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Mr Kanu had had developing insight and reflection into his conduct. It also noted that at the previous review hearing, the reviewing panel found that there had been no meaningful engagement by Mr Kanu since the substantive hearing. At this hearing the panel considered that the position before it remained materially unchanged. It considered that despite the additional period of suspension, Mr Kanu has not engaged with the regulatory process. He has not attended today's hearing, nor responded to attempts made by the NMC to contact him. Further, the panel had no evidence of strengthened practice or any information regarding his current professional circumstances.

The panel was mindful that non-attendance, of itself, is not evidence of lack of insight. However, in the absence of any objective evidence demonstrating remediation or development of insight, the panel had no objective evidence upon which it could conclude that the concerns identified by previous panels have been addressed or that the risk of repetition has reduced.

In light of this, this panel determined that Mr Kanu is liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved which had caused risk of harm to the patient. 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. Mr Kanu's conduct as found by

the original panel placed the NMC's reputation into disrepute as the public would expect a nurse to carry out duties safely and effectively. The panel therefore 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 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, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened 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 Mr Kanu's failure to engage. It 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 identified in this case.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that Mr Kanu has not engaged with the NMC. It acknowledged that the first reviewing panel had extended the suspension order to provide Mr Kanu with a further opportunity to develop insight, undertake training, strengthen his practice and demonstrate remediation.

However, the panel noted that none of those expectations have been met. Mr Kanu has not engaged since the substantive hearing, has not provided any evidence of remediation and has given no indication that he intends to return to nursing or resume safe practice.

The panel had regard to the NMC guidance, which invites it to consider whether there has been progress and engagement, and it was satisfied that the answer to both is in the negative.

The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Mr Kanu no longer posed a risk to the public. The previous panel set out recommendations on the evidence that Mr Kanu should provide in order to demonstrate this, but none was provided. The panel was unable to identify any evidentiary basis upon which it could conclude that a further period of suspension would result in Mr Kanu returning to safe unrestricted practice within a reasonable time.

The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Mr Kanu from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 19 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Mr Kanu in writing.

That concludes this determination.