

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Tuesday, 7 July 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	David Anthony Mott
NMC PIN:	0011102E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – RNA Adult Nursing – September 2003
Relevant Location:	Middlesbrough
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	David Hull (Chair, Lay member) Deborah Ann Bennion (Registrant member) Matthew Clarkson (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Paul Housego
Hearings Coordinator:	Petra Bernard
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect on 19 August 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 Mott's registered email address by secure email on 4 June 2026.

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 6 July 2026 and inviting Mr Mott to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mr Mott 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 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 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the fourth review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of six months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 20 September 2023. This order was subsequently reviewed on 11 March 2024, where a suspension order was imposed for 4 months. This order was reviewed on 10 July 2024 and 1 July 2025 where the panel imposed suspension order for a further 12 months on each occasion.

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, whilst working at Ascot Nursing Home, overnight between 7 and 8 September 2020:

3) Did not administer prescribed medication to Resident A, namely:

- a) Amitriptyline*
- b) Atorvastatin*
- c) Zopiclone*

4) Did not administer prescribed medication to Resident B, namely:

- a) Simvastatin*
- b) Hypomellose eye drops*
- c) Trimethoprim*
- d) Omeprazole*

5) Did not administer prescribed medication to Resident C, namely:

- a) Eye drops*
- b) Trimbo inhaler*
- c) Trimethoprim*

6) Did not administer prescribed medication to Resident D, namely:

- a) An inhaler*
- b) Nitrofurantoin*
- c) Apixaban*
- d) Atorvastatin*
- e) Simvastatin*
- f) Donepezil*

7) Did not administer prescribed medication to Resident E, namely:

- a) Simvastatin*
- b) Donepezil*

8) *Did not administer prescribed medication Baclofen to Resident F.*

9) *Did not administer prescribed medication to Resident G, namely:*

- a) Two doses of Omeprazole*
- b) Amitriptyline*
- c) An inhaler*

10) *Did not administer prescribed medication to Resident H, namely:*

- a) Nitrazepam*
- b) Quinine*
- c) Docusate*
- d) Mitazapine*

11) *Did not administer prescribed medication to Resident I, namely:*

- a) Cefalexin*
- b) Hypomellose eye drops*

12) *Did not check the syringe driver for Resident J during the night.*

13) *Did not administer Morphine 10mg sub cut during the night to Resident J.*

14)...

15) *Wrote over an audit completed in red ink as a stock check, in black ink.*

16)...

17)...

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

The third reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

‘The panel has considered carefully whether Mr Mott’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 ability to practice kindly, safely and professionally. 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 the written statement emailed by Mr Mott on 6 June 2025.

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 Mott’s fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel considered that Mr Mott has made it clear in his recent communications via email on 6 June 2025, that he does not intend to return to nursing. He has stated his desire to ‘move on professionally’ and has shown no indication of re-engaging with the profession. In light of this, the panel did not expect to see recent training or development but nonetheless, it noted the absence of any evidence of steps taken to strengthen his practice or to address the concerns identified by the previous panels.

Further, the panel determined that there is a continued lack of insight, reflection and remorse from Mr Mott regarding his previous misconduct. Moreover, the panel noted that Mr Mott continues to attribute the issues to others and the system, rather than acknowledging his own failings. There is no evidence before

the panel of any meaningful reflection, understanding of the seriousness of his conduct or recognition of the risk to patient safety and the potential impact on public trust.

In light of the lack of insight and absence of evidence of remediation, the panel determined that a risk of repetition remains, and consequently, a risk of harm to patients and the public as the wide-ranging clinical concerns have not been addressed. The panel determined that there has been no material change since the last review. 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 Mott's fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

'The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Mr Mott'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.

The panel has received information that Mr Mott has not been working as a nurse over the past two years as he has been caring for his mother. He has expressed that he does not intend to return to practise as a nurse and is looking for employment outside of this field. In view of Mr Mott's clear settled intention not to

return to nursing and his lack of recent engagement with the NMC proceedings, the panel considered that any conditions of practice order would not be workable and would serve no useful purpose.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Mr Mott further time to fully reflect on his previous failings. The panel concluded that a further 12-month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Mr Mott adequate time to further develop his insight and take steps to strengthen his practice.

The panel did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be more appropriate, particularly in light of Mr Mott's limited engagement with the regulatory process and his previous statement indicating a desire to leave the profession. The panel considered the NMC guidance on voluntary removal and noted that Mr Mott could apply to be removed from the register, however, this formal route had not been pursued, and the panel could not bypass the required process based on his stated intentions alone.

Further, while the panel considered that Mr Mott's failings were serious, these were not at the most severe end of the spectrum and related to misconduct that took place over one night shift and were not originally incompatible with remaining on the register. The panel considered that Mr Mott's misconduct is capable of being remediated.

The panel determined that a suspension order remains the appropriate sanction as it continues to protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel imposed a suspension order for a period of 12 months, which also provides Mr Mott with a further opportunity to re-engage with the NMC process, should he wish to do so. It considered this to be the most suitable and proportionate sanction available.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of date 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 Mott's engagement with the NMC and participation at any Substantive Order Review Hearing;*
- *A clear indication of Mr Mott's future nursing career intentions;*
- *A reflective statement from Mr Mott demonstrating his insight into the misconduct;*
- *Testimonials from any paid or voluntary work; and*
- *Any evidence of up-to-date targeted training particularly in relation to the importance of medicines administration.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mr Mott'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 its 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 email from Mr Mott to the NMC dated 26 January 2026.

The panel referred to NMC guidance 'Substantive order reviews' Reference REV-2 [Last updated 14/10/2022].

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 Mr Mott's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the previous reviewing panel found that Mr Mott had a continued lack of insight limited insight into misconduct.

The panel considered Mr Mott's email of 26 January 2026 to the NMC, which states:

'I have no intention of returning to nursing or even care work. Taking the above into consideration I have no intention of seeking training in medication administration. I have had to move forward in my life,...'.

The panel had regard to the previous panel's recommendations as to what Mr Mott could provide to assist the next panel reviewing his case:

- *'Mr Mott's engagement with the NMC and participation at any Substantive Order Review Hearing;*
- *A clear indication of Mr Mott's future nursing career intentions;*
- *A reflective statement from Mr Mott demonstrating his insight into the misconduct;*
- *Testimonials from any paid or voluntary work; and*
- *Any evidence of up-to-date targeted training particularly in relation to the importance of medicines administration.'*

This panel considered whether Mr Mott has taken steps to strengthen his practice. The panel was of the view that he has been given ample time, opportunity (approaching three years) and guidance on what a future reviewing panel would like to see in order to help it establish whether he has demonstrated insight, reflection on what happened and

the errors he has made, as well as any training and strengthening of practice. Mr Mott has provided no such evidence.

The panel considered Mr Mott's email of 6 January 2026 and noted that he has made his intentions clear that he does not want to return to nursing practice, train or engage with the profession. The panel therefore did not expect to see recent training or development but nonetheless, it noted the absence of any evidence of steps taken to strengthen his practice or to address the concerns identified by the previous panels.

In light of the lack of insight or remedial steps, this panel determined that Mr Mott remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved, therefore a risk of repetition remains, and consequently, a risk of harm to patients and the public as the clinical concerns have not been addressed. The panel determined that there has been no material change since the last review. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the ground of public protection.

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

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 noted that Mr Mott had disengaged from the process in January 2026 and has not availed himself of the opportunities afforded him to demonstrate insight. Registrants, whether intending to practise or not, have an obligation to engage with their regulator. The panel therefore determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Mott'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 Mott'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 Mott'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 Mott'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 that Mr Mott has not practised for five years and stated that he had no intention of undertaking training or returning to practise. Accordingly, it was not possible to devise conditions of practice.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that Mr Mott has not shown remorse for his misconduct. Further, Mr Mott has not demonstrated any insight, nor taken any steps to address and strengthen his practice in relation to his previous failings. The panel was of the view that persuasive evidence would be required to show that Mr Mott no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel determined that given that Mr Mott has been subject to a suspension order for almost three years, a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances.

The panel had regard to NMC guidance 'Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place' Reference: REV-2h [Last Updated 13/05/2026], which states:

- *'Has the nurse, midwife or nursing associate complied with any conditions imposed? What evidence has the nurse, midwife or nursing associate provided to demonstrate this? What is the quality of that evidence and where does it come from?*
- *Does the nurse, midwife or nursing associate show insight into their failings or the seriousness of any past misconduct? Has their level of insight improved, or got worse, since the last hearing?*
- *Has the nurse, midwife or nursing associate taken effective steps to maintain their skills and knowledge?*
- *Does the nurse, midwife or nursing associate have a record of safe practice without further incident since the last hearing?*
- *Does compliance with conditions or the completion of required steps demonstrate that the nurse, midwife or nursing associate is now safe to practise unrestricted, or does any risk to patient safety still remain?'*

The panel determined that Mr Mott had not taken any steps to satisfy any of these requirements during his almost three years of suspension.

The panel considered whether to allow the order to lapse with impairment, but, following the guidance in Rev-3h decided that this was not appropriate.

The panel determined that as it was undesirable for Mr Mott to remain suspended indefinitely when there was no prospect of engagement it was not appropriate to suspend his registration further and concluded that there was no alternative to making 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 Mott in writing.

That concludes this determination.