

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

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

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

Name of Registrant:	Sandra Marie Young
NMC PIN:	80A0180S
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse (Level 2) (19 February 1982)
Relevant Location:	Newcastle upon Tyne
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Patricia Richardson (Chair, lay member) Chloe McCandlish-Boyd (Registrant member) David Newsham (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Gaon Hart
Hearings Coordinator:	Salima Begum
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (6 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect at the end of 12 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 Miss Young's registered email address on 29 May 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided all appropriate details including that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 29 June 2026 and inviting Miss Young to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel noted that the statement of Gauri Luthra (Ms Luthra) made reference to the service of the notice having been completed on 4 June 2026 which was contrary to the date indicated on the Proof of Service notice sent to Ms Young which indicated a date of 29 May 2026. In addition, the panel noted that the statement of Ms Luthra made reference to service of the notice having been sent by email by Ms Luthra contrary to the information contained within the Proof of Service notice confirming that it had been sent by Micah Roberts (Mr Roberts).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel considered whether the statement of Ms Luthra should be admitted into evidence in light of the discrepancies identified and referred to above. The panel was satisfied that the evidence of Ms Luthra was relevant to the issue being considered by the panel. In considering whether it was fair to admit the statement into evidence the panel took into account that the statement had exhibited a screenshot of the actual notice served upon Miss Young that contained all required details including the date of the meeting. In January 2026, Miss Young had indicated that she was aware that the review would be considered at a meeting and that she did not intend to attend.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Young 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 a striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order. This order will come into effect at the end of 12 August 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 6 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 14 January 2026. The current order is due to expire at the end of 12 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 was as follows:

'That you, a Registered Nurse:

1. ...

2. Between 12 and 13 October 2022, in relation to Patient A, you:

a) ...;

b) Failed to take observations following the patient collapsing;

c) Documented that the patient had a NEWS Score of zero when you had not taken any observations;

d) Documented that the patient had been escalated to the RMO, when you had not done so.

3. Your conduct at charge 2 (c) and/ or (d) was dishonest in that you sought to mislead others that you had provided care when you knew you had not done so.

4. Between 12 and 13 October 2022 watched TV on your phone whilst on shift.

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 first considered whether any of the limbs of the Grant test were engaged in the past. It was of the view that at the time of the incidents, Miss Young's misconduct placed Patient A, who was particularly vulnerable, at risk of unwarranted harm.

The panel determined that Miss Young's misconduct constituted serious breaches of the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession as she failed to uphold the standards and values of the nursing profession, thereby bringing the nursing profession into disrepute. The panel had also found a charge of dishonesty proved against Miss Young.

The panel therefore concluded that limbs a, b, c and d of the Grant test were engaged in the past.

The panel considered the factors set out in the case of Ronald Jack Cohen v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin), namely whether the conduct is easily remediable, whether it has been remedied and whether it is highly unlikely to be repeated.

The panel first considered whether the misconduct in this case is remediable. The panel recognised that the misconduct in this case relates to a single incident, involving a single act of dishonesty, and did not form part of a pattern of repeated dishonest behaviour. It further acknowledged that the incident occurred during a period when Miss Young was experiencing difficult personal circumstances which provided some context for her actions. The panel also noted that there was some evidence of remorse in that Miss Young expressed regret for her conduct and accepted that her actions were wrong. The panel was satisfied that the clinical failings were capable of remediation. In relation to the

dishonesty, whilst acknowledging that dishonesty is difficult to remediate, it considered that in this case it was capable of remediation, given that it related to a single incident which occurred at a time of particularly difficult personal circumstances for Miss Young.

However, the panel concluded that, although the misconduct is capable of remediation, it has not been remediated by Miss Young. Miss Young has provided no reflective piece addressing the seriousness of her dishonesty, the impact of her actions on the reputation of the profession, or the potential risk to public trust. There was no evidence before the panel of testimonials, references, or completion of any relevant training courses to demonstrate learning or changed behaviour. As a result, the panel had nothing which it could rely on to be satisfied that Miss Young has taken meaningful steps to remediate her misconduct.

The panel also noted that Miss Young has not worked as a nurse since she resigned and has expressed that she has no intention of returning to nursing and therefore there is no evidence of safe, honest, and ethical nursing practice since the incident. In addition, the panel took into account Miss Young's own acknowledgment that her practice was impaired at the time of the misconduct. In the absence of any evidence of remediation or developing insight, the panel determined that there remains a real risk that the misconduct could be repeated.

Accordingly, while the panel acknowledged that the misconduct in this case related to a one-off incident of dishonesty and was not indicative of a broader pattern of behaviour, it concluded that Miss Young's lack of insight, reflection, and remediation means that the concerns are ongoing. The panel therefore found that Miss Young's fitness to practise is currently impaired on public protection grounds.

The panel bore in mind 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 had regard to the serious nature of Miss Young's misconduct and determined that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case, particularly as this misconduct involved dishonesty. It was of the view that a fully informed member of the public, aware of the proven charges in this case, would be very concerned if Miss Young were permitted to practise as a registered nurse without restrictions. For this reason, the panel determined that a finding of current impairment on public interest grounds is also required. It determined that this finding is necessary to mark the seriousness of the misconduct, the importance of maintaining public confidence in the nursing profession, and to uphold the proper professional standards for members of the nursing profession.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Miss Young's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds.'

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'Having found Miss Young's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what sanction, if any, it should impose in this case. The panel has borne in mind that any sanction imposed must be appropriate and proportionate and, although not intended to be punitive in its effect, may have such consequences. The panel had careful regard to the SG. The decision on sanction is a matter for the panel independently exercising its own judgement.

The panel took into account the following aggravating features:

- *Patient A was vulnerable in the circumstances.*

- *Miss Young's misconduct placed Patient A at risk of harm.*
- *No evidence of reflection or remediation has been provided by Miss Young.*

The panel also took into account the following mitigating features:

- *Miss Young's misconduct relates to a single incident.*
- *Miss Young was going through difficult personal circumstances at the time of the incident.*
- *Miss Young apologised for her actions at an early stage.*

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 Miss Young'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 Miss Young'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 placing conditions of practice on Miss Young'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.

The panel determined that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate given the circumstances of this case. Although there were areas identified that could be addressed through conditions, the panel took into account that it had found a charge of dishonesty proved which is difficult to address through retraining. In addition, the panel noted that Miss Young has not worked as a nurse since resigning from the Hospital and has expressed that she has no intention of returning to nursing which would make conditions unworkable.

Furthermore, the panel concluded that the placing of conditions on Miss Young's registration would not adequately address the seriousness of this case and would not protect the public.

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;*

The panel took into consideration that Miss Young's misconduct was confined to a single incident and that Miss Young had been practicing as a nurse for many years. The panel was therefore satisfied that there are no deep-seated attitudinal issues. Rather, her dishonest conduct was a one-off incident in the context of a long career at a time when she was experiencing very difficult personal circumstances. There has been no evidence of repetition of this behaviour since the incident and the panel noted Miss Young's comments to the NMC which demonstrated some insight into her behaviour. Whilst the panel had been unable to conclude that the conduct was 'highly unlikely to be repeated' due to the lack of

remediation, it did not consider that there was a 'significant risk' of Miss Young repeating the behaviour. The panel was therefore satisfied that in this case, the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register.

It did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate, as per the NMC's sanction bid. Taking account of all the information before it, and of the mitigation provided, 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 Miss Young'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 noted the hardship such an order will inevitably cause Miss Young. However this is outweighed by the public interest in this case.

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 of six months was appropriate in this case to mark the seriousness of the misconduct.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Young's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of impairment, 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 fitness to practice of Miss Young.

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 which included:

- Email correspondence with registrant [Miss Young] regarding future nursing practise intentions dated 23 January 2026

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 Miss Young's fitness to practise remains impaired. At this meeting the panel had regard to the original panel's findings, the evidence before it and the overarching objective of protecting the public. It noted that, at the original hearing, it had been identified that further reflective evidence, relevant training, testimonials and clarification of Miss Young's intentions regarding a return to nursing would assist a future reviewing panel. The panel acknowledged that it had received confirmation of Miss Young's intention not to remain on the register in her email dated 23 January 2026. However, there was no supporting information or evidence provided of her intention to retire. Additionally, no reflection, evidence of relevant training, remediation, strengthening of practice or keeping up to date with skills and knowledge or testimonials had been provided.

The panel acknowledged that Miss Young accepted her misconduct and has apologised for her actions. The panel considered that this demonstrated some insight and was consistent with her early admissions when questioned by her manager. However, there remained no evidence of reflection demonstrating an understanding of the impact of Miss Young's misconduct on patients and the public. The panel therefore concluded that Miss Young had insufficient insight.

The panel noted that the original concerns related to conduct which created an unwarranted risk of harm to patients, breach the fundamental tenets of nursing, brought the profession into disrepute and dishonesty. It found that there has been no material change since the original hearing and no evidence that the concerns have been addressed. Accordingly, the panel remained of the view that there is a real risk of repetition.

The panel acknowledged that Miss Young said in her email to the NMC dated 23 January 2026 that she has no intention to return to nursing. However, in the absence of any supporting evidence or application for voluntary removal, the panel could not be satisfied that she would not seek to return to practice in the future. The panel therefore concluded that it could not rely on Miss Young's stated intention to retire when assessing the risk of repetition.

The panel determined that Miss Young remains unable to practise safely and effectively without restriction. For these reasons, it therefore concluded that Miss Young's fitness to practise remains currently impaired on the grounds of public protection and public interest.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Young'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 considered its requirements to consider extending the existing order, making a new order or allowing the existing order to expire, in accordance with NMC Guidance Rev-2a.

The panel considered whether a further period of suspension would be appropriate. There was no evidence provided by Miss Young before the panel of her development of insight, remediation or strengthening of practice despite this being recommended by the original panel. In the absence of such evidence and in light of the information provided by Miss Young that it was her intention to retire from nursing practice, the panel was not satisfied

that extending the suspension order would realistically result in Miss Young 's developed insight, remediation and strengthened practice.

The panel next considered whether it was appropriate to revoke the original order and replace it with a new order. The panel considered the seriousness of the misconduct as assessed by the original panel and the lack of any information or evidence from Miss Young as to insight, remediation, or strengthening of practice. Having carefully considered the NMC Guidance and the panel's overriding objective or public protection, it determined that a revocation of the original and replacement of a new order was the fair proportionate and appropriate sanction having regard the issues above.

The panel firstly 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 therefore considered the imposition of a caution order. 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'*. However, the panel determined that, given the seriousness of the original misconduct and the continuing public protection concerns identified, an order that did not restrict Miss Young's practice would be inappropriate. The panel considered that Miss Young's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum and concluded that a caution order would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest.

The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice order would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel was mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, workable, measurable and capable of addressing the concerns identified. However, the panel concluded that the concerns were not capable of being addressed by conditions of practice. Further, there was no evidence of remediation, reflection, continuing professional development or steps taken to maintain clinical skills. It noted the indication, by email dated 23 January 2026, that Miss Young intended to retire from nursing.

"I appreciate your letter and your kind regards, as I have already said I have no intention of returning to nursing. I accepted my fitness to

practice was impaired and that through my actions I brought a profession I loved into question. By the date of the suspension ending I will be retiring. Again I apologize to my fellow nurses and to the NMC.”

In the absence of any supporting evidence or application for voluntary removal, the panel was not satisfied that this intention was sufficiently settled. It therefore concluded that a conditions of practice order would not be workable, would serve no useful purpose, and would neither adequately protect the public nor satisfy the public interest.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. It noted the original panel's assessment of the seriousness of the misconduct and considered this in its decision. The original panel had identified the evidence that would assist a future reviewing panel, including reflective evidence, relevant training, remediation and testimonials. However, none of this evidence had been provided. Although Miss Young had indicated by email that she intended to retire from nursing, the panel had no evidence that this intention was settled and could not be satisfied that she would not seek to return to practice in the future.

In these circumstances, the panel concluded that a further period of suspension would serve no useful purpose. There was no evidence to suggest that an extension of the order would result in the development of insight, remediation or strengthened practice. The panel therefore remained satisfied that there was a continuing risk of repetition and that allowing the suspension order to lapse would not adequately protect the public.

Having regard to all of the circumstances, the panel concluded that a striking-off order was the only appropriate and proportionate sanction. The panel noted the absence of information or evidence that the concerns had been addressed, the lack of remediation, the lack of appreciation of the impact on patients of Miss Young's actions, the lack of evidence that Miss Young has kept her skills and capability up to date and the seriousness of the issues identified which include dishonesty. The panel determined that such an order was necessary to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and uphold proper professional standards.

The panel carefully considered the NMC Guidance Rev-2h as to whether it was appropriate to allow Miss Young's registration to lapse whilst she remains impaired.

Allowing Miss Young's registration to lapse, would allow her to apply for readmission to nursing at any time. Having determined that there remains a risk of repetition and in the absence of meaningful engagement, the panel was of the view that this would not satisfy the overriding objective of protection of the public and accordingly determined that the appropriate sanction was strike off.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 12 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Miss Young in writing.

That concludes this determination.