

Nursing and Midwifery Council Fitness to Practise Committee

Substantive Order Review and Fact-finding Hearing

**Wednesday, 4 February 2026 – Friday, 6 February 2026
and
Monday, 8 June 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant: Alina-Denisa Neacsu

NMC PIN: 16H0409C

Part(s) of the register: Midwives part of the register
RM: Midwife (11 August 2016)

Relevant Location: London

Type of case: Misconduct/ Lack of knowledge of English

Panel members: Christine Nwaokolo (Chair, lay member)
Sandra Abramsamadu (Registrant member)
Harriet Fielder (Registrant member)

Legal Assessor: Megan Ashworth (4 February 2026 – 6 February 2026)
Michael Hosford-Tanner (8 June 2026)

Hearings Coordinator: Samara Baboolal (4 February 2026 – 6 February 2026)
Monsur Ali (8 June 2026)

Nursing and Midwifery Council: Represented by Nicola Kay, Case Presenter

Ms Neascu: Present and represented by Alejandra Tascon, counsel instructed by the Royal College of Nursing (RCN).

Facts proved: Admitted: Charges 1, 2, 4(a) and 4(b)

Facts not proved:	Charges 3 and 5
Order being reviewed:	Conditions of practice order (4 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Conditions of practice order (12 months) to come into effect at the end of 18 June 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private

At the outset of the hearing, Ms Tascon, on your behalf, made a request that this case be held partly in private on the basis that proper exploration of your case involves reference to your health and private life. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

Ms Kay, on behalf of the NMC, confirmed that she supported the application.

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

The panel determined to go into private session in connection with your health and private life, as and when such issues are raised, in order to protect your privacy.

Procedure

The case had been scheduled for a substantive order review of the conditions of practice order currently in place. It is alleged that there have been breaches of a number of the conditions and dishonesty related to the alleged breaches. Consequently, before the review itself, there was to be a fact-finding process, to ascertain whether or not the alleged breaches and associated dishonesty were proved. If any or all were found proved, then they would be taken into account in the review of the conditions of practice order itself.

Details of charge

1. Potential breach of condition 5 of your conditions of practice order in force from 19 May 2023 and condition 4 of your conditions of practice order in force from 19 May 2024 in that you did not inform your NMC Case Officer within seven

- days that you had accepted and/or left employment at Brunswick Surgery as a Locum Practice Nurse [ADMITTED]
2. Potential breach of condition 7 of your conditions of practice order in force from 19 May 2023 and condition 6 of your conditions of practice order in force from 19 May 2024 in that you did not provide Brunswick Surgery with a copy of your conditions of practice order at the time of application and/or during the course of your employment [ADMITTED]
 3. Dishonesty in relation to the non-disclosure of the conditions of practice order to your employer, Brunswick Surgery, at the time of application and/or during the course of your employment
 4. That you have worked as a Locum Practice Nurse at Brunswick Surgery:
 - a. Whilst not entered on the NMC register as a Registered Nurse
 - b. Without passing an English language competence test after a Fitness to Practise Committee found your fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of your lack of knowledge of English. [ADMITTED]
 5. Dishonesty in relation to working as a Locum Practice Nurse at Brunswick Surgery when you knew you were not entered on the NMC Register as a Registered Nurse.

Decision and reasons on application to introduce additional charge 6

The panel heard an application made by Ms Kay, on behalf of the NMC, to introduce charge 6 to the charge sheet. The proposed charge is as follows:

‘Dishonesty in relation to the non-disclosure of your employment at Brunswick Surgery to the NMC, in that you intended to conceal your employment.’

Ms Kay submitted that this charge should have been included in the charge sheet from the outset, but was not due to an oversight. She submitted that the NMC is not seeking to introduce new evidence for this charge, and is relying on the same evidence, therefore you would not be prejudiced. She submitted that dishonesty is already an issue being considered by the panel in relation to the fact-finding element of this case, in charges 3 and 5.

Ms Tascon opposed the application. She submitted that she was notified of the new charge thirty minutes prior to the hearing start, and therefore, was only able to have a brief discussion with you in relation to it.

Ms Tascon submitted that this application raises issues of fairness and justice. She submitted that, if this charge were admitted at this stage, there is a great risk of unfairness and injustice to you, as you have not had sufficient time to prepare for and understand this new charge.

Ms Tascon submitted that the consequences of introducing another dishonesty charge is very serious and could result in a striking off order. She submitted that the NMC had sufficient time to introduce this charge in advance, and it should have been made within reasonable time.

When asked by the panel, Ms Kay clarified that she herself was informed of this additional charge at approximately 10:15 am this morning.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel decided to reject the application to introduce charge 6.

The panel accepted that the NMC would not seek to introduce further evidence for this charge, and would rely on the evidence already contained in the evidence bundles.

However, the panel determined that to introduce such a serious charge of dishonesty 30 minutes before the start of a hearing is intrinsically unfair to you.

The panel considered that you and Ms Tascon would have had insufficient time to prepare your defence in relation to this charge. Whilst the NMC were not seeking to adduce additional evidence in support of the charge, the panel was of the view that introducing an additional charge so late in proceedings would deprive you of the opportunity to consider or obtain potential evidence which you may have wished to adduce in support of your case. It noted that dishonesty is very serious, and could result in a striking off order.

Given that these fact-finding matters had been adjourned from a previous hearing in May 2025, the panel determined that the NMC had sufficient time to introduce this charge, and should have done so within a fair and reasonable time frame. The NMC's submission that it was an 'oversight', in the panel's view, does not justify its admittance at this very late stage, particularly when the charge sought to be added was a serious charge of dishonesty. It thereby determined not to allow the NMC's application as it would be unfair to do so.

Decision and reasons on facts

At the outset of the hearing, Ms Tascon informed the panel that you made admissions to charge 1, charge 2, and charge 4 in its entirety.

The panel was satisfied that your admissions were unequivocal and therefore finds charges 1, 2 and 4 proved by way of your admissions.

In reaching its decisions on the disputed facts, the panel took into account all the oral and documentary evidence in this case together with the submissions made by Ms Kay, on behalf of the NMC and by Ms Tascon, on your behalf.

For the fact-finding process, the panel adopted the approach of a substantive hearing. The panel was aware that the burden of proof rests on the NMC, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, namely the balance of probabilities. This means that a fact will be proved if a panel is satisfied that it is more likely than not that the incident occurred as alleged.

The panel heard live evidence from the following witness called on behalf of the NMC:

- Witness 1: Practice manager at Brunswick Surgery and Lady Margeret Road medical centre.

The panel also heard evidence from you under affirmation.

Before making any findings on the facts, the panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor. It considered the witness and documentary evidence provided by both the NMC and Ms Tascon.

The panel then considered each of the disputed charges and made the following findings.

Charge 3

“Dishonesty in relation to the non-disclosure of the conditions of practice order to your employer, Brunswick Surgery, at the time of application and/or during the course of your employment.”

This charge is found NOT proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account Witness 1’s oral evidence and written statement, and your oral evidence under affirmation.

In considering whether your conduct amounted to dishonesty, the panel considered the test set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos Ltd t/a Crockfords* [2017] UKSC 67.

The panel took into account your oral evidence, during which you explained that you provided your employer with your NMC Personal Identification Number (PIN), with the understanding that they would check your pin against the NMC registry and see that you were under conditions of practice. You told the panel that you understood that your conditions of practice were publicly available, and that you were not hiding them, and misunderstood that these conditions required you to send a physical or electronic copy.

The panel noted that Witness 1, in her oral evidence, told the panel that you did not disclose that you were under conditions of practice, and had you disclosed this, you would have not been employed. She said you had provided your PIN to her, and that she had checked the register, but had not noticed that you had conditions of practice attached to your entry.

The panel first considered your state of mind. You provided for the panel, extracts of the register from today. The extracts showed that on entering either your PIN or your surname, the words “conditions of practice” appeared next to your name and there was the option to click on this to see the terms of the conditions. You said that you had checked your entry at the time and this was how it appeared at that time as well.

The panel found your evidence compelling. It was clear from the NMC register that you were subject to a conditions of practice order that was publicly available to anyone searching the register, including your employer. The panel accepted that you had provided your PIN to your employer, which would provide this information, and was therefore not satisfied that you were taking steps to conceal the conditions of practice order from your employer. The panel noted that Witness 1 also accepted that you provided your PIN to her.

The panel accepted your explanation that you believed Brunswick Surgery would have been aware of your conditions of practice order once you provided your PIN number to them, especially as you had previously been employed by them in the role of a Locum midwife and Healthcare Assistant (HCA) in 2017.

The panel noted that you admitted the breach that you had not in fact provided a physical copy of your conditions to your employer. The panel accepted your explanation that you were undergoing a difficult time, and that you did not think to email the copy of the conditions to your employer.

Although the onus was on you to provide your conditions of practice to your employer, given that the information was easily visible against your name on the register, the panel did not consider that, by the standards of ordinary, decent people, your failure to disclose a physical copy of the conditions would be regarded as dishonest. The panel therefore concluded that your non-disclosure of your conditions of practice was not dishonest.

The panel therefore determined that the NMC has failed to discharge the burden of proof in relation to this charge. As such, this charge is found not proved.

Charge 5)

“Dishonesty in relation to working as a Locum Practice Nurse at Brunswick Surgery when you knew you were not entered on the NMC Register as a Registered Nurse.”

This charge is found NOT proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account Witness 1’s oral evidence and written statement, and your oral evidence under oath.

In considering whether your conduct amounted to dishonesty, the panel considered the test set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos Ltd t/a Crockfords* [2017] UKSC 67.

The panel considered your state of mind at the time. You gave clear evidence that you believed you were undertaking work in the capacity of a midwife, rather than as a Registered Nurse. You told the panel that you did not believe that you were accepting work as a Registered Nurse, and that belief was consistent with the absence of a written contract, the lack of a job description, and the informal nature of communications between yourself and Witness 1. You had previously worked at the practice in 2017 as a Locum midwife and HCA. You said that when you had gone back to work at the practice on this occasion, you carried out the same role and tasks as before. You told the panel that the surgery already had a practice nurse.

The panel was of the view that your evidence was consistent and reliable, and it accepted your account.

The panel accepted your account that there was no contract of employment or job description provided, and this was confirmed by Witness 1 in her oral evidence.

The panel took into account that the communication between yourself and Witness 1 was very informal, often on WhatsApp, and the lines had become blurred as to what specifically your role was, in absence of a job description and a written contract. Further, in the WhatsApp communications between yourself and Witness 1, there was no explicit mention of the offer of employment, on this occasion, being as a 'registered nurse'. Upon looking at the task sheet, the panel noted that it appeared that there were a number of clinical tasks which midwives, registered nurses, and/or HCAs could undertake. It accepted that your expertise and skillset is extensive, as you hold further qualifications from your home country. The panel accepted that it was your genuine belief that you were returning to the previous role as a Locum midwife and HCA, undertaking similar clinical tasks.

The panel noted your admission at charge 4(a), that you now accept that you were working as a Locum practice nurse at Brunswick surgery. However, the panel was satisfied that, at the time you accepted that role and for the period that you were working in that role, you held the genuine belief that you were returning to Brunswick surgery in the capacity of a Locum midwife/HCA, and you were not deliberately misrepresenting yourself as a registered nurse when you knew you were not entered on the NMC register as a registered nurse. In these circumstances, the panel did not consider that, based on the standards of ordinary, decent people, that would be considered dishonest.

The panel therefore determined that the NMC has failed to discharge the burden of proof in relation to this charge. As such, this charge is found not proved.

Decision and reason on application to extend the current order

On day three of the hearing, having handed down the decision on facts, Ms Kay and Ms Tascon raised concern around insufficient time to conclude this hearing. Ms Tascon informed the panel that she intends to call you to provide evidence at the impairment stage, and you have time restrictions due to childcare obligations. She informed the panel that it will be unfair to you to “rush” your oral evidence regarding your fitness to practise.

Ms Kay made an application to extend the current conditions of practice order under these circumstances. She submitted that there is a lack of time for this hearing to safely conclude today, and as there has been no change in impairment, she invited the panel to extend the current conditions of practice order until the next hearing day can be listed.

Ms Tascon submitted that she does not oppose Ms Kay’s application.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel accepted the application to extend the current conditions of practice order.

The panel agreed that there is insufficient time to conclude this review and that this hearing is going part-heard due to time pressures. As such, you have been unable to demonstrate that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The panel took into account that the agreed position is that the current conditions of practice order remains appropriate and proportionate and determined that it is appropriate to extend this order until the period of the next review, the date of which is yet to be confirmed. It was satisfied that the public would remain suitably protected by the extension of the current conditions of practice order.

The panel noted that this current order is due to expire on 18 February 2026, at which point it would lapse if no action were taken by the panel. The panel was satisfied that extending the order is necessary to protect the public and meet the public interest. Although a date has not yet been identified, the panel determined to extend the current order for a period of four months, in the expectation that the resumption of the review would be listed as soon as reasonably possible, accommodating the availability of the panellists, you, and your legal representative.

It decided to extend the conditions of practice order, with the following conditions, which it considered remains appropriate and proportionate in this case:

'For the purposes of these conditions, 'employment' and 'work' mean any paid or unpaid post in a nursing, midwifery or nursing associate role. Also, 'course of study' and 'course' mean any course of educational study connected to nursing, midwifery or nursing associates.'

1. You must not practise as a registered midwife until you have secured either:
 - a) An overall score of at least 7 in the IELTS examination, achieving at least 6.5 in the writing section and at least 7 in the reading, listening and speaking sections, or

- b) A grade B in the Occupational English Test (OET) or
 - c) Any other test approved by the NMC to demonstrate the necessary knowledge of the English.
2. Once you have complied with condition 1 and gained employment as a midwife you must work with your line manager/mentor/supervisor to create a personal development plan (PDP). Your PDP must demonstrate how you have improved your practice, particularly relating to your record keeping and giving evidence based information and advice. You must:
- a) Meet with your line manager/mentor/supervisor at least every month to discuss your clinical caseload and progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP.
 - b) Send your case officer a copy of your PDP within six weeks of commencing employment as a midwife.
 - c) Send your case officer a report from your line manager/mentor/supervisor prior to any review hearing. This report must show your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP.
3. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are working by:
- a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment.
 - b) Giving your case officer your employer's contact details.
4. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are studying by:
- a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting any course of study.
 - b) Giving your case officer the name and contact details of the organisation offering that course of study.

5. You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:
- a) Any organisation or person you work for.
 - b) Any agency you apply to or are registered with for work.
 - c) Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).
 - d) Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.
 - e) Any current or prospective patients or clients you intend to see or care for on a private basis when you are working in a self-employed capacity.
6. You must tell your case officer, within seven days of your becoming aware of:
- a) Any clinical incident you are involved in.
 - b) Any investigation started against you.
 - c) Any disciplinary proceedings taken against you.
7. You must allow your case officer to share, as necessary, details about your performance, your compliance with and / or progress under these conditions with:
- a) Any current or future employer.
 - b) Any educational establishment.
 - c) Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions.

The period of this order is for four months in order to allow sufficient time for a further hearing date to be listed and confirmed to all parties.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 18 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

The hearing resumed on Monday, 8 June 2026.

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The 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 a registrant's suitability to remain on the register without restriction and the ability to practise 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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Kay on behalf of the NMC and those submitted by Ms Tascon.

Ms Kay submitted that you had made genuine efforts to comply with the conditions of practice order by attempting to book the required English language test. Ms Kay told the panel that administrative difficulties relating to payment prevented you from taking the test and that this was not due to any lack of effort on your part.

Ms Kay submitted that you had worked in an English-speaking healthcare environment and had not been the subject of concerns regarding your communication skills. Ms Kay told the panel that you had expressed confidence in your ability to communicate effectively with patients and colleagues.

Ms Kay submitted that you had engaged with the regulatory process by attending the hearing and providing an updated reflective piece. Ms Kay submitted that whilst it shows developing insight into the concerns and showed you have considered the seriousness of the matters but there no reference to the impact on the public when you had not passed

the necessary language. Ms Kay sought a suspension order in the light of the breaches of the conditions admitted by you at the start of this review in February 2026.

In response to questions from the panel, Ms Kay confirmed that the regulator remained willing to fund the English language test. She explained that the previous difficulties on the NMC's part arose from administrative issues and that steps could be taken to avoid similar problems in the future, including exploring alternative arrangements for booking the test.

Ms Kay also addressed the panel's questions regarding the effect of a suspension order. She told the panel that there was nothing to indicate that a suspended registrant would be prevented from taking an English language test and that further enquiries had been made to confirm this position.

Ms Kay informed the panel that alternative options were available to facilitate the booking of the test, including booking through a different provider. She also advised that, if you had not completed the required practice hours for revalidation, you may need to undertake a return-to-practice process before being eligible to revalidate your registration.

Ms Tascon submitted that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired because your English language skills have improved significantly since you first failed the English language test in 2018. She told the panel that you had made genuine efforts to book and take the test, but had been unable to do so because of difficulties outside your control. She submitted that, if you had the financial means, you would have paid for the test yourself.

Ms Tascon told the panel that there was other evidence available to demonstrate your ability to communicate in English. She referred to evidence from your former employer, who had raised no concerns about your English language skills and confirmed that patients had been satisfied with the care you provided. She also submitted that the panel had seen you give evidence clearly and effectively throughout the hearing.

Ms Tascon accepted that you had breached some of the conditions of practice. However, she submitted that these breaches arose from a lack of understanding and poor judgement rather than any deliberate attempt to avoid your responsibilities. She told the panel that you had accepted your mistakes, reflected on them, and shown insight into what had happened.

Ms Tascon submitted that you had faced significant personal difficulties during the period of the order, [PRIVATE]. She told the panel that these events had affected your ability to focus on regulatory requirements but that, despite these challenges, you remained committed to returning to nursing and midwifery.

Ms Tascon submitted that you had learned from your previous actions and were determined to comply with any requirements placed upon you. She told the panel that you wanted to complete the English language test, undertake any necessary refresher training, and take whatever steps were needed to return safely to practice. The NMC had agreed to pay for the test last year but it failed to do so.

In response to questions from the panel about sanction, Ms Tascon submitted that, if the panel found your fitness to practise remained impaired, a short period of suspension would be more appropriate than a further conditions of practice order. She explained that a suspension order would be simpler for you to understand and comply with while giving you time to prepare for the English language test, address any registration requirements, and put yourself in a position to return to practice.

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 your fitness to practise remains impaired. In doing so, it took account of the findings made by previous panels, the evidence presented at this hearing, and the findings made during the fact-finding stage of these proceedings.

The panel noted that a previous panel found your fitness to practise impaired because of concerns regarding your knowledge of English and your ability to provide safe and effective care. The panel recognised that it is not its role to revisit those findings. It accepted that the previous findings established that there had been a risk of harm to patients and that there had been breaches of fundamental professional standards.

The panel carefully considered the steps you have taken to address the concerns. It noted that you have made efforts to book and undertake the required English language test. The panel accepted that administrative difficulties, which were outside your control, prevented you from taking the test. The panel noted the evidence of the manager that you worked in a healthcare setting for approximately one year and that no concerns were raised regarding your communication skills during that period. The panel does not condone that you worked in the position of a nurse when you did not have registration. The panel considered this evidence might indicate your English language skills had improved as well as your clinical practice. The panel also noted your reflective piece and considered that it showed you had reflected on the seriousness of the matters before the panel.

The panel was aware that you were uncertain about your job description and role. The panel did not consider that these points obviated the need for you to create a PDP with your line manager, as required by the conditions of practice order, to address fully the failings in respect of record keeping and advice on vaccine in the charges found proved in 2022 which the substantive panel found amounted misconduct.

However, the panel noted that you have not yet completed the English language test required by the Conditions of Practice Order. The panel was therefore unable to conclude that the original concerns had been fully addressed. Whilst the panel considered that the

concerns are capable of being remedied and that you have taken steps towards doing so, it was not satisfied that the remediation process is complete.

The panel also considered the findings made during the fact-finding stage of this hearing. It found that you had breached conditions of your conditions of practice order and had worked when you were not registered as a nurse. The panel took into account that it did not find your actions to be dishonest. However, it considered that the breaches demonstrated a failure to fully comply with regulatory requirements and raised concerns about your professional judgement and understanding of your obligations as a registered professional.

Having considered all of the evidence, the panel concluded that a finding of current impairment remains 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, qualification and performance. The panel determined that, in the absence of a completed English language test, there remains insufficient assurance that the original concerns have been fully addressed. 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.

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 and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour 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 imposing a further conditions of practice order on your registration would still be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel decided that this is the right and proportionate outcome in your case. The panel considered that it is possible to set clear and workable conditions that will address the concerns identified. The panel also considered that although there have been difficulties with previous conditions, this does not mean that conditions cannot work in the future.

The panel paid particular attention to the issue of your English language ability. The panel noted that you had a bad fail in English language test in the past. The panel also considered the evidence from your manager, who said there were no concerns about your communication at work. However, the panel decided that this is not enough on its own. The panel said that, from the point of view of public protection and public confidence, there must be formal evidence that you meet the required standard. The panel accepted that you are able to communicate and use systems at work, but it still considered that formal proof of language competence is required.

The panel also considered the fact that there had been breaches of previous conditions. The panel decided that these breaches do not make the case significantly more serious. The panel accepted that the breaches were not deliberate and were not dishonest. The panel considered that they were the result of misunderstanding and circumstances at the time, rather than intentional disregard of the conditions. The panel also noted that you now appear to understand the expectations placed on you more clearly.

The panel considered whether a suspension order would be appropriate. The panel decided that suspension would not be proportionate in your case. The panel did not find that your conduct shows that you are fundamentally unfit to remain registered. There was no evidence of dishonesty, no evidence of deep rooted attitudinal problems, and no evidence of general incompetence. The panel decided that suspension or removal from the register would be too severe and not justified in the circumstances of your case.

The panel therefore decided that a further conditions of practice order is sufficient to protect patients and to maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel considered that this allows you to continue practising safely while making sure that the concerns in your case are properly addressed.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of 12 months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 18 June 2026. It decided to impose the following conditions which it considered are appropriate and proportionate in this case:

'For the purposes of these conditions, 'employment' and 'work' mean any paid or unpaid post in a nursing, midwifery or nursing associate role. Also, 'course of study' and 'course' mean any course of educational study connected to nursing, midwifery or nursing associates.'

1. You must not practise as a registered midwife until you have secured either:

- a) An overall score of at least 7 in the IELTS examination, achieving at least 6.5 in the writing section and at least 7 in the reading, listening and speaking sections, or
 - b) A grade B in the Occupational English Test (OET) or
 - c) Any other test approved by the NMC to demonstrate the necessary knowledge of the English.
2. Once you have complied with condition 1 and gained employment as a midwife you must work with your line manager/mentor/supervisor to create a personal development plan (PDP). Your PDP must demonstrate how you have improved your practice, particularly relating to your record keeping and giving evidence based information and advice. You must:
- a) Meet with your line manager/mentor/supervisor at least every month to discuss your clinical caseload and progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP.
 - b) Send your case officer a copy of your PDP within six weeks of commencing employment as a midwife.
 - c) Send your case officer a report from your line manager/mentor/supervisor prior to any review hearing. This report must show your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP.
3. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are working by:
- a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment.
 - b) Giving your case officer your employer's contact details.
4. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are studying by:
- a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting any course of study.

b) Giving your case officer the name and contact details of the organisation offering that course of study.

5. You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:

- a) Any organisation or person you work for.
- b) Any agency you apply to or are registered with for work.
- c) Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).
- d) Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.
- e) Any current or prospective patients or clients you intend to see or care for on a private basis when you are working in a self-employed capacity.

6. You must tell your case officer, within seven days of your becoming aware of:

- a) Any clinical incident you are involved in.
- b) Any investigation started against you.
- c) Any disciplinary proceedings taken against you.

7. You must allow your case officer to share, as necessary, details about your performance, your compliance with and / or progress under these conditions with:

- a) Any current or future employer.
- b) Any educational establishment.
- c) Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely at the end of 18 June 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of the order, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well you have complied with the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order or any condition of it, it may confirm the order or vary any condition of it, or it may replace the order for another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Your attendance at the next review
- A reflective piece demonstrating your insight into the concerns identified in this case, the impact of your failings on patients, colleagues and the public confidence in the profession, and the steps you have taken to strengthen your practice and prevent repetition.

This decision will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.