

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting  
Wednesday, 17 June 2026**

Virtual Meeting

**Name of Registrant:** Adria Pearce

**NMC PIN:** 14H0087E

**Part(s) of the register:** Nursing Sub part 1 RNA, Registered Nurse -  
Adult 31 October 2014

**Relevant Location:** Leicester

**Type of case:** Misconduct

**Panel members:** Michaela McAleer (Chair, Lay member)  
Patricia Ford (Registrant member)  
Chanelle Gibson-McGowan (Lay member)

**Legal Assessor:** Suzanne Palmer

**Hearings Coordinator:** Petra Bernard

**Order being reviewed:** Suspension order (12 months) with review

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired

**Outcome:** **Striking-off order to come into effect at the end of  
31 July 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 Pearce's registered email address by secure email on 7 May 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 8 June 2026 and invited Miss Pearce to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Pearce 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 31 July 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 12 months with review by a Fitness to Practise Committee on 3 July 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 31 July 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, while working as a registered nurse at Glenfield Hospital:*

1. On 30 April 2021 took dihydrocodeine from the medication cupboard on a ward without authorisation and/or clinical justification.

2. On 30 April 2021 took codeine phosphate from the medication cupboard on award without authorisation and/or clinical justification.

3. Your actions as set out at charges 1 and/or 2 were dishonest in that you took medication that did not belong to you.

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

The substantive panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

*'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.*

*In consideration of putting patients at unwarranted risk of harm, the panel determined that removing medication which was not generally required by patients of the Ward, Miss Pearce would not have put patients at risk of physical harm as a result of her misconduct. The panel noted that there was no evidence before it to suggest that patients were harmed during this incident, however this does not mitigate the potential for harm of patients, should the medication not be readily available were this to be repeated in other wards. The panel also noted that Miss Pearce gave an explanation for her misconduct, however there was no evidence before it to suggest that Miss Pearce's [PRIVATE] had changed since the incident and therefore that she would not remove medication in the future. The panel determined that there is a risk of future harm as a result of Miss Pearce's misconduct.*

*The panel was of the view that Miss Pearce's misconduct was such that it breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession. Registered Nurses are expected to act honestly, and with integrity, and that a member of the public would expect that of a Registered Nurse. The panel considered that a member of the public would not expect a Registered Nurse to steal from their place of work and lie about it when confronted. It considered that, if the public knew this information their confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined. In this regard, the panel determined that Miss Pearce's misconduct fell below the standards expected of a Registered Nurse and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute.*

*Further, the panel was of the view that the misconduct relating to dishonesty in this case could not easily be remediated. The panel acknowledged the fact that Miss Pearce has shown remorse and apologised for her misconduct. She has admitted to dishonesty in regard to removing the medication from the Ward. However, the panel noted the lack of evidence before it, by way of an up to date reflective statement, strengthening of practice and Miss Pearce's lack of recent engagement with proceedings. It determined that it was likely that matters of the kind found proved could be repeated without any evidence to suggest that Miss Pearce's [PRIVATE] have been resolved. The panel was of the view that should the opportunity arise in the future, and Miss Pearce found herself to be [PRIVATE], then she would be tempted to repeat her misconduct.*

*The panel was satisfied that confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if its regulator did not find charges relating to dishonesty extremely serious.*

*In the absence of any detailed evidence demonstrating reflection, insight and strengthening practice, the panel could not conclude that Miss Pearce's misconduct is highly unlikely to be repeated. In the circumstances, the panel concluded that there remains a risk of repetition. The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.*

*The panel determined that an informed member of the public would be concerned about Miss Pearce's misconduct and that public confidence in the profession, and also the confidence of colleagues, would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made. The panel therefore finds Miss Pearce's fitness to practise also to be impaired on public interest grounds.*

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

The substantive panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

*Having found Miss Pearce'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:*

- *Miss Pearce abused her position of trust as a Registered Nurse*
- *Limited insight into failings*

*The panel also took into account the following mitigating features:*

- *Miss Pearce made admissions to her misconduct at an early stage*
- *Miss Pearce expressed remorse of her misconduct at an early stage and throughout her engagement with the NMC*
- *Personal mitigation*

*The panel had regard to the SG San-2 which gives guidance on sanctions of particularly serious cases, including those involving dishonesty;*

*'Honesty is of central importance to a nurse, midwife or nursing associate's practice. Therefore allegations of dishonesty will always be serious and a nurse, midwife or nursing associate who has acted dishonestly will always be at some risk of being removed from the register. However, in every case, the Fitness to Practise Committee must carefully consider the kind of dishonest conduct that has taken place. Not all dishonesty is equally serious.'*

*The guidance outlines a list of criteria which may indicate when dishonesty may be more or less serious. In this case, the panel noted that matters relating to Miss Pearce's dishonesty occurred as a single instance. It also noted that Miss Pearce's actions involved abuse of a position of trust as a Registered Nurse. There is evidence of Miss Pearce's personal gain through her explanation as to why she dishonestly removed medication from the Ward. Having regard to all of the factors, the panel determined that whilst Miss Pearce's dishonesty in this case was serious, it was not at the upper end of the spectrum of seriousness.*

*The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case and public protection concerns. 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 Pearce'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 Miss Pearce'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 Pearce'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, in particular:*

- No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- Identifiable areas of the nurse or midwife's practice in need of assessment and/or retraining;*
- No evidence of general incompetence;*
- Potential and willingness to respond positively to retraining;*
- The nurse or midwife has insight into any health problems and is prepared to agree to abide by conditions on medical condition, treatment and supervision;*
- Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions;*
- The conditions will protect patients during the period they are in force; and*
- Conditions can be created that can be monitored and assessed.*

*The panel is of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated, given the nature of the charges in this case. The misconduct identified in this case was not something directly linked to Miss Pearce's clinical practice and as such cannot be addressed through conditions of practice. Furthermore, the panel concluded that the placing of conditions on Miss Pearce'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 considered all of the evidence before it and noted that Miss Pearce's misconduct was a single instance. According to the limited evidence put before it, the panel determined that there were no deep-seated attitudinal concerns or concerns regarding Miss Pearce's clinical practice. The panel acknowledged that Witness 4 in her NMC statement dated 28 January 2025 said "She was a valued member of the staff a good team player." Further, in Witness 1's NMC statement dated 12 July 2023, she said, "I thought she was a very good nurse, very bright, conscientious and gave great nursing care."*

*The panel acknowledged Miss Pearce's apology, early admissions of her misconduct and disclosure of [PRIVATE] show limited but developing insight. However, with limited up to date evidence regarding Miss Pearce's [PRIVATE], the panel determined that there would still be a risk of Miss Pearce's misconduct being repeated. Considering the misconduct in the light of [PRIVATE] that Miss Pearce said led to it, the panel was satisfied 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 but, 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 Pearce'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 Pearce. 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.*

*In making this decision, the panel carefully considered the submissions of the NMC in relation to the sanction that the NMC was seeking in this case. However, the panel considered that a striking-off order would not be proportionate or appropriate in this case. The panel was satisfied that a suspension order would be sufficient in maintaining public confidence in the nursing profession. The panel determined that if a well-informed member of the public was aware of the [PRIVATE] of Miss Pearce, they would view a striking-off order to be punitive. The panel therefore determined a suspension order would be sufficient to mark the seriousness of Miss Pearce's misconduct whilst protecting the public.*

*The panel determined that a suspension order for a period of 12 months with review was appropriate in this case to mark the seriousness of the single instance of misconduct and to allow Miss Pearce sufficient time to re-engage with proceedings, reflect, develop insight and begin to strengthen her practice.*

*At 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:*

- *Re-engagement with NMC proceedings*
- *Evidence of Miss Pearce's continued interest in nursing, including completion of professional courses, research and testimonials from any employer*
- *Reflective statement including how Miss Pearce's misconduct and her actions have impacted on her and others.'*

### **Decision and reasons on current impairment**

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Pearce'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 referred NMC guidance 'Substantive order reviews' Reference REV-2 [Last updated 14/10/2022].

The panel has had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel noted that the circumstances in which Miss Pearce stated that her misconduct arose was out of an [PRIVATE]. The panel had some concern whether there had been any follow-up checks on [PRIVATE]. However, today's panel has seen no new information put before it in relation to these circumstances.

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 Pearce's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the substantive panel found that Miss Pearce had limited insight into her failings.

The panel had regard to the previous panel's recommendations as to what Miss Pearce could provide to assist the next panel:

- *'Re-engagement with NMC proceedings*
- *Evidence of Miss Pearce's continued interest in nursing, including completion of professional courses, research and testimonials from any*
- *employer*
- *Reflective statement including how Miss Pearce's misconduct and her actions have impacted on her and others.'*

The panel noted that Miss Pearce was further reminded of these same recommendations in an email to her from the NMC dated 16 March 2026.

At this meeting the panel has seen nothing before it from Miss Pearce that demonstrated an understanding of why what she did was wrong and how this impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession and others or how she would handle the situation differently in the future. She has also not provided any updated information in relation to her current personal circumstances or her future career intentions.

The panel noted from the substantive panel's determination that Miss Pearce had provided written submissions in the form of her local Trust investigation statement dated 11 July 2022, however the panel has not had sight of it, noting that in terms of

engagement with the NMC, Miss Pearce has disengaged with the NMC and its proceedings since July 2022.

In its consideration of whether Miss Pearce has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel was of the view that Miss Pearce had been given an opportunity to put this behind her and turn things around, yet has still not engaged with the NMC since 2022. Miss Pearce has not provided any reflection or further information on why she stole these highly addictive drugs from her employer.

The substantive panel determined that there remains a risk of repetition of matters of the kind it found proved. In light of the absence of any new information about Miss Pearce's personal circumstances, insight or remedial steps, this panel determined that Miss Pearce remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. 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 was of the view that members of the public would find it unacceptable if a registrant, given recommendations on the steps they should consider taking during their period of suspension in order to persuade a panel that their fitness to practise was no longer impaired, simply ignored them and disengaged from the process. The panel therefore determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

For the reasons set out above, the panel finds that Miss Pearce's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Having found Miss Pearce'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 arising from the dishonesty which has not been addressed. 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 Pearce'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 Miss Pearce's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum, as dishonesty was engaged and that a caution order, therefore, 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 Miss Pearce'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 substantive meeting and 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 relating to Miss Pearce's dishonest act which is attitudinal in nature and difficult to remediate. The panel was also concerned that because of Miss Pearce's disengagement with the process conditions of practice order were unworkable and would serve no useful purpose.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel considered that Miss Pearce has not shown remorse for her misconduct. Further, Miss Pearce has not demonstrated any further insight into her previous failings or any steps taken by her to prevent a recurrence, despite having been afforded the opportunity to do so by the recommendations of the substantive panel. The panel was of the view that evidence would be required to show that Miss Pearce no longer posed a risk to the public.

The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel decided that it was necessary to take action to prevent Miss Pearce 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.

The panel considered the 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 previous panel considered the time elapsed since Miss Pearce's last submission to the NMC was dated 11 July 2022 and noted that the current suspension has been in place for ten months. The panel determined that the lack of any meaningful engagement pointed to a barrier in the progression of her case and a striking-off order is the appropriate sanction in this case.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 31 July 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Miss Pearce in writing.

That concludes this determination.