Nursing and Midwifery Council
Fitness to Practise Committee

Substantive Order Review Hearing
Wednesday, 27 May 2026

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Sandra Mohamed
NMC PIN:	03K0793O
Part(s) of the register:	Nursing – Sub part 1 RN1: Adult Nurse (Level 1) – 24 November 2003
Relevant Location:	Glasgow
Type of case:	Misconduct/Lack of Competence
Panel members:	Michael Williams (Chair, Lay member) Sharon Haggerty (Registrant member) Yusuf Deerow (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Valerie Paterson
Hearings Coordinator:	Bethany Seed
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Alejandra Tascon, Case Presenter
Mrs Mohamed:	Not present and unrepresented
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (3 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	**Striking-Off order to come into effect on 31 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)**

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Mrs Mohamed was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Mrs Mohamed's registered email address by secure email on 28 April 2026.

Ms Tascon, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Hearing provided details of the substantive order being reviewed, the time, date and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Mrs Mohamed's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Mohamed had been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Mrs Mohamed

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mrs Mohamed. The panel had regard to Rule 21 of the Rules and heard the submissions of Ms Tascon who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Mrs Mohamed. She submitted that Mrs Mohamed had voluntarily absented herself. Ms Tascon submitted that this order is due to expire imminently on 31 May 2026, and therefore it is in the interest of justice for this hearing to proceed today.

Ms Tascon submitted that there had been no meaningful engagement at all by Mrs Mohamed with the NMC in relation to these proceedings and, as a consequence, there

was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion. She referred the panel to an email from Mrs Mohamed to the Hearings Coordinator dated 26 May 2026, which stated:

> *"As I have indicated multiple times now, I am not interested in attending anymore meetings moving forward. Please do not contact me again regarding these meetings and this case. I am finished with it."*

Ms Tascon therefore invited the panel to proceed in Mrs Mohamed's absence today.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel decided to proceed in the absence of Mrs Mohamed. In reaching this decision, the panel considered the submissions of Ms Tascon and the advice of the legal assessor. It had regard to relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Mrs Mohamed;
- Mrs Mohamed has informed the NMC that she no longer wishes to engage in these proceedings or attend any future hearing;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date; and
- This order expires in two working days, and therefore there is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Mrs Mohamed.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to replace the current suspension order with a striking off order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 31 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (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 28 July 2023. This was reviewed on 22 January 2024 and was extended for a further six months. The substantive suspension order was reviewed on 19 July 2024, and the panel replaced it with a conditions of practice order. This order was reviewed on 22 January 2026, and the conditions of practice order was replaced with a suspension order for three months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 31 May 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:

1) Administered Warfarin to Patient L when it had not been prescribed by the ward doctor on:

a. 21 January 2019.
b. 22 January 2019.

2) [NOT PROVED]

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

3) On 5 March 2019, during an observed drug round:

a. Did not discuss with an unknown patient their reason for refusing their prescribed medication.

b. Incorrectly stated Clopidrogel was used to treat cholesterol.

c. Did not carry out basic safety checks without prompting.

d. Required assistance with looking up medication in the BNF.

4) [NOT PROVED]

While subject to a formal stage 1 capability process:

5) On 5 April 2019, during an observed drug round:

a. Did not carry out safety checks when completing the round.

b. Spoke over an unknown patient when they were responding to your question.

6) On 10 May 2019, during an observed drug round:

a. Did not notice that an unknown patient was wearing the wrong name band.

b. Did not consistently check patients for their allergies.

7) On 27 May 2019, during an observed drug competency:

a. Did not check every page of the kardex for one or more unknown patients.

b. Did not identify a potential drug error in relation to an unknown patient in that you did not query why the patient was prescribed both metoclopramide and cyclazine.

c. Did not identify the correct course of action with an unknown patient who was unwell and struggling to breathe.

d. Walked out of the room whilst an unknown patient was talking to you.

8) On 28 May 2019, during an observed drug competency:

a) *Did not check every page of the kardex for one or more unknown patients.*
b) *Did not engage appropriately with an unknown patient who was unable to speak by asking questions which required more than yes or no answers.*
c) *[NOT PROVED]*

9) *On 27 June 2019, during an observed drug competency:*

a. *Prepared to administer one medication patch to an unknown patient when two were prescribed.*
b. *Did not administer paracetamol to an unknown patient when you had been instructed to by a senior colleague.*

c. *While subject to a formal stage 2 capability process*

10) *On 1 July 2019, during an observed drug competency:*

a. *[NO CASE TO ANSWER]*
b. *When communicating to an unknown patient who had requested pain medication, did not ensure that patient was able to hear or understand your response.*

11) *On 8 July 2019, during an observed drug competency:*

a. *Did not check a pump delivering medication to an unknown patient until prompted to do so.*
b. *[NO CASE TO ANSWER]*

12) *On 12 July 2019, during an observed drug competency:*
a. *Whilst attending an unknown terminal patient:*
    i. *[NOT PROVED]*
    ii. *Did not respond when a doctor asked what was happening with the patient.*

b. Whilst attending another unknown terminal patient:

i. [NOT PROVED]

ii. Lifted the patient's oxygen mask up so that the bottom was resting on their eyelid.

iii. Did not replace the oxygen mask in a prompt manner.

c. [NOT PROVED]

13) On 23 July 2019, during an observed drug competency, did not notice that you had not successfully injected insulin to an unknown patient.

AND in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct and your lack of competence and/or lack of competence.'

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

'The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Mrs Mohamed's insight was developing. However, at this hearing, the panel had no new information before it to demonstrate any further development of insight. The panel noted that there was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Mohamed has reflected upon the concerns identified or demonstrated an understanding of how her actions placed patients at risk of harm, breached fundamental tenets of the profession, or undermined public confidence. The panel further noted that the email dated 22 December 2025 indicated that she no longer wished to engage with the proceedings, and the panel received no communication directly from Mrs Mohamed herself. In the absence of any engagement, explanation, or evidence from Mrs Mohamed, the panel was unable to identify any meaningful insight into her misconduct and lack of competence.

In its consideration of whether Mrs Mohamed has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that there was no evidence before it to demonstrate any effective steps taken to remediate the concerns or to comply with the conditions imposed by the previous panel. The panel noted that there was no

evidence of training undertaken, no reflective material, no testimonials, and no information regarding whether Mrs Mohamed has been working in a healthcare environment or otherwise seeking to transition safely back into registered nursing practice. The panel was therefore unable to conclude that Mrs Mohamed has taken any steps to strengthen her practice or address the deficiencies previously identified.

The panel noted that the failures found proved involved breaches of fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and occurred over a sustained period of time, including while Mrs Mohamed was subject to informal and formal capability processes and receiving significant support. The panel considered that these failures placed patients at direct risk of harm although no harm was caused, particularly in relation to medication administration and failure to follow policies and procedures. In the absence of any new evidence addressing these concerns, the panel determined that the risk of repetition remains. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel has also borne in mind the wider public interest, including the need to maintain confidence in the nursing profession and to uphold proper professional standards. Given the seriousness, repetition, and sustained nature of the concerns, together with the absence of insight, remediation, or engagement, the panel determined that a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

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

'The panel next considered whether the continuation of the current conditions of practice order would be a sufficient and appropriate sanction. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel noted that there is no evidence before it to demonstrate that Mrs Mohamed

has engaged with the conditions imposed, or that she has demonstrated a willingness to comply with them. The panel further noted that Mrs Mohamed has withdrawn from the process and is no longer engaging with the NMC, and that it is the responsibility of Mrs Mohamed to demonstrate insight, remediation, and compliance. In the absence of any engagement, evidence of training, reflection, or professional development, the panel concluded that a conditions of practice order is no longer practicable or appropriate in this case. The panel determined that no workable conditions could be formulated which would adequately protect the public or satisfy the wider public interest.

The panel therefore determined that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel decided to impose a suspension order for a period of three months, which would provide Mrs Mohamed with an opportunity to re-engage with the NMC and to provide evidence of compliance with the previous conditions of practice order. The panel considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

The panel noted that although Mrs Mohamed is not currently engaging with these proceedings, she previously engaged with the NMC between 2019 and August 2024 and attended review hearings and undertook some training, albeit not directly relevant to the concerns identified. The panel is not aware of the reason for Mrs Mohamed's non-engagement and whether or not this is temporary stance as a result of her personal circumstances or whether it is a firm decision to disengage with the NMC. In light of this, the panel concluded that a striking-off order at this stage would be disproportionate.

The panel considered that a suspension order would continue to protect the public while affording Mrs Mohamed a final opportunity to demonstrate insight, remediation and a clear intention in relation to her future nursing practice. The panel determined that a three-month suspension would provide Mrs Mohamed sufficient time to inform the NMC of her intention to continue in registered nursing practice and the steps she is taking to address the misconduct and lack of competence identified. The panel noted that this would place a future panel in a better position to

review her case based on any evidence of engagement, insight or remediation that may be provided.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mrs Mohamed's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as the ability of a professional on our register to practise as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively without restriction. In considering this case, the panel has carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it has noted the decision of the last panel, this panel has exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle and the email from Mrs Mohamed dated 26 May 2026. It took into account the submissions made by Ms Tascon on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Tascon outlined the background of the case. She submitted that the persuasive burden lies with Mrs Mohamed to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired. She submitted that Mrs Mohamed's fitness to practise remains currently impaired, and an order is necessary and proportionate to protect the public. She submitted that it is a matter for this panel to determine what the most appropriate order is in this case.

Ms Tascon submitted that Mrs Mohamed was given ample notice of today's hearing, as well as a copy of the previous panel's determination, which included a list of documents that may assist this reviewing panel in its review of this case. She submitted that there is a lack of any new evidence before this panel, and therefore Mrs Mohamed has not demonstrated any further insight or strengthened practice in relation to her misconduct and lack of competence. She submitted that therefore, there remains a real risk of harm to the public which has yet to be addressed.

Ms Tascon submitted that in the absence of any further evidence demonstrating Mrs Mohamed's level of insight or strengthened practice, her fitness to practise remains impaired on the public interest ground.

In relation to sanction, Ms Tascon submitted that several options are available to the panel today. She submitted that Mrs Mohamed has, on three occasions, indicated that she has disengaged with these proceedings. She submitted that Mrs Mohamed's email to the Hearings Coordinator dated 26 May 2026 makes it clear that she does not wish to be contacted in relation to this case in future. She submitted that it is a matter for this panel to determine the most appropriate sanction. She submitted that a further period of suspension may assist Mrs Mohamed in addressing and taking steps to address the previously found deficiencies in her fitness to practise. She submitted that the panel may also determine that a striking off order is necessary and proportionate at this stage.

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 Mrs Mohamed's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel considered that the charges found proved are serious relating to fundamental nursing skills, including medication administration errors and broad drug competency issues. The panel considered that numerous charges were admitted or found proved and demonstrates a pattern of conduct over a period of time.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Mrs Mohamed had not demonstrated any further meaningful insight into her misconduct and lack of competence since the last review. At this hearing, the panel noted that Mrs Mohamed has disengaged from the NMC, and therefore it had no new information to suggest that there has been any change in Mrs Mohamed's level of insight.

In its consideration of whether Mrs Mohamed has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that it has seen no new information to demonstrate the steps, if any, Mrs Mohamed has taken to strengthen her practice.

The last reviewing panel determined that Mrs Mohamed was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has received no new information to undermine the previous panel's decision. The panel considered that these incidents occurred in 2019, and a substantive order has been imposed since July 2023. The panel noted that since the imposition of the substantive order, Mrs Mohamed has not demonstrated developed insight or strengthened practice. The panel further noted that the previous reviewing panel made recommendations to the documents Mrs Mohamed could provide in order to assist this panel in its decision making. Mrs Mohamed has not provided any reflections, references, testimonials or evidence of further training, and therefore the risk to the public is ongoing. The panel was of the view that there has been no demonstrable improvement in Mrs Mohamed's insight and strengthened practice since the review in August 2025.

In the absence of any evidence that Mrs Mohamed has addressed her previous misconduct and lack of competence, this panel determined that she remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the ground of public protection.

The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. The panel considered that a member of the public would be concerned knowing that Mrs Mohamed has had ample opportunity to engage in these proceedings but has chosen not to do so. The panel was of the view that the reputation of the nursing profession, and the NMC as a regulator would be seriously damaged if a finding of impairment is not made in this case, given that Mrs Mohamed has disengaged from her regulator and has indicated she no longer wishes to receive communication in relation to her case. Therefore, 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 Mrs Mohamed's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mrs Mohamed'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 Mrs Mohamed'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 Mrs Mohamed'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 order on Mrs Mohamed's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel was mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable. The panel noted that Mrs Mohamed has previously been subject to a conditions of practice order, however Mrs Mohamed did not make sufficient demonstrable progress towards addressing the misconduct and lack of competence issues found proved. The panel considered that given Mrs Mohamed's disengagement from the NMC, the panel considered that any conditions of practice would not be workable or measurable in this case. The panel concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that Mrs Mohamed has not demonstrated sufficient insight or strengthened practice and has now fully disengaged with the NMC in respect of these regulatory proceedings. The panel was

of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Mrs Mohamed no longer posed a risk to the public, given the time that has elapsed since the allegations arose in 2019. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel was of the view that Mrs Mohamed has had sufficient time to begin addressing the misconduct and lack of competence issues found proved, and she has failed to do so despite having prior notice of this hearing and recommendations from previous reviewing panels. Mrs Mohamed has been subject to a substantive order since 2023 and has not yet demonstrated sufficient insight or strengthened practice. The panel had particular regard to the NMC Guidance SAN-2d *Suspension order* (last updated: 28 January 2026), which states:

> *"while it is possible that the professional could be fit to practise in future, only a period out of practice would be sufficient to allow them to fully strengthen their practice through reflection, the development of their professional skills and / or development of insight and remediation"*

The panel considered this was not a case where a further period of suspension would serve a useful purpose. The panel considered that there have been previous review panels that have determined that the least restrictive sanction in this case was suspension order, and Mrs Mohamed has been unwilling to work towards returning to safe and effective practice.

The panel was of the view that it is incumbent on registrants to fully engage with their regulator, and therefore Mrs Mohamed's extended non-compliance and refusal to engage in these proceedings is very serious. The panel considered that non-engagement with the NMC as regulator undermines public confidence in the wider profession. The panel considered that on balance, a further period of suspension would not be proportionate to manage the risk of harm to the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel considered that it is proportionate to impose a striking off order.

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

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

This decision will be confirmed to Mrs Mohamed in writing.