

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Thursday, 28 May 2026**

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

Name of Registrant: Ezra Brown Musango

NMC PIN: 09K0603E

Part(s) of the register: RNMH: Mental health nurse, level 1
28 October 2011

Relevant Location: London

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: Serene Rollins (Chair, lay member)
Richard Curtin (Registrant member)
Barry Greene (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Oliver Wise

Hearings Coordinator: Hanifah Choudhury

Order being reviewed: Conditions of practice order (12 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Revised conditions of practice order for a further 12 months to come into effect at the end of 10 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 Mr Musango's registered email address by secure email on 23 April 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review that the review meeting would be held on or after 25 May 2026, and invited Mr Musango 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 Mr Musango 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 extend the conditions of practice order for a further 12 months. This order will come into effect at the end of 10 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 conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 12 June 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 10 July 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 were as follows:

'That you, a registered nurse:

1) On 7 February 2021, having become aware that Secure Patient A without permission had left the secure forensic unit, where they were detained, failed to:

- a) search Secure Patient A adequately, or at all;
- b) did not take sufficient preventative measures to mitigate the security breach;
- c) notify any other members of staff on the shift, of the security breach.
- d) record the incident;
- e) escalate the matter.

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:

'Regarding insight, the panel considered that Mr Musango has displayed developing insight into the incident having made early and full admissions, submitted a reflective piece – albeit a short one, and engaged with the NMC procedure. The panel noted that Mr Musango has since been employed for 21 months as a community mental health nurse with another employer and there are no reported concerns regarding his current practice. However, the panel considered that there is limited evidence of Mr Musango's strengthening of practice due to the lack of any training certificates on working in a secure facility or the importance of reporting serious incidents in a timely manner.

The panel considered that while there was no actual harm caused as a direct result of the misconduct, given the high security nature of the unit and the serious concern that results from a breach of the secure perimeter, there was a real risk of harm. By failing to report that a patient had left the secure unit and further failing to adequately search the patient, Mr Musango prevented the appropriate security review being carried out. The panel found that this put patients, colleagues, and the wider public at risk of serious potential harm.

The panel considered there remains a risk of repetition; however, it noted Mr Musango has worked as a registered mental health nurse with no evidence of further incidents. Therefore, the panel concluded that the first limb of the test set out in Grant is met as regards to future conduct and a finding of impairment is required on the ground of public protection.

The panel considered that the second and third limbs of Grant are also engaged in this case as by creating the possibility for serious harm Mr Musango's actions are likely in the future to bring the reputation [sic] into disrepute and breach the fundamental tenets, namely safe, effective, and collaborative nursing practice.

The panel bore in mind that 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 profession and upholding the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

In addition, the panel concluded that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment was not made in this case, given the potential for harm that arose from Mr Musango's failures, the panel also finds his fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Mr Musango's fitness to practise is currently impaired.'

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order

that does not restrict Mr Musango'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 Mr Musango'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 Mr Musango'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;*
- ...*
- 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 determined that it would be possible to formulate appropriate and practical conditions which would address the failings highlighted in this case. The panel considered that Mr Musango would likely be willing to comply with conditions of practice given his engagement in this process.

The panel had regard to the fact that these incidents occurred in a particular workplace with a set of security concerns and risks of harm that may not be present in all nursing roles.

Balancing all of these factors, the panel determined that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of a conditions of practice order.

The panel was of the view that to impose a suspension order or a striking-off order would be wholly disproportionate and would not be a reasonable response in the circumstances of this case because the misconduct identified occurred on a single shift, and has not been repeated.

Having regard to the matters it has identified, the panel has concluded that a conditions of practice order will mark the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and will send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standards of practice required of a registered nurse.

The panel determined that the following conditions 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. Create a Personal Development Plan (PDP) with your line manager to demonstrate an understanding of the importance of:
 - a) Notifying other members of staff of serious incidents when they occur*
 - b) Recording of serious incidents*
 - c) Escalation of serious incidents.**

2. *A reflective piece using a recognised model on the risk of harm to patients and colleagues by failing to follow security procedures.*
3. *Obtain a report from your line manager of your PDP and submit it to your NMC Case Officer, along with your reflective piece before any review of this order.*
4. *You must keep us 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.*
5. *You must keep us 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.*
6. *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.*

7. *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.*

8. *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 12 months.

Before the end of the period of the order, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well Mr Musango has 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:

- *Mr Musango's attendance at the review*
- *Testimonials and references from current employment'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mr Musango'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 has had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle and documentation from Mr Musango which included a Personal Development Plan (PDP), a reflective piece and a supervision summary report from Mr Musango's line manager.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance.

The panel considered whether Mr Musango's fitness to practise remains impaired. In reaching its decision, the panel had regard to the concerns identified in this case, namely that they related to Mr Musango's failure to follow appropriate measures for a mental health patient.

The panel had before it Mr Musango's reflective piece in which he accepted what he had done wrong and acknowledged that his actions had placed the patient and others at risk of harm. The panel noted that a previous panel had found that Mr Musango was developing insight into his misconduct.

The panel also considered Mr Musango's PDP, created on 29 December 2025, which in the panel's view attempted to address the areas previously identified as requiring remediation. The panel further noted that it had not received evidence regarding progress to meeting the objectives such as certificates of completed training.

In addition, the panel had regard to the supervision summary report, recorded from 7 November 2025 to 30 January 2026, which appeared to be part of Mr Musango's ongoing routine supervision (noting that this commenced prior to the PDP being devised) and not specifically addressing progress towards achieving the objectives of his PDP. The panel noted Mr Musango's line manager's comments that:

'Ezra has made measurable progress during the supervision period, particularly in relation to risk recognition, engagement with the PDP process, improving client contact, and completion of some essential training modules. He demonstrates a willingness to learn, appropriately seeks guidance, and has shown improving consistency in documentation and clinical duties.'

The panel acknowledged that the supervision notes identified progress and a willingness on Mr Musango's part to remediate his practice. However, the panel also noted that there remained areas requiring improvement, albeit not directly related to the original charges.

The panel determined that the information before it did not fully address or remediate the concerns identified. The panel noted that the substantive concerns had been considered in June 2025 with the order coming into effect in July 2025 but there was no evidence of supervision between July and November 2025. The panel further noted that supervision notes only commenced in November 2025 and continued until January 2026 whilst the PDP itself was not created until December 2025. The panel considered this chronology to be problematic when assessing the extent of Mr Musango's remediation.

The panel was also concerned that issues relating to record keeping remained outstanding. It noted his line manager's observations that:

'However, further development is required in ensuring timely and accurate documentation, consistent zoning entries, avoiding repetitive or non-specific clinical notes, and completing reflective and PDP activities within expected timeframes.'

The panel also noted that the managerial assessment concluded in January 2026 and that there was no further information before it covering the period from January 2026 to the present date. The panel considered that there were significant gaps in the evidence during the period of the order, including gaps within the PDP itself in relation to completed e-learning and training.

The panel had regard to the previous panel's concerns regarding a lack of training and noted that it had not been provided with sufficient evidence of completed e-learning or

training courses. Further, the panel was not satisfied that there was evidence demonstrating completion of a substantial proportion of the objectives contained within the PDP.

The panel additionally noted that the supervision notes did not appear fully to correlate with the PDP and observed that the PDP appeared to have been created after the supervision notes had commenced. The panel considered that this made it difficult properly to assess the extent of Mr Musango's remediation, strengthening, and insight.

In all the circumstances, the panel determined that whilst Mr Musango had demonstrated developing insight and some positive progress, the evidence before it did not sufficiently close the gap in relation to the concerns identified. The panel therefore concluded that Mr Musango's fitness to practise remains impaired on public protection grounds.

The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Musango fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel noted that its powers are set out in Article 30 of the Order. The panel has also taken into account the 'NMC's Sanctions Guidance' (SG) and has borne in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, though any sanction imposed may have a punitive effect.

The panel first considered whether to take no action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the case. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Mr Musango's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The SG states that a caution order may be appropriate where *'the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise, but the Committee wants to mark that what happened was unacceptable and must not happen again.'* The panel considered that Mr Musango'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 imposing a further conditions of practice order on Mr Musango's 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 considered that Mr Musango has demonstrated developing insight and some evidence of remediation. It acknowledged the positive feedback contained within the supervision notes and recognised that Mr Musango has engaged to some extent with the conditions of practice order currently in place. The panel was satisfied that the concerns identified are capable of remediation and that Mr Musango remains willing to strengthen his practice.

In these circumstances, the panel concluded that varying and extending a conditions of practice order would provide Mr Musango with a further opportunity to fully address the outstanding concerns whilst maintaining public protection. The panel was satisfied that workable, measurable, and proportionate conditions remain sufficient to address the concerns identified in this case. The panel therefore determined that an extension of the conditions of practice order was the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel considered that a suspension order or striking-off order would be disproportionate in the circumstances of this case, given Mr Musango's developing insight, evidence of some remediation and engagement, and the panel's decision that the remaining concerns are capable of being adequately addressed through the continuation of workable and proportionate conditions of practice.

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 10 July 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. Create an updated Personal Development Plan (PDP) with your line manager which must be signed off by them. This PDP must demonstrate an understanding of the importance of:
 - a) Notifying other members of staff of serious incidents when they occur
 - b) Recording of serious incidents
 - c) Escalation of serious incidents.

2. Obtain a progress report from your line manager specifically referencing your progress towards meeting the objectives set out in your PDP produced for Condition 1 and submit it to your NMC Case Officer before any review of this order. A report must be sent no later than 11 January 2026 and a further report sent no later than 31 May 2026 or seven days before your next review hearing.

3. An updated reflective piece demonstrating how you would apply your learning and training from your PDP to your practice.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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 12 months.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 10 July 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 Mr Musango has 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.

This will be confirmed to Mr Musango in writing.

That concludes this determination.