Nursing and Midwifery Council
Fitness to Practise Committee

Substantive Order Review Meeting
Friday, 16 October 2026

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	**Hana Musa**
NMC PIN:	12K0149E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – RNA Adult Nursing – 17 May 2013
Relevant Location:	Windsor and Maidenhead
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Vanessa Rolfe (Chair, Lay member) Alison James (Lay member) Anne Sharpe (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Paul Hester
Hearings Coordinator:	Grace Sharp
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (9 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	**Striking-Off order to come into effect on 1 December 2026 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 Musa's registered email address by secure email on 14 September 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided a copy of the order and decision previously made and that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 12 October 2026 and inviting Miss Musa 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 Musa 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 1 December 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the third review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 9 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 1 August 2024. This was first reviewed on 15 April 2025 where the suspension order was extended for 9 months. The suspension order was reviewed again on 16 January 2026 where the panel decided to further extend the suspension order for 9 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 1 December 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:

During the night shift of 24-25 December 2022

1) *Attended work when you were unfit to safely carry out your duties as a nurse in that you:*
    a) *appeared unbalanced and unaware of your actions*
    b) *shouted and swore at a colleague*
    c) *followed a colleague and had to be asked to stop*

On 28 December 2022:

2) *Attended work when you were unfit to safely carry out your duties as a nurse.*

3) *Failed to provide an adequate level of care towards Patient A in that you:*
    a) *…*
    b) *allowed your hair to "dangle" over Patient A's face*
    c) *Wiped Patient A's face aggressively with a tissue*

4) *Failed to communicate effectively with paramedics and/or other colleagues in that you:*
    a) *Used verbally abusive and/or offensive language towards them and/or in their presence*
    b) *Used threatening language towards them*
    c) *Accused the paramedics, without justification, of being racist/acting in a racist manner towards you*

5) *Failed to act in a professional manner towards paramedics in that you:*
    a) *…*
    b) *Interfered with their equipment*
    c) *…*

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

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

'The panel considered that the charges found proved are serious, involving Miss Musa attending work whilst she was unfit to do so, her failure to provide adequate care to a patient as well as her abusive behaviour to staff. The panel endorsed the findings of previous panels, in that Miss Musa placed the patient at a risk of harm through her interference with the paramedics whilst they were attending to the patient. Further, Miss Musa brought the nursing profession into disrepute and breached the fundamental tenets of the profession through her attendance at work whilst being unfit and her subsequent abusive behaviour towards other staff members.

The panel noted that some references were made to Miss Musa suffering from an illness, particularly as these two incidents occurred in close succession, and there were no concerns in relation to Miss Musa's practice prior to this. However, this panel had no evidence substantiating any health concern.

The panel was satisfied that these concerns, whilst serious, are capable of remediation.

Bearing the above in mind, the panel considered whether Miss Musa's fitness to practise remains impaired. The panel reminded itself that the persuasive burden lies with Miss Musa to indicate that she is currently fit to practice, pursuant to the NMC Guidance, 'Standard reviews of substantive orders before they expire' (Rev-2a).

The panel considered that the last reviewing panel was of the view that Miss Musa's insight was unchanged from August 2024, in that she had not engaged with the NMC process and had not provided any evidence of insight into her misconduct. In addition, there is no new information from Miss Musa before this panel today. The panel considered that Miss Musa has continued to not engage with the process, and has not provided the panel with evidence of her insight or remediation. This

panel was therefore not satisfied that Miss Musa has demonstrated any insight into her misconduct.

Further, in its consideration of whether Miss Musa has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel considered that there has been no information to suggest that Miss Musa has strengthened her practice. The panel recognised that Miss Musa is currently subject to a suspension order, but it noted that no other information, such as training certificates or testimonials from non-nursing roles, has been received.

The last reviewing panel determined that Miss Musa was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has received no new information in respect of Miss Musa's insight, remediation or strengthened practice. The panel bore in mind that Miss Musa has not engaged with the substantive order review process, and has not provided any further evidence for this panel's consideration. In light of this, the panel determined that there has been no change in the level of risk posed to the public, and Miss Musa 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 a well-informed member of the public would be concerned if no finding of impairment was made, particularly given Miss Musa's lack of engagement and the lack of insight or remediation. The panel bore in mind that the charges are serious, and it determined that public confidence in the nursing profession and the NMC as its regulator would be undermined should a finding of impairment not be made against a nurse who has demonstrated no insight into her misconduct, which included interfering with other health practitioners as well as abusive behaviour towards staff. Accordingly, the panel concluded that a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

The second reviewing 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 Miss Musa's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The SG states that a caution order may be appropriate where 'the case is at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen again.' The panel considered that Miss Musa'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 on Miss Musa'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 was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns, particularly as there is no information before it suggesting what caused Miss Musa's behaviour. Furthermore, the panel determined that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate in these circumstances, as Miss Musa has not engaged with the NMC process and there is no guarantee that she would engage and comply with any conditions imposed upon her practice.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. The panel bore in mind the SG, which states that suspension order may be appropriate where some of the following factors are present:

- *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 the above factors in turn.

The panel was satisfied that, whilst there were two incidents, they happened in sufficiently quick succession that, in effect, it was one single instance of misconduct. The panel noted that this was a serious incident, and a lesser sanction would not be sufficient. The panel was satisfied that there is no evidence before it of a harmful deep-seated or attitudinal concern, and there has been no evidence of repetition since the incident as Miss Musa is currently subject to a suspension order.

Accordingly, the panel was of the view that a suspension order would allow Miss Musa further time to fully reflect on her previous misconduct. The panel concluded that a further 9-month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Miss Musa adequate time to engage with the NMC and develop her insight as well as take steps to strengthen her practice.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for the period of 9 months would provide Miss Musa with an opportunity to engage with the NMC and provide evidence of her insight, remediation and strengthened practice. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

The panel determined that a striking-off order would be disproportionate at this stage. The panel was of the view that Miss Musa's conduct, whilst it was serious, is not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register.

The panel was aware that substantive orders are not intended to continue indefinitely, and that Miss Musa cannot be given unlimited opportunities to engage with the process. The time may come when a future reviewing panel may feel that its options are restricted in terms of ongoing registration, even if the underlying matters are remediable, because of a lack of engagement. However, at this stage, the panel was satisfied that a further period of suspension is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to allow Miss Musa the opportunity to develop her insight.

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

Before 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:

- *Miss Musa's meaningful engagement with the NMC and the substantive order review process;*
- *A written reflective piece relating to the misconduct found, addressing the impact of the misconduct on patients, colleagues, and the wider nursing profession;*
- *Evidence of strengthened practice from Miss Musa, including documentary evidence of completion of any training courses undertaken;*
- *Testimonials from any voluntary or paid work that supports Miss Musa's professional development;*
- *Miss Musa's future intention as to her plans to return to nursing.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Musa'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.

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 also reminded itself that the persuasive burden lies with Miss Musa to prove that she is currently fit to practice.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Miss Musa had provided no evidence of insight. At this meeting, the panel noted that Miss Musa had provided no evidence or submissions to demonstrate that she recognised the seriousness of her conduct, understood the potential impact of her misconduct on patients or the professional standards expected of her as a nurse. There was no evidence of remorse, reflection or engagement with the regulatory process throughout provided to the panel. Therefore, the panel had no evidence from which it could conclude that Miss Musa had developed sufficient insight into the concerns identified.

In its consideration of whether Miss Musa has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that there has been no evidence of remediation, relevant training, or evidence of continuing professional development or voluntary work. Miss Musa had also provided no evidence of any other steps taken to address the concerns or demonstrate

that her practice had improved. The panel therefore had no evidence that the underlying concerns had been addressed or that Miss Musa has taken steps to prevent recurrence in the future.

The last reviewing panel determined that Miss Musa was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel received no new evidence from Miss Musa demonstrating insight, remediation or strengthened practice, meaning that the panel had no basis upon which to conclude that the risk of repetition had reduced. Miss Musa has provided no evidence of any relevant change in her circumstances or practice that might reassure the panel that the concerns would not be repeated in the future. In light of this the panel determined that Miss Musa 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 considered that there would be serious damage to the reputation of the nursing profession if a finding of impairment were not made, particularly in light of Miss Musa's lack of engagement with the regulatory process and the absence of evidence of insight or remediation. Having regard to the seriousness of the charges and lack of evidence, the panel determined that public confidence in the nursing profession and the NMC as its regulator would be undermined if Miss Musa were found not to be impaired. The panel therefore concluded that a finding of continuing impairment was also necessary on public interest grounds.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Musa'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 and the finding of current impairment. 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 Musa'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 Musa'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 on Miss Musa'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 original hearing 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 Musa's misconduct and due to her lack of engagement through the regulatory process, could not be satisfied that Miss Musa would comply with conditions.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel had regard to the seriousness of the concerns and Miss Musa's continued failure to engage with the regulatory process and lack of evidence demonstrating remorse, insight or strengthened practice. This is the third review of the substantive order, and Miss Musa has had several opportunities to engage, demonstrate insight, provide evidence of remediation and reassure the panel that the concerns have been addressed. However, no such evidence has been forthcoming.

The panel also considered the NMC guidance '*Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place'* (Reference: REV-2h, last updated: 13 May 2026), which addresses the circumstances in which a professional may be allowed to leave the register while a finding of impairment remains in place.

The panel noted that the previous reviewing panel had explained in detail the circumstances in which this option might be available, including where a health condition prevented a registrant from addressing the concerns. Miss Musa was therefore aware of this option and had been given an opportunity to provide relevant information. However, no response or supporting evidence had been provided.

The panel also noted that '*illness'* had been identified as a mitigating factor at the original substantive hearing. However, the panel has had no evidence of a health condition that might explain Miss Musa's lack of engagement or inability to remediate her practice. Nor was there any evidence that medication or other health-related circumstances had contributed to her lack of progress. Miss Musa has not indicated that she had retired or provided any information about her intentions regarding a return to nursing.

The panel considered that Miss Musa had been afforded sufficient time and opportunity to provide medical information or other evidence that might support the use of this option. In the absence of such evidence, the panel was unable to place weight on the possibility that health-related circumstances explained her lack of progress.

The panel therefore concluded that the circumstances required for lapse with impairment had not been established and that allowing Miss Musa to leave the register in this way would not adequately reflect the seriousness of the concerns, her continued lack of engagement or the absence of evidence that she had addressed the underlying impairment.

The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance '*Deciding between suspension and strike off*' (Reference SAN-3, last updated: 28 January 2026), which advises a panel to:

- *'Consider all relevant aggravating and mitigating factors.*

- *Consider that, unless the Committee directs otherwise, a suspension order will be reviewed before its expiry and may be extended. However, the Committee cannot direct that the suspension must be extended on review. As such the Committee should consider whether public confidence in the profession would be protected if the professional returned to practice after one year, or ever.*
- *Consider the professional's insight and attitude to addressing the concerns, and whether it is realistically possible that these will change positively during the suspension period. If it is unlikely the professional will try to address the concerns, there may not be appropriate for them to be suspended in the hopes that they will eventually return to practice.*
- *Professionals are under an obligation to cooperate with their regulator. Where professionals have failed to engage with the fitness to practise process, it won't usually be appropriate to use a suspension order as a means of giving them a 'last chance' to engage, reflect or show insight.'*

The panel considered the seriousness of Miss Musa's misconduct, including her position as the most senior nurse in charge and the risk her misconduct placed on patients and colleagues. It also considered the absence of insight, remediation and engagement, alongside the opportunities already afforded to Miss Musa at previous reviews. The panel had no evidence of any meaningful change in her circumstances or attitude towards the concerns.

The panel recognised that a striking-off order is the most serious sanction and that it would have a significant impact on Miss Musa. However, in these circumstances, the panel considered that a further period of suspension would serve no useful purpose, as there was no evidence before it to suggest that Miss Musa would use that time to reflect on her conduct, develop insight or remediate her practice. Miss Musa has not engaged with the regulatory process, demonstrated remorse or insight, or provided evidence of any steps taken to strengthen her practice.

Given the repeated opportunities she had been afforded, the panel considered there was no realistic basis to conclude that a further period of suspension would result in a different outcome. The panel also had regard to the previous panels view that they were aware that substantive orders are not intended to continue indefinitely and that a future panel should

take this into consideration. It concluded that a further suspension order would not be an appropriate or proportionate outcome.

The panel next carefully considered the NMC Guidance '*Striking-off order*' (Reference: SAN-2e, last updated 28 January 2026). It noted that this sanction is likely to be appropriate if the professional's actions are fundamentally incompatible with being a registered professional. The panel took into consideration the following:

- *Do the charges found proved raise fundamental questions about their professionalism?*
- *Can public confidence in the profession be maintained if the professional is not removed from the Register?*
- *Is there any amount of insight and reflection which could keep people receiving care and members of the public safe, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold professional standards*
- *Is there a realistic prospect that, after suspension, the professional will have gained insight and strengthened their practice such that the risk they pose will have reduced?*

The panel decided that the charges found proved do raise fundamental questions about Miss Musa's professionalism and that public confidence in the profession would not be maintained if she was not removed from the Register. As already decided, Miss Musa has produced no evidence of any insight into her failings and misconduct. The panel gave particular regard to the last bullet point and decided that after 27 months of suspension there is no realistic prospect of Miss Musa gaining sufficient insight nor of her strengthening her practice so as to reduce the risk to the public.

The panel therefore determined that a striking-off order was the only appropriate and proportionate sanction. It concluded that this was necessary to protect the public and to uphold confidence in the nursing profession and the regulatory process.

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

This decision will be confirmed to Miss Musa in writing.

That concludes this determination.