

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

**Substantive Meeting
Friday, 2 October 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	George Matthew Nish
NMC PIN:	87A0124S
Part(s) of the register:	Nursing, Sub part 1 RN3, Registered Nurse - Mental Health 2 June 1990
Relevant Location:	Scotland
Type of case:	Conviction
Panel members:	Chris Weigh (Chair, Lay member) Mordecai Edziyie Dadzie (Registrant member) Robin John Barber (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Lee Davies
Hearings Coordinator:	Petra Bernard
Facts proved:	Charges 1, 2
Facts not proved:	None
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Sanction:	Striking-off order
Interim order:	Interim suspension order (18 months)
Final outcome:	FTP impaired - striking off order

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 Nish's registered email address by secure email on 25 August 2026.

Further, the panel noted that the Notice of Meeting was also sent to Mr Nish's representatives at the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) on the same date.

The panel had regard to Mr Nish's response via a letter from his representatives at the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) dated 24 September 2026, acknowledging this meeting and that he has engaged with the regulatory process.

The panel took account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the allegation, the time, date and the fact that this meeting was to be held virtually.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In light of all the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mr Nish 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).

Details of charge

That you, a registered nurse:

1. On 5 November 2025 at Ayr Sheriff Court were convicted of one count of taking or permitting to be taken or making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children between 7 October 2022 and 23 September 2024 inclusive contrary to Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 Section 52(1)(a) as amended.
2. On 5 November at Ayr Sheriff Court were convicted of one count of being in possession of indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children between 7

October 2022 and 1 October 2024 inclusive contrary to Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 Section 52A(1)

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

Decision and reasons on amendment to charges 2

The panel having noted the omission of the year of conviction in date in charge 2, decided to make the following amendment to the charge:

Original charge

2. On 5 November at Ayr Sheriff Court were convicted of one count of being in possession of indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children between 7 October 2022 and 1 October 2024 inclusive contrary to Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 Section 52A(1).

Proposed amendment

2. On 5 November **2025** at Ayr Sheriff Court were convicted of one count of being in possession of indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children between 7 October 2022 and 1 October 2024 inclusive contrary to Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 Section 52A(1).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor and had regard to Rule 28 of the Rules.

The panel had sight of the Full Extract Conviction Report from Ayr Sheriff Court and Justice of the Peace Court dated 17 February 2026 and noted that the date of conviction applied to both charges. The panel was of the view that the amendment sought was in the interests of justice. The panel was satisfied that there would be no prejudice to Mr Nish and no injustice would be caused to either party by the proposed

amendment being allowed. It was, therefore, appropriate to allow the amendment to ensure clarity and accuracy.

Background

The NMC received a self-referral from Mr Nish on 21 October 2024. At the time of the referral Mr Nish was employed by NHS Ayrshire and Arran (the Trust) as a Charge Nurse at Ailsa Hospital (the Hospital). Mr Nish informed the NMC that on 1 October 2024 he had been charged with having indecent images on a mobile phone. He stated that he had been released on bail and would attend a plea hearing on 29 October 2024.

On 5 November 2025, Mr Nish was convicted at Ayr Sheriff Court of the following offences:

- 1) That between 7 October 2022 and 23 September 2023, both dates inclusive at [PRIVATE], Loans and elsewhere, you did take or permit to be taken or make indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children contrary to the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 Section 52A(1)(a) as amended
- 2) That between 7 October 2022 and 1 October 2024, both dates inclusive at [PRIVATE] Loans and elsewhere, you did have in your possession indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children contrary to the and Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 S52A(1)

On 23 December 2025, Mr Nish was sentenced by the Ayr Sheriff Court and Justice of the Peace Court to: Sexual Offences Act 2003 Certification; Sexual Harm Prevention Order: 5 years, start date: 23 December 2025; Community Payback Order: Supervision Period - 3 years, Unpaid Work/Activities Period - 300 hours to be completed within 12 months, imposition date – 23 December 2025.

A letter from Mr Nish's representatives at the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) dated 24 September 2026, states:

‘...Mr Nish also acknowledges the charges and accepts the seriousness of his conduct. He has demonstrated insight into the concerns and has expressed genuine remorse. His engagement with the relevant support and remediation demonstrates that he has taken positive steps to address the matters arising from his conviction.

In these circumstances, Mr Nish does not intend to return to nursing, however, he respectfully submits that his engagement with the regulatory process, his admissions, his remorse and the steps he has taken to address the concerns are relevant considerations for the Panel to consider.’

In an email dated 4 April 2025 to the NMC, Mr Nish states:

‘I am informing you of my decision to retire from my post as Senior Charge Nurse, NHS Ayrshire and Arran, effective from Monday 31st March 2025.

I would also like to request to voluntarily remove myself from the NMC Register as of Friday 4th April 2025.

I do not intend to revalidate my registration and I do not intend to reapply to rejoin the register at any time in the future.’

Decision and reasons on facts

The NMC has not provided any formal submissions in regard to the charges.

The charges concern Mr Nish’s conviction and, having been provided with a copy of the Full Extract Conviction Report from Ayr Sheriff Court and Justice of the Peace Court dated 20 February 2026, the panel finds that the facts are found proved in accordance with Rule 31(2) and (3). These state:

‘31.— (2) *Where a registrant has been convicted of a criminal offence—*

- (a) a copy of the certificate of conviction, certified by a competent officer of a Court in the United Kingdom (or, in Scotland, an extract conviction) shall be conclusive proof of the conviction; and*
- (b) the findings of fact upon which the conviction is based shall be admissible as proof of those facts.*
- (3) The only evidence which may be adduced by the registrant in rebuttal of a conviction certified or extracted in accordance with paragraph (2)(a) is evidence for the purpose of proving that she is not the person referred to in the certificate or extract.'*

The panel determined that there is no evidence before it that Mr Nish disputes that the charges relate to him. The panel took account that, via a letter from his representative at the RCN, Mr Nish also acknowledges the charges and accepts the seriousness of his conduct. Accordingly, the panel finds the facts in all charges proved by reason of Mr Nish's conviction.

Fitness to practise

Having reached its determination on the facts of the case, the panel then considered whether, on the basis of the facts found proved, Mr Nish's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of his conviction. There is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, however, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's suitability to remain on the register unrestricted.

The panel has satisfied itself that Mr Nish has been convicted and rely upon the Full Extract Conviction Report from Ayr Sheriff Court and Justice of the Peace Court dated 17 February 2026, that the route of misconduct is made out by way of Mr Nish's conviction.

Representations on impairment

The NMC has not provided any formal written representations regarding impairment.

The panel bore in mind its overarching objective to protect the public and the wider public interest. This included the need to declare and maintain proper standards and maintain public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body. The panel has referred to the case of *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v (1) Nursing and Midwifery Council (2) Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin).

The panel had regard to the email from Mr Nish's representatives at the RCN dated 24 September 2026, however no formal submissions in regards of his impairment have been provided.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Decision and reasons on impairment

The panel next went on to decide if as a result of Mr Nish's conviction, his fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on 'Impairment' (Reference: DMA-1 Last Updated: 28/01/2026) in which the following is stated:

'Being fit to practise is not defined in our legislation but for us it means that a professional on our register can practise as a nurse midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively without restriction.'

Nurses occupy a position of privilege and trust in society and are expected at all times to be professional. Patients and their families must be able to trust nurses with their lives and the lives of their loved ones. To justify that trust, nurses must act with integrity. They must make sure that their conduct at all times justifies both their patients' and the public's trust in the profession.

In considering impairment the panel had regard to the judgment of Mrs Justice Cox in the case of *CHRE v NMC and Grant* in reaching its decision. In paragraph 74, she said:

'In determining whether a practitioner's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct, the relevant panel should generally consider not only whether the practitioner continues to present a risk to members of the public in his or her current role, but also whether the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances.'

In paragraph 76, Mrs Justice Cox referred to Dame Janet Smith's "test" which reads as follows:

'Do our findings of fact in respect of the doctor's misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction, caution or determination show that his/her/their fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that S/He/They:

- a) has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or*
- b) has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or*
- c) has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession; and/or*
- d) [...]*

The panel determined that limbs a), b) and c) are engaged in this case.

The panel considered that the first *Grant* question was engaged. Mr Nish's conviction provided clear evidence of conduct which created a risk of harm to others, including children. The offence was not an isolated event but involved repeated behaviour on more than one occasion. The panel noted from the '*Summary of Evidence*' from the Police, that Mr Nish had stated:

'...this had been going on for several years, on and off, that he knew he should get help for this but couldn't find the ability to stop'.

The panel considered that the repetitive nature and type of conduct raised significant concerns regarding deep-seated attitudinal issues. The panel took account of the report from The Lucy Faithful Foundation dated 31 October 2025, a charity that provides confidential and anonymous help and advice for those affected by arrest for internet offences, including family members of those arrested, where Mr Nish had self-reported.

The report states:

'... he felt that stressed in both work and [PRIVATE]. Mr Nish stated that he did not want to make excuses for his behaviour but stated that his online behaviour (pornography) was a "crutch" when he was [PRIVATE]. This led to risky and illegal behaviour online.'

The panel acknowledged that Mr Nish had demonstrated developing insight and had taken some proactive steps to seek support. However in The Lucy Faithful Foundation report itself, it clearly states that:

'In preparing this report it is important to note that this has not been completed as a comprehensive risk assessment and no formal risk assessment tools have been used.'

The panel bore in mind that the '*Order Of Court*' sentence subjects Mr Nish to: Sexual Offences Act 2003 Certification; Sexual Harm Prevention Order: 5 years, start date: 23 December 2025; Community Payback Order: Supervision Period - 3 years, Unpaid Work/Activities Period - 300 hours to be completed within 12 months, imposition date – 23 December 2025. The panel concluded therefore, that this demonstrates the

seriousness of Mr Nish's offences and whilst the '*Order Of Court*' is in force, he is impaired.

The panel was also mindful that, Mr Nish remains a registered nurse and could potentially come into contact with children and other vulnerable people in the course of his professional life. The panel was concerned that the underlying attitudes and behaviours demonstrated could, if repeated or manifested in a professional setting, place members of the public receiving care at unwarranted risk of harm. The panel therefore could not be satisfied that there was no ongoing risk of harm to patients.

The panel was satisfied that the second *Grant* question was engaged. Mr Nish's conviction, although occurring outside of his professional practice, had brought the nursing profession into disrepute. Nurses occupy a position of privilege and public trust and are expected to maintain professional standards and appropriate boundaries both within and outside their professional practice.

The panel considered that the seriousness and nature of Mr Nish's offending was such that public confidence in the profession could be undermined if a nurse convicted of these offences were permitted to practise without a finding of impairment.

The panel was also satisfied that the third *Grant* question was engaged. The panel found that Mr Nish's offending raised fundamental concerns about his ability to uphold the values, standards and professional boundaries expected of a registered nurse. The panel considered that the conduct demonstrated a serious departure from the fundamental tenets of the profession in that he has failed to '*promote professionalism and trust.*'

The panel had regard to NMC Guidance Reference: FTP-2c-1 in relation to 'Specified Offences', states:

'Specified offences are offences which are, by definition, particularly serious. The nature of these convictions would raise fundamental questions about a nurse, midwife or nursing associate's ability to uphold the standards and values set out in the Code.'

The Guidance includes '*serious offences involving children*'

...

‘Sexual offences are offences which involve sexual activity or sexual motivation. They include crimes such ...the taking or sharing of indecent images of children, and crimes that exploit others for a sexual purpose, whether in person or online.’

The panel had regard to NMC Guidance Reference: FTP-2a-ii ‘Sexual Misconduct’ (Last Updated 31/07/2026), which states that:

‘In our guidance on behaviour outside of professional practice we say that we will take action when a professional’s conduct:

- could pose a risk to our public protection objectives, including risks to public safety, public confidence in the profession or professional standards, or*
- raises fundamental questions about the professional’s ability to uphold the values and standards set out in the Code.*

‘Sexual misconduct outside professional practice could indicate deep-seated attitudinal issues which could put the public at risk. It may also raise fundamental questions about the professional’s ability to uphold the standards and values set out in the Code...’

The panel took into account that Mr Nish’s offences involved sexual offences concerning children and went beyond the possession of sexual images to downloading and taking clones of children and running them through Artificial Intelligence (AI) to create naked images of them. The panel considered that this conduct was a fundamental breach of the tenets of the nursing profession and was capable of seriously undermining public confidence.

The panel determined that the repeated nature of the offending was particularly significant in assessing the likelihood of future harm. Although remediation was theoretically possible, the panel considered that the nature and seriousness of the convictions made full remediation exceptionally difficult.

The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance ‘Concerns outside professional practice’ (Reference: FTP-2a-i Last updated: 3 August 2026). It considered that the features set

out in the guidance, were present in this case and reinforced its concerns regarding Mr Nish's underlying attitudes and the difficulty of achieving full remediation.

The panel considered *Cohen v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) and recognised that concerns arising from deep-seated attitudinal concerns may be capable of remediation, but that this can be particularly difficult where the conduct is repeated and serious. It acknowledged Mr Nish's insight, and efforts to seek support, however the panel was not satisfied that these efforts had sufficiently addressed the underlying concerns.

The panel noted that Mr Nish remains subject to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for five years and considered this to be relevant context when assessing the continuing risk of harm.

The panel determined that, notwithstanding Mr Nish's reflection, the concerns had not been sufficiently remediated and there remained a risk of repetition. The panel was not satisfied that Mr Nish could currently be relied upon to maintain the standards expected of a registered nurse.

The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel bore in mind that the overarching objectives of the NMC are to protect, promote and maintain the health safety and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold/protect the wider public interest, which includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing and midwifery professions and upholding the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

The panel took account of Mr Nish's serious criminal conviction and that he is subject to a Sexual Prevention Of Harm Order which runs from 23 December 2025 until 22 December 2030 and a Community Payback Order until 22 December 2028. The panel was of the view that members of the public would be shocked and dismayed if a finding of impairment was not made in the circumstances of this case.

The panel determined that a finding of impairment on public interest grounds was also required. The panel determined that the nature and seriousness of the offences were

such that public confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if Mr Nish were permitted to practise without regulatory restriction. The panel determined that fellow practitioners would find Mr Nish's actions to be deplorable.

The panel therefore concluded that Mr Nish's fitness to practise was impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds.

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

Sanction

The panel has considered this case very carefully and has decided to make a striking-off order. It directs the registrar to strike Mr Nish off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Mr Nish has been struck-off the register.

In reaching this decision, the panel has had regard to all the evidence that has been adduced in this case and had regard to the NMC Guidance on 'The sanctions available' (Reference: SAN-2 Last Updated: 28/01/2026).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Representations on sanction

The panel noted that in the Notice of Meeting dated 25 August 2026, the NMC had advised Mr Nish that it would seek the imposition of a striking-off order if it found Mr Nish's fitness to practise currently impaired.

The panel noted that Mr Nish has submitted an Agreed Removal Application on 15 September 2026, in which he expressed his desire to be removed from the register as an accepted consequence of his behaviour.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Nish's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what sanction, if any, it should impose. 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 regard to the NMC Guidance on 'The sanctions available' (Reference: SAN-2 Last Updated: 28/01/2026). The decision on sanction is a matter for the panel independently exercising its own judgement.

The panel also had regard to NMC Guidance SAN-4 on 'Sanctions for the highest risk cases' (Last updated 31/07/2026).

The panel took into account the following aggravating features:

- Convictions for sexual offences including those relating to images or videos involving child sexual abuse or exploitation. These offences gravely undermine the public's trust in the professions. Any such conviction makes it highly unlikely the professional can uphold the standards and values set out in the Code
- Long-term or repeated conduct
- In general, where a professional has been convicted of a serious criminal offence or offences they should not be permitted to resume practice until they have satisfactorily completed their sentence
- Deliberate breaches of the Code
- A pattern of misconduct over a period of time

The panel could not identify any mitigating features in this case.

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.

The panel next considered a caution order and had regard to the NMC Guidance on 'Caution order' (Reference: SAN-2b Last Updated: 28/01/2026) in which the following is stated:

'A caution is only appropriate if the Committee has decided there's no risk to the public or to people using services that requires the professional's practice to be restricted. This means 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 Nish's misconduct was not at the lower end of the spectrum, and it found that there is a risk to public safety. The panel therefore determined that a sanction that does not restrict Mr Nish's practice would not protect the public. The panel also determined that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether to place conditions of practice on Mr Nish's registration. In considering whether conditions of practice are appropriate, the panel had regard to the factors set out in the NMC Guidance on 'Conditions of practice order' (Reference: SAN-2c Last Updated: 28/01/2026). Having regard to the nature and seriousness of Mr Nish's conduct, the panel determined that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The panel considered that there are no relevant, proportionate, workable or measurable conditions that could be formulated to protect patients and to uphold professional standards.

The panel went on to consider whether a suspension order is appropriate in this case. The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on 'Suspension order' (Reference: SAN-2d Last Updated: 28 January 2026) in which the following factors on when a suspension order may be appropriate are set out:

- *'the impairment is very serious but not fundamentally incompatible with continuing to be a registered professional'*

- *an outcome less severe than strike-off would still satisfy the over-arching objective.'*

The panel also had regard to the key considerations as set out in the NMC Guidance to weigh up before imposing a suspension. It noted the following list of circumstances that may make a suspension order an appropriate sanction:

- *'the charges found proved are at the most serious end of the spectrum and call into question the professional's suitability to continue practising, either currently or at all*
- *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*
- *there is a risk to the safety of people using services if the professional were allowed to continue to practise even with conditions*
- *what went wrong is so serious that public confidence in the profession and professional standards could not be maintained if the professional were able to continue practising without stopping for a period of time*
- *despite the seriousness of what happened, the professional has engaged in the proceedings and has shown at least some meaningful insight which evidences a realistic possibility that they will continue to develop this insight, address their concerns and return to practice.'*

Whilst the panel acknowledged that the risks identified could be managed by Mr Nish being temporarily removed from the register, it considered that it would not be sufficient to uphold public confidence in the profession and maintain professional standards due to the seriousness and nature of the facts found proved. The panel considered that there is no realistic possibility that he could address the concerns during a period of suspension to such a level where he could return to practise safely.

The panel noted NMC Guidance 'Sanctions for the highest risk cases' (Reference: SAN-4 Last updated: 31 July 2026), which states:

- *‘Situations where the professional has been registered as a sex offender. In such cases, the Committee should consider whether it is appropriate for the professional to return to unrestricted (or any) practice while still registered as a sex offender.*
- *Convictions for sexual offences including those relating to images or videos involving child sexual abuse or exploitation. These offences gravely undermine the public’s trust in the professions. Any such conviction makes it highly unlikely the professional can uphold the standards and values set out in the Code.’*

Any professional who is found to have behaved in this way will be at risk of being removed from the Register. This is because of the severe impact the conduct has on:

- *Public confidence*
- *A professional’s ability to uphold standards and values set out in the Code*
- *The safety of people receiving care*

If the Committee decides to impose a less severe sanction, they will need to make sure they explain the reasons for their decision clearly and carefully.’

The panel considered that the misconduct gravely undermines the trust and confidence that members of the public are entitled to place in registered nurses. The panel was satisfied that any such conduct makes it highly unlikely that Mr Nish will be able to uphold the fundamental standards and values set out in the Code and expected of the nursing profession.

The panel determined that the seriousness of the convictions, the nature of the offending and the continuing concerns identified in relation to Mr Nish, mean that suspension would be insufficient to protect people receiving care and would not adequately address the wider public interest concerns. In this particular case, the panel determined that a suspension order would not be a sufficient, appropriate or proportionate sanction.

In considering a striking-off order, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on 'Sanctions for the highest risk cases' (Reference: SAN-4 Last Updated: 28 January 2026). Having regard to all of the above, the panel determined that this case falls within the definition of being a '*highest risk case*'.

The panel had regard to the following considerations as set out in the NMC Guidance entitled 'Striking-off order' (Reference: SAN-2e Last Updated: 28/01/2026):

- *'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 was of the view that Mr Nish's actions were significant departures from the standards expected of a registered nurse and are fundamentally incompatible with him remaining on the register. The panel determined that the findings in this particular case demonstrate that Mr Nish's actions were serious and to allow him to continue practising would undermine public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body.

Balancing all of these factors and after taking into account all the evidence before it in this case, the panel determined that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of a striking-off order. Having regard to the matters it identified, in particular the effect of Mr Nish's actions in bringing the profession into disrepute by adversely affecting the public's view of how a registered nurse should conduct themselves, the panel has concluded that nothing short of a striking-off order would be sufficient in this case.

The panel considered that this order was 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 standards of behaviour required of a registered nurse.

This will be confirmed to Mr Nish in writing.

Interim order

As the striking-off order cannot take effect until the end of the 28-day appeal period, the panel has considered whether an interim order is required in the specific circumstances of this case. It may only make an interim order if it is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the public, is otherwise in the public interest or in Mr Nish's own interests until the striking-off sanction takes effect.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Representations on interim order

The panel took account that the NMC nor Mr Nish has provided representations or formal submissions in regard to an interim order.

Decision and reasons on interim order

The panel was satisfied that an interim order is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. The panel had regard to the seriousness of the facts found proved and the reasons set out in its decision for the substantive order in reaching the decision to impose an interim order.

The panel concluded that an interim conditions of practice order would not be appropriate or proportionate in this case, due to the reasons already identified in its determination for imposing the substantive order. The panel therefore imposed an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months due to the seriousness of the

conviction and the ongoing concerns regarding public protection and public confidence in the nursing profession.

The panel considered that, in the absence of an interim order, there would be a period during which Mr Nish could potentially practise before the striking-off order took effect. An interim suspension order was therefore necessary to provide continued protection to people receiving care and to maintain confidence in the profession during the appeal period.

If no appeal is made, then the interim suspension order will be replaced by the striking-off order 28 days after Mr Nish is sent the decision of this hearing in writing.

That concludes this determination.