

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

**Substantive Meeting
Friday, 11 September 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	Kiran Farooq
NMC PIN:	1312739S
Part(s) of the register:	Nurses part of the register Sub part 1 RNC: Children's nurse, level 1 (2 October 2018)
Relevant Location:	Glasgow
Type of case:	Conviction
Panel members:	Isabelle Parasram (Chair, lay member) Chanelle Gibson-McGowan (Lay member) Julia Briscoe (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Nigel Ingram
Hearings Coordinator:	Yousrra Hassan
Facts proved:	N/A
Facts not proved:	N/A
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Sanction:	Striking-off order
Interim order:	Interim suspension Order (18 months)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Meeting

The panel was informed at the start of this meeting that that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Miss Farooq's prison address by recorded delivery and by first class post on 31 July 2026, and was advised that a meeting would take place after 6 September 2026.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

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

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Farooq 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. Were convicted on 4 August 2025 in the High Court of Justiciary at Glasgow, of on 30 December 2023 at...and elsewhere you Kiran Farooq were concerned in the supplying of a controlled drug, namely Cocaine a Class A drug specified in Part I of Schedule 2 to the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 to another or others in contravention of Section 4 (1) of the aforementioned Act: Contrary to the Misue of Drugs Act 1971, Section 4 (3) (b).
2. Were convicted on 4 August 2025 in the High Court of Justiciary at Glasgow, of on 30 December 2023 at...and elsewhere you Kiran Farooq were concerned in the supplying of a controlled drug, namely a compound or compounds of the type specified in Paragraph 1 (c) of Part I of Schedule 2 to the aforementioned Act, said compound or compounds being commonly known as 'Ecstasy' a Class A drug in terms of said Act, to another or others in

contravention of Section 4 (1) of the aforementioned Act: Contrary to the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, Section 4 (3)(b).

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

Background

The charges arose whilst Miss Farooq was employed as a Registered Nurse.

Miss Farooq was convicted on 4 August 2025 at the High Court of Justiciary at Glasgow, following pleas of guilty to two charges of being concerned in the supply of Class A controlled drugs. The offences related to the supply of cocaine and ecstasy occurring on or around 30 December 2023.

At the sentencing hearing, the Court characterised the offending as a significant drug-trafficking operation rather than activity on a minor scale. In assessing its nature and extent, the Court referred to the recovery of just under £40,000 in cash, six sets of scales bearing traces of cocaine and benzocaine, a blender bearing similar traces, approximately four kilograms of bulking agent, and Class A controlled drugs with a value exceeding £175,000. The Court also referred to Miss Farooq's account in the Criminal Justice Social Work Report, which indicated that she understood the nature of her activities and had been involved in drug trafficking for some time.

The Court noted Miss Farooq's professional background as a nurse and observed that, by virtue of that profession, she would have been aware of the significant harm associated with the misuse and supply of controlled drugs.

Miss Farooq pleaded guilty, thus reducing her proposed six-year sentence to four years, commencing from 4 August 2025.

Representations on impairment

This being a conviction case the panel moved directly to determining whether or not Miss Farooq's practice was impaired by reason of her conviction.

The NMC requires the panel to bear 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 accepted the advice of the legal assessor which included reference to a number of relevant judgments. These included: *Roylance v General Medical Council (No 2)* [2000] 1 A.C. 311, *Nandi v GMC* [2004] EWHC 2317 (Admin), and *GMC v Meadow* [2007] QB 462 (Admin).

Decision and reasons on impairment

The panel next went on to decide whether, as a result of the conviction, Miss Farooq's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on '*Impairment*' (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 and to maintain professional boundaries. 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 be honest and open and 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.

The panel first considered: 'The Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives (2015)' ("the Code"). The panel determined that a number of sub-paragraphs of paragraph 20 were engaged.

20 Uphold the reputation of your profession at all times

20.1 keep to and uphold the standards and values set out in the Code

20.2 act with honesty and integrity at all times, treating people fairly and without discrimination, bullying or harassment

20.3 be aware at all times of how your behaviour can affect and influence the behaviour of other people

20.4 keep to the laws of the country in which you are practising

20.5 treat people in a way that does not take advantage of their vulnerability or cause them upset or distress

20.8 act as a role model of professional behaviour for students and newly qualified nurses, midwives and nursing associates to aspire to

In this regard the panel considered 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 fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that she/he:

- 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;*
- d) ...'*

The panel considered that Miss Farooq's conduct had not directly placed any patient or person receiving care at an unwarranted risk of harm.

However, the panel considered that Miss Farooq's convictions for serious Class A drug-related offences represented conduct fundamentally incompatible with the standards and values expected of a Registered Nurse. The panel considered that involvement in the supply of Class A drugs presents a serious risk to the safety and wellbeing of the wider public. It also took into account that, as a Registered Nurse, Miss Farooq would have been aware of the significant harm associated with the distribution and misuse of controlled drugs.

The panel had regard to the relevant fitness to practise guidance, including FTP-2c-1. The panel considered Miss Farooq's conviction for serious drug-related offences to a four-year sentence of imprisonment falls squarely within the guidance.

The panel also had regard to the fundamental principles of nursing, including compassion, respect for the dignity and worth of individuals, and a commitment to protecting and promoting the health and wellbeing of the public. It considered that Miss Farooq's deliberate involvement in the supply of Class A drugs, notwithstanding her professional knowledge of the harm that such drugs can cause, was fundamentally inconsistent with those principles.

The panel referred to the Code:

"When joining our register, and then renewing their registration, nurses, midwives and nursing associates commit to upholding these standards. This commitment to professional standards is fundamental to being part of a profession. We can take action if those on our register fail to uphold the Code. In serious cases, this can include removing them from the register."

Regarding insight, the panel considered that while Miss Farooq's offending occurred outside her nursing practice and that the criminal consequences of her conduct had been addressed through the sentence of imprisonment imposed upon her. However, the panel considered that the underlying regulatory concerns were attitudinal in nature and had not been addressed. Miss Farooq is currently in custody and there was no evidence before the panel that she had undertaken any relevant rehabilitative work, therapy or reflection to demonstrate that she had reconsidered her conduct or developed an understanding of why it was fundamentally incompatible with the standards expected of a Registered Nurse. In particular, there was no evidence that she had demonstrated an understanding of the impact of her conduct on the reputation of the nursing profession or how she would act differently in the future. The panel therefore considered that Miss Farooq had not demonstrated sufficient insight into the regulatory concerns arising from her convictions.

The panel is of the view that there remains a risk of repetition in light of any evidence of insight or remediation or any steps for Miss Farooq to strengthen her practice. 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 determined that, in this case, a finding of impairment on public interest grounds was required. It considered that Miss Farooq did not currently present a risk to patient or public safety, noting that she is presently serving a custodial sentence. However, the panel determined that the nature and seriousness of her convictions had seriously undermined professional standards and a well-informed member of the public would be appalled by the conduct of Miss Farooq.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession, and in the NMC as its regulator, would be undermined if a finding of current impairment were not made in these circumstances. Such a finding was therefore necessary to uphold proper professional standards and maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and its regulation. Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Miss Farooq'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 Miss Farooq off the register. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Miss Farooq 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 32 July 2026, the NMC had advised Miss Farooq that it would seek the imposition of a striking-off order if it found Miss Farooq's fitness to practise currently impaired.

The panel also bore in mind Miss Farooq's response in NMC form for agreed removal from the NMC register.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Miss Farooq'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 took into account the following aggravating features:

- Deliberate breaches of the Code.
- Seriousness of the criminal behaviour which resulted in a sentence of imprisonment of four years.

The panel could not identify any mitigating features.

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 Miss Farooq’s misconduct was at the higher end of the spectrum, and while it found there is no obvious risk to patient safety but could not be assured of the future position following Miss Farooq’s release from prison. The panel therefore determined that a sanction that does not restrict Miss Farooq’s practise 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 a conditions of practice on Miss Farooq’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 found that the panel determined that a condition of practice order would not be appropriate or workable. Miss Farooq is not currently practising and, therefore, there would be no realistic means of monitoring compliance with any conditions imposed. Further, the concerns arise from her conduct outside of her nursing practice and do not relate to her clinical practice that could be addressed by conditions. Having regard to the nature and seriousness of Miss Farooq’s conduct, the panel determined that a condition 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: 28/01/2026) 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 Miss Farooq’s 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. Given Miss Farooq’s limited insight, lack of remorse, together with no evidence of training and development, the panel considered that there is no realistic possibility that she would address the concerns to such a level where she could return to practise safely, additionally engaging in drug dealing on the scale identified is indicative of deep-seated attitudinal issues.

The panel determined that a suspension order would not adequately address the public interest concerns or mark the seriousness of Miss Farooq's convictions, which involved serious Class A drug trafficking and were at the more serious end of the spectrum. The panel also considered the significant risk to the wider public associated with drug trafficking and the absence of meaningful insight into her offending and the resulting regulatory concerns. Further, Miss Farooq is serving a four-year custodial sentence and would therefore be unable to return to nursing practice during the maximum 12-month period of suspension. In all the circumstances, the panel concluded that a suspension order would be insufficient to protect the public interest, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper professional standards.

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: 28/01/2026). [set out panels reasons] 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 found that the convictions found proved were fundamentally incompatible with continued registration and had seriously undermined public confidence in the nursing profession. The panel considered that public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as its regulator would be undermined if Miss Farooq were permitted to remain on the register in the circumstances of this case.

In reaching its decision, the panel gave particular weight in respect of the seriousness of the offending and the remarks made by Lord Mulholland when sentencing Miss Farooq.

The judge stated:

“As I said when you pled guilty, you shame yourself, your family and your nursing profession for which you were part of. You will know the harm that drugs bring to users: addiction, family discord, break-up, financial problems. Drug trafficking is not something that a professional nurse dedicated to helping others should be doing.”

The panel considered these observations particularly relevant to the incompatibility between Miss Farooq's involvement in serious Class A drug trafficking and the values and standards expected of a Registered Nurse. Her professional background meant that she would have been aware of the harm that the supply and misuse of controlled drugs can cause.

Miss Farooq's actions were significant departures from the standards expected of a Registered Nurse and are fundamentally incompatible with her remaining on the register. The panel was of the view that the findings in this particular case demonstrate that Miss Farooq's actions were serious and to allow her 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 during 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 Miss Farooq's actions in bringing the profession into disrepute by adversely affecting the public's view of how a Registered Nurse should conduct herself, the panel has concluded that nothing short of this 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 standard of behaviour required of a registered nurse.

This will be confirmed to Miss Farooq 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 Miss Farooq's own interests until the striking-off sanction takes effect. The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

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 fact that this was a conviction case 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 the panel's determination for imposing the substantive order. The panel determined that not to impose an interim suspension order would be incompatible with its determination.

Therefore, imposed an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months.

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

That concludes this determination.