

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Tuesday, 8 September 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Nanette Combatir Florida
NMC PIN:	02H1104O
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 Adult Nursing (Level 1) – 19 August 2002
Relevant Location:	Bury
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Nilla Varsani (Chair, Lay member) Christopher Bithell (Lay member) Patience McNay (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Ben Stephenson
Hearings Coordinator:	John Kennedy
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Lauren Fullerton, Case Presenter
Ms Florida:	Not present and unrepresented at this hearing
Order being reviewed:	Conditions of practice order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Order to lapse upon expiry, with a finding of impairment in accordance with Article 30 (1), namely 15 October 2026

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Ms Florida was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Ms Florida's registered email address by secure email on 3 August 2026.

Further, the panel noted that the Notice of Hearing was also sent to Ms Florida's representative at the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) on 3 August 2026.

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

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

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

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

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Ms Florida

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Ms Florida. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Fullerton who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Ms Florida. She submitted that Ms Florida had voluntarily absented herself.

Ms Fullerton referred the panel to the documentation from Ms Florida's representative at the RCN which confirmed she is content for the hearing to proceed in her absence and provided written submissions.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Ms Florida. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Fullerton, the representations made on Ms Florida's behalf, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to any relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Ms Florida;
- Ms Florida has informed the NMC that she has received the Notice of Hearing and confirmed she is content for the hearing to proceed in her absence;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.

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

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to permit the order to lapse with a finding of impairment at the end of 15 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the fourth review of a substantive order originally imposed as a suspension order for a period of 6 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 19 October 2023. The order was first reviewed on 2 May 2024 when a conditions of practice order was imposed for 9 months. The order was further reviewed on 16 January 2025 when the conditions of practice order was varied and extended for 9 months. The order was further

reviewed on 5 September 2025 where the conditions of practice order was varied and extended for 12 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 15 October 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, whilst employed at Fairfield General Hospital;

1) ...

2) ...

3) ...

4) *On or around 16 August 2017, inaccurately recorded Patient E's intentional rounding log to indicate that;*

a) ...

b) Patient E had declined skin care checks

5) ...

6) *Your actions in charge 4 b) were dishonest, as you knew Patient E had not declined skin care checks, but you sought to represent that they had.*

7) *On or around 26 July 2018;*

a) Did not wear Personal Protective Equipment, namely an apron when administering IV Omeprazole to Patient A.

b) ...

c) ...

- d) *Incorrectly flushed the cannula with 0.9 % Saline 50ml following the administration of IV Omeprazole to Patient A.*
 - e) *Did not record that you had incorrectly flushed the peripheral cannula with Saline 50 ml in Patient A's notes.*
 - f) *Did not document/monitor Patient A's fluid intake and urine output on an hourly basis.*
- 8) *On or around 27 July 2018, incorrectly recorded Patient A's NEWS score as green.*
- 9) *On or around 27 July 2018;*
- a) *...*
 - b) *Failed to offer Patient B a skin care check at 14:00*
 - c) *Inaccurately signed Patient B's rounding log to indicate that he had declined a skin care check at 14:00.*
 - d) *....*
 - (i) *...*
 - (ii) *...*
 - (iii) *...*
 - e) *...*
- 10) *Your actions in charge 9 c) above were dishonest as you knew Patient B had not declined a skin care check at 14:00, but you sought represent that they had.*

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

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

'The panel considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that you had developed further insight into your misconduct but there were still concerns about your ability to

practise safely with regard to IV administration and infection control practice.

Today's panel took into account that you have continued to reflect on your misconduct and you have provided an updated reflective statement. It noted that you have complied with the recommendations of the last reviewing panel as you have continued to engage actively with the NMC proceedings and you have provided positive references made on your behalf. The panel further noted that you have undertaken relevant training courses in the areas of concern.

Nevertheless, the panel considered that you are yet to fully comply with the current conditions of practice order. The panel noted that you are yet to complete the IV passport or an NHS Trust equivalent and therefore you have not strengthened your nursing practice in the area of IV administration. The panel also noted that you are currently working as a healthcare assistant, and you have been unable to secure employment as a registered nurse. Therefore, you have not yet had the opportunity to strengthen your practice and demonstrate your clinical competence, particularly in the areas of IV administration and infection prevention control.

In light of this, the panel determined that there remains a real risk of repetition and a consequent risk of harm to the public. It therefore concluded 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 determined that, given your progress in remediating the public interest concerns in this case, a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is not required.

For these reasons, the panel finds that your fitness to practise remains impaired on public protection grounds alone.'

The third 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. It had found that you have

not sufficiently strengthened your nursing practice. The panel therefore decided that taking no action would be neither proportionate nor protect the public

The panel 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 your nursing 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 your 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 a caution order would not protect the public.

The panel next considered whether imposing a further conditions of practice order on your 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 you have not been able to comply with the current conditions of practice. Despite your efforts, you have been unable to secure employment as a registered nurse and have not completed all your IV passport or an NHS Trust equivalent. The panel heard from Ms Maqboul that you have completed an online element of this training and provided evidence of this. However, it still remains that you will need to complete practical elements, any aspect that remains outstanding and an assessment. The panel also noted your progress so far in further developing your insight into your misconduct and in remediating the concerns. It noted that you have been actively engaging with these proceedings and that you require further time to secure a nursing role in order to take steps to strengthen your practice.

The panel therefore determined that a conditions of practice order remains appropriate and proportionate to address the failings highlighted in this case. It was of the view that a further conditions of practice order remains sufficient to protect the public.

The panel was of the view that to impose a suspension order or striking-off order would be wholly disproportionate and would not be a reasonable response in the circumstances of this case given that such an order would deprive you of the opportunity to strengthen your nursing practice.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to vary the current conditions of practice order and extend it for a period of 12 months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 15 October 2025. 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. You must limit your nursing practice to one substantive employer which can be an agency.*
- 2. You must obtain and provide a monthly record or supervision notes in the form of a report/feedback log or clinical competence checklist from a registered nurse, focusing on your clinical practice and in particular, infection prevention control.*
- 3. You must not administer IV drugs, until you have passed your IV passport or an NHS Trust equivalent including practical assessment of your competency. Evidence of such completion should be provided to your case officer prior to any future NMC review hearing or meeting.*
- 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 twelve months in order to provide you with sufficient time to obtain employment as a registered nurse and demonstrate compliance with the conditions of practice order.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 15 October 2025 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 you have 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:

- *Your continuing engagement with the NMC proceedings.*
- *Updated testimonials, including at least one from your current manager and other staff you have recently worked alongside.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Ms Florida'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 the written submissions for the RCN on behalf of Ms Florida.

Ms Fullerton submitted that it is open for the panel to decide if Ms Florida's fitness to practice remains impaired and if so whether to impose a striking-off order or to permit the current order to lapse. She submitted that as Ms Florida has not been able to secure nursing employment meaning the conditions of practice order has not been able to become effective and therefore there remains a risk of repetition.

Ms Fullerton made reference to the NMC Guidance Rev-2h and submitted that the NMC is neutral as to whether the panel accede to the RCN position of lapse with impairment or if the panel instead chose a striking off order.

In the written submissions provided to the panel, the RCN stated that Ms Florida has no intention of returning to nursing practice, that her registration is only effective because of the substantive order, and that the misconduct was not at the most serious end. Therefore the RCN submitted that allowing the order to lapse with a finding of impairment would be appropriate in this case.

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

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

The panel considered whether Ms Florida's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the RCN have stated that Ms Florida has not been able to secure a nursing role and that she has not been in practice since 2023, when the order was first imposed. Therefore the panel found that the conditions of practice order have not become operative and as such Ms Florida has not been able to demonstrate any strengthening of practice or remediation. In light of this, this panel determined that Ms Florida 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 determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

The panel then considered the submissions of the RCN to allow the order to lapse with a finding of impairment. The panel noted the NMC Guidance Rev-2h and considered the following points in reaching its decision.

‘It is not in the public interest or a professional’s interests to remain on the register indefinitely when they are not fit to practise;’

The panel noted that Ms Florida has been subject to a substantive order since 2023 and the misconduct relates to events that occurred nearly ten years ago in 2017 and 2018, and that it is not in the interests of fairness to allow her to remain on the register indefinitely.

- *‘the professional would no longer be on the register but for the order in place;*
- *the panel concludes that the professional is unlikely to return to safe unrestricted practice within a reasonable period of time;*
- *The case relates solely to health or English language or is one where the professional has retired and has made it clear through engagement with the NMC and evidence that they do not intend to return to practice or situations where a professional’s inability to address impairment not related to health (for example misconduct or lack of competence) is clearly related to a health condition;*
- *The case doesn’t involve concerns of the kind referred to in our guidance on sanctions for the highest risk cases.’*

The panel considered that Ms Florida did not complete revalidation by 31 August 2026 and therefore only remains on the register because of the substantive order in place. Through her RCN representative Ms Florida has accepted she is unlikely to return to safe unrestricted practice within a reasonable time and that she has no intention of returning to nursing practice.

The panel noted that the misconduct in this case is not at the most serious end of the highest risk concerns.

The panel considered the reference to the case of *PSA v NMC & Graham* [2025] EWHC 3132 (Admin) and noted that Ms Florida has remained fully engaged with the NMC process throughout the review process and that, through her RCN representative, has

made written submissions before this panel. Therefore, the panel considered that there has been meaningful engagement and contact with the NMC since the last hearing.

In light of all the above, the panel considered that in this case it is appropriate to allow the order to lapse with a finding of impairment. Noting that should Ms Florida seek to rejoin the register in the future this finding will remain, and that she will need to complete the necessary steps to return to safe unrestricted practice following being out of practice for at least three years.

This will be confirmed to Ms Florida in writing.

That concludes this determination.