

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Wednesday, 2 September 2026**

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

Name of Registrant:	Zeriya Pamela Gandifere
NMC PIN:	18F2034E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 Mental Health Nursing – 04 September 2019
Relevant Location:	Scunthorpe
Type of case:	Misconduct and Health
Panel members:	Angela Kell (Chair, Lay Member) Richard Curtin (Registrant Member) Colleen Sterling (Lay Member)
Legal Assessor:	Paul Housego
Hearings Coordinator:	Angela Nkansa-Dwamena
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect at the end of 15 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Meeting

The panel noted at the start of this meeting that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Ms Gandifere's registered email address by secure email and her registered address by recorded delivery on 24 July 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review, that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 31 August 2026 and inviting Ms Gandifere to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Ms Gandifere 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 15 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the second review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 16 September 2024. This was reviewed on 1 September 2025, when the order was extended for a further 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 which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

'That you, a Registered Mental Health Nurse:

1. Have or have had in the past one or more of the health conditions set out in Schedule 1.

2. As a consequence of your health condition between 9 and 10 August 2019 slept on duty.

3. Between 09 August 2019 and 10 August 2019:

a. Slept whilst on duty.

b. Failed to maintain 1:1 observations on Resident A between 03:00-04:00 on said date.

4. Your actions at Charge 3:

a. Intentionally took an unreasonable risk with Resident A's safety and/or

b. Contributed to the death of Resident A.

5. Between 09 August 2019 and 10 August 2019 recorded an entry timed at 0400 which incorrectly recorded amongst other things that Resident A was asleep and there were no issues.

6. Your conduct in Charge 5 was dishonest in that you:

a. Knew you had not observed Resident A sleeping between 03:00 and 04:00 on said date.

b. Sought to conceal that you had not undertaken the observations.

c. Intended any reader of Resident A's notes to believe that you had undertaken the observations.

AND, in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your health in charges 1 and 2 and misconduct in charges 3-6.

Schedule 1:

[PRIVATE]'

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

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

The panel noted that the original panel found that Ms Gandifere had insufficient insight. At this meeting the panel determined that it had no further information regarding Ms Gandifere's insight into her misconduct and how this would have impacted Patient A, her colleagues, the public and the reputation of the nursing profession. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Gandifere continues to lack insight.

In its consideration of whether Ms Gandifere has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that it has before it no new information or evidence of having strengthened her practice.

The original panel determined that Ms Gandifere was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel was of the view that Ms Gandifere remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved, as she has not engaged with the NMC, nor has she presented any remediation nor insight into her failings.

In light of this the panel determined that Ms Gandifere is still 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 Gandifere's fitness to practise remains impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds.'

The first reviewing panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel considered extending the current period of suspension. It was of the view that a further period of suspension would allow Ms Gandifere further time to fully reflect on her previous failings and further time to engage with the NMC. It considered that Ms Gandifere needs to gain a full understanding of how the dishonesty of one nurse can impact upon the nursing profession as a whole and not just the organisation that the individual nurse is working for. The panel concluded that extending the suspension order by a period of 12 months would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Ms Gandifere adequate time to develop her insight and take steps to strengthen her practice. It would also give Ms Gandifere an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals to attest to her honesty and integrity in her workplace assignments since the substantive hearing.

The panel considered whether it would be proportionate at this stage to impose a striking-off order but determined that it would not. The panel was mindful that this was the first review of the original order and was of the view that it would be appropriate to allow Ms Gandifere with a further opportunity to consider her position and engage with the NMC.

The panel determined therefore that an extension to the current suspension order is the appropriate order which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to extend the suspension order for the period of 12 months to provide Ms Gandifere with an opportunity to engage with the NMC and to provide evidence of both insight and remediation into her actions. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate order available.

This extension to the suspension order will take effect upon the current date of expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 15 October 2025 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.

The panel noted and adopted the following recommendations made for the registrant, by the original panel:

- 1. A reflective piece, demonstrating Ms Gandifere's insight into the charges found proved and the impact her misconduct and health condition had on Resident A, colleagues and the wider public;*
- 2. Evidence of strengthening of practice;*
- 3. Evidence of any relevant work Ms Gandifere is currently undertaking;*
- 4. Evidence of Continuing Professional Development;*
- 5. If relevant, any testimonials in support of Ms Gandifere's practice;*
- 6. Evidence of Ms Gandifere's management of her health condition; and*
- 7. Any information about Ms Gandifere's intentions for her practice in the future.*

The panel was concerned that there was no evidence that Ms Gandifere had engaged with the above recommendations of the previous panel, or the NMC, since the original hearing.'

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel considered carefully whether Ms Gandifere'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 the 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 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 noted that the previous panel found that Ms Gandifere had demonstrated insufficient insight into her misconduct. At today's meeting, the panel determined that it had no further information regarding Ms Gandifere's insight into her misconduct and how this contributed to Resident A's death and the impact on Ms Gandifere's colleagues, the public and the reputation of the nursing profession. The panel therefore concluded that Ms Gandifere continues to demonstrate a lack of insight.

In its consideration of whether Ms Gandifere has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account that Ms Gandifere has provided no new information or evidence to demonstrate that she has strengthened her practice since the last review of the substantive order.

The panel noted that the previous panels also determined that Ms Gandifere was likely to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Again, today's panel was of the view that Ms Gandifere remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved, as she has not engaged with the NMC, nor has she presented any evidence of remediation, insight, reflection or strengthened practice to the original panel, to the first reviewing panel or to this panel. The panel therefore concluded that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel bore 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 there was no evidence of developing insight, reflection or remediation since the previous panel's decision. In these circumstances, the panel determined that a finding that Ms Gandifere's fitness to practise was no longer impaired would undermine public confidence in the nursing profession and in the NMC as its regulator and would fail to uphold proper professional standards because of the tragic circumstances of the case. 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 Gandifere's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

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

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

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Ms Gandifere'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 Ms Gandifere'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 Ms Gandifere's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel was 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 as it was of the view that there was no information before it to suggest that Ms Gandifere would comply with a conditions of practice order. The panel noted that Ms Gandifere had not provided the NMC with any information regarding her current

employment or whether she intends to return to practice as a nurse. In view of this, the panel considered that any conditions of practice order would not be workable and would serve no useful purpose.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that Ms Gandifere has not shown remorse for her misconduct, nor has she demonstrated any insight into her previous failings. It further noted that Ms Gandifere has shown no engagement with the NMC. The panel was of the view that it is a nurse's professional responsibility to maintain engagement with their regulator and it appears that Ms Gandifere has failed to do so throughout these proceedings.

The panel was of the view that considerable evidence would be required to show that Ms Gandifere no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel noted that no information has been provided by Ms Gandifere that shows that she has reflected on her misconduct or that she has shown any insight into or remorse for her failings.

The panel therefore determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances and that there is no realistic prospect of Ms Gandifere returning to safe professional practice.

The panel then went on to consider whether a striking off order would be an appropriate sanction. The panel took into account NMC Guidance *REV-2h* 'Allowing nurses, midwives or nursing associates to be removed from the register when there is a substantive order in place'. The guidance states:

'Cases where striking-off is likely to be appropriate include when:

- the professional has shown limited engagement and/or insight,*
- ...the professional has otherwise made no or negligible progress towards addressing issues with their fitness to practise.'*

The panel considered the above points are engaged in the circumstances of this case as Ms Gandifere's misconduct has and would continue to put patients at risk of harm and is therefore fundamentally incompatible with her remaining on the register. The panel

determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Ms Gandifere from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

The panel did consider allowing Ms Gandifere's order to lapse with impairment upon its expiry, thereby removing her from the register. However, the panel found that in light of the seriousness of her misconduct and her lack of engagement with the NMC, the only appropriate sanction was that of a striking-off order.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 15 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Ms Gandifere in writing.

That concludes this determination.