

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Monday, 21 September 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	Ioan Adrian Laurentiu
NMC PIN:	11L0147C
Part(s) of the register:	Nurses Part of the Register – Sub Part 1 RN1: Adult Nurse, Level 1 (22 December 2011)
Relevant Location:	Causeway Coast and Glens Borough
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Fiona Abbott (Chair, Lay member) Alison Thomson (Registrant member) Joanne Morgan (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Nigel Mitchell
Hearings Coordinator:	Zahra Khan
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-off order to come into effect on 3 November 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 Mr Laurentiu's registered email address by secure email on 11 August 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 21 September 2026 and inviting Mr Laurentiu 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 Mr Laurentiu 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 replace the current suspension order with a striking-off order. This order will come into effect at the end of 3 November 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 3 October 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 3 November 2026.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

The charges found proved which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

'That you, a registered nurse:

1. *Between the dates of 17 and 19 August 2023:*

a. Stored medication for multiple residents in an unlocked and/or accessible visitors/smoke room.

b. Falsely entered blood sugar readings for the following residents:

i. Patient A

ii. Patient B

c. ...

i. ...

ii. ...

2. *Your actions in charges 1b ... were dishonest in that:*

a. you knew you had not reviewed patients sufficiently or at all, and/or had not provided care to patients

b. you sought to mislead others that you had done so.

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

Schedule 1

• ...'

The original panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'The panel was satisfied that all four limbs of the Grant test are engaged.

The panel determined that residents were put at risk of harm as a result of Mr Laurentiu's misconduct. Mr Laurentiu's misconduct breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute. Having had regard to its findings at charge 2a and 2b the panel determined that Mr Laurentiu has in the past acted dishonestly.

The panel had regard to the case of Cohen v GMC [2008] EWHC 581. The panel took into account that dishonest conduct can be indicative of attitudinal concerns

which are inherently difficult to remediate. The panel also took into account that Mr Laurentiu's dishonest conduct was sustained, in that throughout the local investigation he continued to maintain that he measured Patient A and Patient B's blood glucose levels on his own glucometer. However, the panel noted that the misconduct occurred on 17/18 August 2023, he attended an investigatory meeting on 24 August 2023 and the disciplinary meeting was held on 5 September 2023. The panel therefore concluded that the local investigation and subsequent disciplinary meeting occurred over a short period of time. The panel also had regard to the fact that the misconduct occurred during one night shift and there is no evidence of a pattern of misconduct.

The panel therefore concluded that the misconduct could be remediable with sufficient insight and strengthening of practice. However, the panel had no evidence before it, of any insight, remediation and/or strengthening of practice due to Mr Laurentiu's lack of engagement.

The panel therefore concluded that there is a real risk of repetition and consequently a real risk of harm, in the absence of sufficient insight and strengthening of practice. Accordingly, the panel 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; to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold and protect the wider public interest. This 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 a finding of impairment on public interest grounds is required in order to declare and uphold the standards of conduct expected of a Registered Nurse and maintain public trust and confidence in the profession. The panel was of the view that the public's trust and confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of current impairment was not made, given the nature of the facts found proved, including dishonesty, and in the absence of sufficient insight and strengthening of practice.

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel took into account the following aggravating features:

- Conduct which put vulnerable residents, receiving care, at risk of suffering harm*
- Lack of any evidence of insight or remorse in relation to his dishonest actions*
- No evidence of any remediation and/or strengthening of practice*

The panel also took into account the following mitigating features:

- Incidents occurred over a short period of time, namely one night shift*
- Mr Laurentiu had worked at the Home since 2011 with no prior concerns having been raised*

...

The panel determined that there was no evidence of harmful deep-seated attitudinal problems, in that Mr Laurentiu's dishonesty related to a one-off incident in an otherwise unblemished career. However, the panel concluded that the misconduct identified in this case was not something that can be addressed through retraining, in that there are not discrete identifiable areas of Mr Laurentiu's practice which need to be addressed. The panel took into account that due to Mr Laurentiu's lack of engagement there is no evidence of any willingness to comply with conditions. The panel was of the view that there were no relevant, practical, workable and measurable conditions that could be formulated, given the nature of the facts found proved in this case.

Furthermore, the panel concluded that the placing of conditions on Mr Laurentiu's registration would not sufficiently protect the public or adequately address the seriousness of this case and the public interest concerns previously identified.

The panel then went on to consider whether a suspension order would be an appropriate sanction. The SG states that suspension order may be appropriate where some of the following factors are apparent:

- A single instance of misconduct but where a lesser sanction is not sufficient;*
- No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- No evidence of repetition of behaviour since the incident;*
- The Committee is satisfied that the nurse or midwife has insight and does not pose a significant risk of repeating behaviour;*

The panel took into account that there was no pattern of misconduct, this was a case of a single instance of misconduct which occurred during one night shift. The panel had regard to its previous finding that there was no evidence of harmful deep-seated attitudinal problems. The panel took into account that there was no evidence of repetition of the behaviours since the incident but noted that due to Mr Laurentiu's lack of engagement it had no information about whether he has continued to practise as a Registered Nurse. Additionally, the panel had no evidence of any insight, remediation and/or strengthening of practice.

However, having had regard to the nature of the facts found proved, the panel was satisfied that the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register. The panel determined that the misconduct could be remediable with sufficient insight and strengthening of practice and determined a period of suspension would give Mr Laurentiu an opportunity to engage with the NMC and demonstrate that he has addressed the areas of regulatory concern and is currently able to practice 'kindly, safely and professionally'.

The panel went on to consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate but, taking account of all the information before it, the panel concluded that it would be disproportionate. Whilst the panel acknowledges that a suspension may have a punitive effect, it would be unduly punitive in Mr Laurentiu's case to impose a striking-off order.

Balancing all of these factors the panel has concluded that a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel noted the hardship such an order will inevitably cause Mr Laurentiu. However, this is outweighed by the public interest in this case.

The panel considered that this order is 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.

The panel therefore determined that a suspension order for a period of 12 months with a review was appropriate in this case to mark the seriousness of the misconduct.

At the end of the period of suspension, another panel will review the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order, or it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- *Mr Laurentiu's engagement with the NMC and proceedings*
- *Any evidence of insight, remediation and/or strengthening of practise, specifically in respect of the duty of candour*
- *An in-depth reflection relating to the misconduct*
- *Any evidence of testimonials from paid or unpaid employment*
- *Evidence of Mr Laurentiu's future intentions regarding his nursing practice'.*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching its decision, the panel had regard to the NMC guidance titled 'Substantive order reviews' (Reference: REV-2, last updated on 14 October 2022). The panel

considered carefully whether Mr Laurentiu's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant's suitability to remain on the register without restriction. In considering this case, the panel carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it noted the decision of the last panel, this panel exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle, which contained the determination from the original hearing dated 3 October 2025 and an initial meeting letter sent by the NMC to Mr Laurentiu dated 27 April 2026.

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 Mr Laurentiu's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Mr Laurentiu's misconduct was capable of remediation through the development of sufficient insight and the strengthening of his practice. However, at the substantive hearing, there was no evidence before the original panel of insight, remediation or strengthened practice due to Mr Laurentiu's lack of engagement.

The panel noted that there had been no material change in circumstances since the substantive hearing. Mr Laurentiu has not engaged with the NMC during the period of the order and has not provided any information or evidence for the purposes of this review. As such, there was nothing before the panel to demonstrate that he had developed insight into his misconduct, reflected on the impact of his actions, addressed the attitudinal concerns identified by the original panel or taken any steps to remediate and strengthen his practice.

In considering whether Mr Laurentiu had taken steps to strengthen his practice, the panel therefore concluded that there was no evidence before it of any progress since the substantive hearing. In the absence of engagement, reflection or evidence of remediation,

the panel could not be satisfied that the concerns identified by the original panel had been addressed or that the risk of repetition had reduced.

The original panel determined that Mr Laurentiu was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. In the absence of any new information demonstrating that the risks previously identified had reduced, this panel determined that Mr Laurentiu remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore determined that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel also 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. Given the nature and seriousness of the misconduct, together with the absence of any evidence of insight or remediation, the panel determined that a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Laurentiu 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 also took into account the 'NMC's Sanctions Guidance' (SG) and bore 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.

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 Mr Laurentiu's practice would not be appropriate in the circumstances. The SG states that a caution order may be appropriate where *'the case is*

at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen again.' The panel considered that Mr Laurentiu'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 order on Mr Laurentiu'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 and nature of the facts found proved at the original hearing, which included dishonesty and conduct which placed vulnerable residents receiving care at risk of harm. It also took into account the attitudinal concerns identified and Mr Laurentiu's continued lack of engagement. In these circumstances, the panel was unable to formulate workable conditions that would adequately address the concerns, manage the continuing risk to the public or satisfy the wider public interest.

The panel next considered whether to impose a further period of suspension. It noted that the original panel had identified a number of aggravating features, including conduct which placed vulnerable residents receiving care at risk of harm, the absence of insight or remorse in relation to Mr Laurentiu's dishonest conduct, and the absence of any evidence of remediation or strengthened practice. The panel noted that Mr Laurentiu has now had a period of suspension in which to reflect upon and address the concerns identified by the original panel. However, he has not engaged with the NMC or provided any evidence for the purposes of this review. Therefore, there was no evidence before the panel of the development of insight or remorse, reflection on his misconduct, remediation or any steps taken to strengthen his practice. In particular, there was nothing to demonstrate that the attitudinal concerns underlying aspects of his misconduct had been addressed.

The panel considered whether a further period of suspension might provide Mr Laurentiu with an additional opportunity to engage and demonstrate remediation. However, in light of his complete lack of engagement throughout the period of the current order and the absence of any evidence of progress since the substantive hearing, the panel had no basis upon which to conclude that a further period of suspension would result in a different

position. It therefore determined that a further period of suspension would serve no useful purpose.

The panel considered that considerable evidence would be required to demonstrate that Mr Laurentiu no longer poses a risk to the public. In the absence of any such evidence, and having regard to the seriousness of the misconduct, the continuing risk of repetition, the attitudinal concerns and the lack of engagement, insight and remediation, the panel determined that it was necessary to prevent Mr Laurentiu from practising in the future.

The panel therefore concluded that a striking-off order is the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. It determined that a striking-off order is necessary and proportionate in the circumstances.

This decision will be confirmed to Mr Laurentiu in writing.

That concludes this determination.