

Nursing and Midwifery Council
Fitness to Practise Committee

Substantive Order Review Hearing
Monday, 28 September 2026

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Karuru Satala (also known as Olivia Satala)
NMC PIN:	03Y0279O
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 Adult Nursing – 14 August 2003
Relevant Location:	Stoke-on-Trent
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Tracy Stephenson (Chair, Lay member) Prisca Igwe (Registrant member) Alan McCrum (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Valeria Charbit
Hearings Coordinator:	Sabrina Khan
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Frances Easton, Case Presenter
Mrs Satala:	Not present and not represented
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Suspension order (2 months) to come into effect on 30 September 2025 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Mrs Satala was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Mrs Satala's registered email address by secure email on 28 August 2026.

Mrs Easton, 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, dates and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Mrs Satala'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 Mrs Satala 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 Mrs Satala

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mrs Satala. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Easton, who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Mrs Satala.

Ms Easton referred the panel to the email dated 28 September 2026 from Ms Satala requesting an adjournment of today's proceedings. In the email Ms Satala stated:

[PRIVATE]

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Mrs Satala. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Easton 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:

- Mrs Satala has informed the NMC that she is aware of the hearing but she is unable to attend due to the fact that [PRIVATE] until this morning and [PRIVATE];
- Mrs Satala has not provided any medical evidence; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case as it is due to expire on 30 September 2026.

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

Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private

Ms Easton made a request that this case be held partly in private on the basis that proper exploration of Mrs Satala's case involves references to [PRIVATE]. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the Rules.

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

The panel determined to go into private session in connection with [PRIVATE] as and when such private issues are raised to protect [PRIVATE]'s privacy.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to impose a suspension order for two months.

This order will come into effect at the end of date in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the third review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of six months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 28 February 2025. The order was reviewed on 22 August 2025 when the panel confirmed that order for 12 months.

The current order is due to expire on 30 September 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, working a day shift on 17 October 2021:

1. *During one-to-one observation of Resident A, failed to maintain constant eyesight observation in that you:*

- a) ...
- b) ...
- c) ...
- d) *Slept on duty [PROVED]*

2. *Failed to provide Resident A with the requisite care in that you did not:*

- a) *Monitor Resident A's breathing and/or [PROVED]*
- b) *Monitor the development of secretions and/or [PROVED]*
- c) *Remove the saliva Resident A had secreted and/or [PROVED]*
- d) *Monitor Resident A's risk of choking [PROVED]*

3. *Your actions as particularised at 1 – 2 above exposed Resident A to the risk of aspiration and/or choking and/or harm [PROVED]*

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

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

'The panel took into account that you have engaged with these proceedings. The panel had regard to your written statement and reflection. The panel acknowledged that this is not a case where deep-seated attitudinal concerns have been identified. It acknowledged that you admitted to the regulatory concerns and have demonstrated some insight through your written reflection, although minimal. However, the panel submitted that this reflection lacks depth of insight and remorse for your misconduct, as although you recognise that you should not have been 'nodding off' whilst on-duty, you have not demonstrated a sufficient understanding of the impact of your actions on the resident and their family. Therefore, the panel decided that you have not demonstrated sufficient insight or remediation, at this time.

The panel noted it has received no new information that shows that you have taken steps to develop your insight or strengthen your practice through training or professional development to remediate the concerns found. The panel has also received no new evidence of where you are currently working or your future plans for returning to nursing and how you plan to maintain safe practice.

The last reviewing panel determined that you were liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Having had regard to all the information before it, today's panel determined that you remain liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved, given the insufficient evidence of insight and remediation in respect of the areas of regulatory concern. 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 both public protection and public interest grounds is required. This is because members of the public would have their confidence in the profession and the NMC undermined in circumstances whereby a nurse who represented a risk of harm to the public were permitted to return to practice without restriction.

For these reasons, the panel finds that your fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

'The panel noted that you have provided limited evidence that you have addressed any of the fitness to practise concerns raised by the previous panel and have had limited engagement with the NMC since the order was imposed. You have provided very limited new information to the panel.

The panel next considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. The panel noted that you have shown limited remorse for your misconduct, as although in your written reflection you recognise that you should not have been 'nodding off' whilst on-duty, the panel are not assured that you have demonstrated sufficient insight into the impact of your behaviour and recognise the risks to the resident, or the wider profession.

The panel was of the view that extending the suspension order would allow you further time to fully reflect on your previous misconduct. The panel concluded that a further 12-month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford you adequate time to demonstrate meaningful insight, and address the concerns raised by the previous panel regarding your fitness to practise. This includes taking steps to develop insight and demonstrate strengthening of your practice

through providing evidence of professional development or training, alongside written reflections.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to protect both the public and satisfy the wider public interest. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

The panel did consider whether to make a striking-off order but considered such a sanction to be disproportionate when focusing on the matters found proved at the original hearing. However, you should be aware that if you choose to not re-engage with these proceedings, then you risk such an outcome at any subsequent review. It would not be appropriate for panels to continuously extend their suspension orders in the hope that a registrant will eventually comply with its suggestions. Accordingly, the panel wishes to encourage you to follow the suggestions made below to assist the future panel reviewing this case.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 30 September 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.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- *Your continued engagement and attendance at NMC proceedings.*
- *Evidence of completed relevant training/courses on high dependency and critical care, risk assessment and accountability and professionalism.*
- *Testimonials or character references.*

- *Detailed reflection using a recognised reflective model to demonstrate insight on addressing patient safety and care, accountability and assessment of priorities, and what you have learnt since the incident.*
- *An update on your employment since the incident and your future intentions regarding your nursing career.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mrs Satala'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. It has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Easton.

Ms Easton submitted that Mrs Satala had provided no further evidence of insight since the previous hearing. In particular, she had not provided an updated reflection, evidence of completed training courses, or information showing how she had strengthened her practice.

Ms Easton submitted that, in the absence of such evidence, there was no basis to conclude that the risk identified at the previous hearing had changed. She submitted that Mrs Satala continued to pose a risk to the public and invited the panel to extend the current suspension order to protect the public.

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 Mrs Satala's fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of misconduct. It considered the findings and reasons of the previous panel, the information available at this review and the submissions made on behalf of the NMC.

The panel noted that the underlying concerns included misconduct relating to sleeping while on duty. It agreed with the previous panel's assessment of the seriousness of those concerns and the risk they presented. The panel considered whether there had been any material change since the last hearing that would demonstrate improved insight, strengthened practice or a reduction in the risks posed by Mrs Satala.

The panel noted that Mrs Satala had attended a previous hearing and had therefore engaged with the process to that extent. However, she had not provided substantive submissions at that hearing or supplied evidence during that hearing or since then. In particular, the panel had received no updated reflection, training evidence, testimonial, character reference or other material demonstrating how she had addressed the concerns of previous panels. The panel noted Mrs Satala's previous statement that she had not received the documents but observed that the previous panel had clearly identified the information that would assist a future review. That information had still not been provided.

The panel was mindful of the information about Mrs Satala's [PRIVATE] and took those circumstances into account. Nevertheless, on the evidence before it, the panel could not conclude that the concerns identified at the previous hearing had been addressed or that the risk of repetition had reduced.

The panel determined that a continuing finding of impairment was necessary to protect the public. It also considered the wider public interest. Given the seriousness of the misconduct and the absence of evidence demonstrating insight or remediation, the panel concluded that a fully informed member of the public would be concerned if Mrs Satala were permitted to practise without restriction at this stage.

The panel therefore determined that Mrs Satala's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of misconduct, on both public protection and public interest grounds.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mrs Satala's 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 Mrs Satala'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 Mrs Satala'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 Mrs Satala's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is 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. The panel was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to Mrs Satala's misconduct.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Mrs Satala further time to fully reflect on her previous failings. The panel concluded that a further two months suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Mrs Satala adequate time to

further develop her insight and take steps to strengthen their practice. It would also give Mrs Satala an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals to attest to her integrity in the workplace since the substantive hearing.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for the period of two months would provide Mrs Satala with an opportunity to provide relevant information before the next review. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 30 September 2026 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.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Evidence of Mrs Satala's continued engagement with the NMC process and attendance at the next review;
- Evidence of completed training relevant to high dependency or critical care practice;
- Testimonials or character references;
- A detailed reflection using a recognised reflective model, addressing the misconduct, its impact, her insight and the steps taken to prevent repetition; and
- Information about any employment and how Mrs Satala has maintained or strengthened her practice.

The panel wished to make clear the seriousness of the position. If no meaningful evidence of insight and remediation is provided at the next review, striking off is likely to be considered. Any decision on impairment and sanction will remain a matter for the future reviewing panel, based on the evidence available to it at that time.

The panel also noted that any future request for an adjournment would need to set out a specific reason and be supported by relevant evidence where available, including

evidence of [PRIVATE] if relied upon. Any such request would be decided on its merits at the time.

This will be confirmed to Mrs Satala in writing.

That concludes this determination.