

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting  
Monday 10 February 2025**

Virtual Meeting

**Name of Registrant:** Ana Maria Reig Torro

**NMC PIN** 16C0489C

**Part(s) of the register:** Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1  
Adult Nursing - March 2016

**Relevant Location:** Bristol

**Type of case:** Lack of competence/Lack of knowledge of English

**Panel members:** Janet Fisher (Chair, lay member)  
Jan Bilton (Lay member)  
Alison Thomson (Registrant member)

**Legal Assessor:** Graeme Henderson

**Hearings Coordinator:** Shela Begum

**Order being reviewed:** Suspension order (6 months)

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired

**Outcome:** **Striking-Off order to come into effect on 28 March 2025 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 Miss Reig Torro registered email address by secure email on 7 January 2025.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review and that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 10 February 2025 and inviting Miss Reig Torro to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Reig Torro 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 28 March 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the third review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 31 August 2022. The first review of the order was held on 17 August 2023 and on that occasion the panel imposed a suspension for a further period of 12 months. At the second review on 16 August 2024, the panel imposed a suspension order for a further period of 6 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 28 March 2025.

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, whilst employed at the Bristol Royal Infirmary, between 9 October 2017 and 20 June 2018 failed to demonstrate the standards of knowledge, skill, and judgement required to practise without supervision as a band 5 nurse, in that you;*

- 1) *On or around 8 November 2017; **(proved in its entirety)***
  - a) *Failed to appropriately dispose of a needle on an insulin pen in the sharps bin.*
  - b) *Failed to appropriately dispose of an injection in the sharps bin.*
  
- 2) *On or around 10 November 2017 failed to accurately verify patient identities on wristbands. **(proved)***
  
- 3) *On 2 December 2017*
  - a) *Did not sign Patient A’s medical chart for the administration of Enoxaparin 40mg. **(proved)***

.....
  
- 4) *On or around 7 December 2017 **(proved in its entirety)***
  - a) *Did not administer Insulin Novomix to Patient C at 6p.m. as required/prescribed.*
  - b) *Delayed the administration of Insulin Novomix to Patient C by approximately 2.5 hours.*
  - c) *Incorrectly signed/indicated that the Insulin Novomix had been administered to Patient C at 6p.m.*
  
- 5) *On 10 December 2017 **(proved in its entirety)***
  - a) *Did not administer a Colomycin Nebuliser to Patient D at 8a.m. as required/prescribed.*
  - b) *Did not escalate your failure to administer the Colomycin Nebuliser to a senior member of staff/colleague.*
  - c) *Did not recognise/understand that the Colomycin Nebuliser was an antibiotic.*

- 6) On or around 13 December 2017 **(proved in its entirety)**
- a) *Placed dirty commode lids on clean worktops*
  - b) *Left disconnected IV medication next to Patient E for several hours.*
  - c) *Were unable to complete nursing handovers over the telephone.*
  - d) *Did not understand nursing handovers on the ward.*
  - e) *Were unable to understand drug chart*
  - f) *Did not change Patient F's dressing*
- 7) On 18 December 2017 you accepted the role of a band 3 nurse/Senior Nursing Assistant. **(proved)**
- 8) Between 27 December 2017 and 16 January 2018 whilst on sick leave, did not remain in contact with the Ward as required. **(proved)**
- 9) On or around 25/26 January 2018; **(proved in its entirety)**
- a) *Did not attend a training session rostered for 7.5 hours.*
  - b) *Did not inform the Ward about the non-attendance of the training session.*
  - c) *Decided to go home rather than attend the ward*
- 10) On or around 9 February 2018
- a) *Did not complete documentation on the behaviour logs for one or more patients. **(proved)***
  - b) *Did not complete documentation in care plans for one or more patients. **(not proved)***
- 11) On 10 February 2018 whilst working as a band 3 nursing assistant; **(proved in its entirety)**
- a) *Disconnected IV equipment*
  - b) *Left IV equipment hanging.*
- 12) On or around 14/15 March 2018 failed to identify/observe that an unknown patient's oxygen saturations were at 89%. **(proved)**

13) On or around 4 May 2018 you accepted the role of a band 4 Assistant Practitioner. **(proved)**

14) On 9 May 2018 following Patient H suffering a fall; **(proved in its entirety)**

- a) Did not complete the outcome of the incident in the SWARM form.
- b) Did not respond to an enquiry/email about Patient H's fall, in that you did not respond to enquiries about;
  - i) Whether the floor was dry in the toilet.
  - ii) Whether Patient H had capacity.
  - iii) If Patient H's next of kin was notified about the fall.
  - iv) Whether Patient H was aware of how to use the call bell.
  - v) Whether Patient H used any walking aids.
  - vi) Whether Patient H was independent with their mobility.
  - vii) Whether the NEWS score was the observations were taken.
  - viii) Whether Patient H suffered any injuries
  - ix) What the result of Patient H's CT scan was.
  - x) Whether a falls risk assessment was re-assessed following the fall.
  - xi) Whether the falling star was updated to RED
  - xii) Whether other staff members were informed of the fall/increased risk.

15) On or around 15/16 May 2018;

- a) Refused to provide a handover to the nurse/staff taking over the night shift. **(proved)**
- b) Used words to the effect;  
.....
  - ii. 'No update' **(proved)**

16) On or around 6 June 2018

- .....
  - b) Failed to follow the basic structure of care plans. **(proved)**

17) *On or around 20 June 2018 failed to complete an action plan to demonstrate competency within the role of a band 4 Assistant Practitioner. (proved)*

*And in light of the above your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your lack of competence.*

18) *That you, a registered nurse, do not have the necessary knowledge of English to practise safely and effectively. (proved)*”

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

*“The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Reig Torro’s fitness to practise remains impaired. There is no statutory definition of fitness to practise. However, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as a registrant’s ability to practise kindly, safely and professionally. 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 the following recommendations of the last reviewing panel:*

- *Miss Reig Torro’s engagement with the NMC.*
- *Evidence of successful completion of the IELTS test to the level required by the NMC;*
- *A reflective statement from Miss Reig Torro demonstrating her understanding of the failings identified;*
- *Provide the NMC with evidence of any relevant training undertaken; and*
- *Any testimonials from paid or unpaid employment.*

*The panel noted that Miss Reig Torro did not attend the substantive hearing and she has not engaged with the NMC since the substantive order was imposed. The panel therefore had no evidence that Miss Reig Torro has successfully completed*

*the IELTS test to the level required by the NMC. The panel also had no evidence of current insight as no reflective statement has been provided by Miss Reig Torro. The panel had no information about Miss Reig Torro's current employment status or testimonials.*

*The panel had regard to the charges found proved at the substantive hearing and determined that, as they related to a lack of knowledge of English and to a lack of competence, they are capable of remediation through re-training and successful language testing. However, it considered that as Miss Reig Torro has not evidenced that she has successfully completed the IELTS test to the required standard, there remains a risk to patients as she has not demonstrated that she has the knowledge of English that is necessary for safe and effective practice. Furthermore, in the absence of any information from Miss Reig Toro, the panel also concluded that her lack of competence has not been addressed and there is a risk of repetition and a consequent harm to patients. The panel therefore found Miss Reig Torro's fitness to practise impaired on public protection grounds in relation to both lack of knowledge of English and lack of competence.*

*The panel determined that a finding of continued impairment on public interest grounds is required as a fully informed member of the public would be concerned if a finding was not made where a nurse has not demonstrated that she has the required knowledge of English for safe and effective practice and where there are outstanding competency issues which had the potential to place patients at a risk of harm. The panel also determined that a finding of impairment was required to maintain and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance as there was no information before the panel to indicate that Miss Reig Torro has the required knowledge of English or has addressed her lack of competence.*

*For these reasons, the panel finds that Miss Reig Torro's fitness to practise remains impaired. “*

The second 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 patient safety issues identified, an order that does not restrict Miss Reig Torro’s practice would not protect patients. 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 lack of competence and lack of knowledge of English and the associated risks of repetition and public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Miss Reig Torro’s practice would not be appropriate. 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 Miss Reig Torro’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 had no evidence from Miss Reig Torro that she has the required knowledge of English necessary for safe and effective practice. Whilst a conditions of practice order could be devised to address the lack of competence, in the absence of evidence that Miss Torro has the required level of knowledge of English for safe and effective practice, a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate at this stage. The panel therefore concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest and uphold proper standards.*

*The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. The panel noted that Miss Reig Torro’s registration is only active because of these proceedings and that her NMC registration lapsed in February 2019. Miss Reig Torro has disengaged from the NMC and there is no information to suggest that she has any intention of returning to practice. The panel noted that as this case relates to a lack of competence and a lack of knowledge of English, and two years have not yet elapsed since the imposition of the substantive order, a striking off order is not currently available to it. The panel therefore decided to extend the suspension order for a period of six months, this will allow Miss Reig Torro time to engage with the*



*NMC, and if she does not, then all sanctions will be available to the next reviewing panel.*

*The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate and proportionate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest and maintain and uphold proper standards.*

*This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 28 September 2024 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:*

- *Miss Reig Torro's engagement with the NMC.*
- *Evidence of successful completion of the IELTS test to the level required by the NMC;*
- *A reflective statement from Miss Reig Torro demonstrating her understanding of the failings identified;*
- *Provide the NMC with evidence of any relevant training undertaken; and*
- *Any testimonials from paid or unpaid employment.*

*This will be confirmed to Miss Reig Torro in writing."*

## **Decision and reasons on current impairment**

The panel has considered carefully whether Miss Reig Torro'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 ability to practise kindly, safely and professionally 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.

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

The panel also noted, as set out in the previous panel's decision, that:

*“A lack of knowledge, skill or judgment of such a nature that the registrant is unfit to practise safely and effectively in any field in which the registrant claims to be qualified or seeks to practice.”*

*In respect of lack of knowledge of English, the panel has regard to the NMC Guidance on ‘English language requirements’ and it bore in mind the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (the Order), which states:*

*‘...knowledge of English... is necessary for the safe and effective practice of nursing and midwifery within the United Kingdom’.*”

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 Miss Reig Torro's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Miss Reig Torro had put nothing before it to demonstrate insight. At this meeting, the panel also noted that Miss Reig Torro has not provided any new evidence of insight or engagement since the imposition of the order. There has been no demonstration of remorse or reflection on the part of Miss Reig Torro regarding her failures. The panel noted that she had not engaged with the NMC's investigation, nor has she engaged with any of the reviews of this case following the imposition of the order.

In its consideration of whether Miss Reig Torro has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account the lack of any evidence presented by Miss Reig Torro. The panel noted that Miss Reig Torro has not submitted any evidence to indicate that she has completed the English Language Assessment IELTS course, any other relevant training courses or undertaken any remediation activities since the original hearing. Additionally, there has been no engagement with the NMC in relation to her proceedings.

The original panel determined that Miss Reig Torro was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel determined that there has been no change in Miss Reig Torro's situation or engagement. Therefore, in light of the lack of progress, the panel determined that Miss Reig Torro 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 because public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of current impairment were not made, given Miss Reig Torro's lack of engagement or remediation since the substantive hearing.

For these reasons, the panel finds that Miss Reig Torro's fitness to practise remains impaired.

### **Decision and reasons on sanction**

Having found Miss Reig Torro'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 Miss Reig Torro'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 Miss Reig Torro's failures were not at the lower end of the spectrum and that a caution order would be inappropriate in view of the issues identified, including her continued lack of engagement and failure to demonstrate any insight into her failings. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to impose a caution order.

The panel next considered whether conditions of practice on Miss Reig Torro'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 further noted that Miss Reig Torro has not engaged with the NMC thus far, which suggests that she would not be willing to meaningfully comply with any conditions of practice. Given this, the panel concluded that a 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 Miss Reig Torro has not demonstrated any progress in respect of her fitness to practise since the imposition of the substantive order nor has she demonstrated any insight into her previous failings. It bore in mind the guidance set out by the NMC on "Standard Reviews of Substantive Orders," which states:

*"If the panel concludes that continuing or imposing a conditions of practice order or suspension order is unlikely to result in the professional returning to safe*

*unrestricted practice within a reasonable period of time, it should ensure that the professional is removed from the register.”*

The panel determined that, in light of Miss Reig Torro’s lack of engagement, her failure to take the IELTSs or demonstrate any progress or insight, and the absence of any stated intention to return to practice, continuing or imposing a suspension order would not result in her returning to safe, unrestricted practice within a reasonable period of time. Therefore, a further suspension would not serve any useful purpose and would not address the public protection concerns identified.

For these reasons, the panel decided to impose a striking-off order.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 28 March 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Miss Reig Torro in writing.

That concludes this determination.