

**Complementary & Natural Healthcare Council
Conduct and Competence Panel
Notice of Decision**

Date of Hearing: 21 and 22 May 2025

Name of Registrant: Amy Payne

Registration No.: CNHC02353

Profession: Nutritional Therapist

Panel: Jon Levett (Chair), Kate Brian, Wendy Harris

Legal Advisor: Matthew Corrie

Council Representative: Hanne Stephens

Registrant Representative: Simon Butler

The Registrant was present in the hearing

Consensual Disposal

CNHC and the Registrant Amy Payne made a joint application for the consensual disposal of this matter. The application was that upon admission by the Registrant of allegations 2. a), b), c) and d) and 3 c) the sanction be a caution order.

The Panel received and accepted legal advice on this issue.

This matter had been listed for a substantive hearing and the Panel had prepared accordingly and so had read all the evidence submitted and the detailed opening submissions provided on behalf of the CNHC. The Panel, therefore, considered the application from an informed position and with an understanding of the issues in the case.

In considering the application, the Panel took heed of the public interest, in particular the need to protect the clients and other members of the public, to maintain public confidence in the complementary therapy disciplines and the CNHC and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

The Panel considered the Sanctions Guidance. In particular it was noted that a caution order will generally only be in the public interest if it is satisfied that there is no risk of repetition and the Registrant does not pose a risk of harm to the public and where the conduct is towards the lower end of the spectrum of misconduct.

F.1 of the Code of Conduct provides that:

“Respecting the skills and contributions of others

You must respect the skills and contributions that others bring to the care of clients. You must not discriminate against or unjustly criticise another health professional.”

The Registrant's statement on 23 January 2024 breached this provision of the Code and the Panel also considered the fact that the statement was on a messenger service which could be shared with others increased the seriousness of the conduct.

Despite the tragic context to this case the Panel considers that the conduct which underlies allegations 2 a), b), c) and d) and 3 c) does fall towards the lower end of the aforementioned spectrum. It relates to a single statement made in a voice note on 23 January 2024, the criticism of the NHS is confined to its approach to mould related illness, the GP records demonstrate that MP did attend his GP on a number of occasions and so there is no evidence of any harm being caused by the comments.

In addition, the Panel has carefully considered the Registrant's reflection and evidence of remediation. It notes that Dr Granger has stated that the Registrant's reflection is evidence that she has learned from the experience. Further, the Registrant is of previous good character, this character is supported by testimonial evidence both as to character and her professional abilities and there has been no repetition of the conduct.

The Panel consider a repetition to be unlikely and, therefore, consider that the risk of harm posed to the public is minimal, if any.

The Panel considered that a caution order serves as a public declaration that the Registrant's conduct was unacceptable and proportionately marks the gravity of the conduct such that public confidence in the profession and the regulatory process is maintained and proper standards of conduct and performance are declared.

The Panel considers that a caution order is consistent with the expected outcome should this matter have proceeded to a full hearing.

The Panel considered that the gravity of the conduct was such that a two year caution order was required to protect the public interest. The Panel invited submissions from the parties on this issue and ultimately the parties were agreed that a two year caution order was appropriate.