

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Fraudulent Entry Meeting
Thursday 11 December 2025**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant:	Mutiat Titilope Bello
NMC PIN:	22H3896E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse Sub Part 1 – Mental Health – March 2023
Relevant Location:	Lincolnshire
Type of case:	Incorrect/Fraudulent entry
Panel members:	Katriona Crawley (Chair, Lay member) Naomi Smith (Registrant member) Linda Hawkins (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Gillian Hawken
Hearings Coordinator:	Rebecka Selva
Outcome:	Registration entry fraudulently procured in respect of the charge
Direction:	Removal of entry from the register
Interim order:	Interim suspension order (18 months)

Service of Notice of Meeting

The panel noted that notice of this meeting was sent to Ms Bello's registered email address by secure email on 29 October 2025.

The notice of meeting informed Ms Bello that a meeting would be held on or after 3 December 2025 and the charge against her and enclosed a bundle of evidence that the panel would consider. It also informed her that if she wished to provide a written response, she should do so no later than 2 December 2025.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of the information available, the panel was satisfied that reasonable notice of this meeting has been served in compliance and accordance with Rules 5 and 34 of the Rules.

The panel considered that this case was suitable to be considered at a meeting, rather than at a hearing. It had regard to the numerous attempts by the NMC to secure Ms Bello's engagement in July and August 2025. Ms Bello had not responded to those communications or the notice of meeting.

Details of charge

That you....

1. On your application form dated 9 March 2023 to join the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) register you did not declare that you were being prosecuted for four offences of conspiring to facilitate a breach of UK immigration law by a non-EU citizen.

And thereby an entry on Sub Part 1 of the NMC register in the name of Ms Mutiat Titilope Bello, PIN 22H3896E, was fraudulently procured and/or incorrectly made.

Background

On 5 June 2023 the NMC received a self-referral from Ms Bello informing that she had been convicted at Chelmsford Crown Court of an offence of conspiracy to facilitate breach of immigration law by a non-EU citizen and was awaiting sentencing.

Ms Bello was sent a Notice of Criminal Charge dated 3 March 2020 and informed that she was required to attend Colchester Magistrates' Court on 31 March 2020.

On 9 March 2023, Ms Bello submitted her admission application to join the NMC register. Ms Bello stated '*no*' to the question '*Have you received a police charge, caution, conviction or conditional discharge that is not protected?*'.

On 12 May 2023, Ms Bello was convicted of four counts of conspiracy to facilitate a breach of UK immigration law by a non-EU citizen. Ms Bello was sentenced on 30 June 2023.

The Certificate of Conviction certified on 12 July 2023 stated that Ms Bello received a 24-month custodial sentence, albeit that it was suspended for 24 months, and 150 hours of unpaid work.

Decision and reasons on the facts

In reaching its decisions on the disputed facts, the panel took into account all the documentary evidence in this case which included: a Notice of Criminal Charge from Essex police issued on 3 March 2020, Certificate of Conviction certified on 12 July 2023, Ms Bello's self-referral sent to the NMC on 5 June 2023 and Ms Bello's reflective account sent to the NMC by her former representative dated 17 January 2025.

The panel was aware that the burden of proof rests on the NMC, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, namely the balance of probabilities. This means that a fact will be proved if a panel is satisfied that it is more likely than not that the incident occurred as alleged.

The panel also had regard to the written statements of the following witnesses:

- Witness 1: Registrations Investigations Manager
at the NMC;
- Witness 2: Head of School – Nursing and
Midwifery at University of Derby.

Before making any findings on the facts, the panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Charge 1

That you....

1. On your application form dated 9 March 2023 to join the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) register you did not declare that you were being prosecuted for four offences of conspiring to facilitate a breach of UK immigration law by a non-EU citizen.

And thereby an entry on Sub Part 1 of the NMC register in the name of Ms Mutiat Titilope Bello, PIN 22H3896E, was fraudulently procured and/or incorrectly made.

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account of all the witness and documentary evidence before it.

The panel had sight of Ms Bello's Notice of Criminal Charge from Essex police issued on 3 March 2020 which predated her application to the NMC on 9 March 2023. The panel noted the specific charges:

- *Between 05/10/2011 and 01/12/2015 at Dagenham in the county of Essex conspired together with Acquaintance 1 and Acquaintance 2 to do an act, namely entered into a sham marriage with Acquaintance 2, which facilitated the commission of a breach of immigration law, namely the illegal application for British Citizenship,*

by a person, namely yourself, who was not a citizen of the European Union, knowing or having reasonable cause for believing that the act facilitated the commission of a breach of immigration law by that person and that the person was not a citizen of the European Union Contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1977.

- *Between 01/09/2015 and 30/03/2018 at Dagenham in the county of Essex entered into an arrangement which you knew or suspected facilitated the acquisition, retention, use or control of criminal property, namely monies from a fraudulent bank account, by or on behalf of another person, namely Acquaintance 1. Contrary to sections 328(1) and 334 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.*
- *Between 01/09/2015 and 30/03/2018 at Dagenham in the county of Essex concealed, disguised, converted, transferred or removed criminal property, namely monies from a fraudulent bank account, by means of transferring it to another bank account. Contrary to sections 327(1) and 334 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.*
- *Between 01/09/2015 and 30/03/2018 at Dagenham in the county of Essex acquired, used or had possession of criminal property, namely monies from a fraudulent bank account. Contrary to sections 329(1) and 334 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.*

In coming to its decision in relation to the factual charge around Ms Bello not declaring that she was being prosecuted for the four criminal offences, the panel had regard to her application form to the NMC. In response to the question of '*have you received a police charge, caution, conviction or conditional discharge that is not protected?*' Ms Bello responded '*no*'. Ms Bello answered '*yes*' to the question asking if she was of good character to enable her to practise safely and effectively. Ms Bello confirmed on the face of the form that all the information provided was true and accurate.

The panel also had regard to Ms Bello's written reflection in which she appeared to accept that she had failed to declare her police charges:

'My failure to disclose this information falls short of the standards, and I regret this deeply... I fully understand the impact of my failure to disclose to NMC earlier

during my registration has significant implications and I compromised the integrity of the registration process.'

In light of all the evidence, the panel was satisfied that the NMC had discharged its burden of proof and that Ms Bello did not declare that she had been charged and was being prosecuted in the criminal courts. It therefore found this charge proved.

The panel next went on to consider if the NMC have proved whether the entry was fraudulently procured and/or incorrectly made. The panel bore in mind that for an entry to be fraudulent there must have been a deliberate attempt to mislead whereas an incorrect entry involves a mistake or genuine error. The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance '*What is incorrect entry or fraudulent entry (IEFE)?*' of 7 October 2025.

The panel determined that Ms Bello deliberately tried to mislead the registrar when she completed her application. The panel was satisfied that when Ms Bello submitted her application form to the NMC she knew that she was being prosecuted for criminal offences, having been sent the Notice of Criminal Charges on 3 March 2020 in advance of the completion of the application form on 9 March 2023. The panel referred to Ms Bello's reflection which stated:

'Upon reflection, I realize that my decision at the time of joining the register not to disclose my police charge was not guided by an intent to deceive, but rather stemmed from fear of rejection, immense shame about the charges, the uncertainty regarding my immigration status and fear about how it would impact my future nursing career which has always been my passion and life goal. This created significant anxiety and the emotional response clouded my judgement. I was overwhelmed and made the wrong decision by prioritizing my immediate concerns over the ethical obligation to be transparent. While these emotions provide context, they do not excuse my actions. This omission was not only a breach of legal requirements but also an ethical failing, that contravenes the NMC Code as honesty and integrity are foundational to the nursing profession and I now realize that honesty, even in difficult situations, is crucial to maintaining professional integrity and it was my responsibility to seek clarification and act transparently.'

The panel determined that Ms Bello had deliberately submitted her application form with false and misleading information in it.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor who referred it to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67, in which Lord Hughes stated:

‘When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual’s knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of his belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest.’

The panel found Ms Bello’s conduct to have been dishonest taking into account both elements of the *Ivey* test.

Accordingly, on the balance of probabilities the panel found that the entry on the Sub Part 1 of the NMC register in the name of Mutiat Titilope Bello, PIN 22H3896E was fraudulently procured.

Decision and reasons on direction

Having determined that Ms Bello had fraudulently procured an entry on the NMC’s register, the panel went on to decide what direction, if any, to make under Article 26(7) of the ‘Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001’ (the Order).

Article 26(7) states:

‘...If the Investigating Committee is satisfied that an entry in the register has been fraudulently procured or incorrectly made, it may make an order

that the Registrar remove or amend the entry and shall notify the person concerned of his right of appeal under article 38.”

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

The panel considered that, having found that Ms Bello’s entry on the NMC register was fraudulently procured, it would be inappropriate to take no action or direct that the register be amended.

In all the circumstances, including finding that Ms Bello’s conduct was dishonest, the panel decided that the only appropriate order is to direct the Registrar to remove Ms Bello entry from the register. The panel recognised the importance of maintaining the integrity of the NMC register.

Ms Bello will be notified of the panel’s decision in writing. Ms Bello has the right to appeal the decision under Article 38 of the Order. This order cannot take effect until the end of the 28-day appeal period or, if an appeal is made, before the appeal has been concluded.

Decision and reasons on interim order

Having directed that the Registrar remove Ms Bello’s entry from the register, the panel then considered whether an interim order was required under Article 26(11) of the Order, in relation to the appeal period.

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

In reaching its decision on whether to impose an interim order, the panel had regard to the reasons set out in its decision on the facts and its decision to direct the Registrar to remove Ms Bello’s entry from the Register. It also had regard to the NMC’s published Guidance on Fraudulent and incorrect entry cases. It noted that the imposition of an interim order is not an automatic outcome but is a matter for the panel’s discretion in the circumstances of the case, having regard to the public interest in maintaining the integrity of the register. It also had regard to Article 31 of the Order and the NMC’s Guidance on interim orders.

The panel first then went on to decide whether to impose an interim conditions of practice order. The panel determined that an interim order was otherwise in the public interest to protect the reputation of the profession and the integrity of the register.

The panel determined that an interim conditions of practice order was not workable or appropriate in this case.

Accordingly, the panel determined that an interim suspension order was in the public interest to protect the reputation and integrity of the profession and the NMC as its regulator.

The period of this order is for 18 months to allow for the possibility of an appeal to be made and determined.

If no appeal is made, then the interim order will lapse upon the removal of Ms Bello's entry in the Register 28 days after she is sent the decision of this hearing in writing.

This will be confirmed to Ms Bello in writing.

That concludes this determination.