

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Incorrect/Fraudulent Entry Hearing
Friday, 25 July 2025**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Kgalalelo Motsisi
NMC PIN:	05I0781O
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse Adult RN1 – 28 September 2005
Type of case:	Incorrect/Fraudulent entry
Panel members:	Jill Robinson (Chair, registrant member) Sally Glen (Registrant member) Darren Rice (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Alain Gogarty
Hearings Coordinator:	Catherine Acevedo
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Chuba Nwokedi, Case Presenter
Mrs Motsisi:	Present and unrepresented
Outcome:	Registration entry fraudulently procured and incorrectly made
Direction:	Directs that the Registrar remove your entry from the register
Interim order:	Interim suspension order – 12 months

Details of charge

That you,

1. On your online application for revalidation dated 29 August 2023, stated that you had a reflective discussion with Colleague A on 25 August 2023 when no such reflective discussion had taken place.
2. On your online application for revalidation dated 29 August 2023, stated that you had received confirmation from Colleague A on 25 August 2023 when you had not received such confirmation.

And thereby an entry on Sub part 1 of the NMC register in the name of Mrs Kgalalelo Motsisi, NMC PIN 05I0781O was fraudulently procured/incorrectly made.

Background

You first entered the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) register on 28 September 2005. On 29 August 2023, you submitted your online revalidation.

On 15 September 2023, the NMC received a referral from Hywel Dda University Health Board (the Trust) raising concerns about your recent revalidation.

The referral states that Colleague A received an email from the NMC thanking him for supporting your recent validation. Colleague A advised his employer, the Trust, that he had not supported you in your recent revalidation.

Colleague A informed the NMC that he was your former line manager at the Trust and has not worked with you for over a year and has not had contact with you since you left.

Colleague A said that you resigned from the Trust on 19 June 2022, and he had not been in contact with you since she left.

Colleague A said that he had not acted as your reflective discussion partner and confirmer for your recent revalidation in 2023 and that you had used his details without his knowledge or permission.

Decision and reasons on the facts

At the outset of the hearing, you informed the panel that you made admissions to charges 1 and 2.

The panel therefore finds charges 1 and 2 proved by way of your admissions.

Decision on Fraudulent/Incorrect Entry

The panel heard submissions from Mr Nwokedi on behalf of the NMC and evidence from you under oath.

Mr Nwokedi submitted that in respect of the charges concerning incorrect entry, the threshold is plainly met in this case. You were permitted to revalidate your registration based on false information you knowingly provided. The information directly related to regulatory requirements i.e. reflective discussion and confirmation. You also accept that your entries on the register were incorrect.

With regards to the concern of fraudulent entry, Mr Nwokedi submitted that this is not a case where the entry was incorrect by accident or an administrative oversight, rather all indicators point to a deliberate act:

- a. You intentionally inputted Colleague A's name and professional details;
- b. You provided a false date of discussion (25 August 2023), which you knew was fictitious;
- c. You submitted the forms knowing Colleague A had played no role in your 2023 revalidation;
- d. You have since admitted that you knew what you did was wrong at the time, describing it as a "very stupid decision" and attributing it to poor peer advice, not a misunderstanding.

Mr Nwokedi submitted that all of the above meets the criteria for deliberate deception. You have also accepted that your entry was fraudulent. He submitted that while you have admitted the facts and offered apologies, your own words confirm the deliberate and dishonest nature of your actions.

Mr Nwokedi submitted that you understood the nature of the revalidation requirements, having completed them in 2020 correctly, and you knew the importance of reflective discussions and confirmation but you circumvented the process by using details from a previous revalidation, thereby undermining the entire system of revalidation.

Mr Nwokedi submitted that this goes beyond procedural breach. It is a deliberate subversion of the regulatory system designed to ensure only competent and honest professionals remain on the register.

You gave evidence under oath. You told the panel that you understand the charges brought against you. You said you cannot deny what happened. You apologised to the panel for your actions. You said you are normally a very honest person, and you know that this has caused members of the public not to trust you. You apologised to Colleague A, members of the public, your nursing colleagues and the NMC for your mistake. You said you hope the panel can accept your apology and be lenient with you. You said you love your job and wish to continue to practise as a nurse.

In answer to questions from Mr Nwokedi, you said you were aware of the revalidation process when you decided to use Colleague A's details. You said that you had just left the Trust and you were working with an agency fulltime. You said you took advice from an agency colleague to use someone's details from a previous revalidation. You said you already knew that this advice was wrong and you still went ahead and used Colleague A's details so that you would not need to find someone else to be able to revalidate. You said there is no justification for this and you accepted that this was a short cut. You said you have not challenged the colleague who gave you the wrong advice.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel considered in respect of each charge, whether the entry on the register in your name was incorrectly made and/or fraudulently procured.

The panel bore in mind that for an entry to be fraudulent there must have been a deliberate attempt to mislead whereas if an entry is only incorrect it may involve a mistake or genuine error.

The panel took into account that you are an experienced nurse having joined the register in 2005. It accepted your oral evidence, that you said you were well aware of the revalidation process having completed it without issue in 2020. It noted that you were permitted to revalidate your registration based on false information you knowingly provided. The panel took into account that you intentionally inputted Colleague A's name and professional details for revalidation and you admitted that you knew what you did was wrong at the time, describing it as a "very stupid decision" and attributing it to poor peer advice, not a misunderstanding.

It also took into account that you accept that the entry was incorrect and fraudulent.

The panel therefore found that the entry on Sub part 1 of the NMC register in the name of Mrs Kgalalelo Motsisi, NMC PIN 05I0781O was incorrectly made and fraudulently procured.

Decision and reasons on direction

Having determined that you had fraudulently procured and incorrectly made 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.”

Mr Nwokedi referred the panel to the guidance issued by the NMC. He submitted that removal from the register is the only proportionate outcome in this case. He submitted that your actions involve dishonesty, the issue touches the heart of the public protection framework, and your actions exploit the name and details of a fellow professional without consent. He submitted that the NMC relies on the honesty of self-declared revalidation for safe and continuous practice. He submitted that beyond an apology, there is no real mitigation or explanation given for your actions.

You apologised for your actions again and that you made a mistake. You asked the panel for forgiveness and leniency. You said you understand that the public rely on nurses to be honest so that they can trust that they have enough knowledge to care for them.

The panel considered that, having found that your entry on the NMC register was incorrectly made and fraudulently procured, it would be inappropriate to take no action.

The panel took account of the NMC Guidance SAN-4 ‘Available orders for fraudulent or incorrect entry’

The panel accepted that your apologies were sincere and noted that you had some insight into your actions and the impact of this on members of the public and your colleagues. It took into account that you said you had taken the wrong advice from a colleague when you had newly moved to working with an agency.

Notwithstanding this, the panel determined that you knowingly submitted deliberately misleading information to the NMC which undermines public trust in the NMC’s revalidation process.

In all the circumstances the panel decided that the only appropriate order is to direct the Registrar to remove your entry from the register.

You will be notified of the panel’s decision in writing.

You have 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 your 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 legal assessor's advice.

The panel took account of the submissions made by Mr Nwokedi. He submitted to impose an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months to cover the appeal period. He submitted that an interim order is in the wider public interest to maintain confidence in the regulatory framework.

The panel also took into account your submissions. You told the panel about the financial hardship an interim suspension order would cause you.

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 your 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 determined that an interim order is otherwise in the public interest. It recognises that the bar for the imposition of an interim order on the public interest ground is set high.

However, the panel was satisfied that this high threshold is met in the circumstances of this case.

The panel first went on to consider whether to impose an interim conditions of practice order. It determined that an interim conditions of practice order was not workable or appropriate given the nature of its findings.

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

The panel noted that this interim order will prevent you from working as a registered nurse and, as a consequence, you may be caused financial hardship. However, in applying the principle of proportionality, the panel determined that, in any event, the wider public interest outweighed your interest in this regard.

The period of this order is for 12 months given the uncertainty in relation to the appeal period which may take up to a year.

If no appeal is made then the interim order will lapse upon the removal of your entry in the Register 28 days after you are sent the decision of this hearing in writing.

That concludes this determination