

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

**Substantive Hearing
Monday, 21 July 2025 – Friday, 25 July 2025
Monday, 28 July – Wednesday 30 July 2025**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Sabbatha Shedrack
NMC PIN:	13C0573E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse - Adult
Relevant Location:	West Sussex
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Richard Weydert-Jacquard (Chair, Registrant member) Matthew Clarkson (Lay member) Vanessa Bailey (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Oliver Wise
Hearings Coordinator:	Tyra Andrews
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Amy Hazlewood, Case Presenter
Ms Shedrack:	Present and unrepresented at this hearing until 25 July 2025 Not present and unrepresented from 28 July 2025
Facts proved:	Charges 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3
Facts not proved:	Not applicable
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Sanction:	Suspension order (6 months)
Interim order:	No order

Details of charge

That you, a registered nurse;

- 1) In or around 2019, incorrectly stated;
 - a) On your 'LinkedIn' profile, that you had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health 7, from South Bank University between 2013-2015.
 - b) On your 'Hola' profile, that you had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health 7, from South Bank University
- 2) In one or more Curriculum Vitae, incorrectly stated that;
 - a) You had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health & Safety Management at Loughborough University in September 2017.
 - b) You had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health & Safety from Loughborough University in September 2018.
- 3) Your actions in one or more of the above charges 1 a), 1 b), 2 a) & 2 b) were dishonest, in that you misrepresented that you had completed a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing and/or Safety Management.

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

Background

The following was alleged against you.

In 2019 the NMC received anonymous whistleblower reports which provided information and concerns about your social media posts. Two social media sites were identified which held accounts under the name of '*Sabbatha Shedrack*'. A Hola profile in your name

included as an apparent qualification a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health, Nursing, Public Health,⁷ at London South Bank University. A LinkedIn profile in your name also included a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health, ⁷ from London South Bank University 2013-2015.

As a result of this information, enquiries were made on behalf of the NMC to investigate whether you had obtained this qualification. According to personnel at London South Bank University, there was no record of you studying there. Further enquiries were made with four employment agencies, which had placed you in various roles. None of those agencies had placed you in a nursing role on the basis of your having an Occupational Health qualification.

An agency called Achieva supplied to the NMC 3 Curriculum Vitae (CV) which that agency held on your file. Under the title qualifications, one CV listed the following '*Pg. Diplo OHSM – Loughborough University – September 217.*' The second CV listed '*Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health and Safety – Loughborough University – September 2018*'.

Enquiries made with Loughborough University showed that you were registered to the Occupational Health and Safety Management course between 2016 – 2019 but did not pass. Your studies were terminated without any qualification being awarded.

Decision and reasons on facts

In reaching its decisions on the disputed facts, the panel took into account all the oral and documentary evidence including CVs, screenshots and emails in this case together with the submissions made by Ms Hazlewood on behalf of the NMC and by yourself.

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 heard live evidence from the following witnesses called on behalf of the NMC:

- Witness 1: Director at Occupational Health & Wellbeing.
- Witness 2: Group Data Protection and Information Compliance Officer at London South Bank University.
- Witness 3: Assistant Registrar (Assessment), Student Records & Operations at Loughborough University.
- Witness 4: Director at Greys specialist recruitment.
- Witness 5: Administrator at Achieva.
- Witness 6: Director at Gel Resourcing.

The panel also heard evidence from you under oath.

Before making any findings on the facts, the panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor. It considered the witness and documentary evidence provided by both yourself and the NMC.

The panel then considered each of the disputed charges and made the following findings.

Charge 1a)

“In or around 2019, incorrectly stated;

- a) On your ‘LinkedIn’ profile, that you had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health 7, from South Bank University between 2013-2015.”

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account screenshot evidence of a LinkedIn profile with the copyright stamp dated 2019. The panel also considered your oral evidence and CV provided to the NMC on 22 April 2022 by Witness 5.

It was common ground between you and Ms Hazlewood that you had attended the relevant course, but not passed it, and that you had not achieved the diploma.

There was an issue of dispute between you and Ms Hazlewood as to whether including a reference to a post graduate diploma in Occupational Health Nursing in a list headed *‘Education and Qualifications’* amounted to a statement that you had obtained that diploma as opposed to it merely being a course of study which you had commenced.

You took issue with the meaning of the word *‘obtained’* in each of the sub-charges. It is clear that you did not use that word on your social media platforms or in your CVs. Additionally, you argued that the only manner in which the NMC could have evidenced that you had purported to obtain any of the stated qualifications would have been had they presented evidence that you had attached a copy of a certificate of those qualifications to your social media profiles/CVs.

When construing the charges, the panel took the word *‘obtained’* as having the plain English meaning of acquiring or establishing. The word *‘obtained’* is not used in any of the

documents forming the basis of these charges. In the context of the *‘Education’* section of your LinkedIn profile, the panel determined that the ordinary reader would conclude that you were stating that you had completed the course and held the qualification listed on the profile.

The panel acknowledged reference to ‘London South Bank University’ in addition to *‘Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health, 7’* being listed under the *‘Education’* section of the profile.

When giving your oral evidence, you did not dispute that the LinkedIn Profile, contained in the screenshots before it, belonged to you. It shows as follows:

‘Education

London South Bank University

***Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health, 7
2013-2015’***

It is common knowledge that LinkedIn and other professional social media profiles/CVs set out professional qualifications and experience without attaching certificates of qualification. Consequently, the panel determined that evidence of certificates being attached to your social media profiles/CVs would not be required to establish whether you had purported to have the qualifications.

The panel also considered CV evidence provided to the NMC on 22 April 2022:

‘...Professional Qualifications and Education:

...

Adv. Dip. Adult Nursing London South Bank University 2013...’

The panel noted the similarities in language in your LinkedIn profile and in your CV. In your oral evidence you agreed that you have not obtained a '*Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health and Nursing, Public Health 7*' from South Bank University. In consideration of this, the panel are of the view that the omission of any suffixes or descriptors in the profile regarding whether the qualification was achieved, or merely in the process of being undertaken, would give the ordinary reader the understanding that it was a qualification that you had already obtained. It was of the view that you should have explicitly stated that the course was either on-going or incomplete, whichever was more accurate at the relevant time, on your LinkedIn profile and CVs.

Accordingly, the panel found charge 1a proved.

Charge 1b)

"In or around 2019, incorrectly stated;

- b) On your 'Hola' profile, that you had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing, Public Health 7, from South Bank University"

This charge is found proved

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account screenshot evidence of a '*Hola*' profile dated 15 February 2019. The panel also considered your oral evidence and Curriculum Vitae provided to the NMC on 22 April 2022 by Witness 5 and a screenshot of your LinkedIn profile copyright stamp dated 2019. As explained above, you do not dispute the fact that you did not obtain this qualification.

In your oral evidence you denied creating the Hola profile. This was challenged by the NMC. The panel therefore gave careful consideration to the documentary evidence.

The panel considered the CV evidence provided to the NMC on 22 April 2022 by Witness 5:

‘...Professional Qualifications and Education:

...

Adv. Dip. Adult Nursing London South Bank University 2013...

The panel noted the similarities in language between the Hola profile and your Curriculum Vitae.

It further considered your LinkedIn profile where you have listed the same qualification under the Education section.

In consideration of the evidence before it, the panel considered the possibility that someone else had created a Hola account without your knowledge and inserted into it the same facts that were contained in your LinkedIn profile and in your CV. The panel determined that this scenario would be implausible. The panel concluded that you had created the Hola account including the professional qualifications in the ‘*Education*’ section. You may have overlooked or forgotten about this account, but the panel did not accept that someone else created it.

Accordingly, for the same reasons set out under charge 1a), the panel found charge 1b) proved.

Charge 2a)

“In one or more Curriculum Vitae, incorrectly stated that;

- a) You had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health & Safety Management at Loughborough University in September 2017.”

This charge is found proved.

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account the CVs sent to the NMC dated 22 April 2022 by Witness 5. The panel also had regard to the CV evidence provided by Witness 4. The panel further noted email evidence provided by Witness 3 and your oral evidence.

The panel took into account the wording in the CV provided by Witness 5 which stated the following:

‘...Professional Qualifications and Education:

Pg. Diplo OHSM Loughborough University September 2017...

The panel also reviewed the curriculum vitae provided by witness 4 which stated the following:

‘...Professional Qualifications and Education:

Pg. Diplo OHSM Loughborough University September 2017

Adv. Dip. Adult Nursing London South Bank University 2013

Phlebotomy & Venepuncture City University 2011

NVQ Level 2 Health Lewisham College, Lewisham 2010

BSc. (Hons) Microbiology (2:2) University of Ibadan, Nigeria 2002...

The panel also had regard to your oral evidence in which you accepted providing the CVs in question to recruiters in response to job advertisements.

When reaching its decision, the panel also had regard to email evidence provided by Witness 3 which stated the following:

'I have been able to access the details of the request, and can confirm that although this individual was registered to our Occupational Health and Safety Management course between 2016 and 2019, she did not pass and the studies were terminated without any qualification awarded.'

Witness 3's witness statement stated the following:

'...Ms Shedrack has never completed any studies at Loughborough University...'

This was confirmed in her oral evidence.

There was nothing in the CVs to distinguish between the courses which you had completed and obtained the relevant qualification, and the diploma course which was incomplete as a result of a failed assessment. The only difference set out in the CV was that the diploma course was dated '*September 2017*' rather than simply the year. This would not suggest to the ordinary reader that the qualification had not been obtained.

Accordingly, for these reasons and for the same reasons set out under charge 1a), charge 2a) is found proved.

Charge 2b)

"In one or more Curriculum Vitae, incorrectly stated that;

- b) You had obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health & Safety from Loughborough University in September 2018.”

This charge is found proved

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account the CVs sent to the NMC dated 22 April 2022 by Witness 5. The panel also had regard to the CV evidence provided by Witness 4. The panel further noted email evidence provided by Witness 3 and your oral evidence and submissions.

The panel had regard to the curriculum vitae evidence provided by Witness 6 which stated the following:

***‘...Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health and Safety
LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY SEPTEMBER 2018...’***

The only material difference from charge 2a) is that the reference to obtaining the diploma gave the date of ‘September 2018’ rather than ‘September 2017’.

For the same reasons as have been set out in charge 1a) and 2a), the panel found charge 2b) proved.

Charge 3

“Your actions in one or more of the above charges 1 a), 1 b), 2 a) & 2 b) were dishonest, in that you misrepresented that you had completed a Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing and/or Safety Management.”

This charge is found proved

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account your oral testimony provided at this hearing.

When questioned by the panel regarding whether you knew by listing '*Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Health Nursing and/or Safety Management*' on your CV would improve your chances of gaining interviews and job opportunities, you advised that it depended on the job and what the business needed.

The panel further posed the question to you as to whether you believe it is the responsibility of the employer or the candidate to disclose whether the qualification is held or not, or whether it is an ongoing or incomplete qualification. You responded that it was the responsibility of the recruiter to find out the status of the candidates' qualifications and ask further questions at interview.

In considering your state of mind at the relevant times in relation to your social media profiles/CVs, the panel determined that your answer to the first question outlined above demonstrated that you were aware that there could have been an advantage by not indicating to recruiters whether any of the stated qualifications were held, ongoing or incomplete. By not taking measures to accurately disclose your qualifications and not being transparent, the panel determined that you accordingly must have known that it may increase the chances that you would progress to an interview. Furthermore, the panel determined that your answer to the second question outlined above, where you stated it was the recruiters' responsibility and not yours to ascertain the status of any stated qualifications, indicates that you chose not to advance the entire truth regarding your qualifications status.

In summary the panel determined that you were content, when producing your LinkedIn profile your Hola profile and the CVs, to allow potential recruiters to be misled, in order that you would have an advantage to which you were not entitled, when consideration was given to whether to call you for an interview.

In light of the findings set out above, the panel determined that in relation to all of charges 1a), 1b), 2a) and 2b), you have misrepresented that you had completed the post graduate diplomas. By the standards of ordinary and decent people, these actions were dishonest. Therefore, the panel found charge 3 proved in respect of all the above charges.

Decision and reasons on the application to proceed in the absence of Ms Shedrack

After the panel handed down their decision on facts to Ms Shedrack and Ms Hazlewood, Ms Shedrack abruptly left the hearing link. Guidance was provided to Ms Shedrack via email that the hearing would resume at 09:15 on Monday, 28 July.

Ms Shedrack did not attend the hearing on Monday, 28 July 2025. She had sent an email which stated the following:

‘ ...
*I am writing to formally notify you that I will **not be attending any further hearings** relating to my case...*’

The panel heard the submissions of Ms Hazlewood who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Ms Shedrack.

Ms Hazlewood submitted that Ms Shedrack had voluntarily absented herself, as shown by the email above, and it would be in the public interest to continue with this case.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel noted that its discretionary power to proceed in the absence of a registrant under the provisions of Rule 21 is not absolute and is one that should be exercised ‘*with the utmost care and caution*’ as referred to in the case of *R v Jones (Anthony William)* (No.2) [2002] UKHL 5.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Ms Shedrack. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Hazlewood, the emails and documents provided by Ms Shedrack, and the advice of the legal assessor. The panel had regard to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. The main considerations were:

- Ms Shedrack made no suggestion that she was unable to attend due to any other commitment. Her decision not to attend appeared to be attributable to her disagreement with the panel's decision on facts. Accordingly, the panel concluded that Ms Shedrack had voluntarily absented herself;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date;
- In consideration of the length of time the case has been with the NMC and the nature of the charges, there is a strong public interest in the expeditious disposal of the case.

The panel acknowledged that, in choosing not to attend any subsequent stages of the hearing, Ms Shedrack may be in principle at some disadvantage. However, it would have regard to documentation she provided by email on 28 July 2025, as well as all her previous submissions and documentation within the course of this hearing. Consequently, the panel determined that any disadvantage could be mitigated by taking into account Ms Shedrack's submissions in its decision-making.

Fitness to Practise

Having reached its determination on the facts of this case, the panel then moved on to consider, whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct and, if so, whether Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise is currently 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.

The panel, in reaching its decision, has recognised its statutory duty to protect the public and maintain public confidence in the profession. Further, it bore in mind that there is no burden or standard of proof at this stage and it has therefore exercised its own professional judgement.

The panel adopted a two-stage process in its consideration. First, the panel must determine whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct. Secondly, only if the facts found proved amount to misconduct, the panel must decide whether, in all the circumstances, Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise is currently impaired as a result of that misconduct.

Submissions on misconduct

Ms Hazlewood referred the panel to the case of *Roylance v General Medical Council (No. 2)* [2000] 1 AC 311 which defines misconduct as a '*word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances.*'

Ms Hazlewood invited the panel to take the view that the facts found proved amount to misconduct. The panel had regard to the terms of 'The Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives 2015' (the Code) in making its decision.

Ms Hazlewood identified the specific, relevant standards where Ms Shedrack's actions amounted to misconduct. She submitted that paragraph 19 of the Code provides that Ms Shedrack has a duty to be aware of, and reduce as far as possible, any potential harm associated with her practice.

Ms Hazlewood submitted that Ms Shedrack had breached part 19.1 of the code:

'19 Be aware of, and reduce as far as possible, any potential for harm associated with your practice

To achieve this, you must:

19.1 *take measures to reduce as far as possible, the likelihood of mistakes, near misses, harm and the effect of harm if it takes place...*

She submitted that by advising of qualifications not received in her CV, Ms Shedrack could potentially gain job opportunities in which she would have a gap in understanding not reflected accurately within her CV and social media profiles. Ms Hazlewood submitted that this could lead to mistakes and harm in her practice should she be offered a role based on the qualifications inaccurately provided within her CV.

Ms Hazlewood further submitted that paragraph 20 of the code – *‘Uphold the reputation of your profession at all times’* - has been breached by Ms Shedrack’s actions. Reference was made to part 20.1 *‘keep to and uphold the standards and values set out in the Code’* and 21.4 *‘make sure that any advertisements, publications or published material you produce or have produced for your professional services are accurate, responsible, ethical, do not mislead or exploit vulnerabilities and accurately reflect your relevant skills, experience and qualifications’*. She submitted that Ms Shedrack’s conduct fell short of the expected standards of a registered nurse and Ms Shedrack failed to acknowledge how presenting these qualifications on her CV without advising whether the course was ongoing or incomplete would mislead recruiters.

Submissions on impairment

Ms Hazlewood moved on to the issue of impairment and addressed the panel on the need to have regard to protecting the public and the wider public interest. This included the need to declare and maintain proper standards and maintain public confidence in the profession and in the NMC as a regulatory body. This included reference to the case of *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v (1) Nursing and Midwifery Council (2) and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) (*Grant*).

Ms Hazlewood submitted that Ms Shedrack is impaired on public protection and public interest grounds. She submitted that Ms Shedrack failed to acknowledge the seriousness of the charges found proved and continues to place the blame on others and therefore fails to maintain public confidence in the profession and regulator.

Ms Hazlewood acknowledged that no specific patients were harmed in this case by Ms Shedrack failing to be honest about the qualifications obtained on her CVs and social media profiles. However, she submitted that her failure to be honest could have placed Ms Shedrack in a position where she was not qualified to care for patients. She submitted that this risk of harm to patients requires a finding of impairment on public protection as well as public interest grounds.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor who referred to *Grant*.

Decision and reasons on misconduct

When determining whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct, the panel had regard to the terms of the Code.

The panel was of the view that Ms Shedrack's actions did fall significantly short of the standards expected of a registered nurse, and that Ms Shedrack's actions amounted to a breach of the Code. Specifically:

'20 Uphold the reputation of your profession at all times

To achieve this, you must:

20.1 keep to and uphold the standards and values set out in the Code

20.2 act with honesty and integrity at all times, treating people fairly and without discrimination, bullying or harassment

20.3 be aware at all times of how your behaviour can affect and influence the behaviour of other people...

‘21 Uphold your position as a registered nurse, midwife or nursing associate

To achieve this, you must:

21.4 make sure that any advertisements, publications or published material you produce or have produced for your professional services are accurate, responsible, ethical, do not mislead or exploit vulnerabilities and accurately reflect your relevant skills, experience and qualifications’

The panel appreciated that breaches of the Code do not automatically result in a finding of misconduct. However, the panel was of the view that significant dishonesty was found in each of the charges found proved, and Ms Shedrack had acted in a manner that fell well below the standards of that expected by a professional nurse.

The panel found that Ms Shedrack’s actions did fall seriously short of the conduct and standards expected of a nurse and amounted to misconduct.

Decision and reasons on impairment

The panel next went on to decide if as a result of the misconduct, Ms Shedrack’s fitness to practise is currently impaired.

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to the Fitness to Practise Library, updated on 27 March 2023, which states:

‘The question that will help decide whether a professional’s fitness to practise is impaired is:

“Can the nurse, midwife or nursing associate practise kindly, safely and professionally?”

If the answer to this question is yes, then the likelihood is that the professional’s fitness to practise is not impaired.’

Nurses occupy a position of privilege and trust in society and are expected at all times to be professional. Furthermore, the public expect that nurses must be honest and open and act with integrity at all times. They must ensure that their conduct justifies both their patients' and the public's trust in the profession.

In this regard the panel considered the judgment of Mrs Justice Cox in the case of *CHRE v NMC and Grant* in reaching its decision. At paragraph 74, she said:

'In determining whether a practitioner's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct, the relevant panel should generally consider not only whether the practitioner continues to present a risk to members of the public in his or her current role, but also whether the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances.'

At paragraph 76, Mrs Justice Cox referred to Dame Janet Smith's "test" which reads as follows:

'Do our findings of fact in respect of the doctor's misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction, caution or determination show that his/her/ fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that s/he:

- a) has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or*
- b) has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or*

c) has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession; and/or

d) has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.'

The panel acknowledged that no patients or members of the public were harmed within this case as the charges are not in relation to Ms Shedrack's clinical practice. The panel further noted that the witnesses did not raise concerns regarding Ms Shedrack engaging with their clients despite the misleading representations made on her CVs and social media profile. The panel found that limb (a) of the test has not been engaged.

The panel next considered whether Ms Shedrack's misconduct had brought the profession into disrepute. It found that in deliberately misrepresenting qualifications that were either ongoing or incomplete on her CVs and social media profiles, such misconduct undermines public trust and confidence in the nursing profession and therefore determined that Ms Shedrack had brought the nursing profession into disrepute. Furthermore, the panel determined that Ms Shedrack's actions breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession namely the expectations that nurses remain professionally transparent at all times.

The panel determined in view of its finding that Ms Shedrack had been dishonest that limb (d) of *Grant* was engaged.

The panel next went on to consider whether Ms Shedrack's misconduct was capable of remedy. The panel bore in mind that Ms Shedrack's dishonesty did not involve financial abuse or clinical care that would put her misconduct at a higher level. The panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being addressed. However, it determined that her dishonesty was still significant repeated across multiple CVs and two social media platforms and therefore it was not on the lowest end of dishonesty.

The panel next considered whether Ms Shedrack had remediated her misconduct. The panel determined with regard to insight, there has been no evidence provided before it to show Ms Shedrack has reflected, even within the abstract, developed insight into her misconduct, or acknowledged how her actions could negatively impact others and the reputation of the nursing profession. The panel acknowledged Ms Shedrack's most recent CV which does not list any qualifications which have not been achieved. However, the panel further noted Ms Shedrack's oral evidence in which she maintained that it is the responsibility of the recruiters to determine whether the candidate has obtained the qualifications listed within their application, CVs or social media profiles, not the nurse's responsibility to advance the full truth about their qualifications at the point of application. Consequently, the panel considered this was evidence of Ms Shedrack having an attitudinal concern regarding her approach to professional transparency.

The panel next considered whether Ms Shedrack's misconduct was highly unlikely to be repeated. The panel is of the view that, in spite of Ms Shedrack having since removed the deliberately inaccurate qualifications from her social media profiles/CVs, there is a risk of repetition based upon her ongoing attitudinal concern.

The panel went on to consider as a result of the above whether Ms Shedrack could practise as a nurse kindly, safely and professionally. It determined that there was no evidence in this case to suggest Ms Shedrack could not practise either kindly or safely. However, in light of the above the panel determined that Ms Shedrack presently could not practise professionally and therefore a finding of impairment was required.

The panel determined as limb (a) of *Grant* was not engaged, a finding of impairment on the grounds of public protection is not necessary.

The panel bore in mind that the overarching objectives of the NMC; to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold and protect the wider public interest. This includes promoting and maintaining public

confidence in the nursing and midwifery professions and upholding the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

The panel concluded that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore finds Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Sanction

The panel has considered this case very carefully and has decided to make a suspension order for a period of 6 months. The effect of this order is that the NMC register will show that Ms Shedrack's registration has been suspended.

In reaching this decision, the panel has had regard to all the evidence that has been adduced in this case and had careful regard to the Sanctions Guidance (SG) published by the NMC. The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Submissions on sanction

Ms Hazlewood informed the panel that in the Notice of Hearing, dated 18 June 2025, the NMC had advised Ms Shedrack that it would seek the imposition of a striking off order if the panel found Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise currently impaired.

Ms Hazlewood invited the panel to consider the pattern of misconduct shown by Ms Shedrack by submitting her CVs and having two profiles across multiple forms as an aggravating factor. Ms Hazlewood further highlighted the risk of harm posed to patients and the deep-seated attitudinal issues identified as aggravating factors to consider.

Ms Hazlewood submitted that no further action or a caution order would not be suitable in consideration of the seriousness of the facts found proved. She further submitted that there are no workable or proportionate conditions that could be formulated in consideration of the charges found proved.

Ms Hazlewood submitted that a suspension order would not protect the public or public protection grounds. She submitted that this was not a single instance of misconduct, and a pattern has been established. She also highlighted that Ms Shedrack in her response to panel questions did not accept responsibility for her misconduct, Ms Hazlewood submitted that this was harmful deep-seated personality and attitudinal problems.

Ms Hazlewood invited the panel to consider a striking-off order in consideration of the regulatory concerns surrounding Ms Shedrack's misconduct. She submitted that Ms Shedrack's actions diminish public confidence in the nursing profession and her dishonesty was an attempt to mislead potential employers of her academic achievements which is a deliberate breach of the duty of candour. Ms Hazlewood submitted that Ms Shedrack's actions were premeditated, systematic and longstanding deception was made repeatedly, and invited the panel to consider a striking off order on these grounds.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor. Given that Ms Shedrack was no longer in attendance and had not been professionally represented, he invited the panel to consider the following arguments which would probably have been advanced in her favour, if she had been represented. First, it appeared that Ms Shedrack had not derived any financial gain from her misconduct. Second, it was found in the panel's determination that she does not present a risk to patients. Third, Ms Shedrack's CV has since been corrected, and the misconduct has not been repeated. Fourth, the length of time taken for these proceedings to conclude since the misconduct has had a significant impact on Ms Shedrack, causing her frustration and impacting her approach to these proceedings.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Ms Shedrack's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel went on to consider what sanction, if any, it should impose in this case. The panel has borne in mind that any sanction imposed must be appropriate and proportionate and, although not intended to be punitive in its effect, may have such consequences. The panel had careful regard to the SG. The decision on sanction is a matter for the panel independently exercising its own judgement.

The panel took into account the following aggravating features:

- Pattern of misconduct
- Lack of insight into failings
- Attitudinal issues

When considering the mitigating features to take into account, the panel bore in mind the delay to conclude proceedings and how this has adversely affected Ms Shedrack's ability to address the charges found proved and her engagement with the process. The panel made note that there have been no previous or subsequent incidents of misconduct found within Ms Shedrack's practice. The panel determined that these factors are relevant but not mitigating in consideration of the hearings process and the high standards of professional conduct expected from a nurse.

The panel also took into account the following mitigating features:

- Ms Shedrack has since removed the inaccurate impressions of her qualifications from her CV.

In reaching its decision on sanction, the panel then had regard to the NMC guidance on 'Considering sanctions for serious cases' (SAN-2). Given the specific circumstances of this case, the panel considered the following in relation to dishonesty:

“Honesty is of central importance to a nurse, midwife or nursing associate’s practice. Therefore allegations of dishonesty will always be serious and a nurse, midwife or nursing associate who has acted dishonestly will always be at some risk of being removed from the register. However, in every case, the Fitness to Practise Committee must carefully consider the kind of dishonest conduct that has taken place. Not all dishonesty is equally serious.”

In light of this, the panel considered the NMC’s guidance on the seriousness of dishonesty. It noted, as in its earlier findings, that the dishonesty were attempts made by Ms Shedrack in order for her to be considered for job roles. However, the panel determined that there was no potential for, or a direct risk of, harm to people receiving care.

The panel further considered the following from the guidance:

“Nurses, midwives and nursing associates who have behaved dishonestly can engage with the Fitness to Practise Committee to show that they feel remorse, that they realise they acted in a dishonest way, and tell the panel that it will not happen again.”

In this regard, apart from amending her CV the panel considered that Ms Shedrack had not demonstrated any evidence of remorse or significant evidence of insight into her dishonesty.

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.

When considering whether to impose a caution order, the panel acknowledged that there was some risk of repetition; however, it has found that there were no public protection issues. Nonetheless, in consideration of the deep-seated attitudinal concerns identified and Ms Shedrack's disengagement with the process after the facts stage, the panel were of the view that a caution order was not appropriate. Furthermore, due to the seriousness of the case, an order that does not restrict Ms Shedrack'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 Ms Shedrack'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 placing conditions of practice on Ms Shedrack'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 took into account the SG, in particular:

- *No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- *Identifiable areas of the nurse or midwife's practice in need of assessment and/or retraining;*
- *No evidence of general incompetence;*
- *Potential and willingness to respond positively to retraining;*
- *Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions;*
- *Conditions can be created that can be monitored and assessed.*

The panel is of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated, given the nature of the charges in this case. The misconduct identified in this

case was not something that can be addressed through retraining. The panel found evidence of deep-seated attitudinal concerns which would not make conditions of practice order an appropriate sanction. Additionally, the panel acknowledged that Ms Shedrack has recently disengaged with the process, indicating that she does not accept the panel's determination on the facts of the case. Consequently, the panel determined they would not have confidence in her engagement with any conditions imposed.

Furthermore, the panel concluded that the placing of conditions on Ms Shedrack's registration would not adequately address the seriousness of this case and would not be in the public interest.

The panel then went on to consider whether a suspension order would be an appropriate sanction. The SG states that suspension order may be appropriate where some of the following factors are apparent:

- *A single instance of misconduct but where a lesser sanction is not sufficient;*
- *No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;*
- *No evidence of repetition of behaviour since the incident;*

The panel was satisfied that in this case; the misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register. The panel acknowledged that there were no concerns raised regarding patient safety and Ms Shedrack's ability to practise kindly and safely. The panel also bore in mind that Ms Shedrack has since amended her CV and there has been no repetition of behaviour since the incident; however, it determined that the deep-seated attitudinal concerns identified and Ms Shedrack's disengagement with the process outweighed the mitigating features.

When weighing all factors the panel determined that a period of suspension would serve to meet the public interest, uphold professional standards and provide Ms Shedrack with

the opportunity and time to reflect further upon her misconduct, develop and demonstrate insight and present evidence of remediation before a future reviewing panel.

It did go on to consider whether a striking-off order would be proportionate but, taking account of all the information before it, and of the mitigation provided, the panel concluded that it would be wholly disproportionate to impose a striking-off order at this stage.

Balancing all of these factors the panel has concluded that a suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel took into account the hardship such an order will inevitably cause Ms Shedrack. However, this is outweighed by the public interest in this case.

The panel considered that this order is necessary to mark the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and to send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standard of behaviour required of a registered nurse.

The panel determined that a suspension order for a period of 6 months was appropriate in this case to mark the seriousness of the misconduct and provide Ms Shedrack with sufficient opportunity to demonstrate insight into her misconduct and remediation towards returning to unrestricted practice.

At the end of the period of suspension, another panel will review the order. At the review hearing the panel would have every option open to it ranging from the lowest being a revocation of the order to the highest being a striking-off order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Ms Shedrack's attendance and engagement in future proceedings;
- Evidence of insight and reflections from Ms Shedrack regarding her misconduct;

- Any evidence of up-to-date work testimonials that may be relevant to nursing practice.

Interim order

As the suspension order cannot take effect until the end of the 28-day appeal period, or any further period during the currency of an appeal, the panel has considered whether an interim order is required in the specific circumstances of this case. It may only make an interim order if it is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the public, is otherwise in the public interest or in Ms Shedrack's own interests until the suspension sanction takes effect.

Submissions on interim order

The panel took account of the submissions made by Ms Hazlewood. She did not apply for an interim order based on either public protection or Ms Shedrack's own interests. She submitted that an interim suspension order should be imposed for 18 months (or such lesser period as the panel might determine) on the basis that it was required in the public interest. She referred to passages in the panel's determination, which she submitted justified taking this course. She sought to distinguish the case of *Davey v General Dental Council* [2015 WL 6757832] in which the High Court had overturned an immediate suspension order made on public interest grounds by a GDC panel after it had made a substantive suspension order of 12 months.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor who had drawn the attention of Ms Hazlewood and the panel to the case of *Davey* and the consequences of an interim suspension order, both if Ms Shedrack succeeded in any appeal and if she failed in any appeal.

Decision and reasons on interim order

The panel was not satisfied that any interim order should be made. There is no application based on the protection of the public; it is made only on the basis that it is otherwise in the public interest. The panel had regard to the guidance headed '*Decision making factors for interim orders*'. That guidance makes it clear that it is relatively rare for an interim order to be made only on the grounds that it is otherwise in the public interest, and that there is a high bar before such an order could be justified. The panel considered the guidance and weighed the scale of the public interest it had identified in this case against any burden that would be placed upon Ms Shedrack were it to impose an interim order. The panel determined that it would be unjust to Ms Shedrack to impose as the cost of any appeal the requirement to be suspended under an interim order until that appeal is held, which might be for a much longer period than the period of 6 months which the panel has decided is the proportionate length for its substantive order, following which this case must be reviewed. The panel has concluded that it would not be in the public interest to make any interim order.

If no appeal is made, then the substantive suspension order will take effect 28 days after Ms Shedrack is sent the decision of this hearing in writing.

That concludes this determination.