

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Hearing
Monday 22 – Tuesday 23 September 2025
Tuesday 21 October 2025**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Appellant:	Abiola Oluwawemimo Ajayi
NMC PRN:	1022075749
Type of case:	Registrations appeal
Panel members:	Liz Maxey (Chair, registrant member) Hazel Wilford (Lay member) Amy Barron (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Melissa Harrison Sean Hammond (21 October 2025)
Hearings Coordinator:	Rebecka Selva
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Uzma Khan, Case Presenter
Ms Ajayi:	Present and represented by Harry Dickens instructed by Royal College of Nursing, (RCN)
Decision:	Appeal dismissed

Decision and reasons

The panel decided to dismiss your appeal against the decision of the Assistant Registrar of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC).

This appeal is made under Article 37(1)(a) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (the Order). You appealed the decision of the Assistant Registrar, dated 25 April 2025, that you did not meet the character requirements for registration to the NMC register.

Background

Pearson VUE have a contract with the NMC as their Computer Based Test (CBT) provider which has been in place since 2014. The CBT is one part of the NMC's Test of Competence (ToC) and is used by the NMC to assess the skills and knowledge of people wanting to join the NMC's register from overseas as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate or re-join the register after a long period away from practice. The second part of the ToC is an objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) – a practical examination.

The current CBT (CBT 2021), created on 2 August 2021, is split into two parts (Part A and Part B). Part A contains a numeracy test consisting of 15 short answer questions and lasts for 30 minutes. Part B is a clinical test consisting of 100 multiple-choice questions and lasts for 2 hours and 30 minutes. All questions are scored as either correct or incorrect.

Pearson VUE contracted with a third party, Yunnik Technologies Ltd, in relation to a Pearson VUE Authorised Test Centre (PVTC) in Ibadan (the Yunnik centre), Nigeria. This testing centre is where the concerns in this matter relate.

Pearson VUE has control over the technology, but the environment is owned/controlled by the test centre and personnel are test centre employees. PVTCs are contractually required to adhere to specific Pearson VUE standards for delivery and operations.

Pearson VUE also provide additional centres referred to as Pearson Professional Centres (PPCs) and PVTC Selects which have additional security measures including biometrics

(palm vein) and CCTV footage. As the Yunnik centre was a PVTC it was not required to have these extra security measures.

Candidates are allowed up to three attempts to pass the CBT as part of one application, with a minimum of 10 days between each sitting. If they fail all three attempts, their application will close, and they must wait six months before submitting a new application to sit the CBT again.

On 15 March 2023, Pearson VUE identified that the Yunnik centre was delivering exams for multiple candidates who were completing the clinical part of the CBT in 10 minutes (2.5 hours is allowed for this part of the exam). The number of candidates was initially unknown.

The NMC was notified, and the Pearson VUE results team ran a report from January 2022, for all NMC exams that were delivered at the Yunnik centre.

Pearson VUE conducted a thorough and detailed investigation into the Yunnik centre and identified testing anomalies. They found that the data set for the period between 15 March 2019 and 31 March 2023 indicated a specific pattern of potentially fraudulent behaviour. Pearson VUE asserted that this was likely to be linked to proficient proxy testing which was not present at other testing centres globally.

Pearson VUE's investigation also concluded that there was no technical error at the Yunnik centre that had led to the data set and alleged that human interference was involved.

The NMC commissioned a report from Witness 5, instructed as an independent expert to analyse and report on data provided by the NMC. His conclusion was that there were a significant number of exceptionally quick test times at the Yunnik centre, compared to global averages.

On 3 August 2023 the NMC's Registrar decided to use as a benchmark the 1 in 2,500 percentile, in order to identify tests which were taken at such a speed that it is likely that the results had been fraudulently obtained (most likely utilising a proxy test taker).

Applying this statistical threshold meant that for those individuals who sat CBT 2021, anyone who sat their Numeracy test in 5.5 minute or under and/or Clinical test in 21.5 minute or under, the Registrar considered this raised a prima facie case that the result had been obtained fraudulently.

Because of the evidence of widespread fraudulent activity at the Yunnik centre, the NMC was unable to be confident in any of the CBT results obtained at the testing centre. The Registrar therefore considered all CBT results obtained there to be invalid and that the safest, fairest, and most proportionate way to deal with this was to ask everyone who sat their CBT at the Yunnik centre, to take a new CBT. In the absence of a valid CBT an individual should not have been allowed entry to the NMC register.

The data in relation to your CBT shows that you achieved a pass in your test in the following time(s):

- Numeracy: 5.2 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes).
- Clinical: 12.77 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes).

Comparing your time to complete your clinical test with times taken by candidates globally, it was considered very unlikely by the NMC that you could have achieved a pass in your test within the times it took you to complete it. Taking into account the time in which your test was taken, in a centre in which the NMC allege there to have been widespread fraudulent activity, it was considered by the NMC to be more likely than not that your CBT result was obtained fraudulently.

You were subject to disciplinary proceedings regarding an inauthentic International English Language Testing System (IELTS) certificate you had submitted to your employer, Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust (the Trust). However, the Trust decided to take no further action on 26 January 2024.

When considering your application to the register, the Assistant Registrar took into account the following documentation:

- Your completed application;
- Expert reports by Witness 5 Head of Data Analytics at OAC;
- Witness statement of Witness 4, Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE;
- Witness statement of Witness 6, Executive Director of Professional Practice at the NMC;

On 25 April 2025, you were informed that the Assistant Registrar had refused your application onto the register.

You appealed the decision on 19 May 2025, within the 28-day time limit.

Evidence

The panel took account of live evidence and witness statements from the following witnesses on behalf of the NMC:

- Witness 4: Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.

The panel took account of the written evidence and witness statements from the following witnesses on behalf of the NMC:

- Witness 1: Band 5 nurse in the UK who provided her experience of sitting an exam at Yunnik.
- Witness 2: Band 4 Pre-registration nurse in the UK who provided her experience of sitting an exam at Yunnik.

- Witness 3: The Deputy Director for Business Transformation and a member of the Executive Team for Professional Regulation.

- Witness 5: An independent Data Analyst who provided the NMC with an analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE.

- Witness 6: Employed by the NMC as the Executive Director of Professional Practice.

- Witness 7: Senior Nursing Education Adviser and member of the Executive Team in the Professional Practice Directorate at the NMC.

- Witness 8: Senior International Registration Manager at the NMC.

You provided the panel with additional documentation to support this appeal including:

- Your defence bundle which includes your CV, testimonials, academic records and certificates;
- Your witness statement dated 19 September 2025; and
- Practice materials that you used in preparation for your exams.

In addition, you provided live oral evidence on oath.

Submissions

Ms Khan, on behalf of the NMC, outlined the background to the case. She submitted that it had been demonstrated beyond doubt that the concern around fast test times was not related to any issues with the Pearson VUE software.

Ms Khan submitted that fraudulent human behaviour was responsible for the quick test times at Yunnik. She referred the panel to Pearson VUE's data, which indicated that the test completion times at Yunnik were significantly faster than global benchmarks. She outlined Witness 5's statistical analysis, which shows that there was a large, and statistically significant, difference between test times at Yunnik and those of candidates at other centres both in Nigeria and globally.

Ms Khan referred the panel to Witness 6's supplementary statement which identified 16 individuals who explicitly admitted to using proxies.

Ms Khan referred to Witness 1 and Witness 2's statements which corroborated the routine nature of proxy operations at Yunnik. She submitted that this is consistent with Witness 5's independent statement and Witness 6's statement.

Ms Khan submitted that the NMC's evidence, including fast test times, high scores and admissions from other test takers, supported the conclusion that widespread fraud occurred at Yunnik. She submitted that the method of fraud was irrelevant, but the key issue was whether the test result was dishonestly obtained. Ms Khan referred to Witness 1 and Witness 2's evidence that candidates were not to pay directly to Yunnik test centre.

Ms Khan referred the panel to Witness 5's analysis of your test times and submitted that your times were exceptionally fast. Ms Khan highlighted that your time for the CBT was one of the fastest achieved by any of the other candidates who sat the test globally (excluding Yunnik). She submitted that it was highly improbable that you completed the CBT without the assistance of a proficient proxy test-taker.

Ms Khan referred to the histograms within Witness 4's evidence and outlined that the statistical anomalies of the test times of Yunnik as opposed to globally, reinforce suspicions of non-standard behaviour. She submitted that this is evidence of proxies.

Ms Khan submitted that the practice materials you provided for the panel are available globally for candidates to prepare for the test and were not unique to you. She submitted that there was no reason for you to rush the test, and you had invested a significant amount of time, and effort to prepare for the test.

Ms Khan drew the panel's attention to the same day evidence in that there were three other candidates who sat their tests in a similarly fast time to you. She submitted that whilst it is unlikely that one person would ever achieve such fast times, it is even more unlikely that four of the world's fastest test takers all happen to sit the CBT exam at the same test centre on the same day within a 94-minute period.

Ms Khan further submitted that as part of this investigation there were secondary concerns. She informed the panel that an investigation was undertaken by the Trust as there were concerns about the authenticity of your IELTS examination certificate. When checks were made it was confirmed that the documents you provided to the Trust were fake. This was investigated by the Trust and resulted in no case to answer, not an '*exoneration*' as you described to the Assistant Registrar.

Ms Khan submitted that nothing outweighed the compelling evidence that you obtained your CBT result through fraud. As such, she invited the panel to find that the Assistant Registrar's decision was reasonable, proportionate and grounded on evidence and dismiss the appeal.

Ms Khan submitted that to admit a candidate on the basis of changing evidence would undermine the trust that underpins the professional standards. The NMC's duty is to the public and they must ensure that only those who meet the character, competence and integrity standards are allowed to join the register.

The panel took account of Witness 4's live evidence given under affirmation.

The panel also took account of your live evidence given under affirmation.

You said that you found the CBT 'easy', but you did not finish your CBT in the times alleged by the NMC, you said that you are only sure that you finished your test before the time allocated, specifically, just before 10am.

You told the panel that in 2022 you lived in Lagos. You said that you chose Yunnik in Ibadan to sit your CBT as your daughter lived 7 to 10 minutes from the test centre. Your daughter had given birth, and you spent time at her home to help her from 13 May 2022 to 13 June 2022.

You told the panel that your desired test centre would have been in Lagos, which was closest to you, but as your daughter had given birth in Ibadan, this changed your plans.

You said that a friend of yours helped you book your CBT. You clarified that you did not have the money to pay for the CBT in British pounds hence you sent your friend the money in naira to be converted to pounds. When she had booked the test, she called you back and told you to check your emails for receipt of payment.

You said that following the allegation of fraud with your IELTS test you sat the Occupational English Test (OET). You said that you did not pass the OET the first time as you failed the listening part of the test. You clarified that you felt you did not pass this part of the test as you were stressed due to the previous allegation of fraud. You passed the listening part of the OET on your second attempt.

In cross examination, you submitted that you wanted to relocate to England as far back as 2012. You began researching into the NMC and registering in the UK in 2021. Your husband would have been joining you in the UK, he would be travelling as a dependant on your visa.

You accepted that the CBT and IELTS was an important test for your career and that your visa would be negatively impacted if you did not pass this test. You accepted that the visa process is costly.

You said that you have never struggled to pass an exam, albeit you have never failed or achieved 100 percent in nursing school. You said that you are an exceptional student.

You clarified that in English tests, the listening aspect of the test is what you struggle with, due to your own hearing ability- not your lack of understanding of the language.

You said that you did not facilitate any fraud in obtaining a IELTS pass certificate, it was an '*unfortunate*' thing which occurred that you were never aware off. You said that you would never intentionally do such a thing, and you would never undermine your integrity.

You clarified that as you were '*new*' in the country at the time you did not know to inform your employer of the IELTS document being flagged as inauthentic. You said that you cannot speak to the other individuals who were also flagged up by your employer, the Trust, at the time for also having inauthentic IELTS certificates.

In cross examination you accepted that you had taken the OET multiple times and passed on your fifth attempt.

You said that you were in Ibadan on 24 May 2022, as the naming ceremony for your grandchild was on 25 May 2022. You said that you did not know to provide your daughter's address or baby's birth certificate to this panel. You said that you decided you wanted to take the test in Yunnik after the naming ceremony.

You said that you checked the available centres closest to you in a generic search, hence Yunnik appeared.

You accepted that on the payment confirmation, the address of your friend appeared to match the address of Yunnik test centre. As far as you were concerned, you stated that your friend is from Lagos but native to Ibadan. You clarified that you cannot speak to the fact that staff members at the test centre were involved in the fraud and were facilitating fraud for candidates. You stated that you did not know any names of the staff members.

You said that you arrived at the test centre for 7am as you wanted to avoid traffic. The test centre was not open when you arrived. You sat back in your vehicle and carried on revising until they opened the doors, which was around an hour.

You said that at around 8am you were processed by the staff who checked your ID and asked you to provide a fingerprint. Between 8:30am and 9am they tidied the room. You said that you remembered an elderly man, a younger man, and a woman who you were not sure if she was a staff member or a candidate. You saw two other candidates waiting with you, you did not speak to them. After this you were ushered into the test room. You started your test some minutes after 9am. You sat at the first room with two computers. There was a separate entrance and exit to this test room. When you went into the test room another woman was just leaving.

You said that you quickly reviewed the answers after you had submitted them.

You told the panel that you left the test centre some minutes before 10am. But you cannot remember exactly how long you took for the CBT. You said that you had to wait for the results as the printer had broken down, but the young man at the test centre said they would have to email the results over.

You denied any involvement in the alleged fraudulent activity concerning the CBT undertaken at the Yunnik Test Centre.

In closing, Ms Khan submitted that the evidence before the panel is credible, consistent and is compelling.

Ms Khan submitted that the evidence of the statistics to indicate that fraud was taking place at Yunnik is overwhelming.

Ms Khan reminded the panel of the inauthentic IELTS form you submitted which was not verifiable by the British Council. She also reminded the panel that it took you five attempts to pass the OET.

Ms Khan submitted that your account of not having known to disclose your inauthentic IELTS to the Trust lacks credibility and is reflective of your continued intention to deceive.

Ms Khan submitted that there was no reason for you to arrive at the Test centre for 7am given it was only a 10-minute journey.

Ms Khan submitted that the reason you chose to sit your test at Yunnik lacked credibility and the fact that the '*friend*' of yours who booked the CBT on your behalf had the same address as the test centre is indicative of proxy usage.

Ms Khan referred to the numerous testimonials presented on your behalf and submitted that whilst you are a capable nurse, there are concerns about your dishonesty in respect of two entirely different exams.

Ms Khan invited the panel to dismiss the appeal and uphold the refusal of the Assistant Registrar based on the credible, consistent and compelling evidence that your CBT results were obtained through fraudulent means. She submitted that your results in question are deeply entangled with systemic malpractice at Yunnik that it cannot be safely relied upon as evidence that you are capable of safe and effective practice, or that you meet the character requirement for entry onto the register.

In closing, Mr Dickens on your behalf, submitted that there is no direct or indirect evidence of fraud by you or any other candidates who sat their tests on the same day as you on 8 June 2022. He highlighted that the generic evidence is only statistical analysis, and this does not prove anything.

Mr Dickens submitted that you have a long-distinguished career in Nigeria since 1989 when you qualified as a nurse. You have held senior positions and have had no disciplinary actions until you were investigated by the Trust which resulted in no case to answer.

Mr Dickens submitted that you sat the CBT on 8 June 2022 with no assistance and you dispute the times disclosed by Witness 4 of how long you took to sit your exam.

Mr Dickens outlined the limitations in Witness 4's and Witness 5's findings.

Mr Dickens reminded the panel that you were in Ibadan to visit your daughter who had just given birth as such there is no suspicious behaviour in why you chose to travel to sit your test at Yunnik. You provided the panel with the birth certificate of your grandchild.

Mr Dickens submitted that if a candidate used a friend to pay for the CBT it is not indicative of a proxy being used. He referred to Witness 4's live evidence who accepted that it is not unusual for third parties to book certain exams for Pearson VUE. He reminded the panel that your friend may be from Lagos, but she is native to Ibadan hence the payment address referencing Ibadan.

Mr Dickens referred to your testimonials which speak to your good character.

Mr Dickens invited the panel to find that your CBT was not obtained through fraudulent means and to allow the appeal.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Panel's decision

In making its decision, the panel first considered whether it had sufficient evidence before it to substantiate the NMC's case that there was widespread fraud occurring at Yunnik at the time you took your CBT. The panel found the evidence before it to be cogent and credible.

The panel had sight of the Pearson VUE data from Witness 4 and the independent expert analysis provided by Witness 5, including tables of data and graphs setting out the times taken globally and at other centres in Nigeria to complete the CBT. The panel noted the distinctly different time distribution plots when compared to the times achieved by candidates at Yunnik. The panel also referred to the statement of agreed facts between the NMC and the Royal College of Nursing (RCN):

'If one excludes Yunnik, almost no one in the entire world completed Part B of the 2021 CBT in under 20 minutes... In other words, the most common times at Yunnik were more than twice as quick as the times anywhere else in the world.'

The panel had sight of statements and analysis provided by Witness 4. It had sight of Witness 5's data analysis, including diagrams which evidence the times taken globally, including other test centres in Nigeria, to complete CBT, compared to the times achieved at the Yunnik centre. The panel considered that Witness 4's findings were corroborated by Witness 5's independent research which outlined the stark difference in the test times taken at Yunnik as opposed to globally. The panel also considered that Witness 4 confirmed that there were no cyber-attacks or software malfunctions at Yunnik test centre.

The panel took particular note of the Pearson VUE evidence prepared by Witness 4 which identified patterns that were not found at other testing centres globally and the fact that the number of fraudulent cases at the centre increased over time, both of which were indicative of the use of human proxies. The panel considered that a proxy's increased familiarity with taking the tests and absence of being discovered were more likely than not to increase their speed and use at the test centre.

Having considered all the information before it, the panel noted the compelling generic evidence of statistical anomalies and patterns of suspicious behaviour at Yunnik. This included:

- Unusually fast test completion times, suggesting interference.
- Independent statistical analysis by Witness 5, confirming statistically significant discrepancies between CBTs taken in Nigeria (excluding Yunnik) and globally.

The panel also noted the evidence of Witness 4 detailing the pattern of proxy behaviour reported on days when the NMC have received admissions of fraudulent behaviour. The panel considered that the evidence of the witness statements of both Witness 1 and Witness 2, although hearsay in nature and not speaking of the day you took your test, provide contextual evidence that proxy activity was taking place at the Yunnik test centre and during the period in question. Again, the panel considered that these do not provide

direct evidence of the day you took your test at Yunnik but provide further contextual evidence to support the proposition of fraudulent activity at Yunnik. The panel also referred to Witness 6's statement that there were 14 other logged admissions of their experience of fraudulent activities and use of human proxies at the Yunnik test centre.

Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that it was more likely than not that there was widespread fraudulent activity taking place at the Yunnik centre.

The panel next considered whether it is more likely than not that you obtained your CBT result at Yunnik fraudulently.

The panel considered your evidence that you chose Yunnik to sit your CBT as it was prompted to you after a generic search when you were at your daughter's house in Ibadan. The panel accepted that you had a grandchild who was born at the time in question in Ibadan. However, the panel had no wider evidence before it of your daughter's address in Ibadan or of any invite/message for your grandchild's naming ceremony. The panel considered that there was no reason before it as to why you were under time constraints to complete your CBT whilst you were in Ibadan for two months, especially whilst you were carrying out caring duties for your daughter which you said was your reason for travelling to Ibadan.

The panel considered that you stated both in live and written evidence that a '*friend*' of yours booked your CBT on your behalf. However, it noted that the name of your friend did not match the payment name – when questioned, you could not provide any further detail. The panel also considered that you could not fully answer to your '*friend's*' address matching that of the test centre. The panel found your evidence in respect of this to be contradictory.

The panel had sight of the analysis provided by Witness 5 and Witness 4's data, including diagrams which evidence the time taken globally, including other centres in Nigeria, to complete the CBT, compared to the times achieved at Yunnik. The panel considered Witness 5's analysis of your specific data, which provided the following odds of how achievable your test times were:

'Evaluated Clinical Timing: 12.77 minutes: Odds 1 in 56478.0.

'Evaluated Numeracy Timing: 5.2 minutes: Odds 1 in 3419.0'.

The panel noted that there were three other candidates who took the test at Yunnik on the same day as you and during the same time period that was in close proximity to your test - all of whom finished in similar rapid times. The panel concluded the probability of four exceptional and fast test takers being present in the same centre and on the same day, within 94 minutes of each other, is highly improbable and a strong indication of fraudulent activity and in all likelihood a proxy being in use at the centre at the time and date you took your test.

The panel considered your live evidence in relation to how long it took you to complete the CBT was inconsistent in that you provided different explanations in your evidence in chief and when you were cross examined. Firstly, you told the panel that you disagreed with your written statement in which you stated you *'have no reason to disagree'* with the evaluated time provided by Witness 4. You then told the panel when cross examined about this that you started your test around 9:18am and left *'some minutes'* before 10am. The panel determined that your evidence in relation to the timings was unreliable and preferred the evidence of the evaluated test time provided by Witness 4.

The panel noted your evidence that you prepared for your CBT with various types of CBT practice material. The panel considered that these resources would be available globally, and that this would suggest that other people globally or in other test centres in Nigeria who accessed similar practice material might have been able to complete the test fast enough to meet the fraudulent concerns threshold. However, the data provided does not indicate such frequent and fast times at any other test centre. Further, the panel has seen evidence of your academic performance and although the certificates demonstrate that you hold professional nursing qualifications, there was nothing to suggest that you are an exceptional student who could complete exams in exceptional times. Similarly, your testimonials discuss your clinical performance, professionalism and good character but do not make any reference to your ability to sit exams quickly. In addition, the panel noted that it took you five attempts to pass the OETs, which did not substantiate your claim that you are an exceptional student.

The panel took account of your evidence that you did not necessarily focus on the time it took you to complete the test. The panel noted that you said that you '*quickly*' reviewed the answers. Contrarily, the panel referred to Witness 5's analysis of your test time which would indicate that almost no time was spent on reviewing answers. This approach appears to be contradictory to the expected approach by a registrant sitting such a critical exam on which your future registration as a nurse in the UK depended on. The panel also took into account that the NMC Guidance on test taking which reinforces the need to check and double check answers. The panel noted that you provided no reason for having to finish your CBT quickly rather than using the full time allocated.

In your live evidence you accepted that the CBT was an important exam for your future to progress in becoming a nurse in the UK and would not have wanted to fail. As such, it found it even more implausible that you would have completed the CBT after such a short time and left early before 10 am when your test did not start until 9:18am and the time allocated for your test was 3 hours. The more likely explanation is that you were confident in your result because of your use of a proxy.

In view of the panel's decision that there was widespread fraud occurring at Yunnik, the panel found that due to the exceptionally quick time in which you achieved your CBT result, making you one of the fastest candidates globally, it was highly unlikely that you could have achieved this without the assistance of a proxy. When looking at the comparison between your times and those of the global candidate population, from a test centre where there was widespread fraud, the panel considered that the only plausible explanation for you achieving your passes in the times that you did, was that you either used a proxy or had the assistance of a proxy. This view is further supported by three other apparently exceptionally fast test candidates within a 94-minute time period when you took your exam.

The panel noted that in your live evidence you did not always agree with your own witness statement, specifically the timings - you said that you did not know how long you had taken but it was not as quickly as noted by Witness 4. Overall, the panel considered that the information provided by you was not consistent, coherent or cogent and differed in a number of aspects under cross examination.

The panel was satisfied that there is cogent evidence in relation to exceptionally fast completion times and the same day evidence at the Yunnik centre on that day. Therefore, the panel determined that it was more likely than not that you obtained your CBT result fraudulently.

The panel went on to determine whether you met the character requirements for admission to the NMC register. The panel had regard to the NMC guidance on health and character. The panel noted that it was for you to satisfy it that you meet the character requirements for successful admission on the register.

The panel had sight of the numerous positive testimonials before it and your previous unblemished career but having found that you fraudulently obtained your CBT result and have maintained your position throughout your engagement with the NMC and the panel, it could not be satisfied that you are of good character. The panel also considered that your initial IELTS certificate was found by the British Council not to be authentic, and you omitted to inform your Trust of this at the earliest opportunity, which is indicative of your failure to recognise the need to be open and honest with your employer.

The panel had regard to 'The Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives (2015)', in particular paragraph 20, which sets out that registered nurses are expected to uphold the reputation of the profession. The panel therefore concluded that, in all the circumstances of your case, you were not able to demonstrate this standard.

The panel therefore decided to dismiss your appeal and to uphold the decision of the Assistant Registrar, thereby refusing your application to the NMC register.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you appeal the decision, you must submit your appeal to the County Court within 21 days of this decision.

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.