

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Wednesday 24 September 2025**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Elizabeth Bolanle Kehinde Edunsin
NMC PIN	92Y0201O
Part(s) of the register:	Registered nurse – sub part 1 RN1: Adult nurse (level 1) - January 1992
Relevant Location:	Manchester
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Janet Fisher (Chair, lay member) Mordecai Dadzie (Registrant member) Caroline Friendship (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Gillian Hawken
Hearings Coordinator:	Ekaette Uwa
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Eleanor Gwilym, Case Presenter
Mrs Edunsin:	Not present and unrepresented
Order being reviewed:	Conditions of practice order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Suspension order (12 months) to come into effect on 28 October 2025 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Ms Edunsin was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Ms Edunsin's registered email address by secure email on 22 August 2025.

Ms Gwilym, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Hearing provided details of the substantive order being reviewed, the time, dates and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join, information about Ms Edunsin's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In light of all the information available, the panel was satisfied that Ms Edunsin has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Ms Edunsin

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Ms Edunsin. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Ms Gwilym who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Ms Edunsin. She submitted that Ms Edunsin had voluntarily absented herself.

Ms Gwilym highlighted the email from Ms Edunsin dated the 22 September 2025 where she stated as follows:

'Hi Good Morning. [PRIVATE]

Hope to hear from you.

Kind Regards'

Ms Gwilym submitted that there had only been this very limited engagement by Ms Edunsin with the NMC in relation to these proceedings and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel decided to proceed in the absence of Ms Edunsin. In reaching this decision, the panel considered the submissions of Ms Gwilym and the advice of the legal assessor. It had particular regard to relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Ms Edunsin;
- Ms Edunsin had limited engagement with the NMC to any of the emails sent to her about this hearing and she did not state whether she would attend today;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case.

In these circumstances, the panel decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Ms Edunsin.

Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private

At the outset of the hearing, Ms Gwilym made a request that this case be held partly in private on the basis that proper exploration of Ms Edunsin's case involves matters relating to her health. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold

hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

The panel decided to go into private session in connection with Ms Edunsin's health as and when such issues are raised in order to protect her privacy.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to replace the current conditions of practice order with a suspension order for a period of 12 months.

This order will come into effect at the end of 28 October 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 30 September 2024.

The current order is due to expire on 28 October 2025.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

The charges found proved which resulted in the imposition of the substantive order were as follows:

'That you a registered nurse;

In respect of working at [PRIVATE] between 1 November 2022 – 23 February 2023;

- 1) Failed to complete clinical records during/following a consultation, for one or more patients as set out in schedule 1.*
- 2) Did not record clearly that you had documented a retrospective entry in the clinical records for one or more patients as set out in schedule 2.*

Whilst working at [PRIVATE] between 14 February – 16 May 2023;

- 3) Failed to complete clinical records during/following a consultation, for one or more patients as set out in schedule 3.*
- 4) For one or more consultations did not record clearly that you had documented a retrospective entry in the clinical records*
- 5) [Not Proved]*

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

‘...The panel found the three limbs above in the Dame Janet Smith test engaged. The panel finds that patients were put at risk and could have been caused physical harm as a result of Mrs Edunsin’s misconduct. Mrs Edunsin’s misconduct had breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute.

The panel had nothing before it to suggest that Mrs Edunsin had demonstrated sufficient insight. It had regard to the registrant’s response bundle, and noted that Mrs Edunsin had not provided a reflective piece on her failings or on what she could do in the future to ensure these failings do not happen again. Witness 2 informed the panel in her oral evidence that without proper records, there is a risk of harm to patients and other colleagues. The panel determined that Mrs Edunsin had not completed numerous records for a vast number of patients, even retrospectively.

The panel considered the positive testimonial that Mrs Edunsin had provided and was of the view that this was of limited value in assisting the panel, as it did not speak to the charges that were found proved.

The panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being addressed. Therefore, the panel carefully considered the evidence before it in

determining whether or not Mrs Edunsin has taken steps to strengthen her practice. The panel took into account the training on documentation and record keeping that Mrs Edunsin had undertaken in June 2023. The panel determined that although Mrs Edunsin had provided documentation on relevant training that speaks to the charges, it had no evidence of how she has used this to strengthen her practice.

The panel is of the view that there is a risk of repetition as Mrs Edunsin has not provided the panel with any evidence that she can practice safely and professionally. The panel found that the incidents took place over a number of months, and involved many patients in two separate practices. It also noted that it had no information on Mrs Edunsin's current practice and no evidence that she can practice safely. The panel therefore decided that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

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.

In addition, 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 also finds Mrs Edunsin's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

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

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'...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.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Mrs Edunsin'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 Mrs Edunsin'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 Mrs Edunsin'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;*
- Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of the conditions;*
- The conditions will protect patients during the period they are in force; and*
- Conditions can be created that can be monitored and assessed.*

The panel determined that it would be possible to formulate appropriate and practical conditions which would address the failings highlighted in this case.

The panel had regard to the fact that other than these incidents, Mrs Edunsin has had an unblemished career of many years as a nurse. The panel also noted that it was only in a minority of cases that records had not been completed by Mrs Edunsin. The

panel was of the view that it was in the public interest that, with appropriate safeguards, Mrs Edunsin should be able to return to practise as a nurse.

Balancing all of these factors, the panel determined that that the appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of a conditions of practice order.

The panel was of the view that to impose a suspension order or a striking-off order would be wholly disproportionate and would not be a reasonable response in the circumstances of Mrs Edunsin's case.

Having regard to the matters it has identified, the panel has concluded that a conditions of practice order will protect the public, mark the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and will send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standards of practice required of a registered nurse.

The panel determined that the following conditions are appropriate and proportionate in this case:

'For the purposes of these conditions, 'employment' and 'work' mean any paid or unpaid post in a nursing, midwifery or nursing associate role. Also, 'course of study' and 'course' mean any course of educational study connected to nursing, midwifery or nursing associates.

- 1) You must limit your practice to one clinical employer.*
- 2) You must have a workplace supervisor who will audit your record keeping entries on a weekly basis*
- 3) Before your next review hearing, you must produce a reflective piece which focuses on:*
 - The importance of comprehensive record keeping*

- *The significance and impact of not maintaining appropriate records*
- 4) *You must send the NMC a report before your next review hearing from your line manager / supervisor / mentor, detailing your record keeping performance.*
 - 5) *You must keep us informed about anywhere you are working by:*
 - a) *Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment.*
 - b) *Giving your case officer your employer's contact details.*
 - 6) *You must keep us informed about anywhere you are studying by:*
 - a) *Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting any course of study.*
 - b) *Giving your case officer the name and contact details of the organisation offering that course of study.*
 - 7) *You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:*
 - a) *Any organisation or person you work for.*
 - b) *Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).*
 - c) *Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.*
 - 8) *You must tell your case officer, within seven days of your becoming aware of:*
 - a) *Any clinical incident you are involved in.*
 - b) *Any investigation started against you.*
 - c) *Any disciplinary proceedings taken against you.*

- 9) *You must allow your case officer to share, as necessary, details about your performance, your compliance with and / or progress under these conditions with:*
- a) Any current or future employer.*
 - b) Any educational establishment.*
 - c) Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions*

The period of this order is for 12 months.

Before the order expires, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well Mrs Edunsin has complied with the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order or any condition of it, it may confirm the order or vary any condition of it, or it may replace the order for another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Mrs Edunsin's engagement with the NMC.*
- Testimonials from Mrs Edunsin's colleagues regarding her practice.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel considered carefully whether Ms Edunsin's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC defines fitness to practise as a registrant's ability to practice kindly, safely and professionally. In considering this case, the panel carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it noted the decision of the last panel, this panel exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle. It took account of the submissions made by Ms Gwilym on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Gwilym submitted that the substantive hearing had imposed a conditions of practice order for 12 months. She noted condition 4, which required Ms Edunsin to send a report

from her line manager, supervisor or mentor to the NMC detailing her record-keeping performance.

Ms Gwilym stated that the substantive panel determined the Ms Edunsin's actions fell significantly short of the standards expected of a registered nurse and amounted to breaches of the Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives 2015' (the Code).

Ms Gwilym submitted that the risks arising from inadequate record keeping are obvious and can result in patients not receiving the necessary follow-up care or undergoing unnecessary repeated treatments. She submitted that such failures bring the profession into disrepute and demonstrate a risk of breaching fundamental tenets of the profession in the future.

Ms Gwilym submitted that Ms Edunsin had not demonstrated insight into her failings. She highlighted that Ms Edunsin had not attended the hearing and did not provide a response bundle. She submitted that there was nothing before the panel to show any change or remediation.

Ms Gwilym reminded the panel of the powers available to them today and submitted that the NMC did not make any specific bid as to the outcome of today's hearing and that it was a matter entirely for the panel to decide.

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

In reaching its decision, the panel was mindful of the need to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and performance.

The panel carefully considered whether Ms Edusin's fitness to practise remains impaired. It noted that accurate and timely record keeping is a fundamental requirement of safe nursing practice. It took note of the concerns identified in this case which include widespread failures to complete clinical records over an extended period in two separate

workplaces. In some cases, she completely failed to make any recording whilst in others she had not clearly recorded that entries had been made by her retrospectively.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Ms Edunsin had not demonstrated sufficient insight. At this hearing Ms Edunsin did not attend nor make any written submissions to the panel to demonstrate an understanding of how her actions put patients at a risk of harm.

The panel accepted that the substantive panel had identified breaches of the Code and had imposed a conditions of practice order to address those deficiencies. However, it noted that since the order was imposed Ms Edunsin has not provided any reflective piece explaining the circumstances of her failings nor any evidence of learning or remediation. Ms Edunsin has not supplied any testimonials or report from a line manager, mentor, or supervisor despite the opportunity to do so.

The panel acknowledged that Ms Edunsin has cited health issues and personal circumstances in her recent email to the NMC. Nevertheless, the panel found that she has not engaged meaningfully or consistently with the NMC or demonstrated insight into her failings. Without such evidence, the panel could not be satisfied that the risk to patients and the wider public has been mitigated.

In light of this, this panel determined that Ms Edunsin is liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel has borne in mind that its primary function is to protect patients and the wider public interest which includes maintaining confidence in the nursing profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance. The panel determined that, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

For these reasons, the panel finds that Ms Edunsin's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Ms Edunsin's fitness to practise currently impaired, the panel then considered what, if any, sanction it should impose in this case. The panel noted that its powers are set out in Article 30 of the Order. The panel also took into account the 'NMC's Sanctions Guidance' (SG) and has borne in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, though any sanction imposed may have a punitive effect.

The panel first considered whether to allow the current order to expire without taking any further action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the ongoing public protection issues. The panel decided that it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to take no further action.

It then considered the imposition of a caution order but again determined that, due to the seriousness of the case, and the public protection issues identified, an order that does not restrict Ms Edunsin'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 Edunsin'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 extending the current conditions of practice order on Ms Edunsin's registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable.

Ms Edunsin has not had any meaningful engagement with the NMC since the imposition of the conditions of practice order imposed on 30 September 2024. This order has not led to any evidence of strengthened practice and there is no information before the panel to conclude that Ms Edunsin is willing and/or able to comply with any conditions imposed upon her practice. On this basis, the panel concluded that a conditions of practice order is no longer appropriate in this case.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for a period of 12 months. This would provide Ms Edunsin with an opportunity to engage with the NMC. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 28 October 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of suspension, another panel will review the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order, or it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- 1) A reflective piece explaining:
 - The reasons for her failings in record keeping.
 - The impact of those failings on patients, colleagues and public confidence
 - The steps she has taken to ensure such failings are not repeated.
- 2) Evidence of professional development, including documentary evidence of completion of relevant training courses and any subsequent reflections.
- 3) Testimonials or references from current or former colleagues.
- 4) Evidence of consistent engagement with the NMC, including attendance at the next review hearing.

This will be confirmed to Ms Edunsin in writing.

That concludes this determination.