

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Hearing
Monday, 30 March 2026 – Wednesday, 1 April 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Appellant: Aderonke Ijandipe

PRA Number: 1021901003

Type of case: Registration appeal

Panel members: Sarah Hamilton (Chair, lay member)
Alien Cherry (Registrant member)
Ian Hanson (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Alice Robertson Rickard

Hearings Coordinator: Daisy Sims

Nursing and Midwifery Council: Represented by Uzma Khan, Case Presenter

Ms Ijandipe: Present and represented by Adewuyi Oyegoke

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 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 concern in this matter relates.

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 in 20 minutes or under.

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 concerning data set and alleged that human interference was involved.

The NMC commissioned a report from Witness 8, 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 minutes or under and/or Clinical test in 21.5 minutes 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:

- Clinical: 15.12 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.

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

- Expert reports by Witness 8 Head of Data Analytics at OAC
- Witness statements of Witness 3, Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE
- Witness statements of Witness 4, Executive Director of Professional Practice at the NMC
- Witness statements of Witness 1 and Witness 2

- Your completed application
- Your comments sent by email on 16 January 2024

In your initial correspondence to the NMC of 16 January 2024, you stated that you chose Yunnik to sit your CBT test because it was a Pearson VUE approved centre. You denied taking part in any fraudulent activity during your test and denied having prior knowledge of such acts taking place at Yunnik. You stated in that correspondence that you undertook extensive online preparation with Able Business Global Solutions between 8 February to 4 March 2022. You also stated that you studied using other reading materials and used Pearson VUE's website for practice tests.

The Assistant Registrar considered your explanation. The Assistant Registrar found that whilst you had shown that you were able to pass the CBT again, it did not explain how you were able to obtain your test result from Yunnik in the time you did when comparing it against times taken by candidates globally. Because of this, the Assistant Registrar was not satisfied that they had been presented with anything that changed the conclusion that it was more likely than not that you obtained your CBT test result from Yunnik fraudulently. The Assistant Registrar therefore determined that you did not meet the character requirements to be considered capable of safe and effective practice.

On 29 January 2024, you were informed that the Assistant Registrar had refused your application onto the register.

You appealed the decision on 3 February 2024, within the 28 day time limit. You subsequently withdrew that appeal. Instead you made a new application to join the NMC register, which was refused on 2 April 2025. You appealed that decision by Notice of Appeal dated 25 April 2025. That is the appeal being determined by this panel.

Mr Oyegoke, on your behalf, had submitted a bundle of evidence to the NMC on 15 March 2025. This included your admission to the fraudulent activity at the Yunnik Centre on 25 April 2022 when you wrote your CBT. In this bundle it states:

'It is her case that she did deny any fraudulent activity in her response of 16 January 2024 to the NMC and her subsequent appeal which was filed following the rejection of her application. That both was because the NMC Nigeria portal p10 <https://healthwise.punchng.com/breaking-nursing-council-reopens-verification-portal-for-nurses/#g> had been suspended at the time which would not made a re-registration to be possible. She did also state that she obtained legal advice which we submit are covered by legal privilege protection. It is our emphasis that it is her privilege not that of the adviser.'

Evidence

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

- A signed witness statement;
- A reflective piece;
- Several character references;
- Your contract for employment as a Care Worker from 22 April 2025 to end on 21 April 2026 in the United Kingdom;
- Confirmation of Pearson VUE Exam Appointment dated 29 March 2026;
- A certificate of sponsorship from UK Visas and Immigration; and
- Payslips form KCare Nursing Agency.

The panel heard from the following live witness on your behalf:

- Witness 10: A registered nurse

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

- Witness 9: Employed by the NMC as the Assistant Director for CBT.

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: Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.
- Witness 4: Employed by the NMC as the Executive Director of Professional Practice.
- Witness 5: Senior International Registration Manager at the NMC.
- Witness 6: The Deputy Director for Business Transformation and a member of the Executive Team for Professional Regulation.
- Witness 7: Senior Nursing Education Adviser and member of the Executive Team in the Professional Practice Directorate at the NMC.
- Witness 8: An independent Data Analyst who provided the NMC with an analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE.

Opening submissions

Ms Khan informed the panel that this is a case where fraud has been admitted, and so the fraudulent nature of your test results is not being challenged. She reminded the panel that you have since resat the assessment and you have passed. Therefore, the only issue for the panel to determine is whether you meet the character requirements for admission to the NMC register given the fraudulent procurement of your initial CBT assessment.

Ms Khan submitted that the refusal from the Assistant Registrar should stand because it is relevant, proportionate and fair. She adopted the findings of the Assistant Registrar.

Ms Khan outlined the background to these allegations. 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 8'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 to Witness 1 and Witness 2's statements which corroborated the routine nature of proxy operations at Yunnik.

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 informed the panel that you sat your clinical test at the Yunnik Centre on 25 April 2022. She explained that you only undertook the clinical examination at the Yunnik centre because you had previously taken both elements of the test, clinical and numerical, prior to 25 April 2022, and you were unsuccessful on the clinical test.

Ms Khan explained that there were two other candidates on 25 April 2022 at the Yunnik centre who had similar short test times that were statistical outliers.

Ms Khan informed the panel that this is in effect your second application. In relation to your first application you originally denied any involvement in the fraud in an email sent to the NMC on 16 January 2024. She explained that you submitted grounds for appeal on this application but it was not pursued.

On your second application, you accepted that you received assistance during the test. The Assistant Registrar considered this explanation and was not satisfied that this adequately addressed the seriousness of the conduct or that you would act differently if faced with similar circumstances in future professional practice. The Assistant Registrar determined that the timing of your admission was key and demonstrated a lack of insight

into the seriousness of the fraud and whether you can be relied upon in future practice (you did not admit your wrongdoing until March 2025).

The Assistant Registrar noted your statement that you felt pressured into your decision to participate in the fraudulent activity, however this was not accepted.

Ms Khan referred the panel to the evidence you submitted for this hearing in which you rely on a different narrative for why you accepted the fraudulent help at the Yunnik Centre. Ms Khan submitted that this explanation still lacks detail and fails to address ongoing concerns and allay any concerns about decision making skills and future conduct. She further submitted that there are concerns about the truthfulness of your explanation.

Ms Khan submitted that dishonest conduct in the application process goes directly to whether you can meet the standards expected of a registrant. She submitted that participation in fraud and delayed admission to being a part of fraud is a serious concern and questions whether the standard expected of a registrant can be met.

Ms Khan submitted that the NMC has a statutory obligation to ensure that all applicants meet its standards of competence, honesty and integrity. This duty extends not only to the individual applicant, but to the wider public interest and the reputation of the nursing profession. She submitted that to accept documentation and test results that are compromised would erode the confidence that patients, employees and the public place in the regulatory process. She invited the panel to conclude that the Assistant Registrar's decision was firmly grounded in evidence and invited the panel to dismiss this appeal and uphold the refusal of registration.

Evidence

The panel heard live evidence from Witness 9, the Assistant Director for CBT. She gave evidence about the number of candidates who were investigated in relation to the suspicious test results at the Yunnik centre and the number who had ultimately been either granted registration or had been permitted to remain on the register.

You provided evidence under affirmation to the panel.

You explained that your first application was refused in January 2024 and you then made a new application. You confirmed that every application needs confirmation from your

home country in order to verify certificates that you are registered as a nurse in that country.

Regarding your admission to fraud in March 2025 and the delay in this admission, you explained that after the Assistant Registrar refused your first application you undertook online courses. You explained that it was not initially possible to make a new application as the website in Nigeria was closed in September 2023 and reopened in September 2024. You could not apply until you had been verified by your home country. You stated that this is why you made a new application in October 2024 and stated that you were planning on using the courses that you undertook as part of this application.

Under cross examination, you stated that in relation to the first CBT test which you undertook in Lagos, your friend made the payment for you. In relation to the second test in Yunnik, you said that you checked the Pearson VUE website and saw the Yunnik centre, and you got the information on how to book from this website. You stated that you sent money to the centre manager of the Yunnik Centre. You explained that to book for the CBT at the Yunnik centre you got a number from Facebook, and someone booked on your behalf. You stated that you did not know that the Yunnik centre staff were involved in fraud. You stated that you do not have a bank account where you can transfer money in pounds so you sent money in Nira to the manager of the Yunnik Centre.

In relation to the day in question you stated that you left your house around 7am in order to get to the centre on time. You stated that you needed to be at the centre at 1 to 1:30pm. You stated that you left that early to avoid traffic. You stated that you arrived at the centre at around 8:30am. In answer to a question regarding why you were able to sit your exam at 9:55am when you were scheduled to take it at 1:30pm, you stated that it was because you were present at the centre and ready to take your test. You explained that you were approached by the manager of the centre, the same person who you had sent money to. When you were ready to start your test, you stated that he informed you that there was someone there who could help you.

You stated that you accept that you should have refused or walked away however you were scared as there were issues of kidnapping in Nigeria and there was risk of killing of women, you stated that you were helpless.

You accepted in cross examination that you were not physically threatened by the manager, he was not abusive and nor were there any threats made to your family. You explained that the manager was a powerful man and you explained that in Nigeria they will not punish him. You conceded that you should have contacted the NMC when you got to the UK. You stated that you did not admit that you had taken part in the fraud because you were scared and feared punishment from the NMC.

If you were to deal with this situation now, you explained that in a clinical setting you should be honest and open and tell them the truth about their treatment.

If you were in a situation where someone invited you to commit fraud, you stated that the courses you have undertaken have helped you, particularly the emotional intelligence course. You explained that you would be able to speak out if you were in the same situation to maintain your honesty.

You stated that if you were in this situation again you would report it to the authorities because it is against the code and ethics of the nursing profession.

You stated that you did tell the people who provided you references that you had fraudulently procured your test result, although in re-examination you stated that you did not.

The panel heard evidence from Witness 10 on your behalf. She had provided two testimonials dated March 2025 and March 2026. Witness 10 is a registered nurse and a volunteer pastor at the church you attend. She stated that she first met you in 2022. Witness 10 stated that she is aware that you have done online courses and saw how intelligent you are.

Witness 10's first testimonial stated '*She has made me aware of the circumstances leading to the refusal of her application with the nursing and midwifery council.*'

Her second testimonial, a year later stated: '*She has made me aware of the circumstances leading to the refusal of her application with the nursing and midwifery council. Aderonke has now realized the gravity of her actions in relation to the Yunnik CBT malpractice. She has admitted her involvement, expressed genuine remorse and undertaken to refrain from any such conduct in the future.*'

Witness 10 stated that she was aware of the circumstances of the events when she wrote her first testimonial dated 2 March 2025, however she then conceded that she was not aware at that time that you had written to the NMC denying your part in the fraud.

Closing submissions

Ms Khan, in closing, reminded the panel that you accept that you took part in the fraud.

Ms Khan submitted that you are not fit to be on the register given the seriousness of your fraudulent behaviour, your evolving explanation, your delay in making a full admission and the limited evidence of sufficiently developed insight which meant that there was a risk of repetition of dishonest behaviour.

Ms Khan submitted that the panel needs to assess the reliability of the result and the credibility of your explanations. She submitted that your explanation has evolved over time and it is difficult to reconcile it with the evidence before the panel. Ms Khan submitted that you have struggled to provide a clear account and submitted that your explanations lacked detail, clarity, consistency and credibility.

Ms Khan reminded the panel that you now state that you were scared to refuse the fraudulent assistance because you were scared for your safety. She submitted that this assertion is not supported by any evidence including your own evidence because you could not explain what the threats were. Ms Khan submitted that there is no suggestion before this panel of any actual threat or any indication of coercive circumstances that would stop you from reporting the incident afterwards.

Ms Khan submitted that there were at least five missed opportunities for you to admit to the fraudulent procural of your CBT test before submitting your appeal.

Ms Khan submitted that the timing of the admission needs to be seen as an ongoing concern. She submitted that you knew at the time of accepting assistance that it was wrong and you denied involvement when you were first asked.

Ms Khan submitted that the delay in you admitting your wrongdoing occurred despite you undertaking professional training. She submitted that this demonstrates that the admission occurred at a late stage and at a time where you believed it would facilitate your ability to gain entry onto the register.

Ms Khan reminded the panel that competence is not in question here.

Ms Khan submitted that you had motive to fraudulently procure your clinical CBT assessment results because you had already failed the clinical part of the exam before your resit at the Yunnik centre. Additionally Ms Khan submitted that you were aware that there were some individuals who had admitted to fraud and have been allowed onto the register and this could be a reason for your late disclosure.

In relation to the testimonials provided, Ms Khan submitted that the genuineness of these testimonials is questionable because of the identical wording in two of these testimonials despite them being from entirely separate individuals, dated at different times and in different places.

Ms Khan invited the panel to reach the same decision as the Assistant Registrar by upholding this decision and rejecting this appeal

Mr Oyegoke submitted that if all people on the register went through this type of regulatory hearing, the majority would fall by the wayside.

Mr Oyegoke submitted that fear is different for all individuals in that some can handle fear differently to others. He submitted that there were environmental concerns with kidnapping in Nigeria at the time and there is information to support this.

Mr Oyegoke reminded the panel of the live evidence of Witness 9 that it is not possible for an applicant to pursue an appeal and commence re registration at the same time.

Mr Oyegoke submitted that the risk of repetition is quite low because from September 2022 you have been working in the United Kingdom with no repetition of similar conduct. He said that it was a case of '*once bitten twice shy*'. He submitted that you have reflected

on your wrongdoing and are now fully aware of your duties. He submitted that your account could properly be described as evolving rather than contradictory and that there was more information available to the panel now.

He submitted that there is a public interest in an otherwise good practitioner, who has learned from their actions, gaining registration and working as a registered nurse in the United Kingdom.

Mr Oyegoke reminded the panel that there were other nurses who, once investigated, were allowed to join or remain on the register.

Mr Oyegoke invited the panel to accept this appeal and direct for your admission onto the register.

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 the Yunnik Centre.

The panel had sight of the analysis provided by Witness 8 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 time achieved at the Yunnik Centre.

This analysis identifies that, as result of your test time, it is likely that you used a proxy tester at the Yunnik Centre.

It is the evidence of Witness 6 that so far, 18 individuals have come forward and made admissions to using a proxy tester at the Yunnik Centre. 16 of those individuals remain anonymous. Additionally, the panel had before it the data from Pearson Vue with regards to the times taken to complete the CBT at the Yunnik Centre. Witness 6 records the accounts given by 14 of individuals and in three admissions, the time recorded for Part B

(Clinical) was inside the threshold of 1 in 2,500 but the time recorded for Part A (the numerical test) was just outside the 1 in 2,500 threshold.

The panel considered the witness statements of both Witness 1 and Witness 2, who describe attending for the CBT at the Yunnik Centre and subsequently being pressured into using a proxy tester.

The panel noted that there were two other candidates who took the test on the same morning as you, and both of them finished it unusually quickly. This raised concerns for the panel and suggested that a proxy tester may have been used that day. Given the history of fraud at the testing centre, it is very unlikely that three candidates sitting for the exam on the same day could complete it so rapidly without help.

Considering all this information, the panel was satisfied that widespread fraud occurred at the Yunnik Centre.

The panel next considered whether it is more likely than not that you used a proxy test taker in obtaining a satisfactory test result from the Yunnik centre.

The panel noted your admission that you did fraudulently procure your clinical test at the Yunnik Centre.

The panel therefore concluded that the only reasonable explanation for your fast completion was more likely than not that you obtained your test results fraudulently.

Finally, the panel went on to determine whether you meet the character requirements for admission to the NMC register. The panel had regard to the NMC guidance on health and character, in particular 'Factors that we take into account when considering character cases', last updated on 5 September 2024. The panel was aware that it was for you to satisfy the panel that you met the character requirements for successful admission on the register.

The panel considered your evidence that you felt under threat to undertake the clinical CBT examination at the Yunnik Centre fraudulently. It noted that you made reference to

kidnappings in Nigeria, however it determined that there is no evidence to support your assertion that you felt under threat specifically at the Yunnik Centre. The panel noted that when repeatedly questioned about the threat you felt, you were unable to provide any detail or explanation. It noted that you were asked why you did not raise your feelings of being under threat when the NMC contacted you in the first instance about your CBT examinations, but you could not explain this. You accepted that the manager was not abusive, did not make any threats towards you and did not know where you or your family lived.

The panel also considered the good character references you provided. The panel determined that there was no reasonable explanation provided for why the contents of two of these references were completely identical, including the same grammatical error. You were not able to provide any explanation for this. The panel therefore determined that these references were unreliable as it could not determine who actually wrote these references and whether they are legitimate. It therefore attached little weight to these references. The panel also considered the answers you provided to questioning regarding when you told the authors of these references that you had engaged in fraud. It determined that you could not provide a consistent answer for when you informed these authors of your fraudulent behaviour. At different points in your oral evidence you said that you had and had not told them that you were involved in the fraud.

The panel noted the live evidence provided by Witness 10. It considered that this witness evidence was inconsistent and did not provide clear explanations for when they were informed of you fraudulently procuring your CBT result. The panel therefore attached little weight to the evidence of Witness 10.

The panel did not accept your account in relation to the level of your involvement in the fraud at Yunnik. It found that it was likely that you were fully aware from the outset that you would be taking the test using a proxy. The panel noted that you had previously failed your clinical CBT assessment which is likely to have been why you chose to resit your test at Yunnik where you would be likely to pass. It also noted that your examination was due to start at 1:30pm on the day in question and you actually started your examination, with a proxy, at 09:55am. The panel did not find your explanation plausible as to why you had arrived at the centre five hours before the exam was due to start. Overall, your evidence

that you were unaware beforehand of the fraudulent activity taking place at Yunnik lacked credibility.

The panel then went on to consider your delayed admission of your part in the fraud to the NMC. It noted that you denied any wrongdoing in your letter of January 2024. You then undertook duty of candour training in February 2024, yet you did not admit the fraud until March 2025. The panel considered it likely that you only admitted the fraud when you believed that this would help with your second application to be admitted to the register.

In determining the risk of you repeating your dishonest conduct, the panel noted that you were dishonest in the first instance in fraudulently procuring your CBT results, you then lied in first response to NMC and did not make any admissions for 13 months afterwards. It noted that during this time you undertook further training including duty of candour and emotional intelligence training. The panel found it concerning that even after completing this training, you still did not apply your learning from these courses straight away by admitting your actions. The panel also found that in your oral evidence to this panel, you were inconsistent in your answers as to when you told your referees that you had cheated, as to why you felt under threat and as to why you delayed your admission to the NMC. The panel considered that your insight remains very limited. The panel therefore determined that there is a real risk of repetition of your dishonest conduct.

The panel acknowledged that the matters before it did not concern your clinical competence or your ability to act with kindness and compassion toward patients. However, the concerns related to honesty and integrity; fundamental tenets of the nursing profession. Your competence as a nurse could not mitigate the seriousness of concerns involving your truthfulness.

In light of the all of the above, it was not satisfied that you meet the good character requirements for admission to the register.

The panel therefore decided to dismiss your appeal, 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.