

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing  
Thursday, 2 April 2026**

Virtual Hearing

**Name of Registrant:** Mary Folake Olanrewaju

**NMC PIN:** 91H01450

**Part(s) of the register:** Nursing – Sub part 1  
RN1: Registered Nurse – Adult (15 August 1991)

**Relevant Location:** Bedfordshire

**Type of case:** Misconduct

**Panel members:** Nilla Varsani (Chair, lay member)  
Donna Green (Registrant member)  
Paula Newton (Lay member)

**Legal Assessor:** Tracy Ayling KC

**Hearings Coordinator:** Hanifah Choudhury

**Nursing and Midwifery Council:** Represented by Alistair Kennedy, Case Presenter

**Mrs Olanrewaju:** Not present and unrepresented

**Order being reviewed:** Suspension order (6 months)

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired

**Outcome:** **Striking-Off order to come into effect at the end of 7 May 2026 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 Mrs Olanrewaju was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Mrs Olanrewaju's registered email address by secure email on 2 March 2026.

Mr Kennedy, 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, date and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join and, amongst other things, information about Mrs Olanrewaju's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Olanrewaju 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 Mrs Olanrewaju**

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mrs Olanrewaju. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Mr Kennedy who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Mrs Olanrewaju. He submitted that Mrs Olanrewaju had voluntarily absented herself.

Mr Kennedy submitted that there had been no engagement at all by Mrs Olanrewaju 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. He also submitted that it is in the public interest for today's review to go ahead.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel has decided to proceed in the absence of Mrs Olanrewaju. In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Mr Kennedy. 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 Mrs Olanrewaju;
- Mrs Olanrewaju has not engaged with the NMC and has not responded to any of the emails sent to her about this hearing;
- 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 has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Mrs Olanrewaju.

### **Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order**

The panel decided to replace the current suspension order with a striking off order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 7 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the second review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 6 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 8 April 2025. The order was reviewed on 3 September 2025 where the panel extended the suspension order for a further 6 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 7 May 2026.

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,*

1. *while working as a locum Nurse Practitioner at Toddington Medical Centre:*
  - a. *On or about 15 October 2019 incorrectly advised Patient A that they did not require an MMR vaccine for a planned trip. **[PROVED]***
  - b. *On 11 October 2019:*
    - i. *wrongly went to inject Denosumab directly into Patient B's stomach, **[PROVED]***
    - ii. *...*
  - c. *On 30 September 2019 incorrectly administered Zoladex to Patient C via the anterior thigh instead of the abdomen. **[PROVED]***
  - d. *In August and September 2019, incorrectly administered both Baby A's first and second baby immunisations early. **[PROVED]***
  - e. *Applied compression stockings while tending to Patients D, E, and/or F's wound dressings when it was clinically incorrect to do so. **[PROVED]***
  - f. *On an unknown date, applied one or more dressings without wearing protective gloves. **[PROVED]***
  - g. *Took one or more smear tests which were inadequate. **[PROVED]***
2. *Having accepted undertakings with the NMC, failed to comply with one or more of the following of those undertakings:*

- a. *Undertaking 6a, in you did not by 11 May 2024 send a report from your line manager or supervisor, setting out the standard of your supervised medication rounds. [PROVED]*
  
- b. *Undertaking 6b, in that you did not by 11 May 2024 send the NMC evidence that you had successfully completed a relevant course in the safe administration of medicines at all/ and/or which included an assessment of your competency. [PROVED]*
  
- c. *Undertaking 7, in that you did not send an up-to-date copy of your Personal development Plan within a month of the undertakings becoming effective. [PROVED]*
  
- d. *Undertaking 8, in that you did not send a report from your supervisor/line manager/mentor each month detailing progress against your Personal Development Plan. [PROVED]*
  
- e. *Undertaking 9, in that you did not send a copy of your reflective profile every two months. [PROVED]*
  
- f. *Undertaking 10, in that you did not complete and/or provide evidence that you had completed the agreed set of undertakings within 12 months of their becoming effective. [PROVED]*

*And, in light of the above, your Fitness to Practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.'*

The first reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

*'The panel considered whether Mrs Olanrewaju's fitness to practise remains impaired.*

*The panel was concerned at Mrs Olanrewaju's lack of engagement with the NMC both prior to and since the substantive meeting on 8 April 2025. As a consequence, the panel has no new information before it. The panel noted that the original panel found that Mrs Olanrewaju had insufficient insight due to the fact that that Mrs Olanrewaju provided no updated reflections since 2019. At this hearing, there is no evidence before the panel to suggest that Mrs Olanrewaju's insight has developed at all. Further, the panel was not afforded the opportunity to hear Mrs Olanrewaju's oral submissions and ask any questions as a result of her non-attendance at this hearing.*

*The panel noted that the original panel was satisfied that the misconduct in this case was capable of being addressed. At this hearing, the panel is of the view that the matters of the kind found proved are capable of being remediated, however there has been no evidence submitted by Mrs Olanrewaju to demonstrate that she has taken any steps to gain further knowledge and strengthen her practice since prior to the substantive meeting on 8 April 2025. Although the panel is aware that the current suspension order prohibits Mrs Olanrewaju from working as a nurse, there is no information of Mrs Olanrewaju's current work situation, and no testimonials in support of her current practice.*

*The panel was satisfied that there remains a risk to the public if Mrs Olanrewaju were allowed to practise without restriction. The panel determined that there is a risk of repetition due to the lack of evidence before it to suggest that Mrs Olanrewaju has reflected fully on her misconduct or completed any further training in the areas of concern. 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 considered that members of the public would be concerned at the manner in which Mrs Olanrewaju had disregarded undertakings with which she had agreed, in order to address her clinical competence, and her failure to engage with the NMC as her*

*regulator. In the light of this, 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 Mrs Olanrewaju's fitness to practise remains impaired.'*

The first reviewing 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 Olanrewaju'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 Olanrewaju'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 a conditions of practice order on Mrs Olanrewaju'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 bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original meeting and that Mrs Olanrewaju had undertakings in place prior to the substantive meeting. The panel was of the view that Mrs Olanrewaju had an opportunity at that time to prove herself as someone who is able to practice kindly, safely and professionally and remediate her misconduct. The panel noted her lack of compliance with the undertakings and the fact that there is no new information before it to suggest that Mrs Olanrewaju would now comply with any conditions of practice if they were to be imposed. Further there is no information about Mrs*

*Olanrewaju's work situation since the allegations were made. The panel concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest.*

*The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Mrs Olanrewaju further time to fully reflect on her previous failings. The panel concluded that a further 6 month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Mrs Olanrewaju adequate time to further develop her insight and take steps to strengthen her practice.*

*The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would continue to both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for the period of 6 months would provide Mrs Olanrewaju with an opportunity to engage with the NMC and to provide the NMC with information in regard to Mrs Olanrewaju's intentions to return to nursing practice. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.*

*The panel was of the view that a striking off order would be disproportionate at present, as the substance of Mrs Olanrewaju's original misconduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register.*

*The panel considered whether to allow the current suspension order to lapse upon expiry with a finding of impairment. The panel determined that it could not conclude at this stage that it was unlikely that Mrs Olanrewaju would return to safe and unrestricted practice within a reasonable period of time.*

*This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 7 November 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, extend 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:*

- *Mrs Olanrewaju's engagement and attendance at a future review hearing.*
- *A written statement recording Mrs Olanrewaju's reflections on the conduct which gave rise to the findings against her, on the impact it had on patients, colleagues and the wider profession, and what Mrs Olanrewaju has done to address them.*
- *Any recent references or testimonials attesting to Mrs Olanrewaju's capability to perform your duties, in whatever role, in any paid or unpaid work.*
- *Any relevant training courses undertaken to address the areas of concern identified in the substantive meeting on 8 April 2025.'*

### **Decision and reasons on current impairment**

The panel has considered carefully whether Mrs Olanrewaju's fitness to practise remains impaired. Whilst there is no statutory definition of fitness to practise, the NMC has defined fitness to practise as the ability of a professional on our register to practise as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate safely and effectively without restriction. In considering this case, the panel has carried out a comprehensive review of the order in light of the current circumstances. Whilst it has noted the decision of the last panel, this panel has exercised its own judgement as to current impairment.

The panel has had regard to all of the documentation before it, including the NMC bundle. It has taken account of the submissions made by Mr Kennedy. The panel did not receive any documents from Mrs Olanrewaju.

Mr Kennedy submitted that there has been no engagement from Mrs Olanrewaju and therefore none of the recommendations set out by the previous panel have been met. He submitted that there has been no information provided by Mrs Olanrewaju to undermine the previous findings of impairment or to suggest that the concerns have been remediated.

He further submitted that a finding of current impairment remains necessary on the ground of public protection and in the wider public interest.

Mr Kennedy submitted that the NMC's position today in relation to sanction is that nothing less than a further suspension would be sufficient to protect the public. He submitted that it is a matter for the panel to decide if a striking off order is now the necessary and appropriate order.

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor. The legal assessor referred the panel to NMC guidance Rev-2h '*Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place*' explaining that this guidance outlines the factors to be considered, including the need for a balanced, lawful, and proportionate approach when reaching a decision.

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 considered whether Mrs Olanrewaju's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that there had been no engagement from Mrs Olanrewaju and no information had been provided by her for its consideration. In the absence of any reflective material, evidence of insight, or completion of relevant training, the panel concluded that there was no indication that Mrs Olanrewaju had addressed the concerns identified.

The panel had regard to the findings of the original allegations and previous panels which determined that the concerns were capable of remediation. However, the panel found that there had been no evidence of any strengthening of practice or steps taken to remediate by Mrs Olanrewaju.

The panel also noted that the concerns date back to 2019 and that undertakings imposed in 2022 and 2023 had not been complied with. The panel considered that there has been an extensive period of non-engagement by Mrs Olanrewaju. The panel determined that, as a registered nurse, there is an expectation that Mrs Olanrewaju engages with her

regulator. The panel considered that Mrs Olanrewaju has been given multiple opportunities to attend hearings and engage with the process. Previous panels had clearly set out what was required of her; however, she has failed to take those steps.

In these circumstances, the panel determined that there is no evidence of insight, remediation, or a willingness to engage. Accordingly, the panel concluded that there remains a risk to the public and that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

Further, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession and the regulatory process would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made. It therefore determined that a finding of impairment is also required in the wider public interest.

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

### **Decision and reasons on sanction**

Having found Mrs Olanrewaju'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 has also taken 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 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 Olanrewaju'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, but the Committee wants to mark that what*

*happened was unacceptable and must not happen again'* The panel considered that Mrs Olanrewaju'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 conditions of practice on Mrs Olanrewaju'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 bore in mind the seriousness of the facts found proved at the original meeting. The panel concluded that whilst it could formulate conditions of practice that would adequately protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest, due to Mrs Olanrewaju's continued lack of engagement the panel could not be satisfied that she would comply with any conditions imposed.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. Mrs Olanrewaju has not engaged with the NMC and therefore there is no evidence before the panel that she has shown remorse for her misconduct nor any insight or reflections into her previous failings. The panel was of the view that it is part of a nurse's professional responsibility to maintain engagement with the regulator and Mrs Olanrewaju has failed to do so throughout proceedings. This implies a disregard to the NMC as a regulator.

The panel therefore determined that in the circumstances of this case a further period of suspension would not be appropriate.

The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Mrs Olanrewaju from practising in the future and concluded that the only sanction that would adequately protect the public and serve the public interest was a striking-off order.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 7 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Mrs Olanrewaju in writing.

That concludes this determination.