

Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee

Fraudulent/Incorrect Entry Hearing
Thursday, 13 August 2026

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Tawanda Lovejoy Chivima
NMC PIN:	10F1833E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse - Mental Health RNMH - October 2010
Relevant Location:	Hertfordshire
Type of case:	Incorrect and Fraudulent entry
Panel members:	Nariane Chantler (Chair, Registrant member) Elaine Bowden (Registrant member) Julian Graville (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Fiona Barnett
Hearings Coordinator:	Elizabeth Fagbo
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	represented by Mr Burch, Case Presenter
Mr Chivima:	Present and represented by Mr Buxton
Outcome:	Registration entry fraudulently procured and incorrectly made
Direction:	Directs that the Registrar remove your entry from the register
Interim order:	No order

Details of charge

That you...

1. On your online revalidation application form dated 03 September 2021, did not declare that you had been convicted on 11 March 2020 at North and East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court for:

- a. taking a motor vehicle without consent contrary to Theft Act 1968 s.12(1),
- b. driving whilst disqualified contrary to Road Traffic Act 1988 s.103(1)(b),
- c. use a handheld mobile phone/device while driving a motor vehicle on a road contrary to Road Vehicles (Construction and use) Regulations 1986 reg. 110(1), and
- d. using vehicle while uninsured contrary to Road Traffic Act 1988 s.143(2)

And thereby an entry on Sub Part 1 of the NMC register in the name of Tawanda Lovejoy Chivima, PIN 10F1833E, was fraudulently procured and/or incorrectly made.

Background

The charges arose whilst you were employed as a registered mental health nurse.

On 25 March 2024 the NMC received a referral from your employer informing the NMC that you had failed to declare a conviction. You received a conviction on 11 March 2020 for taking a motor vehicle without consent, driving while disqualified, use a handheld mobile phone/device while driving a motor vehicle on a road and using vehicle while uninsured, which was by way of a guilty plea. This led to the NMC investigating and obtaining details of these charges and your conviction relating to events which took place on 16 January 2020.

On 3 September 2021 you submitted your online revalidation application. You answered 'no' to the question about whether you had received a police charge, caution, or conviction. As a result, the NMC opened this case in relation to incorrect and/or fraudulent entry on the register.

Decision and reasons on the facts

At the outset of the hearing, the panel heard from Mr Buxton, on your behalf, who informed the panel that you made full admissions to charges 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d.

The panel therefore finds charges 1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d proved in their entirety, by way of your admissions.

The panel had written evidence from the following witness on behalf of the NMC:

- Conor Bell: NMC Registration Investigations
Manager.

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

During your evidence, Mr Buxton made a request that this case be held partially in private. He submitted that any references to personal matters and family life should be heard in

private. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

Mr Burch, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), supported the application.

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 determined to go into private session as and when your personal matters and family life are raised, in order to protect your right to privacy.

Your evidence

You provided the panel with the following documentation to support your case:

- Training Evidence
- Testimonials and Feedback
- NMC revalidation dated 30 August 2024
- Email correspondence with the NMC
- Confirmation of your employment offer dated 10 August 2026
- Your reflections

The panel heard evidence from you under affirmation.

In relation to the letter dated 27 September 2024 regarding your revalidation where the NMC informed you that your registration had been updated and that there was an ongoing investigation into your 2021 revalidation regarding failing to disclose the convictions, you said that you did not fully understand the process in your head at that time. You said that you were also informed that there was a referral by your employer, and you were confused. Further, you said that when you were informed that your registration had been updated you thought that everything had been resolved at that point. However, when you

received communications regarding you being referred to the NMC, you then understood that the NMC had proceeded with its investigation into the events of 2020 and your 2021 revalidation.

You accepted that you were dishonest in your revalidation in 2021 and withheld your convictions. You said that your actions were wrong and you have had a lot of time to reflect on them. You said that it would have been better to disclose your convictions during your revalidation in 2021 as it would have demonstrated integrity on your part, regardless of the actual convictions themselves. However, in not doing so, the trust between yourself, the NMC and the public was broken. You said that this also affected your families trust in you.

You said that you love to support your patients and colleagues as it makes you feel relevant, and you were very afraid of losing your PIN, your job, and the shame that would accompany this. Therefore, you initially chose not to disclose your convictions during your revalidation in 2021 as you were overwhelmed. You also said that you were dealing with a lot of personal stressors at that time, however, it is not in your nature to act in such a manner. You said that you experienced a lot of guilt as a result of this and therefore decided to disclose your convictions in 2024, and in doing so you felt that a weight had been lifted from you. You also stated that you felt responsible to disclose this information to the NMC and the public.

[PRIVATE].

You said that you were open and transparent to your employer about your driving conviction in 2020 and that it did not make sense to withhold your convictions when such information would be displayed in a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check.

You referred to your reflective statements and stated that you have taken accountability, have engaged in relevant training regarding honesty and integrity, and you have demonstrated meaningful insight into this matter.

Closing submissions

In view of the acceptance of the charges Mr Burch stated that the information provided in your revalidation in 2021 was fraudulently procured and incorrectly made.

Mr Burch invited the panel to direct the Registrar to remove your entry from the NMC register. He referred the panel to the relevant NMC Guidance.

Mr Burch submitted that hearings often result in a removal, even when the entry is incorrect rather than fraudulent, because the registrar was not in a position to make a value judgement or balancing exercise about the registration based on the correct information. Regarding your revalidation in 2024, Mr Burch submitted that your revalidation application of 2024 was not considered by the assistant registrar, according to the witness Conor Bell who outlined the revalidation process. Therefore, he submitted that a value judgement was not made regarding your August 2024 revalidation on the basis that there was an ongoing investigation into the events from your conviction of early 2020 and your revalidation of 2021, which forms the basis of the admitted charges.

Mr Burch submitted that the NMC's position is that just because there has been a revalidation in 2024, that does not supersede the allegations in respect to 2020 and your 2021 revalidation. He submitted that it was a formality that you were allowed to remain on the register whilst there were the ongoing investigation and the ongoing case of the incorrect entry and fraudulent entry.

Further, Mr Burch submitted that according to the relevant guidance if an individual is subject to an NMC investigation, they are still required to apply to renew their registration, providing they fulfil all the requirements for renewal and wish to continue practising. Therefore, registrants should still apply for the revalidation.

Mr Burch acknowledged the certificates and positive testimonials that have been submitted on your behalf. He submitted however, that this case is very serious and involves admitted dishonesty. He also submitted that you have accepted that there was an element of personal gain in withholding this information in that you were able to remain on the register. Mr Burch also submitted that you stated that you are more likely to lose your livelihood in going to the NMC, whereas if you disclose to an employer, they can do other things. Further, Mr Burch submitted that dishonesty is very difficult to remediate.

Mr Buxton submitted that you have accepted the charges.

Mr Buxton referred the panel to the relevant NMC Guidance and documentation.

Mr Buxton submitted that you have been practising without issue and have been demonstrating safe practice as indicated by the testimonials, and certificates before the panel. He submitted that the NMC did not seek an interim order against you at any stage and were fully aware of the concerns about which the panel have heard today.

Mr Buxton referred to the following:

‘...If you are subject to an NMC investigation, conditions of practise, order or a caution, you will be able to apply to renew your registration as long as you fulfil all the requirements for renewal. However, you will remain subject to NMC fitness to practise processes and the outcome of those processes...’

Mr Buxton submitted that it appears that the referral led the NMC, to make the inquiries into the nature and extent of your previous criminal convictions. He submitted that the second witness statement of Conor Bell was provided to parties late yesterday afternoon. He referred the panel to specific paragraphs in terms of what apparently happens behind the scenes and the evidence that the 2024 revalidation was not referred to an assistant registrar for a decision. He submitted that the application must have been considered by someone else, otherwise what is the purpose of revalidation at all.

Mr Buxton submitted that the integrity of the register is a vital part of public protection, ensuring public confidence, trust in the register and the NMC as a regulator. He submitted that the Guidance also states that the existence of a criminal conviction is likely to require the registrar to exercise their judgement to decide whether the person should be allowed to be on the register. He submitted that the information in your application for revalidation in 2024 is full and complete. He submitted that he is inviting the panel to take no further action on the basis that you have practised without further concern, without any interim order restrictions, in the face of this investigation and a

referral which led to the NMC itself inquiring into your convictions.

Further, Mr Buxton submitted that it is admitted that dishonesty is serious, however, the appropriate direction would be either joining this concern to the existing fitness to practise investigation or opening a separate fitness to practise inquiry in isolation. He also submitted that at the time you believed that you had put everything right having supplied all relevant information, and that you were “*okay to practise*”. Mr Buxton submitted that you are currently being onboarded for a permanent position with Priory Hospital Cheadle. He submitted that in the circumstances of this case it may be appropriate to take no action and allow the NMC to take what action it deems appropriate in respect of the matter and ongoing investigations.

Decision on Incorrect and Fraudulent Entry

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account the witness statement of Conor Bell dated 20 October 2025, your online revalidation submissions dated 3 September 2021 and 23 August 2024, an email from your former employer confirming the conviction declared dated 23 August 2024, your reflection and supporting documents dated 13 January 2025, the Memorandum of Conviction dated 21 January 2026 and your representative’s response to the Standard Direction Form dated 12 February 2026.

It also took into account your registrant’s bundle which included training evidence, witness statements, testimonials and feedback from your employer and colleagues, your revalidation dated 30 August 2024, email correspondence between you and the NMC and confirmation of your employment offer dated 10 August 2026. It accepted your oral evidence under affirmation.

The panel first considered whether the entry in the register was fraudulently procured and/or incorrectly made.

The panel also had regard to the NMC guidance relating to incorrect and fraudulent entries.

The panel bore in mind that for an entry to be fraudulent, any of the information submitted as part of the registration, readmission or revalidation process had to be submitted with the deliberate intention to mislead the NMC.

It also bore in mind that an entry might be incorrect if the NMC's decision to register, renew, or readmit someone on to the register was based on wrong or inaccurate information about them meeting the relevant requirements.

The panel took into account that during your revalidation in 2021 you had intentionally withheld information regarding your convictions which you admitted in your reflection and your evidence. You accepted that you had not wanted to disclose this to the registrar at this time for fear of losing your PIN and your job. Therefore, the panel decided that you deliberately misled the NMC and that your entry in the register was consequently fraudulently procured. Further, given that you did not disclose the convictions at that time the NMC decision to renew your registration was based on incorrect information. The panel was therefore satisfied that the entry was also incorrectly made.

The panel therefore found that the entry on Sub Part 1 of the of the NMC register in the name of Tawanda Lovejoy Chivima, NMC PIN 10F1833E was incorrectly made and fraudulently procured.

Decision and reasons on direction

The panel next considered what direction, if any, to make under Article 26(7) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

Article 26(7) states:

'...If the Investigating Committee is satisfied that an entry in the register has been fraudulently procured or incorrectly made, it may make an order that the Registrar remove or amend the entry and shall notify the person concerned of his right of appeal under article 38.'

The panel acknowledged that you stated that you were undergoing many [PRIVATE] at the time of the incident which led to your convictions and you had initially withheld this information from the NMC due to fear of losing your PIN and your job. It acknowledged that at the time of your revalidation in 2024, you decided to be honest and transparent and therefore disclosed your convictions to the NMC, after feeling guilty for previously withholding this information. The panel noted that you were then informed that your previous revalidation application that you submitted in 2021 was under investigation. However, you were then informed by the NMC that your revalidation had been successful, and therefore, you believed there was no further investigation. It noted that you stated this process was very confusing to you at the time.

The panel took into account your training in relation to '*powerful honesty*' and '*duty of candour*'. It also took into account positive testimonials and your reflective pieces, where you accepted the charges and expressed remorse. The panel accepted that your apologies were sincere and noted that you had some insight into your actions and the impact of this on members of the public and your colleagues. However, it noted that this was not an isolated incident as there had been similar findings towards you in 2015.

The panel considered that, having found that your entry on the NMC register was incorrectly made and fraudulently procured, it would be inappropriate to take no action in this particular case. It was of the view that your actions were deliberate and planned dishonesty, and that your explanation in that you feared losing your PIN led you to make an invalid declaration. The panel determined that you had put your personal interest above being honest and trustworthy at the time of your 2021 revalidation and this appeared to be repeated dishonesty in light of the 2015 findings. The panel considered that you stated you had successfully revalidated in 2024. However, it accepted the submissions from the NMC that an assistant registrar had not considered the 2024 revalidation and therefore, in accordance with the Guidance, no value judgement about whether you would now meet the requirements for registration had been made by the assistant registrar.

Integrity of the register is central to the functioning of the NMC and achieving its statutory objective. To fulfil its function the registrar needs to be in a position to make fully informed decisions about registration. Withholding relevant information from the registrar in the way that you did for your 2021 revalidation prevented the registrar from fulfilling the regulatory

purpose of protecting the public and undermines public confidence in the profession and in the register. The panel concluded that the outcome should not be based on whether you are a good nurse, but on the integrity of the register. Therefore, the panel decided to limit the weight attached to your training and testimonials. The panel determined that integrity of the register outweighed your interest in this case.

In all the circumstances the panel decided that the only appropriate order is to direct the Registrar to remove your entry from the register.

You will be notified of the panel's decision in writing. You have the right to appeal the decision under Article 38 of the Order. This order cannot take effect until the end of the 28 day appeal period or, if an appeal is made, before the appeal has been concluded.

Decision and reasons on interim order

Having directed that the Registrar remove your entry from the register, the panel then considered whether an interim order was required under Article 26(11) of the Order, in relation to the appeal period.

The panel heard and accepted the legal assessor's advice.

The panel took account of the submissions made by Mr Burch. He invited the panel to impose an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months to cover the appeal period. He stated that fraud is serious and there are no appropriate or workable conditions that could address dishonesty and fraud.

The panel also took into account Mr Buxton's submissions on your behalf. He submitted that there are no valid reasons for imposing an interim order in this case as there have been no interim orders sought by the NMC in the course of progressing this case.

He submitted that you have made full admissions in respect of the dishonest conduct and the 28-day period which allows for an appeal is one which is not going to be taken up by you.

Mr Buxton submitted that you are currently employed and are undergoing onboarding for a new permanent employment position. He submitted that not making an interim order would allow you the opportunity to set matters in order with your employer. He referred the panel to the testimonials, all of which attest to your candour and openness in relation to the allegations and the admitted facts. Further, Mr Buxton submitted that there is no risk to the public and the public interest would not be offended if you were allowed to settle matters with your employers. He submitted that the threshold for an interim order had not been reached.

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

In reaching its decision on whether to impose an interim order, the panel had regard to your admissions of the facts and its decision to direct the Registrar to remove your entry from the Register. It also had regard to the NMC's published Guidance on Fraudulent and incorrect entry cases. It noted that the imposition of an interim order is not an automatic outcome but is a matter for the panel's discretion in the circumstances of the case, having regard to the public interest in maintaining the integrity of the register. It also had regard to Article 31 of the Order and the NMC's Guidance on interim orders.

The panel considered that fraudulent entry to the register is extremely serious. It carefully evaluated the necessity of an interim order during the 28 day appeal window under the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest against your circumstances. The panel identified no current risk to patient safety or clinical practice; you are currently practicing with no clinical concerns, and your current employer provides full, explicit support. The employer's testimonial confirms that you '*openly informed*' them of the matter, and the panel received highly positive character references attesting to your ongoing honesty and day-to-day integrity. Furthermore, the panel considered your full engagement in the process, your comprehensive written reflection and verbal evidence, in which you fully admitted how wrong your actions were.

The panel considered that your written reflection articulated why you should have been honest, alongside demonstration of how misleading the NMC impacts patients, the wider public, and the regulator. You acknowledged it was a '*stupid decision*' made while in a '*bad place*' [PRIVATE].

The panel noted that you stated that your circumstances are now entirely stable with a supportive partner, [PRIVATE], you love nursing and it really helps you have purpose.

To address the core integrity issue, you have proactively undertaken training in the Duty of Candour and attended training on '*honesty*'.

Maintaining your current employment directly supports your wellbeing and enables you to provide continuity of care. You completed a revalidation in 2024 with correct and honest information regarding character. The NMC have been aware of the admissions for a significant period of time and did not make an application for an interim order.

The panel considered all the above and determined there is no ongoing risk to the public and therefore an order was not necessary for the protection of the public. The panel also determined that a member of the public, aware of all the information before it today, would not lose confidence in the integrity of the register, the regulator, or the profession if no interim order was made. Public confidence in the integrity of the register can be maintained by the substantive decision for removal at this time due to the fraudulent entry on the 2021 revalidation. Finally, applying the proportionality test, the panel decided that the threshold for an interim order was not met.

That concludes this determination.