

**Nursing and Midwifery Council  
Investigating Committee**

**Fraudulent Entry Meeting  
Monday, 19 January 2026**

**Virtual Meeting**

**Name of Registrant:** Maxine Elstob

**NMC PIN:** 00C1536E

**Part(s) of the register:** Registered Nurse Adult: RNA (March 2003)

**Relevant Location:** England

**Type of case:** Incorrect/Fraudulent entry

**Panel members:** Palbinder Thandi (Chair, lay member)  
Karen McCutcheon (Registrant member)  
Hazel Wilford (Lay member)

**Legal Assessor:** Graeme Dalgleish

**Hearings Coordinator:** Tyra Andrews

**Outcome:** Registration entry fraudulently made

**Direction:** Removal of entry from the register

**Interim Order:** Interim Suspension order (18 months)

## **Service of Notice of Meeting**

The panel noted that notice of this meeting was sent to Mrs Elstob registered email address by secure email on 15 December 2025.

The notice of meeting informed Mrs Elstob that a meeting would be held on or after 19 January 2026 detailed the charges against her and enclosed a bundle of evidence that the panel would consider. It also informed her that if she wished to provide a written response, she should do so no later than 18 January 2026. The panel noted that no written responses had been provided by Mrs Elstob to the notice of this meeting.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of the information available, the panel was satisfied that reasonable notice of this meeting has been served in compliance and accordance with Rules 5 and 34 of the Rules.

The panel was further satisfied that it would be suitable to proceed in the absence of Mrs Elstob. It noted that Mrs Elstob has not engaged with the NMC and considered the strong public interest in the expeditious disposal of this case.

## **Details of charge**

That you...

1. On your online revalidation application form dated 17 August 2021, did not declare that you had been convicted on 12 August 2021 at Northamptonshire Magistrates Court of an offence of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol contrary to s5(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.

And thereby an entry on Sub Part 1 of the NMC Register in the name Maxine Elstob, PIN 00C1536E, was fraudulently procured and/or incorrectly made.

## **Background**

On 20 December 2023, a self-referral was made to the NMC by Mrs Maxine Elstob regarding a drink driving conviction that they had received in September 2023. However, in the linked case 098172/2023, after a PNC was obtained, it came to light that Mrs Elstob had previously received another conviction from Northamptonshire Magistrates on 12 August 2021 for an offence of driving with excess alcohol.

On 17 August 2021 Mrs Elstob submitted her online revalidation application. Mrs Elstob did not declare the conviction and answered 'no' to the question about whether she had received any police charges, cautions, or convictions. As a result, the NMC opened an IEFE investigation on 11 June 2024.

Mrs Elstob has not provided the NMC with any response or submissions despite its best efforts to obtain this via the appropriate channels.

The last known employer for Mrs Elstob was Northamptonshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust. Mrs Elstob's employment was terminated in March 2024.

## **Decision and reasons on the facts**

In reaching its decisions on the facts, the panel took into account all the documentary evidence in this case. The panel noted that Mrs Elstob had not provided any response to the charges.

The panel was aware that the burden of proof rests on the NMC, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, namely the balance of probabilities. This means that a fact will be proved if a panel is satisfied that it is more likely than not that the incident occurred as alleged.

The panel received written statements from the following witness called on behalf of the NMC:

- Mr 1: NMC Registration Investigations Manager.

Before making any findings on the facts, the panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

### **Charge 1**

1. On your online revalidation application form dated 17 August 2021, did not declare that you had been convicted on 12 August 2021 at Northamptonshire Magistrates Court of an offence of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol contrary to s5(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.

### **This charge is found proved.**

In reaching this decision, the panel took into account the following:

- Mrs Elstob's self-referral for the August 2023 conviction – December 2023
- Mr 1 Witness statement – 10 September 2025
- Memorandums of conviction from Northamptonshire Magistrates Court – 12 August 2021 and 27 September 2023
- Revalidation application form – 17 August 2021
- Email correspondence from deputy director – 22 January 2025
- Stage 2 final review meeting from the Trust – 26 March 2024

The panel understood the NMC is seeking to have Mrs Elstob removed from the register in consideration of this charge, it further noted that Mrs Elstob has not engaged with the NMC or provided a response to the charge.

The panel found the evidence before it to be cogent and reliable. Upon review of the Memorandum of conviction, the panel understood that Mrs Elstob was convicted of an offence of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol in August 2021 and subsequently in

August 2023. The panel found this documentation to be clear and does not present any confusion regarding the offence. The memorandum of conviction is conclusive evidence.

It also had regard to NMC documentation which clearly outlines which offences and convictions should be reported. The panel found the NMC guidance and rules to be clear in stating that offences including driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol should be reported to the NMC.

The panel further had sight of Mrs Elstob's revalidation form for August 2021, which clearly shows she had selected 'no' when asked about any convictions against her.

The panel noted that Mrs Elstob had been convicted 7 days prior to completing the revalidation form. It considered that no evidence has been put forward to suggest any mitigating circumstances that would have prevented Mrs Elstob from disclosing her conviction to the NMC.

Upon review of the evidence before it, the panel found clear and cogent evidence has been provided by the NMC which has not been challenged by Mrs Elstob. It considered that Mrs Elstob had multiple opportunities to disclose her conviction to the NMC, but she did not. In light of the evidence before it, and on the balance of probabilities, the panel found it is unlikely that Mrs Elstob incorrectly selected 'no' when questioned about any convictions on her revalidation form.

It found that Mrs Elstob had no intention of disclosing her 2021 conviction to the NMC, and considered her actions to fall below the standards expected of a registered nurse. It therefore finds this charge proved.

### **Decision on Incorrect/Fraudulent Entry**

The panel decided, for the above reasons, that in respect of this charge the entry on the register in Mrs Elstob's name was fraudulently procured.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor who referred it to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67, in which Lord Hughes stated:

*'When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of his belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest.'*

The panel bore in mind that for an entry to be fraudulent there must have been a deliberate attempt to mislead whereas an incorrect entry involves a mistake or genuine error.

The panel therefore found that the entry on Registered Nurse Adult, RNA of the NMC register in the name of MAXINE ELSTOB, PIN 00C1536E was deliberately and fraudulently procured.

### **Decision and reasons on direction**

Having determined that Mrs Elstob had fraudulently procured an entry on the NMC's register, the panel went on to decide 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 considered that, having found that Mrs Elstob's entry on the NMC register was fraudulently procured, it would be inappropriate to take no action.

The panel noted the seriousness of the charge and considered there to be attitudinal concerns surrounding dishonesty in Mrs Elstob's actions. The panel further noted there was repetition as Mrs Elstob had a previous conviction in 2021 which was not disclosed to the NMC, similarly to the most recent conviction in 2023 which she did disclose.

In all the circumstances the panel decided that the only appropriate order is to direct the Registrar to remove Mrs Elstob's entry from the register. The fraudulent procurement of the entry on the register is a breach of fundamental and core tenets of the profession and is a serious breach of the NMC code.

Mrs Elstob will be notified of the panel's decision in writing. Mrs Elstob has 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 Mrs Elstob's 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 advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching its decision on whether to impose an interim order, the panel had regard to the reasons set out in its decision on 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 first then considered whether to impose an interim conditions of practice order. It determined that an interim conditions of practice order was not workable or appropriate in this case.

Accordingly, the panel determined that an interim suspension order was in the public interest to protect the reputation of the profession and the NMC as its regulator.

The period of this order is for 18 months to allow for the possibility of an appeal to be made and determined.

If no appeal is made then the interim order will lapse upon the removal of Ms Elstob's entry in the Register 28 days after she is sent the decision of this hearing in writing.

That concludes this determination.