

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Wednesday, 8 July 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Christie Nonye Okwaraji
NMC PIN:	18B0302E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse - Sub Part 1 19 March 2018
Relevant Location:	London
Type of case:	Lack of competence
Panel members:	Vicki Wells (Chair, registrant member) Sara Morgan (Registrant member) Yusuf Deerow (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Christopher McKay
Hearings Coordinator:	Yvonne Temah
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Nina Dunn, Case Presenter
Mrs Okwaraji:	Present and unrepresented
Order being reviewed:	Conditions of practice order (6 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect on 17 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to impose a striking-off order.

This order will come into effect on 17 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the fifth review of a substantive conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 18 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 19 October 2021.

The order was first reviewed on 6 April 2023, where the order was extended and varied for a period of 12 months. At the second review on 9 April 2024, the panel imposed a conditions of practice order for period of nine months. At the third review on 24 January 2025, the panel confirmed the conditions of practice order for a further period of 12 months.

A review hearing was listed for 13 January 2026 however; this was postponed at your request. A further review was listed for 9 February 2026. However, the reviewing panel was unable to consider the case due to insufficient hearing time, and the review was subsequently relisted before another panel.

At the fourth review on 13 February 2026, the panel confirmed the conditions of practice order for a further six months.

This hearing is therefore the fifth review of the substantive conditions of practice order currently in place.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 17 August 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) Between 20 August 2018 and 17 February 2019, failed to demonstrate the standards of knowledge, skill and experience required to practise safely as a Band 5 nurse in that you:

a) ...

b) on one or more occasion, used incorrect drug codes on medication charts;

[PROVED]

c) did not demonstrate that you had knowledge of what each code represented; [PROVED]

d) on one or more occasion, inaccurately recorded drugs on medication charts; [PROVED]

e) on an unknown date, failed to follow instructions to send medication home with a patient despite having received specific instructions from the pharmacy to do so; [PROVED]

f) on an unknown date, transferred a patient to another ward without the patient receiving their medication despite having been given specific instructions not to do so; [PROVED]

g) on an unknown date, incorrectly noted that a patient had self-administered IV medication when they had not; [PROVED]

h) on an unknown date, having been told that a patient's NG tube had come out by accident, failed to re-insert the tube and/or escalate to a colleague; [PROVED]

i) on an unknown date, having received specific instructions on how to perform checks on a syringe driver, failed to complete the required checks during the course of your shift and failed to record the readings; [PROVED]

j) on an unknown date, failed to change a patient's soiled dressing despite having been asked by the patient to do so; [PROVED]

k) on an unknown date, called a patient by the wrong name throughout the course of the shift; [PROVED]

l) on an unknown date, having been advised by a patient that they were in pain, failed to escalate and seek assistance; [PROVED]

m) on an unknown date, failed to obtain consent from a patient before administering pain relief; [PROVED]

n) on one or more occasion, failed to communicate effectively with colleagues at handovers; [PROVED]

o) on an unknown date, having been told specifically by Colleague 1 how to deal with a challenging clinical scenario, you failed to relay the relevant information to the doctor: [PROVED]

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

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

'Today's panel considered that it had received limited evidence of compliance with the conditions of practice order currently imposed on your registration.

The panel considered that you had demonstrated little insight and noted that it had not received persuasive evidence of strengthening of skills and knowledge, other than online courses undertaken in January 2026.

Further, the panel attached little weight to your assertions, given during oral evidence, that you had made significant efforts at securing appropriate supervised employment to comply with your conditions.

The panel was not convinced of the extent and depths you went to in order to secure appropriate employment and considered that your oral evidence had been vague. It further noted the absence of any testimonials.

However, the panel was mindful of the fact that were not legally represented and noted that you had stated that you found representing yourself at a Fitness to Practise hearing to be difficult.

The panel considered that you had in the past posed a risk. It considered that you had provided nothing to suggest a strengthening of practice other

than training that you claim to have undertaken. Therefore, the panel could not be sure that you do not pose a future risk.

The panel noted that multiple people had been affected by the index incidents involving your lack of competency.

The panel also bore in mind that your failings related to a lack of competency had undermined fundamental tenets of the profession and it had received no evidence that you had corrected or remediated these failings.

The panel has also 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

For these reasons, the panel determined that your fitness to practise remained impaired.'

The fourth panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel considered that taking no further action would be neither appropriate nor proportionate taking into account the public protection concerns and the need to uphold the wider public interest in this case.

The panel considered that a caution would not be appropriate given the risk of repetition and risk to patients and would not protect the public.

The panel noted that you are currently on the register independent of this order and that your current registration does not lapse until 31 March 2026. It was therefore not open to the panel to consider the order to lapse with impairment.

The panel did consider that your lack of competence was remediable but noted your continued failure to comply with the conditions of practice order currently imposed.

It further considered that the current conditions of practice order was workable and could be complied with, but noted your continued failure to secure suitable supervised employment in order to comply with the conditions.

The panel determined that extending your conditions of practice order could be appropriate but was of the view that you must secure an appropriate position and considered that, if you failed to appropriately engage with the NMC, or continued to fail to provide any evidence of compliance with the order, then, in future, imposing further conditions would not be workable or appropriate.

The panel determined that the imposition of a suspension order which would temporarily remove you from the register would not be appropriate.

The panel considered that a continued failure to comply with the conditions of practice order could result in circumstances where a striking off order was now appropriate and proportionate.

Accordingly, the panel determined, pursuant to Article 30(1)(c) to make a conditions of practice order for a period of six months, which will come into effect on the expiry of the current order, namely at the end of 17 February 2026. It decided to impose the following conditions which it considered 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 ensure that you are supervised by another registered nurse any time you are working. Your supervision must consist of working at all times on the same shift as, but not always directly observed by another registered nurse until you are assessed as competent in the following areas:

- d) Communication with patients and colleagues including handovers.*
- e) Record keeping and documentation.*
- f) Prioritisation.*

You must be signed off as competent in three consecutive assessments occurring every six weeks utilising a competency assessment framework(s).

2. You must not administer medication without direct supervision from another registered nurse until you are signed off as competent to do so in three further consecutive assessments occurring every six weeks. The assessment must utilise a competency assessment framework and be carried out by a clinical supervisor who is at least Band 6.

3. You must work with a clinical supervisor who is at least Band 6 or above to create a personal development plan (PDP). Your PDP must use competency assessment frameworks to address the concerns about:

- Medicines management.*
- Communication with patients and colleagues, including handovers.*
- Record keeping and documentation*
- Prioritisation.*

4. You must:

c) Send your case officer a copy of your PDP before the next NMC review hearing.

d) Meet with your clinical supervisor who is at least Band 6 or above at least every month to discuss your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your PDP until deemed competent in the aforementioned areas above.

5. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are working by:

c) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment.

d) Giving your case officer your employer's contact details.

6. You must keep the NMC informed about anywhere you are studying by:

c) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting any course of study.

d) 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:

f) Any organisation or person you work for.

g) Any agency you apply to or are registered with for work.

h) Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).

i) Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.

j) Any current or prospective patients or clients you intend to see or care for on a private basis when you are working in a self-employed capacity

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 organisation with which you volunteer in a nursing capacity.*
- b) Any current or future employer.*
- c) Any educational establishment.*
- d) Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions.*

The period of this order is for six months.

Before the end of the conditions of practice order, 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:

- Very clear documented evidence of tailored and considered job applications;*
- Clear documented evidence of any training you had undertaken, the specific content within these learning packages and how these relate to the concerns raised;*
- Up-to-date reflections on any training activities detailing how they have developed your knowledge and understanding and the potential influence this will have on your future practice;*
- References/and or testimonials relating to your performance in any environment. This can include voluntary work or other paid work outside of nursing.*

These documents should be submitted 14 days before an future review hearing.

This order will come into effect at the end of 17 February 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

[...]

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether your 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 Ms Dunn on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Dunn outlined the background to the case, noting that this was the fifth review of the substantive conditions of practice order imposed in October 2021 following findings of lack of competence. The concerns related to record keeping, medication administration, prioritisation, patient care and communication.

Ms Dunn referred the panel to the previous panel's finding that your fitness to practise remained impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds due to limited compliance with the conditions of practice order, insufficient evidence of remediation and limited insight.

Ms Dunn acknowledged your continued engagement and the recent offer of a Healthcare Assistant role. However, she submitted that you had not yet started the role, there was no supporting evidence from your pending employer, and the role would not enable you to demonstrate competence in the areas identified by the conditions of practice order.

Ms Dunn submitted that there was no evidence of recent relevant training, updated reflection or sufficient evidence of attempts to secure a nursing role under the conditions of practice order. She therefore submitted that your fitness to practise remains impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds.

In relation to sanction, Ms Dunn submitted that taking no further action or imposing a caution order would not be appropriate. She invited the panel to consider whether a further conditions of practice order remained workable, given the limited progress since the last review and the length of time the order has been in place. Ms Dunn also submitted that suspension or a striking-off order were available sanctions for the panel's consideration, but that allowing the order to lapse with impairment was not available because your registration remains active independently of the current substantive order.

The panel also had regard to your oral submission. You explained that several personal matters had affected your ability to secure employment to enable you to comply fully with the conditions of practice order.

You told the panel that you have continued applying for registered nursing roles but have received very few responses. You explained that you accepted a Healthcare Assistant role with an agency as an opportunity to return to a healthcare setting and with the hope that it may lead to a nursing role. You confirmed that you have not yet started the role.

You also told the panel that you had completed induction training for the Healthcare Assistant role, which included communication, documentation and medication training. However, you accepted that this training related to the Healthcare Assistant role rather than registered nursing practice.

In relation to reflection, you explained that you had not provided a reflective piece because you understood from your case officer that, as you had not yet commenced employment, no further reflection was required.

When asked about your efforts to comply with the conditions of practice order, you failed to provide documented evidence as suggested by the previous panel but told the panel that you had continued to apply for registered nursing roles through NHS Jobs, recruitment agencies and other online job sites. You estimated that you had submitted around 30 applications in the last six months, most of which were for registered nursing roles, but had received very few responses and no offers of employment.

You also told the panel that you had completed induction training and shadowing for your Healthcare Assistant role with an agency. You explained that this had reinforced the importance of effective communication and documentation.

When asked how you would demonstrate safe practice if you secured a registered nursing role, you said you would apply the learning you had gained, particularly in relation to communication and documentation. You told the panel that you remained committed to addressing the concerns identified and were confident you would be able to demonstrate safe and effective practice if given the opportunity to return to nursing.

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 considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found there was no further evidence of insight since the third review hearing. It also noted the previous panel's finding that there had been no evidence of a reduction in risk due to the lack of information provided by you and limited progress since the previous review.

Today's panel considered whether you had demonstrated sufficient insight, strengthened practice and remediation since the last review. It noted that you had engaged with these proceedings, attended the hearing and offered oral submission on your lack of competence and current circumstances.

Today's panel has received limited new information; the information the panel did receive included multiple online training certificates and an email from you stating that you have had a job offer as a Healthcare Assistant. However, this was not accompanied with evidence from the prospective employer. Although, there had been multiple unsuccessful job applications there is no evidence of tailored and considered process. Therefore, you are not able to demonstrate your ability to practice safely.

The panel noted that the evidential burden is upon you to persuade it that your fitness to practice is no longer currently impaired. The panel decided that you have not discharged that burden and there is insufficient evidence that you can now safely and efficiently practise as a nurse without restriction. No evidence of strengthened practice under the conditions of the order as a nurse.

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 your fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found your 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.

In coming to its decision, the panel had regard to its findings on impairment.

It bore in mind that its primary purpose is to protect the public and maintain public confidence in the nursing profession and the NMC as its regulator.

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 your 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 your 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 on your registration would still be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable.

The panel accepted that you had made efforts to obtain employment and had recently completed induction training and shadowing for a Healthcare Assistant role. However, there was very little documentary evidence before it to demonstrate tailored applications for registered nursing posts, targeted remediation or strengthened practice in the areas of concern. Whilst the panel accepted your oral submission regarding the applications you had made and the learning you had gained through your Healthcare Assistant training, it was not satisfied that this addressed the competency concerns identified at the substantive hearing or demonstrated that you had remediated those concerns.

The panel bore in mind that the previous reviewing panels had clearly identified the evidence that would assist a future panel, including evidence of strengthened practice, relevant training, reflective pieces and documentary evidence of considered job applications. Whilst you provided some explanations for the absence of this evidence, the panel was not satisfied that sufficient objective evidence had been produced to demonstrate that the concerns had been addressed.

Having considered the history of your case and the limited progress made over a prolonged period, the panel was not satisfied that extending the current conditions of practice order would result in meaningful progress or enable you to demonstrate safe and unrestricted practice within a reasonable timescale.

The panel then considered whether a suspension order would be appropriate. It concluded that suspension would achieve little, as it would not provide you with any greater opportunity to address the outstanding competency concerns or produce evidence of strengthened practice. In the panel's view, a period of suspension would simply delay matters without any realistic prospect of remediation.

In these circumstances the panel determined that a period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose.

The panel therefore considered whether a striking-off order would be appropriate and proportionate sanction. It had regard to the SG, namely SAN-2e, which states that:

'Before imposing this sanction, the Committee should consider:

- Do the charges found proved raise fundamental questions about their professionalism?*
- Can public confidence in the profession be maintained if the professional is not removed from the Register?*
- Is there any amount of insight and reflection which could keep people receiving care and members of the public safe, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold professional standards?*

- *Is there a realistic prospect that, after suspension, the professional will have gained insight and strengthened their practice such that the risk they pose will have reduced?’*

The panel also considered the previous reviewing panel's observation that:

‘The panel considered that a continued failure to comply with the conditions of practice order could result in circumstances where a striking off order was now appropriate and proportionate.’

The panel was mindful of that observation and concluded that those circumstances had now arisen. Whilst it acknowledged your continued engagement with the NMC and the personal matters you had described, there remained insufficient objective evidence before the panel to demonstrate that you had remediated the concerns or were able to return to unrestricted practice safely.

The panel determined that, after more than four years of regulatory restrictions and five review hearings, your case had reached the stage where extending the current conditions of practice order or imposing a suspension order would no longer be proportionate. You had been given repeated opportunities to demonstrate strengthened practice, remediation and insight into the concerns identified by the substantive panel. However, despite those opportunities, the panel was not satisfied that sufficient progress had been made.

The panel concluded that your continued inability to demonstrate safe and effective practice, together with the absence of objective evidence that the competency concerns had been addressed, now raised fundamental concerns about your professionalism. The panel determined that public confidence in the profession and the regulatory process would be undermined if you remained on the register.

The panel therefore determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent you 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. The panel therefore directs the registrar to strike your name off the register.

However, the panel has taken into account the NMC guidance set out in REV-2c which discourages the making of an immediate striking-off order under Article 30(2), if, the panel are satisfied that the existing substantive order provides adequate protection for the public and the public interest until it expires. In the present case the existing conditions of practice order expires on the 17 August 2026 and contains significant restrictions on your ability to practice which in the panel's judgement will adequately protect the public. In addition, you are not currently working as a nurse and in the panel's judgement it is extremely unlikely that you would be able to obtain employment in the next five weeks.

This striking-off order will come into effect upon the expiry of the current order, namely 17 August 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.