

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Monday, 23 March 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant: Adenike Simiat Balogun-Sadiq

NMC PIN: 99I8529E

Part(s) of the register: Nurses part of the register Sub part 1
RNA: Adult nurse, level 1 (11 September 2002)

Midwives part of the register
RM: Midwife (15 September 2006)

Relevant Location: Bromley

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: Paul Grant (Chair, lay member)
Karen Shubert (Registrant member)
Elaine Whitton (Registrant member)

Legal Assessor: Elisa Hopley

Hearings Coordinator: Andrew Ormsby

Nursing and Midwifery Council: Represented by Giedrius Kabasinskas, Case Presenter

Adenike Simiat Balogun-Sadiq: Not present and unrepresented

Order being reviewed: Suspension order (6 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Suspension order (6 months) to come into effect on 6 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)**

Decision and reason on possible conflict of interest

At the outset of the hearing, a panel member (Karen Shubert) informed the panel and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) case presenter that, from June 2014 until June 2019, she had worked as a Supervisor of Midwives at Kings College Maternity unit, and had worked in various roles at the Princess University Hospital in Bromley during this period. However, she stated that, while it was possible that she had come into contact with Mrs Balogun-Sadiq, she could not remember Mrs Balogun-Sadiq, and that she was not involved in any disciplinary meetings with Mrs Balogun-Sadiq.

Further, the panel member stated that the events relating to Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's misconduct took place after she had left her position at Kings College Maternity unit and the Princess University Hospital.

Mr Kabasinkas, on behalf of the NMC, submitted that, whilst it was possible that the panel member had come into contact with Mrs Balogun-Sadiq some years ago, in these circumstances, the NMC was not aware of anything that would suggest unfairness to proceeding. Therefore, Mr Kabasinkas invited the panel to proceed.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching its decision the panel was mindful that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq had not had the opportunity to comment on this issue, the information having come to the NMC's attention following service of the hearing bundles. The panel considered that there was nothing to suggest that there could be real or apparent bias. It noted that the panel member had no memory of Mrs Balogun-Sadiq and the events in question that led to Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's misconduct had taken place after the panel member had left her place of work and there was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq could not receive a fair hearing or that there was a real possibility of bias.

Having considered the test for recusal as set out in the case of *Porter v Magill* [2002] 2 AC 357 the panel did not consider that a fair-minded and informed observer, having reviewed the facts, would conclude that there was a real possibility of bias.

Accordingly, the panel determined to proceed with the hearing.

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's registered email address by secure email on 17 February 2026.

Mr Kabasinkas submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 8 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 allegations, 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 Balogun-Sadiq'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 Balogun-Sadiq has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 8 and 34.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Mrs Balogun-Sadiq

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mrs Balogun-Sadiq. It had regard to Rule 8 and heard the submissions of Mr Kabasinkas who invited the panel to continue in the absence of Mrs Balogun-Sadiq. He submitted that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq had voluntarily absented herself.

Mr Kabasinkas submitted that there had been limited engagement by Mrs Balogun-Sadiq 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 further stated that there was a public interest in expeditiously progressing this hearing and noted that there was a need to review this case before the order expires.

Mr Kabasinkas concluded by submitting that the public interest in this case proceeding outweighed Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's interest and invited the panel to proceed in her absence.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In making its decision on whether or not to proceed in the absence of the registrant the panel had regard to the NMC guidance.

In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Mr Kabasinkas, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to any 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 Balogun-Sadiq;
- Mrs Balogun-Sadiq has had limited engagement with the NMC and has not responded to the correspondence sent to her about this hearing, and noted a diminishing engagement with the regulatory process;
- The panel considered that, whilst there might be a disadvantage to Mrs Balogun-Sadiq in proceeding, she could have submitted written materials for this hearing;
- This is a mandatory review and there is a public interest in conducting a review of the order; and
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date.

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Mrs Balogun-Sadiq.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to confirm the current suspension order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 6 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 six months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 7 April 2025. This was reviewed on 17 September 2025, and the suspension was confirmed for a further six months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 6 May 2026.

The panel is reviewing the order pursuant to Article 30(1) of the Order.

The following charges were found proved, whilst charge 3 was proved by way of admission, and resulted in the imposition of the substantive order:

'That you, a registered midwife

1. At Princess Royal University Hospital on 17-18 July 2019 failed to treat Mother A with kindness, respect and compassion in that you

a. On one or more occasions did not respond at all or kindly when Mother A spoke to you

b. Did not provide reassurance or encouragement to Mother A during care of her

c. When Mother A stated she felt she couldn't push anymore responded by saying (words to the effect of)

'If you don't push, I'm going to have to cut you'

d. ... [NOT PROVED]

e. When Mother A cried out in pain, responded by saying (words to the effect of)

'What's wrong with you? Are you emotional?'

2. At Princess Royal University Hospital on 17-18 July 2019 failed to ensure that Mother A had adequate pain relief in place before commencing and/or during the suturing process

3. *On or around 03 November 2022 completed paperwork for consideration by the Nursing & Midwifery Council ('NMC') that stated that you 'retired on 31 August 202' (sic) which was not true as you continued to undertake midwifery shifts at St Georges Hospital'.*

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

'The panel considered whether Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq had insufficient insight.

At this hearing the panel felt that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq had not provided enough evidence due a lack of a reflections and testimonials.

In its consideration of whether Mrs Balogun-Sadiq has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel took into account the additional relevant training Mrs Balogun-Sadiq has undertaken, which included:

- *RCM Introduction to Reflection.*
- *RCM Personalised Care.*
- *RCM Human Rights in Maternity Care: Advocating for Women.*
- *RCM Human Factors – reducing errors in maternity care.*
- *RCM Health inequalities: the power of maternity care.*
- *RCM Delivering unexpected news in pregnancy.*
- *RCM Promoting dignity respectful and compassionated care in midwifery practice.*
- *RCM Managing change for midwifery managers.*
- *RCM Ethical practice for maternity care.*
- *RCM Epidurals in labour.*

However, the panel determined that the original concerns had not been addressed, although the panel acknowledge the relevance of the certificates provided. However, due to the lack of the meaningful reflections, and no positive testimonials there is insufficient evidence of developing insight. The panel concluded that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's progress was minimal, and her insight is incomplete, the panel was of the view that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq had not taken the adequate steps to address the regulatory concerns.

The original panel determined that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has received information of training undertaken; the panel did not consider that this information, was adequate to address the concerns coupled with the lack of evidence. The panel considered the original panel's finding:

'The panel finds that Mother A was put at risk and was caused physical and emotional harm as a result of your misconduct.'

The panel also referred to the facts and the issue of Mrs Balogun-Sadiq not administering pain medication to Mother A, the panel considered this was serious. In light of this, this panel determined that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq is still liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved because she had not yet fully addressed the underlying concerns. 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 midwifery profession and upholding proper standards of conduct and performance.

The panel considered that a fully informed member of the public would be concerned that the NMC is failing in its duty to maintain professional standards should Mrs Balogun-Sadiq be permitted to return to unrestricted

practice. The public should expect that registered professionals will only be permitted to practice without restriction, when it is safe for them to do so. The panel was of the view the public should expect that if there are serious regulatory concerns about a Registrant, that such concerns will be addressed before they return to unrestricted practice. The public's faith in the midwifery profession would be undermined if they thought that serious regulatory concerns were not being fully addressed, professionals were being allowed to return to unrestricted practice despite the risk of harm. On that basis 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 Balogun-Sadiq's fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

'The panel next considered whether a conditions of practice on Mrs Balogun-Sadiq'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 hearing and concluded that a condition of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel considered the nature of Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's role as a midwife and felt that there would not be any workable conditions that could be imposed.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Mrs Balogun-Sadiq further time to fully reflect on her previous misconduct. The panel concluded that a further six month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Mrs Balogun-Sadiq 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 six months. This would provide Mrs Balogun-Sadiq with an opportunity to engage with the NMC to provide evidence of further insight and strengthened practice. The panel had regard to NMC guidance 'REV-2a' on substantive order reviews and felt that 6 months was adequate time for Mrs Balogun-Sadiq to reflect and strengthen her practice.

It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available. The panel felt that a strike off would have had a punitive effect and was of the view that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's concerns were remediable. The panel stated that the onus was on Mrs Balogun-Sadiq and for her to show she is fit to practise safely. The panel considered that this was an isolated incident and that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq should be given the opportunity to show she has addressed these concerns.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 6 November 2025 in accordance with Article 30(1).

[...]

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Evidence of any further professional development including documentary evidence of additional courses.*
- Testimonials from a line manager or supervisor that detail current work or voluntary positions.*
- A structured reflective piece which critically examines the regulatory concerns to include what Mrs Balogun-Sadiq would do differently if faced with a similar situation.*

- *A reflective piece on what Mrs Balogun-Sadiq has learnt from the training she has done, how it will inform her practice in the future and how it addresses the regulatory concerns.*
- *Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's attendance at a future review hearing.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mrs Balogun-Sadiq'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 Kabasinkas on behalf of the NMC.

Mr Kabasinkas took the panel through the background of the case, and submitted that there was no new information relating to Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's impairment, and reminded the panel that there was a persuasive burden upon Mrs Balogun-Sadiq to demonstrate that issues relating to her impairment had been sufficiently addressed.

Mr Kabasinkas stated that the panel must consider what has happened since the last hearing. He submitted that the panel had not received any evidence which might go to show whether Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's insight has improved or deteriorated since her last review and there was no evidence to resolve this question.

Mr Kabasinkas submitted that the last reviewing panel still deemed that there was a risk of repetition. He stated that the current panel had no new information since the last hearing and that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's impairment was entirely a matter for the current panel.

Mr Kabasinskas stated that, in relation to sanction, the NMC's position was that there were only limited options available. He stated that, whilst the sanction was entirely a matter for the panel's discretion, it should revisit NMC guidance of suspension (SAN-2D). He also stated that the panel would have to consider a striking off order. However, he submitted that allowing the order to lapse with impairment was not appropriate.

Mr Kabasinskas concluded by stating that whether the panel determine to suspend Mrs Balogun-Sadiq or strike her name from the register was entirely a matter for the panel but asserted that orders other than suspension of striking off were not appropriate in this case.

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 Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last panel found that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq had not addressed the original concerns and concluded that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's progress was minimal, her insight is incomplete, and was of the view that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq had not taken the adequate steps to address the regulatory concerns. It also found that she was liable to repeat her misconduct.

Today's panel has received no new information to demonstrate that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq has gained insight into her misconduct or that she is not liable to repeat her misconduct. In light of this, this panel determined that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq is liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. 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 Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's fitness to practise remains impaired.

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mrs Balogun-Sadiq'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 accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

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 and midwifery profession and the NMC as its regulator. 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 order would not be appropriate given the risk of repetition and risk to patients and would not protect the public.

Further, the panel considered that conditions of practice were not appropriate in this case as all of the concerns related to Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's misconduct rather than any concerns relating to competence. The panel noted that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq had effectively not engaged with the NMC and, as such, imposing conditions would not be workable or appropriate.

In the circumstances, the panel determined that the extension of the order of suspension was necessary to protect the public and satisfy the public interest.

The panel considered that a period of suspension would afford Mrs Balogun-Sadiq the opportunity to provide reflections on her misconduct and would allow her to undertake further relevant training.

The panel noted that the original panel had considered that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's misconduct was remediable. It also considered that it was possible that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq could re-engage with the regulatory process. Further, the panel was of the view that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's misconduct had related to an isolated incident in what had hitherto been 22 years of a previously unblemished career. In those circumstances the panel determined that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq should be given the opportunity to re-engage with her regulator and provide evidence of strengthened practice.

In those circumstances, the panel considered that suspension was the appropriate order.

However, the panel did note the following NMC Guidance, '*Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place*' (Rev-2h), which stated:

'There is a persuasive burden on the professional at a substantive order review to demonstrate that they have fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments.'

'While Suspension Orders and Conditions of Practice Orders can be varied or extended, they are not intended to exist indefinitely. In time the professional must be allowed to practise without restriction or they must leave the register. It is neither in the interests of the public nor the professional's own interests that they are kept in limbo.'

The panel gave careful consideration to imposing a striking off order at this review and considered that a striking off order could be deemed appropriate at a future review were Mrs Balogun-Sadiq to continue to not engage in the regulatory process.

However, the panel determined that, at this time, and according to the criteria of SAN-2D, it was currently realistic that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq could return to practise in the future, and

there was still a realistic prospect of Mrs Balogun-Sadiq engaging to remediate her misconduct.

Accordingly, the panel determined that a suspension order for a further period of six months was the necessary and proportionate sanction to reflect the lack of insight and the need for Mrs Balogun-Sadiq to demonstrate that she has strengthened her practice.

Before the end of the period of suspension, 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.

The panel endorsed the previous review panel's recommendations that Mrs Balogun-Sadiq provide the following:

- Evidence of any further professional development including documentary evidence of additional courses.
- Testimonials from a line manager or supervisor that detail current work or voluntary positions.
- A structured reflective piece which critically examines the regulatory concerns to include what Mrs Balogun-Sadiq would do differently if faced with a similar situation.
- A reflective piece on what Mrs Balogun-Sadiq has learnt from the training she has done, how it will inform her practice in the future and how it addresses the regulatory concerns.
- Mrs Balogun-Sadiq's attendance at a future review hearing.

The panel determined to impose an order of suspension for a period of six months.

This order will come into effect at the end of 6 May 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This will be confirmed to Mrs Balogun-Sadiq in writing.

That concludes this determination.

