

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting
Tuesday, 12 May 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Registrant: Noah Akakpo

NMC PIN: 06A1365E

Part(s) of the register: Registered Nurse, Sub Part 1, Mental Health (30 September 2006)
Registered Specialist Community Public Health Nurse (25 September 2020)

Relevant Location: Stevenage

Type of case: Misconduct

Panel members: George Duff (Chair, Lay member)
Deborah Bennion (Registrant member)
Richard Mann (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Graeme Henderson

Hearings Coordinator: Teige Gardner

Order being reviewed: Suspension order (12 months)

Fitness to practise: Impaired

Outcome: **Suspension order (6 months) to come into effect on 3 July 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)**

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Meeting

The panel noted at the start of this meeting that the Notice of Meeting had been sent to Mr Akakpo registered email address by secure email on 10 April 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review and that the review meeting would be held on or after 11 May 2026 and inviting Mr Akakpo to provide any written evidence seven days before this date. Mr Akakpo was presented with the opportunity to have a hearing, however he did not ask the NMC for one to be arranged.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mr Akakpo has been served with notice of this meeting in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11A and 34 of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 (as amended) (the Rules).

Decision and reasons on review of the current order

The panel decided to impose a suspension order for a period of 6 months. This order will come into effect at the end of 3 July 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the first review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 5 June 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 3 July 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. *On 18 December 2020, took an unknown quantity of Felodipine medication from the drugs cupboard without clinical justification;*
2. *Your actions at Charge 1 were dishonest in that you took medication that did not belong to you.”*

The original panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

“The panel considered that all four limbs apply in this case. It finds that, as a result of Mr Akakpo’s misconduct, a patient was put at potential risk of harm as the medication prescribed for them was wrongfully removed. Mr Akakpo’s misconduct had breached the fundamental tenets of the nursing profession and therefore brought its reputation into disrepute. The panel was satisfied that confidence in the nursing profession would be undermined if its regulator did not find charges relating to dishonesty serious.

The panel considered that Mr Akakpo has not demonstrated an understanding of how his dishonest action put a patient at risk of harm, nor has he demonstrated an understanding of why what he did was wrong and how his action impacted negatively on the reputation of the nursing profession. The panel was not provided with any information to suggest how Mr Akakpo may handle the situation differently in the future.

The panel acknowledged that it is often difficult for a registrant to demonstrate how dishonesty has been remedied. In considering whether Mr Akakpo had taken any steps to strengthen his practice, the panel carefully reviewed the evidence before it. However, the panel was not provided with any evidence of relevant training or a reflective statement that might have demonstrated insight or remediation.

The panel took into account two character references provided by Mr Akakpo:

- *A reference from the Occupational Health Adviser at North Middlesex University Hospital, dated 19 January 2021.*
- *A reference from Mr Akakpo’s GP, dated 25 January 2021.*

However, the panel considered these references to be of limited value. They were weak in content, provided little indication that the individuals knew Mr Akakpo well, and did not specifically address the regulatory concerns. In particular, the panel noted that the reference from Mr Akakpo's GP made no mention of the charge or any reflections on Mr Akakpo's conduct.

The panel noted that, while Mr Akakpo denied the charges, he did not take the opportunity to provide a reflective statement demonstrating his understanding of how acts of dishonesty may impact public confidence in the nursing profession. He did not demonstrate any insight, and the panel considered this lack of reflection to be significant. The panel found that the references and other material before it did not mitigate the risk of repetition. As a result, the panel could not be satisfied that there was no risk of repetition should similar circumstances arise in the future.

In light of all the above, the panel determined that a finding of current impairment is necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The panel bore in mind the overarching objectives of the NMC to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public and patients, and to uphold and protect the wider public interest. This includes promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing and midwifery professions and upholding the proper professional standards for members of those professions.

The panel determined that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case, given its findings in relation to dishonesty that put a patient at potential risk of harm. These are serious matters that would, in the view of the panel, rightly alarm the public and undermine confidence in the NMC as a regulator, without a finding of impairment. Therefore, the panel also finds Mr Akakpo's fitness to practise impaired on the grounds of public interest.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel was satisfied that Mr Akakpo's fitness to practise is currently impaired."

The original panel determined the following with regard to sanction:

“In relation to the imposition of a conditions of practice order, Mr Page submitted that the panel may consider that there is an unprofessional and concerning conduct as identified in the dishonesty charge which could not be addressed through a conditions of practice order. He also submitted that the panel may consider that the dishonesty charge is too serious to warrant the imposition of a conditions of practice order, and that such a sanction would not adequately protect the public and is unlikely to be otherwise in the public interest. He submitted that, where there are deep-seated attitudinal issues, a conditions of practice order would be neither appropriate nor proportionate.

In relation to the imposition of a suspension order, Mr Page submitted that the panel determined that Mr Akakpo took advantage of his position of seniority. Therefore, this impacted upon the medication being no longer available thus creating a potential risk of harm to a patient. Further, he submitted that the panel identified a risk of repetition and that the character references provided on behalf of Mr Akakpo carry limited weight. Mr Page also submitted that Mr Akakpo has not demonstrated any insight into the concern. Accordingly, Mr Page submitted that a suspension order would not be appropriate or proportionate in this case.

In relation to whether the panel should impose a striking-off order, Mr Page submitted that there are no mitigating features and that the panel previously determined that Mr Akakpo has not demonstrated an understanding of how his dishonesty had put a patient at risk of harm, nor has he demonstrated an understanding that what he did was plainly wrong. Mr Page submitted that no positive steps have been made by Mr Akakpo to strengthen his practice since the incident nor has he provided any reflective statement upon the conduct.

Therefore, balancing all of the factors, Mr Page submitted that the imposition of a striking-off order is both appropriate and proportionate. He submitted that a striking-off order is necessary to protect the public and to mark the importance of maintaining public confidence in the professions and the maintenance of high

professional standards, and to send to the public and the professions a clear message about the standards of behaviour required of a registered nurse.”

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mr Akakpo'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 information provided by Mr Akakpo. 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 and the written responses from Mr Akakpo which included:

- Reflective statements, including the four reflective sessions and your reflective piece
- Character references, not signed
- A Continued Professional Development Certificate, dated 3 July 2021
- Documentation relating to your personal circumstances

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.

In regard to insight, the panel was of the view that Mr Akakpo has provided documentation which shows limited progress developing insight. The panel particularly noted that he now admits to the charges found proved and has highlighted how his misconduct has affected others in his reflective statement. He has not explained why he continued to deny the charges throughout the regulatory process. On 15 February 2025, despite completing the Continued Professional Development course on 3 July 2021, he returned a written

response to the NMC denying the charges. Although he has attempted to explain his reasons for taking the medication he has not explained why he continued to deny these charges until recently.

The panel was of the view that the information Mr Akakpo has provided within his reflective statement lacks depth. The panel was of the view that, whilst Mr Akakpo has made slight improvements to his insight since the original hearing, there is no information regarding what Mr Akakpo's plan is to return to nursing practice, which was a specific request made by the original panel. The panel has no information regarding what Mr Akakpo currently employment situation or whether he is undertaking any paid or unpaid work, another specific request made by the original panel. The panel did note Mr Akakpo's reflective meetings with Ms Higgins, however it also noted that she is one of your personal acquaintances and there are no independent examples of you being dependable in a professional setting. Therefore, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Akakpo has full insight into his misconduct at this meeting.

In its consideration of whether Mr Akakpo has taken steps to strengthen his practice, the panel took into account the training he has undertaken in Continued Professional Development, dated 3 July 2021 and the reflective piece Mr Akakpo has provided. The panel also took into consideration the character references and reflective pieces provided by Mr Akakpo. He stated in his reflective piece that he has undertaken training in dishonesty, professional responsibility and accountability, but there is no documentary evidence provided to the panel of this recent training. Therefore, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Akakpo has strengthened his practice sufficiently to where he can be considered no longer impaired.

The original panel determined that Mr Akakpo was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Today's panel has received more information, particularly his reflective statements, however the risk of repetition has not been sufficiently addressed in the view of the panel. Overall, the panel was of the view that Mr Akakpo has taken some steps in developing his insight since the original hearing. However, the panel was of the view that the insight shown by Mr Akakpo lacks depth in relation to his misconduct including his repeated denials to the NMC. In light of this the panel determined that Mr Akakpo remains

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 determined that the public interest in this case has been served by the 12-month suspension order imposed on Mr Akakpo's practise. Therefore, a finding of impairment is not also necessary in the wider public interest.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mr Akakpo 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 Mr Akakpo'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 Mr Akakpo'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 on Mr Akakpo'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 concluded that a conditions of practice order would not adequately protect the public or satisfy the public interest. The panel was not able to formulate conditions of practice that would adequately address the concerns relating to Mr Akakpo's misconduct.

The panel considered the imposition of a further period of suspension. It was of the view that a suspension order would allow Mr Akakpo further time to fully and more actively reflect on his previous dishonesty in greater depth and detail. It considered that Mr Akakpo needs to evidence how he has remedied his dishonesty with examples in a professional setting. The panel concluded that a further 6 month suspension order would be the appropriate and proportionate response and would afford Mr Akakpo adequate time to further develop his insight and take steps to strengthen his practice. It would also give Mr Akakpo an opportunity to approach past and current health professionals to attest with better evidence, more specific examples and fewer generic statements to his honesty and integrity in his workplace assignments since the substantive hearing.

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 Mr Akakpo with an opportunity to provide current information regarding your current employment, future plans and how you have demonstrated honesty in a professional setting. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

The panel considered a striking-off order, however it was of the view that it would be inappropriate and disproportionate at this time. The panel was mindful that this was the first review of the substantive order and that Mr Akakpo should be given further opportunity to demonstrate insight and strengthened practice.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of date 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, 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:

- Evidence of professional development, including documentary evidence of Mr Akakpo completing courses relating to dishonesty, professional responsibility and accountability.
- Information regarding Mr Akakpo's current employment status and whether he is undertaking any paid or unpaid work.
- Future plans as a registered nurse if you were reinstated onto the register without restrictions.
- Evidence and examples of Mr Akakpo being dependable and trustworthy within a work setting (paid or unpaid).
- Evidence of Mr Akakpo keeping up to date with current nursing practices.
- Mr Akakpo's attendance at the next hearing.
- An updated reflective piece explaining why he denied the charges found proved until recently.

This will be confirmed to Mr Akakpo in writing.

That concludes this determination.