

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

**Substantive Order Review Meeting  
Friday, 1 May 2026**

Virtual Meeting

**Name of Registrant:** Eruore Augustina Obibi

**NMC PIN:** 94I0385E

**Part(s) of the register:** Registered Nurse – Mental Health  
RNMH – 23 March 1998

**Relevant Location:** Belfast

**Type of case:** Misconduct

**Panel members:** Anne Ng (Chair, lay member)  
Richard Curtin (Registrant member)  
Fulata Shawa-Siyunyi (Lay member)

**Legal Assessor:** Graeme Dalglish

**Hearings Coordinator:** Catherine Blake

**Order being reviewed:** Suspension order (9 months)

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired

**Outcome:** **Striking-Off order to come into effect on 12 June 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 Mrs Obibi's registered email address by secure email on 18 March 2026.

Further, the panel noted that the Notice of Meeting was also sent to Mrs Obibi's representative on 18 March 2026.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Meeting provided details of the review that the review meeting would be held no sooner than 20 April 2026 and inviting Mrs Obibi to provide any written evidence seven days before this date.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Obibi 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).

The panel, having heard legal advice, determined it was fair to proceed with this review as a meeting and in the absence of Mrs Obibi.

## **Decision and reasons on review of the current order**

The panel determined to issue a striking-off order. This order will come into effect at the end of 12 June 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (as amended) (the Order).

This is the third effective review of a substantive suspension order originally imposed for a period of nine months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 12 February 2024. This was scheduled for a review on 4 November 2024 (which was adjourned) and was reviewed 29 November 2024, where the suspension imposed on Mrs Obibi's registration was extended for a further nine months. This was most recently reviewed on 7 August 2025, and the panel imposed a further period of suspension for nine months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 12 June 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 20 March 2022, failed to preserve patient safety in that you left the door to the Unit unlocked;*
- 2) On 28 April 2022, failed to provide care in accordance with Patient A's care plan and/or risk assessment in that you failed to undertake adequately, or at all, 1:1 observation for Patient A;*
- 3) On a date between 28 April and 2 May 2022, you failed to preserve patient safety in that you left keys to the Unit unattended;*
- 4) On 5 May 2022 you behaved inappropriately towards Patient A in that you:
  - a. put your bottom towards Patient A and/or slapped your bottom and said "slap it, slap my arse" or words to that effect;*
  - b. said "kiss my arse" or words to that effect;*
  - c. put your index and middle finger up to the ceiling and said "fucked in the arse" or words to that effect**
- 5) Your actions at charge 4(a) and/or 4(b) and/or 4(c) breached professional boundaries'*

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

*'In its consideration of whether Mrs Obibi has taken steps to strengthen her practice, the panel was pleased to see that she had submitted updated reflective pieces. It considered that her reflective pieces evidenced some developing insight around the impact of her actions on the nursing profession and limited insight into*

*the impact on patients. However, it failed to fully reflect and take accountability of the seriousness of her misconduct. It also noted that she had not provided reflection against all of the charges which implied that her insight was not fully developed.*

*On question of impairment, even taking into account the two further reflective pieces, the panel concluded that Mrs Obibi remained impaired.*

*The panel noted the lack of any further training undertaken specifically in relation to communicating with young people and risk assessment in a mental health setting. It considered that the failure to make any progress in that regard was significant. Taking into account all of the aforementioned factors the panel concluded that Mrs Obibi had not discharged the persuasive burden on her to demonstrate that she is no longer impaired and therefore there was real risk of repetition of her misconduct.*

*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 protection and public interest grounds is required.*

*For these reasons, the panel finds that Mrs Obibi's fitness to practise remains impaired.'*

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

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

*In addition, the panel considered that a period of suspension would afford Mrs Obibi the opportunity to provide further reflections in relation to all of the charges and would allow her to undertake further training and provide evidence of understanding as to how she would put this into practice.*

*The panel considered that striking Mrs Obibi's name from the register would not be proportionate given her continued engagement with the regulatory process and her developing insight [PRIVATE].*

*Accordingly, panel determined that a suspension order for a further period of nine months was the necessary and proportionate sanction to reflect the level of insight which is still developing and the need for Mrs Obibi to demonstrate further remediation ...'*

### **Decision and reasons on current impairment**

The panel considered whether Mrs Obibi'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. The panel received no information or documentation from Mrs Obibi for this review.

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 Obibi's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that the last reviewing panel found that Mrs Obibi had demonstrated limited insight into her misconduct, and it noted that she '*failed to fully reflect and take accountability of the seriousness of her misconduct*'. Whilst that panel was encouraged by Mrs Obibi's reflective statements, training certificates and testimonials, it concluded that

Mrs Obibi was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved, as she has not demonstrated sufficient insight.

Today's panel has seen no further information from Mrs Obibi to demonstrate the contrary. The panel considered that Mrs Obibi has disengaged from the NMC, and there has been no further evidence from her acknowledging the seriousness of the misconduct, or any further evidence of insight or remediation from her. The panel bore in mind that the persuasive burden rests on Mrs Obibi to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired, and it has no evidence before it suggesting that Mrs Obibi has developed any insight since the last review.

Further, today's panel bore in mind that there is no evidence from Mrs Obibi of her strengthened practice or any information in respect of a demonstrable period of safe practice. The panel noted that there is no information before it on Mrs Obibi's future intentions with nursing.

[PRIVATE].

The last reviewing panel determined that Mrs Obibi was liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. In the absence of any information from Mrs Obibi of her insight, remediation or strengthened practice, this panel determined that she remains liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. This is particularly the case as Mrs Obibi has not been in nursing practice since the imposition of the substantive suspension order in 2024. The panel therefore decided that a finding of continuing impairment remains 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 the absence of any further evidence of Mrs Obibi's remediation or strengthened practice, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

## Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mrs Obibi 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 reaching its decision, the panel had sight of the 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.'*

*'Professionals who are not subject to fitness to practise proceedings have to revalidate every three years to stay on the register. In many cases it will be more appropriate for a professional to leave the register if they have been on a substantive order for this period of time and remain impaired.'*

The guidance further states, on determining whether to allow an order to lapse with a finding of impairment, or to impose a striking off order:

*'Cases where **striking off** is likely to be appropriate include when:*

- the professional has shown limited engagement and/or insight,*
- the professional has breached a substantive order; or*

- *the professional has otherwise made no or negligible progress towards addressing issues with their fitness to practise.*

*Striking off will **not** usually be an appropriate outcome where:*

- *the professional has engaged with the fitness to practise process; **and***
- *the concerns relate solely to matters involving health or English language skills*

*Our guidance on conditions of practice orders sets out that a nurse, midwife or nursing associate must comply with the conditions of a conditions of practice order. A deliberate failure to comply with a conditions of practice order could be proper grounds for making a striking off order.’ (emphasis as quoted)*

The panel considered the above guidance. It determined that it would not be appropriate to allow the current suspension to lapse with a finding of impairment, given Mrs Obibi’s current non-engagement with this review, and that this case relates to misconduct, as opposed to health or a lack of knowledge of English.

Bearing the above in mind, the panel then considered what sanction, if any, to impose.

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 Mrs Obibi’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 Mrs Obibi’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 Mrs Obibi'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 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 Mrs Obibi's misconduct.

Further, the panel noted that Mrs Obibi has not renewed her registration, and only remains on the NMC Register by virtue of these proceedings. The panel has no information that Mrs Obibi intends to return to practise as a nurse, and noted she has ceased to engage with the NMC. In view of this, the panel considered that there is no indication that she would comply with conditions of practice, and any conditions of practice order would not be workable and would serve no useful purpose.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order. The panel noted that Mrs Obibi has not shown remorse for her misconduct. Further, Mrs Obibi has not demonstrated insight into her previous failings. The panel was of the view that sufficient evidence would be required to show that Mrs Obibi no longer posed a risk to the public. The panel determined that a further period of suspension would not serve any useful purpose in all of the circumstances. The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Mrs Obibi 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.

This striking-off order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 12 June 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Mrs Obibi in writing.

That concludes this determination.