Nursing and Midwifery Council
Fitness to Practise Committee

Substantive Order Review Hearing
Tuesday, 24 November 2026

Virtual Hearing

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:	Denford Chifamba (Chair, Registrant member) David Anderson (Lay member) Amanda Anderson (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Melissa Harrison
Hearings Coordinator:	Hannah Luedke
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Isabella Priestman-Bennett, Case Presenter
Mr Akakpo:	Present and unrepresented
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (6 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	**Conditions of practice order (12 months) to come into effect at the end of 3 January 2027 in accordance with Article 30(1)**

Decision and reasons on application for hearing to be held in private

At the outset of the hearing, the panel, of its own motion, considered whether this case should be held partly in private on the basis that proper exploration of your case involves reference to [PRIVATE]. This was considered by the panel pursuant to Rule 19 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

Ms Priestman-Bennett, on behalf of the NMC indicated that she supported this to the extent that any reference to [PRIVATE] should be heard in private.

The legal assessor reminded the panel that while Rule 19(1) provides, as a starting point, that hearings shall be conducted in public, Rule 19(3) states that the panel may hold hearings partly or wholly in private if it is satisfied that this is justified by the interests of any party or by the public interest.

The panel determined that the hearing would be heard partially in private when matters pertaining to your personal life, [PRIVATE] were raised in order to fully explore the circumstances of your case.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to replace the current suspension order with a conditions of practice order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 3 January 2027 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 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 5 June 2025. This was reviewed on 12 May 2026 and the suspension order was extended by a further 6 months.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 3 January 2027.

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 first reviewing panel determined the following with regard to impairment:

'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'

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

> *'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.'*

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, submissions made by you and the supporting documentary evidence provided by you. It

has taken account of the submissions made by Ms Priestman-Bennett on behalf of the NMC.

Ms Priestman-Bennett took the panel through the background of the case and referred it to the relevant pages in the bundle.

Ms Priestman-Bennett referred the panel to the recommendations made by the previous reviewing panel, which stated that:

> *'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.'*

Ms Priestman-Bennett highlighted that you had provided several documents addressing the above recommendations, including a reference from a colleague in the NHS, a character reference from a manager at your current place of employment, an updated reflective statement, training certificates of continuing professional development (CPD) courses completed by you in recent months, as well as evidence regarding your current employment status. She submitted that it was up to the panel to consider whether there were any gaps that had not been addressed by you.

Ms Priestman-Bennett submitted that there has been some progress in relation to insight, in that your updated reflective statement explains why you initially denied the allegations and shows some insight into the consequences of your actions. Ms Priestman-Bennett however invited the panel to consider whether you had provided sufficient detail around how the incident happened and how it could be prevented in the future in your reflective statement.

Ms Priestman-Bennett further submitted that there is a substantial volume of documentary evidence supporting that you have taken steps to strengthen your practice, together with two testimonials. However, she submitted that there are no concrete examples given by you or the testimonials evidencing whether you are currently demonstrating honesty and integrity in the workplace. Ms Priestman-Bennett submitted that the NMC's position on your fitness to practise being impaired was neutral and she invited the panel to consider whether you have discharged the persuasive burden on you to demonstrate that you are no longer impaired.

Ms Priestman-Bennett submitted that should the panel find your fitness to practise impaired, it should have regard to imposing a conditions of practice order. She highlighted that none of the charges found proven at the substantive hearing relate to your clinical practice and that a conditions of practice order may allow you to make progress towards strengthening your practice and to eventually return to unrestricted practice. She further submitted that the panel could alternatively consider a continuation of the suspension order, should the panel not be able to impose workable conditions on you.

The panel also had regard to the submissions made by you during the hearing.

You told the panel about the circumstances surrounding the charge found proved. You explained that you were dealing with multiple challenging [PRIVATE] at the time, which clouded your judgement. You explained that you had [PRIVATE] before coming to work. You recognise now that you could have flagged this to a manager and returned home, but that you failed to do so at the time. You stated that you took medication you were not authorised to take and that you now recognise that this was the wrong thing to do. You stated that you did initially write letters of apology but did not send them after receiving legal advice not to do so. You told the panel that you did not want [PRIVATE] to find out

about you taking the medication, which contributed to you denying this charge initially. You stated that you now accept the charges and sought to assure the panel it will never happen again. You stated this was a one-off incident that was out of character for you, and that you are normally an honest person who follows rules.

You stated that since the incident took place, you have taken multiple CPD courses and have conducted supervision and reflective sessions with former colleagues you trust. You stated that you have continuously reflected on what went wrong and would continue to do so if you were allowed to practice again. You said that you promise to never let something like this happen again and would act differently in the future by flagging issues to a manager and asking for help.

In response to questions posed to you by the panel, you further stated that you are currently employed in a non-clinical setting but would like to return to practise as a nurse. You would like to eventually work in occupational health, as you completed postgraduate training in this field. You stated that you have kept up to date with current nursing practice through conversations with former colleagues who are currently practising and by reading up on developments. You stated that the main things you have learnt through the CPD courses is to not take anything for granted, that sometimes one falls into unhelpful habits and that it is important to take a moment to think before acting. You also stated that it is important to ask for help when you need it and to not try and resolve issues on your own.

You further stated that you may have an opportunity for employment as a bank nurse should you be allowed to practise again and that you would value the opportunity to demonstrate to members of the public that you can be trusted when working in a clinical workplace.

The panel 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 considered that you have made significant progress since the last review of the substantive order. It was impressed by your engagement with these proceedings, willingness to answer the panel's questions and documentary evidence you supplied to the panel in response to the recommendations made by the previous reviewing panel.

The panel determined that your insight has developed significantly as demonstrated by your updated reflective statement. The panel noted that you have demonstrated remorse, have shown insight into the consequences your actions have had and that you have apologised in your reflective statement. It also found it encouraging that you provided a full explanation of the reasons that led to the incident found proved at the substantive hearing, together with some developing insight into how you would prevent something like this from happening again. However, the panel determined that your insight could develop further, particularly in relation to how you might apply the learning from the numerous training courses you have undertaken to your future practice.

The panel further considered that it is clear that you have taken several steps towards strengthening your practice as outlined in the documentary evidence provided by you. However, the panel determined that the quality of this evidence is limited by you not having demonstrated how you have, or would, apply any learnings to your practice as a nurse in the future. The panel also considered that it did not have any testimonials before it sufficiently demonstrating that you are now able to work in a dependable and trustworthy manner in the workplace.

The panel had particular regard to the case of *Cohen v GMC* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin), which considers whether:

- The concern can be addressed by taking steps to strengthen practice
- The concern has been addressed
- It is highly unlikely that the conduct will be repeated

The panel considered that the concerns raised in relation to your practice are remediable in principle. It determined that, as outlined above, you have taken significant steps in addressing these concerns. However, the panel determined that the concerns have not

been addressed in full. The panel determined that further evidence is needed demonstrating how any CPD or other learning has or would impact your practice in the future, as well as clear examples and evidence demonstrating your ability to work dependably and in a trustworthy manner.

The panel acknowledged that there are barriers to you demonstrating this as you are currently not working in nursing or another healthcare role. The panel therefore determined that as you have been unable to demonstrate how your developed insight and strengthening of practice has impacted on your ability to practise safely in a clinical setting, you have been unable to address the concern in full. The panel determined that while the risk of repetition was low, the concerns had not yet been fully remediated and therefore a risk to the public remains. The panel therefore determined that you currently remain impaired on the ground 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 given the serious nature of this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required, as it considered that a fully informed member of the public would expect to see relevant concerns to be sufficiently addressed before your fitness to practise was considered no longer impaired. The panel therefore determined that you also currently remain impaired on the ground of public interest.

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 guidance on sanctions 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, as this outcome does not provide for any checks and balances to be made on any progress you may or may not make.

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 NMC guidance titled '*Caution order'* (SAN-2b, last updated 28 January 2026) 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, as this outcome also does not provide for any checks and balances to be made on any progress you may or may not make.

The panel considered substituting the current suspension order with a conditions of practice order. Despite the seriousness of your misconduct, there has been evidence produced to show that you have developed your insight and have taken steps to strengthen your practice. In light of your developing insight and steps taken to strengthen your practice, combined with your wish to return to nursing, the panel determined that a conditions of practice order would facilitate your return to safe practice within a structured and supportive framework, while maintaining public protection. The panel recognised that the allegations found proved do not directly relate to your clinical practice. Having carefully considered the conditions of practice library, the panel was satisfied that it would be possible to formulate practicable and workable conditions that, if complied with, may lead to your unrestricted return to practice and would serve to protect the public, satisfy the public interest in this case and protect the reputation of the profession in the meantime.

As required by the guidance, the panel went on to consider the next available sanction, namely a suspension order. Having regard to all the circumstances of your case, it considered that a further period of suspension would not only be disproportionate but

would serve no meaningful purpose. Additionally, it did not consider that a further period of suspension would provide you with the necessary opportunity to demonstrate safe practice and the application of relevant learning to that practice.

The panel decided that the public would be suitably protected as would the reputation of the profession by the implementation of the following conditions of practice:

> ‘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 limit your nursing practice to a single substantive employer. This may include working as a bank nurse but not include work at an agency.
>
> 2. You must ensure that you are working at all times on the same shift as, but not always directly observed by, a registered nurse of band 6 or above.
>
> 3. You will send the NMC a report seven days in advance of the next NMC hearing from your line manager, outlining your ability to work in a dependable and trustworthy manner.
>
> 4. You must keep us informed about anywhere you are working by:
>   a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting or leaving any employment.
>   b) Giving your case officer your employer’s contact details.
>
> 5. You must keep us informed about anywhere you are studying by:
>   a) Telling your case officer within seven days of accepting any course of study.

b) Giving your case officer the name and contact details of the organisation offering that course of study.

6. You must immediately give a copy of these conditions to:
   a) Any organisation or person you work for.
   b) Any employers you apply to for work (at the time of application).
   c) Any establishment you apply to (at the time of application), or with which you are already enrolled, for a course of study.

7. 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.

8. 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 current or future employer.
   b) Any educational establishment.
   c) Any other person(s) involved in your retraining and/or supervision required by these conditions

The period of this order is for 12 months.

This conditions of practice order will take effect upon the expiry of the current suspension order, namely the end of 3 January 2027 in accordance with Article 30(1).

Before the end of the period of the order, a panel will hold a review hearing to see how well you have complied with the order. At the review hearing the panel may revoke the order or any condition of it, it may confirm the order or vary any condition of it, or it may replace the order for another order.

Any future panel reviewing this case would be assisted by:

- Your attendance at the next hearing.
- A portfolio addressing:
    - Reflective statements on the professional training you have undertaken this year in relation to the concerns found proved. This statement should outline what you have learnt from these activities, how you have implemented the learnings in your practice and how your practice has been impacted by your learnings.
- Testimonials from individuals you have worked with outlining examples of you being dependable and trustworthy within a work setting (paid or unpaid).

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.