

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

**Substantive Order Review Hearing
Thursday, 8 October 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Elizabeth Bolanle Kehinde Edunsin
NMC PIN:	92Y0201O
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Sub Part 1 Adult Nursing – 13 January 1992
Relevant Location:	Manchester
Type of case:	Misconduct
Panel members:	Farrah Jaura (Chair, Lay member) Sue Quayle (Registrant member) Keith Murray (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Paul Hester
Hearings Coordinator:	Eyram Anka
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Nawazish Choudhury, Case Presenter
Mrs Edunsin:	Not present and unrepresented
Order being reviewed:	Suspension order (12 months)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Striking-Off order to come into effect on 28 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30 (1)

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Mrs Edunsin was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Mrs Edunsin's registered email address by secure email on 8 September 2026.

Mr Choudhury, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 11 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 substantive order being reviewed, 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 Edunsin'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 Edunsin has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rules 11 and 34.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Mrs Edunsin

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Mrs Edunsin. The panel had regard to Rule 21 and heard the submissions of Mr Choudhury who invited the panel to proceed in the absence of Mrs Edunsin.

Mr Choudhury submitted that there had been no recent engagement by Mrs Edunsin 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 submitted that there is a public interest in the expeditious review of this

case as the order expires on 28 October 2026. He submitted that it is in the interest of justice for this case to go ahead. He therefore invited the panel to proceed in Mrs Edunsin's absence.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel decided to proceed in the absence of Mrs Edunsin. In reaching this decision, the panel considered the submissions of Mr Choudhury and the advice of the legal assessor. It had regard to relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- Mrs Edunsin has not engaged with the NMC and has not responded to any of the emails sent to her about this hearing;
- No application for an adjournment has been made by Mrs Edunsin;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure Mrs Edunsin's attendance at some future date; and
- There is a strong public interest in the expeditious review of the case as the present order expires on 28 October 2026.

In these circumstances, the panel decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Mrs Edunsin.

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

Mr Choudhury made an application for this case to be held partly in private on the basis that proper exploration of Mrs Edunsin's case involves matters relating to [PRIVATE]. The application was made pursuant to Rule 19 of the Rules.

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.

Having heard that there will be reference to Mrs Edunsin's [PRIVATE], the panel determined to go into private session as and when such matters are raised, to protect her privacy.

Decision and reasons on review of the substantive order

The panel decided to impose a striking-off order.

This order will come into effect at the end of 28 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

This is the second review of a substantive conditions of practice order originally imposed for a period of 12 months by a Fitness to Practise Committee panel on 30 September 2024. This order was reviewed and replaced with a 12-month suspension order on 24 September 2025.

The current order is due to expire at the end of 28 October 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;

In respect of working at Charlestown Medical Practice between 1 November 2022 – 23 February 2023;

- 1) Failed to complete clinical records during/following a consultation, for one or more patients as set out in schedule 1.*
- 2) Did not record clearly that you had documented a retrospective entry in the clinical records for one or more patients as set out in schedule 2.*

Whilst working at Park View Medical Centre between 14 February – 16 May 2023;

- 3) Failed to complete clinical records during/following a consultation, for one or more patients as set out in schedule 3.*
- 4) For one or more consultations did not record clearly that you had documented a retrospective entry in the clinical records*
- 5) [Not Proved]*

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

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

'The panel carefully considered whether Ms Edunsin's fitness to practise remains impaired. It noted that accurate and timely record keeping is a fundamental requirement of safe nursing practice. It took note of the concerns identified in this case which include widespread failures to complete clinical records over an extended period in two separate workplaces. In some cases, she completely failed to make any recording whilst in others she had not clearly recorded that entries had been made by her retrospectively.

The panel noted that the original panel found that Ms Edunsin had not demonstrated sufficient insight. At this hearing Ms Edunsin did not attend nor make any written submissions to the panel to demonstrate an understanding of how her actions put patients at a risk of harm.

The panel accepted that the substantive panel had identified breaches of the Code and had imposed a conditions of practice order to address those deficiencies. However, it noted that since the order was imposed Ms Edunsin has not provided any reflective piece explaining the circumstances of her

failings nor any evidence of learning or remediation. Ms Edunsin has not supplied any testimonials or report from a line manager, mentor, or supervisor despite the opportunity to do so.

The panel acknowledged that Ms Edunsin has cited [PRIVATE] in her recent email to the NMC. Nevertheless, the panel found that she has not engaged meaningfully or consistently with the NMC or demonstrated insight into her failings. Without such evidence, the panel could not be satisfied that the risk to patients and the wider public has been mitigated.

In light of this, this panel determined that Ms Edunsin 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 Ms Edunsin's fitness to practise remains impaired.'

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

'The panel first considered whether to allow the current order to expire without taking any further action but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the ongoing public protection issues. 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 Ms Edunsin'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 and the panel wishes to mark that the behaviour was unacceptable and must not happen again.’ The panel considered that Ms Edunsin’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 extending the current conditions of practice order on Ms Edunsin’s registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The panel is mindful that any conditions imposed must be proportionate, measurable and workable.

Ms Edunsin has not had any meaningful engagement with the NMC since the imposition of the conditions of practice order imposed on 30 September 2024. This order has not led to any evidence of strengthened practice and there is no information before the panel to conclude that Ms Edunsin is willing and/or able to comply with any conditions imposed upon her practice. On this basis, the panel concluded that a conditions of practice order is no longer appropriate in this case.

The panel determined therefore that a suspension order is the appropriate sanction which would both protect the public and satisfy the wider public interest. Accordingly, the panel determined to impose a suspension order for a period of 12 months. This would provide Ms Edunsin with an opportunity to engage with the NMC. It considered this to be the most appropriate and proportionate sanction available.

This suspension order will take effect upon the expiry of the current conditions of practice order, namely the end of 28 October 2025 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:

- *A reflective piece explaining:*
 - *The reasons for her failings in record keeping.*
 - *The impact of those failings on patients, colleagues and public confidence*
 - *The steps she has taken to ensure such failings are not repeated.*
- *Evidence of professional development, including documentary evidence of completion of relevant training courses and any subsequent reflections.*
- *Testimonials or references from current or former colleagues.*
- *Evidence of consistent engagement with the NMC, including attendance at the next review hearing.'*

Decision and reasons on current impairment

The panel has considered carefully whether Mrs Edunsin'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 had regard to all of the documentation before it.

Mr Choudhury provided the panel with an overview of the background to the case.

Mr Choudhury referred the panel to the recommendations made by the previous panel regarding the information that would assist a future reviewing panel, namely:

- 1) A reflective piece explaining:
 - The reasons for her failings in record keeping.
 - The impact of those failings on patients, colleagues and public confidence
 - The steps she has taken to ensure such failings are not repeated.
- 2) Evidence of professional development, including documentary evidence of completion of relevant training courses and any subsequent reflections.
- 3) Testimonials or references from current or former colleagues.
- 4) Evidence of consistent engagement with the NMC, including attendance at the next review hearing.

Mr Choudhury submitted that Mrs Edunsin has not engaged with any of the recommendations made by the previous panel. He further submitted that Mrs Edunsin has not discharged the persuasive burden of demonstrating that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

Mr Choudhury also took the panel through the original substantive panel's decision dated 30 September 2024. He submitted that the matters found proved at the substantive hearing related to clinical matters. He reminded the panel that the original panel imposed a conditions of practice order, which he submitted was reasonable and proportionate.

Mr Choudhury also took the panel to the previous reviewing panel's decision dated 24 September 2025. He referred the panel to email from Mrs Edunsin dated 22 September 2025, in which she provided an update on her circumstances. The email states:

[PRIVATE]

Mr Choudhury submitted that Mrs Edunsin did not attend the previous review hearing, and save for the email referred to above, did not provide any evidence to demonstrate that she was willing or able to comply with the conditions of practice order.

Mr Choudhury acknowledged that Mrs Edunsin *[PRIVATE]*. However, he submitted that there remains an expectation that she would participate in the proceedings or provide relevant documentary evidence, even if she chose not to attend this hearing.

Mr Choudhury referred the panel to the case of *Abrahaem v General Medical Council* [2008] EWC 183, in which the Judge stated the following:

'In practical terms, there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision, or other achievements sufficiently addressed to past impairments. That burden is on a registrant panel.'

Mr Choudhury submitted that, in light of Mrs Edunsin's failure to discharge the burden of proof, her fitness to practise remains impaired.

Mr Choudhury reminded the panel of the powers available to it. He submitted that the purpose of a substantive order review is not to give registrant an indefinite period within which to return to a position of safe practice.

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 Mrs Edunsin's fitness to practise remains impaired.

The panel noted that Mrs Edunsin did not attend the previous substantive review hearing in September 2025. Mrs Edunsin has not attended today, nor engaged with the NMC in respect of this review. Further, she has not provided any evidence as to her strengthening her practice or any evidence which was suggested by the previous reviewing panel.

The panel considered that the persuasive burden rests with Mrs Edunsin to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The panel found no evidence of strengthened practice or a reduction in the risk posed by Mrs Edunsin to the public. The panel was therefore satisfied that there is nothing before it to undermine the previous finding of impairment.

The panel determined that the first three limbs of the Shipman test approved of in *Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) remain engaged. It considered that Mrs Edunsin remains liable in the future, to put patients at an unwarranted risk of harm, bring the profession into disrepute and breach fundamental tenets of the nursing profession.

In light of this, this panel determined that Mrs Edunsin is liable to repeat matters of the kind found proved. Accordingly, the panel concluded that a finding of continuing impairment is necessary 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, in this case, a finding of continuing impairment on public interest grounds is also required.

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

Decision and reasons on sanction

Having found Mrs Edunsin'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 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 Edunsin'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 Edunsin'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 Edunsin'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 Edunsin's misconduct. The panel further noted that Mrs Edunsin did not comply with the conditions of practice order in that she has not practised as a registered nurse and there is no evidence of any attempted compliance.

The panel next considered imposing a further suspension order.

The panel noted that Mrs Edunsin has not engaged with the regulatory proceedings or the recommendations made by the previous panel. It further noted that there is no evidence before it to demonstrate that Mrs Edunsin has developed insight into her previous failings or taken steps to strengthen her practice. The panel was of the view that material evidence would be required to show that Mrs Edunsin no longer posed a risk to the public.

The panel gave careful regard to the NMC's guidance '*Suspension order*' (SAN-2d). The panel noted that a further suspension order would protect the public and address the wider public interest. However, the panel went on to consider whether it is realistic that Mrs Edunsin would return to unrestricted practice in the future, given that she did not comply with the conditions of practice order imposed at the substantive hearing on 30 September 2024.

The panel considered an email dated 22 September 2025 from Mrs Edunsin, in which she outlined her employment status and [PRIVATE]. She stated:

[PRIVATE]

Whilst the panel acknowledged that Mrs Edunsin stated that she was experiencing [PRIVATE] in 2025 and may be experiencing continuing difficulties, it had no independent [PRIVATE] evidence of these [PRIVATE] and no update from Mrs Edunsin as to her current [PRIVATE] and prospects of returning to work as a registered nurse. The panel considered that there has been a continued lack of engagement since the email. In these circumstances, the panel decided that there is no realistic prospect of Mrs Edunsin engaging with the process in the future and that the making of a further suspension order would not result in her engaging.

The panel next gave consideration to imposing a striking-off order.

The panel carefully considered the NMC guidance '*Striking-off order*' (SAN-2e). The panel noted that before imposing this sanction, it 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?’*

Further into this guidance, there is a further consideration which is failing to engage with the fitness to practise process.

The panel was particularly concerned by Mrs Edunsin’s lack of engagement since the first review in September 2025 and noted that the only engagement appears to be the email concerning [PRIVATE] on 22 September 2025. It was the panel’s view that public confidence could not be maintained if Mrs Edunsin was not removed from the register. Further, Mrs Edunsin has not demonstrated any insight or reflection which could keep people receiving care and members of the public safe, maintain public confidence in the profession, and uphold professional standards. The panel further determined that there is no realistic prospect, in light of Mrs Edunsin’s non-engagement, that a further period of suspension would gain insight and strengthening of her practice such that the risk she poses would be reduced.

The panel also had regard to the NMC guidance *‘Deciding between a suspension order and strike off’* (SAN-3).

The panel gave careful regard to the factors set out within this guidance when deciding between a suspension or a striking-off order, which are as follows:

- *‘consider all of the relevant aggravating and mitigating factors.*
- *consider that, unless the Committee directs otherwise, a suspension order will be reviewed before its expiry and may be extended. However, the Committee*

cannot direct that the suspension must be extended on review. As such the Committee should consider whether public confidence in the profession would be protected if the professional returned to practice after one year, or ever.

- Consider the professional's insight and attitude to addressing the concerns, and whether it is realistically possible that these will change positively during the suspension period. If it is unlikely the professional will try to address the concerns, there may not be appropriate for them to be suspended in the hopes that they will eventually return to practice.*
- Professionals are under an obligation to cooperate with their regulator. Where professionals have failed to engage with the fitness to practise process, it won't usually be appropriate to use a suspension order as a means of giving them a 'last chance' to engage, reflect or show insight.'*

The panel considered the aggravating features found by the substantive panel and noted that no mitigating features were identified. In this regard, the panel decided that the aggravating features identified by the substantive panel are serious. The panel also noted that in respect of the charges found proved that there was misconduct on numerous occasions and over a significant period of time, involving multiple sites and patients.

In respect of the third factor, the panel again noted Mrs Edunsin's non-engagement with the NMC and the regulatory process, with the exception of one email in September 2025. There has been no evidence provided by Mrs Edunsin of strengthening of practice either at the substantive hearing in 2024 or over the last 12 months.

In respect of the fourth factor, the panel noted that professionals are under a clear obligation to cooperate with the NMC. The panel gave particular regard to the situation within this factor where professionals have failed to engage with the process and that it will not be usually appropriate to use a suspension order as a means of giving a registrant a last chance. Mrs Edunsin did not comply with the conditions of practice order imposed by the substantive panel and not engaged with NMC since the review in September 2025, therefore the panel decided that this is not a situation where a last chance should be given.

The panel recognises that a striking-off order is the most serious order, the consequences that it will have on Mrs Edunsin and therefore considered whether removal from the register by allowing the order to lapse with a finding of impairment is available to it. The panel gave careful regard to the NMC guidance '*Removal from the register when there is a substantive order in place*' (REV-2h).

In deciding a striking-off order the panel did note that there is mention in the previous panels' decisions of Mrs Edunsin's [PRIVATE]. [PRIVATE]. Further, Mrs Edunsin has provided no update as to [PRIVATE] conditions and her prospects and intentions of returning to work as a registered nurse.

The panel determined that it was necessary to take action to prevent Mrs Edunsin 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 28 October 2026 in accordance with Article 30(1).

This decision will be confirmed to Mrs Edunsin in writing.

That concludes this determination.