

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Hearing
5-6 March 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Appellant:	Fadekemi Gbadamosi
NMC PRN:	1021362620
Type of case:	Registrations appeal
Panel members:	Dr Gary Tanner (Chair – Lay member) Sue Gwyn (Registrant member) Eleanor Harding (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Alice Robertson-Rickard
Hearings Coordinator:	Vicky Green
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Uzma Khan, Case Presenter
Ms Gbadamosi:	Present and unrepresented
Decision:	Appeal dismissed

Decision and reasons

The panel decided to dismiss your appeal against the decision of the Assistant Registrar of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC).

This appeal is made under Article 37(1)(a) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (the Order). You appealed the decision of the Assistant Registrar, dated 2 April 2025, that you did not meet the character requirements for registration to the NMC register.

Background

On 16 March 2023, Pearson VUE, the NMC's computer-based test (CBT) provider, alerted it to unusual data relating to tests taken at Yunnik Technologies Ltd test centre in Ibadan, Nigeria (Yunnik). The CBT test is in two parts, numeracy and clinical. The data raised questions about whether some or all of the CBT results at Yunnik had been obtained through fraud and called into question the validity of all tests taken at Yunnik.

Following completion of the NMC's initial investigation into this issue it concluded that there was evidence of widespread fraud at the Yunnik centre, where a large number of candidates had allegedly fraudulently obtained their CBT. The NMC asked Pearson VUE to provide it with assurance that the data concerning tests taken at Yunnik were accurate, and not the result of a system error, cyber-attack, or other technical issue. Pearson VUE confirmed that, following a detailed investigation into the testing facility at Yunnik and review of the data, Pearson VUE were satisfied that there was no evidence of system error, cyber-attack, or other technical error and that the data was indicative of one or more proxy testers operating at the centre.

The NMC next asked an independent data analytics expert of OAC Limited (OAC), Witness 4, to provide the NMC with an objective analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE. OAC looked at the times in which CBT candidates at Yunnik took to achieve their CBT pass, compared with times taken by CBT candidates from other test centres in Nigeria and globally. Using this data, OAC then calculated the probability that each CBT candidate at Yunnik could achieve their CBT pass within the time it took them to complete the test. OAC's analysis of the data supports Pearson VUE's conclusion

that there may have been widespread fraudulent activity at Yunnik probably through a proxy tester acting on behalf of test candidates.

The data in relation to your CBT showed that you achieved a pass in your test in the following times:

- Numeracy: 10.45 minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes).
- Clinical: 7.48 minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes).

Comparing your time to complete your test with times taken by candidates globally, it was considered very unlikely that you could have achieved a pass in your test within the time it took you to complete it.

Taking into account the times in which your tests were taken, in a centre in which the NMC allege there to have been widespread fraudulent activity, it was considered by the NMC to be more likely than not that your CBT result was obtained fraudulently.

When considering your application to the register, the Assistant Registrar took into account the following documentation from the NMC:

- Your completed application.
- The 'evidence bundle' consisting of:
 - Expert report by [Witness 4], Head of Data Analytics at OAC.
 - Witness statement of [Witness 3], Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.
 - Witness statement of [Witness 5], Executive Director of Professional Practice at the NMC.
 - Witness statement of Registrant A and Registrant B.
- Other test activity at Yunnik on the date you sat your test.
- Documents from Pearson Vue:
 - Confirmation of Exam appointment.
 - Exam registration details.
 - Individual candidate record.
 - Photograph and signature submitted at Yunnik.

The Assistant Registrar also took into account the following documentation provided by you:

- Your email dated 31 January 2025.
- Your email dated 4 March 2025 with the following documents:
 - Character reference from [J].
 - Character reference from A
 - Passport/Visa photographs x4.
 - A photograph of you.
 - Travel confirmation.
 - Tenancy agreement.

In your email dated 31 January 2025 entitled 'Victim of Circumstances', you set out the following:

'I am writing to address the unfortunate situation I was unknowingly involved in regarding the examination fraud at Yunnik's Examination Centre.

Firstly, I wish to categorically state that I never sat for the examination at this centre.

In March 2022, while pursuing my top-up degree in Nursing here in the UK, I joined a CBT WhatsApp group. Through this group, I came across an advert for a coaching centre. I contacted them to inquire about their services, including OET preparation and exam booking, CBT preparation and exam booking, as well as OSCE preparation and exam booking.

The man who communicated with me explained everything step by step. He advised me to take the OET first, and once I passed, I would proceed with the CBT.

I made the payment, and they began training me for both the OET and CBT via WhatsApp. They also sent me study materials for personal preparation through WhatsApp. Since I am already in the UK, I plan to take all my tests here.

As I was planning to visit my family in Nigeria at the end of June, I informed this man that I would need a break to be with my family for a week. The centre

suggested that I could take my CBT and OET exams during my visit, assuring me that an exam date would be available within the one week I intended to spend in Nigeria.

However, in late June, while I was still in the UK, a representative from the centre contacted me and informed me that I had “passed” my CBT. This came as a complete shock, as I had not even received confirmation of a test date from Pearson VUE, let alone sat for the exam.

A few days later, I logged into my NMC portal and noticed that a “pass” was recorded for my CBT. Alarmed, I contacted the centre to question this, as I had neither taken the exam nor authorised anyone to act on my behalf. I suspected that my NMC portal may have been tampered with, particularly as the same representative had previously assisted me with my verification process.

When I confronted the representative over the phone, I demanded a refund and informed him that I intended to wait two years for the invalid result to expire before retaking the CBT. Shortly after this conversation, the representative blocked my number and ceased all communication. My attempts to contact him through other means were unsuccessful.

As a result of this fraudulent activity, I was unable to proceed with booking my OSCE, as the CBT result was not legitimate. In May 2023, I received a message from the NMC concerning the examination. I have no knowledge of where or how this test was conducted.

I hold my profession and its ethics in the highest regard and would never involve myself in any activities that could compromise my values.

I have worked as a nurse in both government and private hospitals in Nigeria, and my professional ethics and values can be verified.

I trust that this explanation will help clarify my non-involvement in this fraudulent activity. Please do not hesitate to contact me if further information is required.’

You provided further clarification in your email dated 4 March 2026.

The Assistant Registrar considered your explanation. The Assistant Registrar made the following decision:

'In your correspondence you stated that you were unknowingly involved in your CBT being obtained by fraud at Yunnik on 17 June 2022. You admitted that on that date, you were in the UK, meaning that the test was completed by a proxy. You also confirmed that the photograph and signature submitted at Yunnik on that date do not match your likeness or handwriting.

I've considered what you said about a coaching centre, who you paid for advice, training and study materials for the OET and CBT. You said that you planned to take the CBT in the UK, but as you were travelling to Nigeria in June 2022 for a week, the coaching centre assured you that an exam date would be available during that period. You said that you planned to sit the CBT in Lagos, close to your family and where you had previously sat a CBT in 2018.

I noted you said that, at the end of June 2022, whilst you were still in the UK the coaching centre told you that you had passed the CBT which you knew you had not taken yourself. I note the travel confirmation you have provided. You logged into your NMC portal and saw that your CBT result was recorded as a pass. You believed that the coaching centre may have tampered with your NMC Portal. I note what you said about your intention to wait two years for the fraudulent CBT to expire before you sat a new CBT. I've also noted what you said about the contact with the coaching centre afterwards.

I've considered that despite knowing that your test was completed by someone else on your behalf and that you suspected that your NMC Portal was tampered with, you didn't act promptly to raise your concerns to the appropriate authorities. I've also noted the lack of reflection and insight from you.

I've considered that Pearson Vue sent confirmation of your test booking to you in May 2022 which you say you did not receive. I'm concerned that the confirmation

includes a home address that matches the signed tenancy agreement you provided. However, you have said that you started living at this address much later, in May 2023. I also noted that the tenancy agreement you provided is in a different name to that in your registration application.

I've considered the character references that you have provided in support of your application and I've noted the positive comments made about you.

I've considered the Registrar's decision with regards to the time in which your CBT test result at Yunnik was obtained, and in light of the admission you have made, I'm satisfied that I've not been presented with anything that changes the conclusion that it was more likely than not that you obtained your CBT test result fraudulently.

I consider dishonest conduct, especially when it directly relates to registration as a nurse, midwife, or nursing associate, to be a serious concern that can be more difficult to put right. After carefully considering all of the information and evidence presented to me, I'm not satisfied that you've suitably reflected on what you did wrong and I'm concerned about the risk of it happening again if you face a similar situation in future

After carefully considering all information and evidence presented to me, I decided that you didn't meet the character requirements for registration. I consider that your conduct, would breach one of the fundamental requirements of our code:

- Standard 20 - Promote professionalism and trust.*

To promote professionalism and trust, you're required to display a personal commitment to the standards of practice and behaviour set out in the Code. You should be a model of integrity and leadership for others to aspire to. This should lead to trust and confidence in the professions from patients, people receiving care, other health and care professionals and the public.

I consider that obtaining a CBT fraudulently to join the NMC register, falls well below the standard expected, raises serious concerns about your trustworthiness and has the potential to undermine public confidence in the profession. For these reasons, I'm not satisfied that you meet the character requirements for registration and as such, I'm refusing your application to join the NMC register.'

On 2 April 2025, you were informed that the Assistant Registrar had refused your application onto the register. You appealed the decision on 23 April 2025, within the 28 day time limit.

Evidence

The panel also took account of the written evidence including exhibits and the witness statements from the following witnesses on behalf of the NMC:

- Witness 1: Test taker at the Yunnik Centre.
- Witness 2: Test taker at the Yunnik Centre.
- Witness 3: Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.
- Witness 4: An independent Data Analyst who provided the NMC with an analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE.
- Witness 5: The Deputy Director for Business Transformation and a member of the Executive Team for Professional Regulation.

During the course of the hearing, you provided the panel with six pieces of evidence in relation to your address at the date the CBT test was booked.

You gave evidence under affirmation. In your evidence to the panel, you said that you would like to be clear and transparent in that you did not sit the CBT examination on 16 June 2022, and that you did not authorise anyone to take the examination on your behalf. You told the panel that on 16 June 2022 you were in the UK undertaking a BSc nursing '*top up*' degree and working as a healthcare assistant. You said that you were using an online coaching service for exam preparation which was common practice at the time.

You told the panel that you shared your login details with the individual at the online coaching service for administrative assistance, which included help with examination booking and that you had planned on sitting the exam during a planned visit to Nigeria.

You said that you now realise that this was a serious error of judgement and that you did not authorise an examination to be taken in your absence. You told the panel that you were not aware that an examination had been booked and conducted. You said that you were later informed that you had achieved a pass of an examination you had not sat. You told the panel that you were shocked, immediately challenged and rejected the results and disengaged from the individual involved. You said that you did not use the results to progress your registration and that you waited for this result to expire. You told the panel that you later completed the CBT legitimately in the UK and progressed your OSCE in line with the requirements.

You told the panel that you accept responsibility for sharing your login details and for your lack of understanding of UK regulatory processes at the time. You said that you maintain that you did not act dishonestly, you did not intend to cheat and you did not knowingly benefit from any irregularity. You told the panel that once you became aware, you corrected the situation and upheld professional standards.

You referred to the witness statement provided by the NMC and noted that the email address was incorrect which you said confirms that you did not receive any booking confirmation. However, you were referred to a print out of your exam registration from Pearson Vue, which you confirmed contained the correct email address.

During cross examination, you confirmed that you had previously taken the CBT in 2018 and said that you failed this as you had not properly prepared for it. You said that you provided the coaching company with your login details so that they could access the system and arrange the exam on your behalf. You said that you did not recognise the name that appeared on the Pearson Vue invoice. You told the panel that you tried to recover the costs from the coaching company but that they had blocked all communications from you.

When referred to the invoice from Pearson Vue dated 28 May 2022, you said that the address contained within it was not where you were residing at the relevant time and that you did not know how the coaching company had obtained this information as you did not move to that address until May 2023. You said that this must be an error and provided the panel with some documentation to show where you were living at around the relevant time. You were unable to provide confirmation of where you were living in precisely May and June 2022.

Submissions

Ms Khan provided the panel with a background to the case and referred the panel to the generic evidence and to the specific evidence. Ms Khan referred the panel to the NMC written submissions which she adopted.

Ms Khan submitted that the panel will need to adjudicate on two matters, namely whether your test result in June 2022 was fraudulently obtained and whether it was taken with your knowledge and authorisation. She submitted that the evidence of widespread fraud through the use of proxy testers at the Yunnik centre is reliable and unchallenged and it is therefore more likely than not that this occurred. Ms Khan submitted that you accepted that you did not attend the Yunnik centre in June 2022 and that the test was not undertaken by you. She submitted that the panel can safely conclude that the result was obtained fraudulently.

Ms Khan submitted that the panel will need to determine the circumstances in which the examination was undertaken and the extent of your knowledge and authorisation of a

proxy taking the test on your behalf. She submitted that the matter of where you were living at the time is a “*red herring*” and that on the information you provided, it cannot be established where you were living in May-June 2022.

Ms Khan referred the panel to the information provided by Pearson Vue and submitted that your email address is correct and any booking confirmation and reminders would have been sent to that email address. She submitted that it is unlikely that you would have been unaware that the coaching company arranged your examination and used a proxy to ensure that you passed the CBT. Ms Khan submitted that it is also unlikely that the coaching company would go ahead with the fraudulent activity without your knowledge and notify you of this as it would place their fraudulent operation at risk.

Ms Khan submitted that your failure to take any action, instead waiting for the fraudulent result to expire, raises significant concerns. She submitted that as you had previously failed the CBT in 2018, this was a potential motive for using a proxy to ensure that you passed. Ms Khan submitted that at the relevant time you were residing in the UK and could have taken the CBT in the UK. She submitted that that it is more likely than not that you were aware that a proxy would take the exam on your behalf and that you consented to it.

Ms Khan submitted that you remained silent on the fraudulent activity for over two years and only disclosed it to the NMC after your registration application was refused. She submitted that you should have notified the NMC as soon as you became aware of the fraudulent activity. Ms Khan submitted that you should have known your professional obligations and that cheating in the UK is the same as in Nigeria and that you would have known that having a proxy sitting your exam is fundamentally wrong.

Ms Khan submitted that there are two elements of dishonesty in this case. In using a proxy to undertake your CBT, she submitted that you acted dishonestly. Ms Khan submitted that further dishonesty and a lack of integrity occurred in that you failed to notify the NMC of the fraudulent activity. She submitted that your failure to act transparently is inconsistent with the character requirements expected of a nurse and that the decision of the Assistant Registrar to refuse your application was correct. Ms

Khan submitted that as the CBT result cannot be relied upon and that you have not satisfied the character requirements for registration your appeal should be dismissed.

You submitted that you have found this experience to be deeply distressing and humbling. You submitted that you have extensively reflected on the NMC Code and in particular the duty to uphold honesty and act with integrity. You also submitted that you did not authorise anyone to sit the CBT on your behalf and did not knowingly participate in any fraudulent activity. You submitted that you accepted that when you became aware of the irregularity you should have reported it immediately and you now understand that even failing to act promptly can raise concerns about your professional integrity and transparency, although you did not use the results. You submitted that you did not know that you were supposed to report it and if you had known then you would have reported it immediately.

You submitted that this experience has been deeply distressing and that it has taught you an important lesson about professional responsibility. You submitted that integrity requires not only avoiding wrongdoing, but also taking immediate action when concerns arise. You submitted that you respect the role of the NMC in protecting the public and upholding public trust and standards. You also submitted that you are committed to honesty, accountability and ethical conduct going forward. You invited that panel to consider that you did not deliberately engage in dishonesty and you have never done so. You also submitted that you have reflected and that you are sorry and take your responsibility seriously.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Panel decision

In making its decision, the panel first considered whether it had sufficient evidence before it to substantiate the NMC's case that there was widespread fraud occurring at the Yunnik Centre. The panel had regard to the information about the investigations carried out by Pearson VUE, and an independent data analyst commissioned by the NMC (Witness 4). The panel had regard to Witness 4's report dated 20 July 2023 and noted that overall, the time taken to complete the tests at the Yunnik Centre were more than twice as fast as the time taken in all of the other test centres across the world. The

panel also had regard to the admissions made by numerous other candidates who completed tests at the Yunnik Centre in which they said that proxy test takers were being used. The panel also noted your evidence in which you admitted that you did not take the test in June 2022 and that this was undertaken by a proxy. Having regard to all of the evidence before it, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that there was widespread fraud at the Yunnik Centre between March 2019 and March 2023.

The panel had regard to the evidence of Witness 1 and Witness 2. It noted that whilst this evidence was hearsay, the panel considered that there was no reason for them to lie about their admission that they had used proxy testers to pass the CBT at the Yunnik Centre. The panel therefore attached considerable weight to their evidence.

The panel noted that there were three other candidates who took the examination on the same day as your test was taken, and who also finished inside the 1 in 2,500 threshold which the NMC deemed to be suspicious. The panel further noted that within Witness 4's report dated 20 July 2023 in which he stated that there were many days with a high instance of multiple people passing the CBT on the same day with similar times and these became more prominent from June 2022.

The panel next considered whether it is more likely than not that you used a proxy test taker in obtaining a satisfactory test result from the Yunnik centre in Ibadan, Nigeria. The panel had regard to the specific evidence and circumstances which led to the refusal of your application on to the NMC register.

The panel noted that candidates were allocated 30 minutes to complete Part A (the numeracy element) of the test and 2 hours 30 minutes to complete Part B (the clinical element) of the test.

The data in relation to your CBT showed that you achieved a pass in your test in the following times:

- Numeracy: 10.45 minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes).

- Clinical: 7.48 minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes).

The panel accepted that your time on the numeracy part of the CBT falls outside of the 1 in 2,500 threshold identified by the NMC. However, it noted that there are very few people in the world who have completed the clinical part of the test as quickly as you did and that the odds of you doing so were 1 in 56,478.

The panel had regard to your evidence that you did not take the CBT at Yunnik. The panel accepted your admission and found that a proxy took your CBT in June 2022.

The panel went on to consider whether you were aware of and authorised a proxy to complete the CBT on your behalf. The panel noted that the email address held by Pearson Vue was the email address that you have continued to use. The panel therefore considered that it was more likely than not that you would have received a booking confirmation email and any associated email correspondence about the CBT. The panel had regard to your evidence that when you became aware of the fraudulent activity, you did not notify the NMC and decided to wait for the result to expire before resitting the CBT.

Having regard to all of the above, the panel determined that it was more likely than not that you were aware of the use of a proxy and that your conduct was dishonest. The panel also determined that in failing to disclose the fraudulent activity to the NMC your actions and omissions lacked integrity and amounted to further dishonesty. Whilst the panel acknowledged that you were of previous good character, the evidence supports that you were a knowing participant in fraudulent activity and by the standards of ordinary, decent people would be considered to be dishonest.

The panel had regard to the NMC Guidance on health and character and the requirements set out in respect of an applicant's conduct, behaviour and attitude. This indicates that the test of whether someone is of sufficiently good character to be admitted to the register is a high one. It also indicates that it is unlikely that an applicant will meet the character requirements for admission if they have been involved in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud or deception.

The panel was of the view that the dishonesty found in this case was particularly serious as in addition to allowing proxy testing to occur, you also failed to make disclosure of the fraudulent test for over two years despite repeated opportunities to do so. For example, you did not make disclosure in response to two letters sent to you by the NMC in May and September 2023 setting out the concerns about fraudulent activity at Yunnik. You made no admission until your NMC registration application was refused. The panel had regard to your reflective statements, character testimonials and to your evidence provided during this hearing. However, in all the circumstances the panel was not satisfied that you have demonstrated that you meet the character requirements for registration.

The panel therefore decided to dismiss your appeal, to uphold the decision of the Assistant Registrar, thereby refusing your application to the NMC register.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you appeal you must submit your appeal to the County Court within 21 days of this decision.

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.