

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Meeting
Friday, 17 July 2026**

Virtual Meeting

Name of Appellant:	Teedeeep Kumar Kissoon
NMC PIN:	01I9595E
Type of case:	Registrations appeal
Panel members:	Michael Lupson (Chair, Lay member) Sue Gwyn (Registrant member) Michaela Higgins (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Suzanne Palmer
Hearings Coordinator:	Catherine Blake
Decision:	Appeal dismissed

Decision and reasons

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

This appeal is made under Article 37 of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (the Order). Mr Kissoon has appealed the decision of the Assistant Registrar, dated 16 October 2025, who refused his application for revalidation on the grounds of character.

In reaching its decision, the panel considered all of the evidence in this case contained in the meeting bundle, including:

- Mr Kissoon's confirmation documents dated 23 July 2025;
- Email correspondence between the NMC and: Omotosho Ololade, Hertfordshire Partnership NHS Trust (the Trust), Clinical Matron at the Trust, and Mr Kissoon;
- Mr Kissoon's new confirmer form;
- Mr Kissoon's written statement;
- The Assistant Registrar's decision letter dated 16 October 2025;
- Mr Kissoon's Notice of Appeal and supporting documents dated 25 October 2025; and
- NMC determination letter dated 16 April 2026 with reasons why previously scheduled appeal meeting was adjourned.

Background

Mr Kissoon applied for revalidation on 23 July 2025. Within his application he declared that he had a confirmation discussion with Ms Omotosho Ololade on 28 February 2025. The NMC were contacted by Ms Ololade on 30 July 2025, and again on 13 August 2025 by the Deputy Director of Nursing and Quality at the Trust, informing them that Ms Ololade did not review Mr Kissoon's revalidation portfolio and that a confirmation discussion had not taken place.

Mr Kissoon said that he named Ms Ololade as his confirmer because he had worked with her for over three years. He said it was an honest mistake which will not happen again.

The Assistant Registrar was concerned that Mr Kissoon's insight is limited in relation to the conduct and responsibilities expected of a registered nurse (in line with the NMC Code), and so was not satisfied that he met the character requirements for registration. The Assistant Registrar considered that Mr Kissoon showed minimal recognition or understanding of the purpose of revalidation and appeared to minimise the gravity of his actions. The Assistant Registrar refused Mr Kissoon's application on character grounds due to concerns of dishonesty.

A letter was sent to Mr Kissoon advising him of the Assistant Registrar's decision.

Mr Kissoon appealed the Assistant Registrar's decision in a Notice of Appeal dated 25 October 2025 which included the following documents:

- Grounds of appeal
- New revalidation application dated 23 October 2025

Whilst Mr Kissoon had now demonstrated that he met the NMC's revalidation requirements by providing a new confirmer, the NMC was concerned about whether he met the NMC's character requirement because he had previously declared a confirmation discussion which did not take place.

Today's panel was mindful that its role is to determine the appeal application, and not the new revalidation application.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Panel's decision

At the outset of the hearing, the panel was concerned that there was nothing before it to indicate that Mr Kissoon was clear of the purpose of today's meeting, or that he had waived his right to a hearing. The panel noted that this appeal meeting had been

previously adjourned for similar reasons, and so requested to see a copy of all correspondence between Mr Kissoon and the NMC since the last appeal meeting was adjourned.

It noted the following sent by Mr Kissoon on 3 June 2026:

'I am in receipt of your email and thanks for confirming the Meeting 17 of July 2026. I understand my attendance is Not required as I chose to have a Meeting instead.'

This was in response to the email from the NMC on 3 June 2026:

'I am pleased to let you know your appeal meeting is scheduled on Friday 17 July 2026.'

The panel was accordingly satisfied that Mr Kissoon was aware that his appeal would be dealt with as a meeting, and that he had waived his right to attend.

The panel noted that no testimonials have been provided by Mr Kissoon, despite being requested in the determination of the previous panel. The panel was satisfied that the NMC has clear guidance on revalidation and that Mr Kissoon would have access to this. It was satisfied that Mr Kissoon was aware that the onus to provide additional information including testimonials rested upon him.

The panel considered whether, on the evidence before it, Mr Kissoon is capable of safe and effective practice, including the requirement of good character. Although Mr Kissoon had not provided a reflective statement, the panel decided to treat the statement titled '*New application*' as if it were his statement in support of his appeal.

The panel had sight of Mr Kissoon's original confirmation document, and note that it names Ms Ololade as his confirmer. It noted that in the application Mr Kissoon was asked direct questions as to Ms Ololade's involvement in the process and he consistently stated that she was.

The panel then considered the evidence of Ms Ololade, who indicated in email that she was not Mr Kissoon's confirmer:

'I am surprised that I have been listed to confirm Teedeeep Kumar Kissoon application. I have not seen nor spoken to him in over 8 months.'

The panel noted the following from Mr Kissoon's Notice of Appeal in which he admits to providing incorrect information:

'It is true that the confirmation discussion did not take place initially; I rushed to meet the Revalidation deadline and incorrectly put Ms. Ololade Omotosho name without having a discussion... There was also this pressure and anxiety to meet the deadline, I appreciate this fact does not justify the correct revalidation procedure and should never be repeated. I have also tried to revalidate as per NMC Guidelines a second time by finding another Confirmer and sending all relevant documents.

...

Throughout this time, I have maintained a clean professional record and good character. I am deeply regretful of this incident and its escalation to NMC. I have since used this time to reflect on my behaviour and its impact. My reflection has been on specific aspect of professional standard of practice and behaviour for Nurses. I now have a much deeper understanding of the importance of not just meeting the requirement of revalidation but doing so with uncompromising candour.'

The panel bore in mind that it was not asked to make findings of fact, and that this is not a Fitness to Practise case. However, it was satisfied that the evidence points to the concern being one of dishonesty and that this gives rise to character and attitudinal concerns. In respect of dishonesty, the panel considered Mr Kissoon's knowledge at the time of the application, and that he has admitted to knowing that the information he was providing was not true at the time of the application. The panel was satisfied that this would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary, decent people.

The panel bore in mind Mr Kissoon has an otherwise unblemished record of 15 years, and noted there is no allegation of patient harm. However, the panel was concerned by the lack of character references or additional information provided by Mr Kissoon in advance of this meeting and again reminded itself that the burden of proof is on Mr Kissoon to demonstrate that he is of suitable character to be readmitted on to the NMC's register. The panel considered that Mr Kissoon has shown some remorse and some reflection in the Notice of Appeal, but determined that his insight is limited. For example, he has not spoken directly to the matter of the dishonesty, why the public would be concerned about this, or in any depth around why the integrity of the revalidation process is so important. Mr Kissoon has chosen not have a hearing, so the panel is not able to assess if further insight has developed.

The panel considered that the integrity of the NMC register is paramount, in order to uphold professional standards and thereby maintain public confidence in the profession, The revalidation process is designed to ensure that those registered are safe to do so. When false information is provided, this seriously compromises the integrity of the register. Given the character concerns, specifically that of dishonesty, and the lack of supporting evidence provided by Mr Kissoon to support his assertion that he is of good character, the panel could not be satisfied that Mr Kissoon meets the character requirements for entry onto the register, which is essential to ensure safe and effective practice.

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

This will be confirmed to Mr Kissoon in writing.

If Mr Kissoon wishes to appeal today's decision, he has 21 days from today's meeting to lodge an appeal with the County Court. He can discuss his options with the NMC.

That concludes this determination.