

Nursing and Midwifery Council

Investigating Committee

Registration Appeal Hearing

Monday, 11 May 2026 and Monday, 27 July 2026

Virtual Hearing

Name of Appellant:	Archana Maswa Limbu
Type of case:	Registrations appeal
Panel members:	Michael Lupson (Chair, Lay member) Anne-Marie Borneuf (Registrant member) Sandra Norburn (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Andrew Reid
Hearings Coordinator:	Priyam Jain (Monday, 11 May 2026) Rene Aktar (Monday, 27 July 2026)
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Simon Ridding, Case Presenter Genevieve Bentley (27 July 2026)
Ms Limbu:	Present and represented by Neha Modi, Medline Educational Consultancy
Decision:	Appeal dismissed

Decision and reasons

The panel decided to dismiss your appeal against the decision of the Assistant Registrar (AR) 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 have appealed the decision of the AR, dated 19 November 2025, to refuse your application for registration on the grounds that you did not meet the character requirements for registration.

In reaching its decision, the panel considered all of the evidence in this case, as well as your oral evidence, and the submissions of Mr Ridding, on behalf of the NMC, and Ms Modi on your behalf. In addition, the panel also heard oral evidence from Mandeep Kumar Mishr who is the Documentation Officer at Medline Educational Consultancy.

Background

You first applied for registration as an overseas-trained nurse on 6 October 2023. This means that you were applying for NMC registration having completed your nursing training overseas.

In order to progress your application for registration, applicants are required to set up an account on the NMC's online portal and upload the evidence required for registration.

One of the requirements to join the register is that a nurse, midwife or nursing associate must satisfy the Registrar of their good health and character, and that they are capable of safe and effective practice.

On 21 December 2023, North Bristol NHS Trust (the Trust) raised concerns with the NMC that you had allegedly used identical supporting information as another candidate as part of your employment application and recruitment process. The Trust informed the NMC that they could not accept your application due to the appearance of false information.

On 3 October 2025, your application was referred to the Registration Investigations Team (RIT) to investigate the concerns raised by the Trust.

On 15 October 2025, the NMC contacted the Trust for further information regarding the concerns raised. On 21 October 2025, the NMC contacted you to confirm the concerns raised by the Trust and requested your account and reflections in relation to the matter.

On 31 October 2025, you provided a formal statement and reflection in response to the concerns raised.

On 4 November 2025, the NMC received further information from the Trust, including responses to questions raised by the NMC and email correspondence from the Trust's International Team regarding your application, together with copies of the supporting information submitted by you and another candidate.

The Agreed Removal (AR) considered the concerns raised by the Trust, the further information provided by the Trust, the supporting information submitted as part of your application, and your reflective statement dated 31 October 2025.

The AR refused your application on the grounds that they were not satisfied that your account was credible and were concerned that your insight was limited in relation to your conduct and the responsibilities expected of a registered nurse in line with the Code. The AR therefore concluded that you did not meet the character requirements for registration.

A letter dated 19 November 2025 was sent to you advising you of the AR's decision.

On 17 December 2025, you appealed the decision of the AR in a Notice of Appeal (NoA). Alongside your NoA, you provided supporting documentation including:

1. An email to the Trust requesting clarification for NMC registration dated 9 December 2025;
2. The AR decision letter dated 19 November 2025;
3. An NMC letter regarding a test of competence invitation dated 7 February 2023;
4. An email response from the Trust dated 21 December 2023;

5. A further email to the Trust dated 22 December 2023;
6. A screenshot of your NMC portal; and
7. Your OET results dated 2 September 2023.

Submissions

You provided the panel with additional documentation to support this appeal including:

- An email dated 22 December 2023 corroborating your engagement with the Trust;
- Occupational English Test (OET) and NMC Verification Details of Prasansha Rai;
- Supporting documentation about your representative Ms Modi and Medline Educational Consultancy; and
- Witness statement of your witness Mr Mandeep Kumar Mishr who works as a Documentation Officer at Medline Educational Consultancy.

Ms Modi submitted that the concerns in this case arose from an administrative error during the preparation and submission of documentation to the Trust and did not amount to deliberate dishonesty or an attempt to mislead either the Trust or the NMC.

Ms Modi submitted that the issue originally appeared to relate to an incorrect front sheet or preliminary information having remained attached to your application in error. She submitted that you had accepted from an early stage that mistakes had been made within the application documentation and that you had never sought to dispute that incorrect information had been submitted.

Ms Modi submitted that you had met all of the substantive requirements for registration, including satisfying the English language requirements through your OET results, and that there was no obvious personal or professional advantage to be gained from submitting incorrect information of the nature identified by the Trust.

Ms Modi submitted that the application documentation had been prepared during a busy period and that documentation had been prepared quickly using pre-existing templates

and documents. She submitted that whilst this demonstrated poor checking and inadequate attention to detail, it did not amount to dishonesty.

Ms Modi referred the panel to your engagement with both the Trust and the NMC following the concerns being raised and submitted that you had cooperated throughout the process.

Ms Modi further submitted that, during the hearing, you had openly accepted that parts of the supporting information were not your own wording when this was explored by the panel. She submitted that your willingness to make those concessions when questioned supported your credibility rather than undermined it.

In response to questions from the panel regarding the supporting information, Ms Modi clarified that your position was that templates and supporting documentation had been used during the preparation of the application and that this explained how material belonging to another candidate came to be included within your own documentation.

Ms Modi submitted that there was no evidence before the panel that you had deliberately intended to deceive the Trust, obtain employment dishonestly, or gain registration through fraudulent means. She invited the panel to distinguish between deliberate dishonesty and administrative carelessness.

Ms Modi submitted that you had demonstrated insight into the seriousness of the concerns raised and had reflected upon the importance of ensuring that accurate information is submitted in professional settings. She submitted that this was an isolated incident and that there were no wider concerns regarding your professional competence or clinical practice.

Ms Modi invited the panel to conclude that, despite the errors identified within the application documentation, you remained capable of safe and effective practice and satisfied the character requirements for registration.

You gave oral evidence under oath.

You told the panel that you accepted that incorrect information had been submitted as part of your application to the Trust. You said that this had been a mistake and that you had not intended to mislead the Trust or the NMC. You explained that you had been completing applications at pace and under pressure, and that you had not checked the documents carefully before submitting them.

You told the panel that, at the time of submitting the application, you did not realise that the front sheet or supporting information contained errors. You said that you had used documents and templates when preparing your application, and that this had resulted in incorrect information being included. You accepted that you should have checked the application more carefully before submitting it.

You were taken to the supporting information submitted to the Trust. You accepted that some of the information contained within the document was not accurate. When questioned by the panel, you accepted that parts of the supporting information were not your own narrative and did not relate to your own experience. You accepted that the wording appeared to be the same as, or very similar to, that submitted by another candidate.

You told the panel that you did not deliberately copy another candidate's information and that you did not intend to gain an unfair advantage. You said that you believed the error arose because you had used a template when preparing your application. You said that you had not appreciated the extent of the incorrect information until the matter was explored during the hearing.

In response to questions from the panel, you were asked to explain how an entire supporting statement containing information that was not yours had come to be submitted as part of your application. You were unable to provide a clear explanation beyond stating that it had been a mistake and that you had not checked the document properly. You accepted that you should have read the document carefully before submitting it.

The panel asked you about the email correspondence from the Trust dated 21 December 2023, in which concerns were raised about the information you had provided. You accepted that the Trust had raised concerns that the information appeared to be false.

You said that you responded to the Trust and attempted to clarify matters. You maintained that the information had been submitted in error and that you had not intended to act dishonestly.

You were asked why, once the Trust had raised concerns, you had not reviewed the whole application more carefully and corrected the supporting information. You said that you had not fully understood the extent of the issue at that time and that you had believed the concern related mainly to the preliminary or front sheet information. You accepted that, with hindsight, you should have checked all of the documents again and provided a fuller explanation.

You told the panel that you had worked hard to meet the requirements for registration and that you had passed the OET. You said that you wished to join the NMC register and practise as a nurse in the United Kingdom. You stated that you understood the importance of honesty, accuracy and integrity in nursing practice.

You said that you had reflected on the matter and understood that registered nurses are expected to provide accurate information and act honestly at all times. You accepted that submitting incorrect information was serious and that it could affect confidence in you as a professional. You said that you had learnt from the matter and would ensure that any future applications or professional documents were checked carefully before submission.

You maintained throughout your evidence that you had not acted deliberately or dishonestly. You said that the incident arose from poor checking, pressure and a mistake, rather than any intention to mislead the Trust or the NMC.

Mr Ridding outlined the background to the case and referred the panel to the concerns raised by the Trust regarding the identical supporting information submitted as part of your employment application.

Mr Ridding submitted that the central issue for the panel was whether you had discharged the burden of satisfying the panel that you are of good character and capable of safe and effective practice as a nurse in the UK.

Mr Ridding submitted that the similarities identified by the Trust were not confined to a front sheet or administrative details but extended to the supporting information itself and the narrative used within the application.

Mr Ridding submitted that the panel should consider whether it was credible that an entire supporting statement containing another person's experiences and narrative could have been submitted innocently or accidentally. He submitted that the evidence suggested more than a simple administrative oversight.

Mr Ridding referred the panel to the email correspondence from the Trust dated 21 December 2023 in which concerns were expressly raised regarding the appearance of false information within your application. He submitted that, even if the panel accepted that the original submission had been inadvertent, it would have expected you, once placed on notice of those concerns, to have reviewed all of the application documents carefully and taken steps to identify and correct any inaccuracies.

Mr Ridding submitted that your response to the Trust instead amounted to confirmation that the remaining information provided was accurate. He submitted that this was a significant factor for the panel to consider when assessing your credibility and insight.

Mr Ridding submitted that it only became apparent following detailed questioning by the panel that substantial parts of the supporting information were not your own work or personal narrative. He submitted that the panel was entitled to take into account the manner in which that information emerged during the hearing.

Mr Ridding submitted that your explanation regarding templates and supporting documents did not adequately explain how an entire narrative statement identical or substantially similar to another candidate's submission came to be included within your application.

Mr Ridding submitted that honesty and integrity are fundamental components of good character and central to safe and effective nursing practice. He referred the panel to the Code and submitted that nurses are expected to act honestly and with integrity in all

professional dealings, including in interactions with employers, prospective employers and regulators.

Mr Ridding submitted that the concerns identified in this case raise attitudinal concerns regarding honesty and integrity and that such concerns are directly relevant to the assessment of good character.

Mr Ridding therefore submitted that you have not discharged the burden of satisfying the panel that you are of good character so as to be capable of safe and effective practice and invited the panel to dismiss the appeal and uphold the decision of the Assistant Registrar.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Panel's decision

In reaching its decision, the panel considered all of the evidence before it, including your oral evidence, the documentary evidence, and the submissions made by Mr Ridding and Ms Modi.

The panel had regard to the NMC's Guidance on health and character. The panel noted that the relevant issue in this case was whether, in light of the concerns regarding the supporting information submitted as part of your employment application, your character is such that you are capable of safe and effective practice as a nurse in the UK.

The panel recognised that the burden rests upon you to satisfy the panel that you meet the character requirements for registration.

The panel considered the concerns raised by the Trust regarding the identical supporting information submitted by you and another candidate. The panel noted that it was not disputed that the documentation had been submitted as part of your application.

The panel first considered whether the incorrect information had been submitted deliberately or whether this was an innocent administrative error, as suggested by you and Ms Modi.

The panel noted your explanation that you had been working under pressure, had used templates whilst preparing your application, and had failed to check the documents carefully before submission. The panel took into account your acceptance that errors had been made within the application.

The panel initially considered whether the concerns could be explained by an incorrect front sheet or preliminary information remaining attached to the application in error. However, the panel concluded that the concerns extended beyond this and included the supporting information itself, which contained narrative material that was not your own and substantially mirrored information submitted by another candidate.

The panel carefully considered your oral evidence in relation to how this occurred. The panel noted that it was only after careful and detailed questioning during the hearing that it became apparent that substantial parts of the supporting information were not your own account or experience. The panel was of the view that you were unable to provide a clear or satisfactory explanation as to how an entire narrative statement belonging to another candidate came to be submitted as part of your application.

The panel considered the email correspondence from the Trust dated 21 December 2023. The panel noted that the Trust expressly raised concerns regarding the appearance of false information within your application. The panel determined that, even if it were to accept that the original submission had arisen through carelessness, it would reasonably have expected you, at that stage, to carefully review all of the documentation submitted and take steps to identify and correct any inaccurate information.

The panel considered that, instead, your subsequent response to the Trust amounted to a confirmation that the remaining information provided was correct. The panel determined that this significantly undermined your explanation that the matter was simply an innocent administrative oversight.

The panel took into account that you accepted during the hearing that multiple parts of the supporting information were not your own wording. The panel considered that, despite being given opportunities during oral questioning to explain how this had occurred, your explanation remained unclear and unconvincing.

The panel considered that, on the balance of probabilities, it was more likely than not that you were aware that inaccurate supporting information had been submitted as part of your application.

The panel considered whether ordinary members of the public would regard such conduct as dishonest. The panel concluded that knowingly submitting inaccurate supporting information within an employment application, which could potentially provide a personal advantage in obtaining employment or sponsorship, would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel then considered whether these concerns meant that you are not capable of safe and effective practice.

The panel had regard to the importance of honesty and integrity within the nursing profession. The panel considered that nurses are entrusted with vulnerable patients, confidential information, accurate record keeping, and acting in the best interests of patients at all times. The panel determined that honesty and integrity are fundamental requirements of safe and effective nursing practice.

The panel considered that the concerns identified in this case are attitudinal in nature and therefore difficult to remediate fully. The panel was concerned that, when the inaccuracies within the application were identified by the Trust, there was no immediate acknowledgment or full correction of the issue. The panel considered that this raises wider concerns regarding openness, candour and integrity.

The panel was also concerned that you demonstrated limited insight into the seriousness of the concerns raised. Whilst you accepted that mistakes had been made, the panel was not satisfied that you fully acknowledged the dishonest nature of the conduct or its impact upon public confidence in the profession and the integrity of the registration process. The panel concluded that it could not be satisfied that your character is such that you are capable of safe and effective practice as a nurse in the UK.

The panel decided to dismiss your appeal, thereby upholding the decision of the Assistant Registrar to refuse your application to the NMC register.

This will be confirmed to you in writing.

That concludes this determination.