

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Hearing
Tuesday 30 June 2026 - Wednesday 1 July 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Appellant: Omoniyi Obadeyi

Type of case: Registrations appeal

Panel members: John Anderson (Chair, Lay member)
Louisa Hilton (Registrant member)
Darren Rice (Lay member)

Legal Assessor: Paul Hester

Hearings Coordinator: Emily Mae Christie

Nursing and Midwifery Council: Represented by Tola Hassan, Case Presenter

Ms Obadeyi: Present and represented by Julius Nkafu of
Julex Chambers

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 1 September 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 administered there.

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 assurance that the data on 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 a review of the data, it was satisfied that there was no evidence of a 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, now known as Broadstone Regulatory & Risk Advisory Limited (Broadstone), Mr Richard Steele, to provide the NMC with an objective analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE. Broadstone looked at the times taken by CBT candidates at Yunnik to achieve their CBT pass, compared with those taken by CBT candidates from other

test centres in Nigeria and globally. Using this data, Broadstone 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. Broadstone'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.

On 15 February 2023, you completed your CBT at Yunnik at 09:55. The data in relation to your CBT shows that you achieved a pass in your tests in the following times:

- Numeracy: 2.38 minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes)
- Clinical: 5.38 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes)

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

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.

The NMC notified you of the concerns regarding your CBT result on 19 September 2023. You were invited to resit the CBT and informed that if you passed the new CBT and decided to continue with your application for registration, your application would be referred to one of the Assistant Registrars for a decision about whether you meet the character requirements to be considered capable of safe and effective practice.

In a letter dated 24 June 2025, you were informed that the Assistant Registrar would be considering your application for registration with the NMC in the week commencing Monday, 11 August 2025. The NMC invited you to provide any comments or evidence for the Assistant Registrar to consider by Wednesday, 6 August 2025.

On 9 August 2025, you sent an email to the NMC outlining your position, stating that your preparation for the CBT was extensive and structured over a period of five to six months, using a range of reliable resources, including downloaded practice questions, videos, and the official Pearson VUE website. You practised daily to become familiar with the test format and relied on your 10 years of nursing experience, clinical knowledge and judgment to answer the questions. On the day of the exam, all checks were completed properly, and the questions reflected the topics of your revision. You stated that you later retook the CBT exam in the UK and passed again, despite having less preparation time and while also preparing for the OSCE. You emphasised that passing both the CBT and OSCE demonstrates that your original success was a genuine reflection of your knowledge and competence.

Further, in an email dated 25 August 2025, you shared four character references for the NMC Assistant Registrar to consider.

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

From the NMC:

- Your completed application;
- Expert reports by Richard Steele, Head of Data Analytics at Broadstone;
- Witness statements of Bryan Friess, Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE;
- Witness statements of Sam Foster, Executive Director of Professional Practice at the NMC;
- Witness statements of Witness 1 and Witness 2; and
- Other test activity at Yunnik on the date you sat your test.

From you:

- An email from you to the NMC, dated 9 August 2025;
- Character reference from Pastor Rotimi Ogidan, dated 18 August 2025;
- Character reference from Ozioko Bernardine, dated 19 August 2025; and

- Character reference from Dr Taiwo C. Omirin, dated 25 August 2025.

The Assistant Registrar considered your explanation. In particular, they noted that you say you were familiar with the structure of the tests and accepted that thorough preparation undertaken by any candidate may increase the likelihood that they would achieve a pass. However, in their view, this did not explain how you were able to obtain your test result from Yunnik in the time you did, compared with the times taken by candidates globally. The Assistant Registrar was not satisfied that they had been presented with anything that changed the conclusion that you more likely than not obtained your CBT result fraudulently. Therefore, the Assistant Registrar determined that you did not meet the character requirements to be considered capable of safe and effective practice.

On 1 September 2025, you were informed that the Assistant Registrar had refused your application to the register. You appealed this decision on 29 September 2025, within the 28-day time limit.

Since making your appeal and in the lead-up to this hearing, you emailed the NMC on 20 June 2026, providing a number of documents for this panel to consider. Within those documents, you provided a witness statement, dated 10 June 2026; a reflection, dated 11 June 2026; and a skeleton argument dated 11 June 2026. Within these documents, you explain that there were serious irregularities that occurred at the Yunnik centre on the date you completed your CBT, and that you should have reported the conduct you witnessed.

In an email dated 23 June 2026, you informed the NMC that you no longer sought the attendance of the NMC's witnesses for the purpose of cross-examination.

Evidence

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

- Witness 1: Band 5 nurse in the UK who provided her experience sitting an exam at Yunnik.
- Witness 2: Band 4 Pre-registration nurse in the UK who provided her experience sitting an exam at Yunnik.
- Mr Bryan Friess: Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.
- Mr Richard Steele: An independent Data Analyst who provided the NMC with an analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE.
- Ms Julie Bliss: A registered nurse, employed by the NMC as a Senior Nursing Education Adviser, and part of the Executive Team in the Professional Practice Directorate.
- Ms Sara Kovach-Clark: Employed by the NMC as Assistant Director of Policy and a member of the NMC's Executive Team.
- Ms Elizabeth Lamont: Employed by the NMC as Assistant Director for Registration and Revalidation,

and a member of the NMC's Executive Management Team for Professional Practice.

- Ms Wendy Fowler: Employed by the NMC as a Nursing Education Adviser.
- Ms Nazira Ashikin: Employed by the NMC as a paralegal based in the Professional Practice directorate.
- Mr Darren Richards: Head of Insurance, Regulatory and Risk at Broadstone Regulatory & Risk Advisory Limited. Adopts Mr Steele's report and addendums as evidence.

You provided the panel with the following documentation to support your appeal:

- A character reference from Risikat Adesola Bakare, dated 12 September 2025;
- A character reference from Eva Okeke, dated 3 September 2025;
- A character reference from Adrian Nyangombe, dated 22 September 2025;
- A character reference from Roseline Aina, dated 12 September 2025;
- Your CBT pass confirmation, dated 2 October 2023;
- Your academic transcript from Lagos State College of Nursing, stamped and dated 22 September 2025;
- Your transcript of training for post-basic psychiatric nursing (18 months) from School of Psychiatric Nursing, Neuropsychiatric Hospital, stamped and dated 23 July 2024;
- Your witness statement, dated 10 June 2026;

- A news report by Alarabiya News titled '*Protests break out in Nigerian city over cash shortages*', dated 15 February 2023;
- A BBC news report titled '*Protests, yawa gas for dis states for Nigeria today sake of naira scarcity*', dated 15 February 2023;
- A news report by the Guardian titled '*Riots erupt in Nigerian cities as bank policy leads to scarcity of cash*', dated 15 February 2023;
- A news report by The Cable, titled '*Gridlock as protests erupt in Ibadan over rejection of old naira notes*', dated 15 February 2023;
- Your Workplace Ethics and Professional Integrity Certificate, dated 4 June 2026;
- Your OSCE pass confirmation, dated 29 February 2024;
- A character reference from Dr S.A. Bakare, dated 5 May 2026;
- Your reflective piece, dated 11 June 2026;
- Your skeleton argument, dated 11 June 2026;
- Your supplementary position statement, dated 19 June 2026; and
- Your representatives, Mr Nkafu's, written submissions, dated 25 June 2026.

The panel took into account your live evidence given under oath.

You relied on your witness statement dated 10 June 2026 and your supplementary statement dated 19 June 2026. You also relied on your reflective statement dated 11 June 2026. You explained that you were deeply sorry for your actions on the day of your CBT and for how long it has taken you to come forward about it. [PRIVATE]. You told the panel that you have undertaken some training, specifically in relation to ethics.

In cross-examination, you were asked why you accepted assistance with your CBT. You explained that on the day, you did not intend for anyone to support you. However, when you were inside and had started your test, riots broke out outside, and a woman came in and told you to finish the exam quickly. You said you tried to resist her, but she would not listen to you, even when you asked her to allow you to concentrate on your exam. You said the centre's owner was there but didn't do

anything about her, and you felt overpowered. You accepted that you obtained your CBT result through dishonest means and that you understand it was wrong.

When asked why you did not report what happened during your CBT in February 2023, you explained that you did not understand how the process worked and had no one to guide you until you recently contacted solicitors. You explained that you did not understand who you were supposed to speak to at the NMC and would have reported it to your manager.

When asked about your judgment and understanding of professional standards, you explained that this incident was very unlike you and that you have always wanted to be the best you could be in your profession and to be truthful in everything you do. You explained that you have always acted with integrity, save for this one incident, and that you would like the panel to trust that you would never repeat this incident again. If faced with similar circumstances, you would ensure you followed due process *“to the letter.”*

You told the panel that even if there was no evidence of what happened, you would still admit to it. You denied that you had only made an admission because you had been caught and reiterated that it was a genuine recognition that you had done something wrong. You explained that you did not admit to this when you applied to the Assistant Registrar for admission to the register because you were afraid that saying something without proper guidance would not be the right thing to do. You told the panel you never intended to deceive the Assistant Registrar.

The panel asked you some questions about the CBT at Yunnik itself. You explained that it took you between an hour and a half and two hours to travel to Yunnik, and you chose to take your CBT there because it was the only centre you were aware of at the time, and a friend recommended it to you.

In relation to the test itself, you explained that a lady was standing next to you when you started your test, and she kept interrupting you. You told the panel that she would click on the longer question answers, but when you wanted to answer, she would let you do that.

In response to questions from the panel as to what was on your mind at the time, you explained that what happened was not what you had expected on the day, as you had taken other international exams. You were uncomfortable throughout, and you felt bad that you had prepared for the exam when someone interfered with your test. You accepted that allowing the lady to interfere with your exam was cheating, and when asked if you were acting dishonestly, you stated that you should not have allowed it. When further asked by the panel if you acted dishonestly, you said 'yes' but did not provide any further details.

You clarified that you did not tell the NMC about your concerns sooner because you did not have someone to properly guide you on how to report them. You stated you did not have support, and as you had not appreciated the gravity of the situation, did not understand how to address the NMC so it would understand what happened to you when you sat your CBT.

You told the panel that the people who provided your character references in August 2025 were unaware of the NMC proceedings. In response to a question, you explained that you began reflecting on the incident as it was happening. You explained that you did not ignore it and that it was always on your conscience, and continued to bother you. You apologised again for not saying anything sooner, but wanted to be clear today before the panel and to give full details of what happened.

The panel then took account of the oral evidence and written statement from the following witness on your behalf:

- Dr Sefiu Adewale Bakare: Your family friend who provided an oral character reference.

Submissions

Ms Hassan, on behalf of the NMC, submitted that your application for registration was refused because the Assistant Registrar decided that you did not meet the character requirements for registration. She reminded the panel that the burden of proof is on the NMC to prove that you were involved in fraud when obtaining your CBT result at the Yunnik centre.

Ms Hassan outlined the evidence before the panel. She submitted that your fast test time and high-test scores, coupled with the other factors, including Mr Friess' same-day data and the admissions from other applications, specifically the individual who completed their CBT on the same date as you, demonstrate that your CBT result was likely obtained through fraud, which you do not dispute. Ms Hassan submitted that should the panel find that your test was obtained through fraud, it should dismiss your appeal.

Ms Hassan informed the panel that the key issue before it is whether you have demonstrated that you have met the character requirements for registration as a nurse. She submitted that despite your admissions and subsequent remediation efforts, your evidence has not established that you have met the high threshold. Ms Hassan submitted that whilst you have demonstrated awareness that healthcare professionals have a positive obligation to raise concerns whenever they witness conduct that could undermine professional standards, you failed to discharge that obligation at Yunnik, which you acknowledge. She submitted that dishonesty is fundamentally different from other professional failings.

In relation to your remediation, Ms Hassan submitted that this is limited. You have completed training in workplace ethics, and whilst it is valuable, she submitted that this does not address the core issues of a character issue. She submitted that whilst you have provided a reflection and some insight explaining that you understand your conduct was wrong, you have not proved that you are no longer dishonest. In relation to your testimonials, Ms Hassan submitted that the referees were not fully informed of the NMC's concerns, and therefore, the panel should treat them with caution as they do not provide a complete picture of our current character.

Ms Hassan submitted that whilst you have made admissions and accepted responsibility, you did not do so at an early stage, which is a significant factor for the panel to consider. She submitted that you did not voluntarily come forward or report your own conduct; you only admitted to wrongdoing after proceedings had been initiated.

Ms Hassan submitted that your conduct was serious, deliberate, and involved both dishonesty and a failure to report serious wrongdoings. She told the panel that while your admissions and remediation efforts should be noted, they should not sufficiently demonstrate that you have the integrity required for professional registration. In light of this, Ms Hassan invited the panel to dismiss your appeal.

Mr Nkafu, on your behalf, referred the panel to his written submissions. Following on from the NMC's submissions, he told the panel that dishonesty can be remedied, as everyone can make mistakes, and the key is that you have accepted responsibility for your dishonesty, which the panel should consider demonstrates that you have insight into the concerns, and that you have taken the right steps to ensure this is not repeated.

In relation to your character references, Mr Nkafu submitted that whilst you did not inform them of the NMC proceedings, the panel heard from Dr Bakare, who told the panel he was aware of these proceedings and maintains what he said in support of your good character.

Mr Nkafu submitted that the key issue before the panel today is whether you have shown insight and remorse, and whether you have taken steps to ensure that something like this never happens again. He reminded the panel that it had heard your evidence, of which you have demonstrated your remorse for what has happened. Mr Nkafu submitted that when the Assistant Registrar first considered your case, they did not have the benefit of this, nor did they have your witness statement, reflective statement, evidence of your workplace ethics training, character references, or the oral evidence from Dr Bakare, which are before this panel.

Mr Nkafu submitted that you have taken responsibility for your actions, recognise that what you did was not right, and have now taken steps to show insight and remediation, which is supported by evidence. In relation to the risk of repetition, he submitted that you have been a nurse for 15 years, and this is the only incident of dishonesty during your career.

In light of all this, Mr Nkafu invited the panel to allow your appeal.

Panel's decision

The panel heard and accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In making its decision, the panel first considered whether the NMC had, on the balance of probabilities, provided sufficient, cogent evidence to substantiate the NMC's claim that there was widespread fraud occurring at the Yunnik Centre.

The panel had sight of statements and analysis provided by Mr Friess. The panel considered that Mr Friess's findings were corroborated by Mr Steele's independent research, which outlined the stark difference in test times at Yunnik compared with globally. The panel also considered that Mr Friess confirmed that there were no cyber-attacks, power outages, or software malfunctions at the Yunnik test centre. The panel took note of the Pearson VUE evidence prepared by Mr Friess, which identified patterns not found at other testing centres globally, and the fact that the number of fraudulent cases at the centre increased over time, both of which the panel considered suggestive of the use of human proxies. The panel also noted the evidence of Mr Friess detailing the apparent pattern of proxy behaviour reported on days when the NMC have received admissions of fraudulent behaviour.

The panel took into account Mr Steele's independent expert analysis, including the diagrams and data tables which evidence the times taken globally, including other test centres in Nigeria, to complete CBT, compared to the times achieved at the Yunnik centre. It noted that this data and analysis identified patterns of unusually quick test times that were not observed at other testing centres, nationally or

globally. The panel found that Mr Steele's independent expert analysis verified and validated the statements, data, and analysis provided by Mr Friess.

The panel also considered the witness statements of both Witness 1 and Witness 2. It noted that Witness 1 accepts that she used a proxy as she felt pressured to do so. Witness 2's experience was different as she stated she did not use the proxy at the test centre. However, she stated that she was being shouted at with answers, threatened and felt pressured. The panel considered that both witness statements provided some contextual background as to fraudulent activity occurring at the Yunnik test centre on the dates they attended.

The panel also took into account Ms Kovach-Clark's statement that there were a number of other recorded admissions of candidates' experience of fraudulent activities and use of human proxies at the Yunnik test centre. The panel considered this material to be properly admissible and to carry considerable weight because it was consistent, corroborated, and aligned with the contextual data.

Having considered all the information before it, the panel noted the compelling generic evidence of statistical anomalies and patterns of suspicious behaviour at Yunnik. This included unusually fast test completion times with high test scores, suggesting interference, and independent statistical analysis by Mr Steele, confirming statistically significant discrepancies between CBTs taken at Yunnik and those taken in the rest of Nigeria and globally.

The panel noted that you stood the NMC witnesses down from attending and giving evidence on 23 June 2026 and did not challenge any of the NMC evidence as to widespread fraud at the Yunnik centre during this hearing.

Therefore, the panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the NMC has provided sufficient cogent evidence to substantiate that there was widespread fraud occurring at the Yunnik centre.

The panel went on to determine whether the NMC has proved on the balance of probabilities that you had obtained your CBT results through fraud.

In relation to your specific CBT at Yunnik on 15 February 2023, the panel noted your exceptionally fast test times and your partial admission that you obtained your result by way of proxy test-taking. It considered Mr Friess's analysis of your specific data, which provided the following odds of how achievable your test times were:

'Evaluated Clinical Timing...: 5.38 minutes: less likely than 1 in 56,478

Evaluated Numeracy Timing...: 2.38 minutes: less likely than 1 in 58,123'

The panel considered Mr Friess' same-day data, which shows that four other candidates were identified as outliers who took their test within about 1 hour of yours and, along with you, completed it unusually quickly. In light of this, the panel also took into account the evidence of Ms Kovach-Clark, who exhibited an ongoing record kept by the NMC of individuals who have come forward and made admissions to using a proxy tester at the Yunnik centre. The panel noted that there is an admission of the use of a proxy from an individual who took their test on 15 February 2023 at 09:18, whose account describes a lady calling out answers to each question they clicked on. Referring back to the same-day data, this candidate completed the first part of the CBT in 5 minutes and the second part in 6 minutes. Having noted that you took your test on the same day at 09:55 and completed it in a similarly fast time, the panel was of the view that it was more likely than not that a proxy tester was in use at the Yunnik centre on the day of your test.

In Mr Steele's breakdown of the time spent to complete 100 questions, it is stated that you took:

- 2 to 4 seconds to complete 69 questions;
- 4 to 6 seconds to complete 21 questions;
- 6 to 8 seconds to complete 6 questions;
- 8 to 10 seconds to complete 2 questions; and
- 12 to 14 seconds to complete 2 questions.

The panel questioned the feasibility of an honest test taker completing a CBT at this pace. Therefore, it decided to accept Mr Steele's evidence.

The panel also took into account the documentation you have submitted as well as your oral evidence. You explained that a lady was present during your test who told you to complete your exam quickly and would call out the answers to you and tell you where to click. The panel also took into account your explanation that riots were breaking out outside of the centre, and noted the multiple news reports you had provided to evidence this. The panel was of the view that while this may have added to your stress on the day, it should not have affected your ability to act with honesty and integrity.

Therefore, in light of the evidence before it and your acceptance at the end of your oral evidence that you obtained your CBT dishonestly, the panel determined that, on the balance of probabilities, that you obtained your CBT result fraudulently at the Yunnik centre.

Finally, the panel went on to determine whether you meet the character requirements for admission to the NMC register.

The panel had regard to the NMC guidance on health and character, in particular '*Factors that we take into account when considering character cases*', last updated on 5 September 2024. The panel was aware that it was for you to satisfy the panel that you met the character requirements for successful admission on the register, principally that you are capable of safe and effective practice. This is underpinned by the NMC Code of Conduct at 20.2: '*You must act with honesty and integrity at all times.*' In the panel's judgement, fraudulent conduct is incompatible with UK registration as a nurse on the grounds of public protection and in the wider public interest.

The panel found that your dishonest behaviour in obtaining your CBT result fraudulently constituted a breach of the code and therefore raises concerns about your character. The panel noted that the test for good character is a high bar and, as such, considered your evidence.

The panel first took into account your five positive character references and Dr Bakare's oral evidence. However, the panel noted that Dr Bakare had never worked with you and could only testify to your good character as a family friend.

The panel noted paragraph 64 of Mr Rory Dunlop KC's submissions on behalf of the NMC:

'If an appellant admits to using a proxy, or being involved in fraud in some other way, it is open to the appellant to attempt to reassure the RAP that they are, nonetheless, capable of safe and effective practice. This would likely require them to give a detailed account of the circumstances of their Yunnik CBT, detailed and reassuring reflections on their involvement in that fraud, reflections and reassurances about how they would avoid being involved in anything similar again and a supportive employer reference which makes reference to the admission made. In such circumstances, the RAP could still dismiss their appeal. However, if the RAP is satisfied, in light of an appellant's admissions, insight and remediation, that the appellant is capable of safe and effective practice, the RAP could allow the appeal and substitute, in place of the original AR's decision to refuse entry to the register, a decision to admit the appellant to the register.'

The panel further noted that Mr Nkafu did not seek to go behind this submission and sought to rely upon it in his written submissions on your behalf.

The panel considered whether you have given a detailed account of the circumstances at the time of your Yunnik CBT and whether you have made full admissions as to your fraudulent activity.

The panel first considered your witness statement, dated 10 June 2026, in which you said *'Looking back, I recognise that this conduct should not have occurred during a*

professional examination.' Beyond this, there is no mention or any admission by you acting fraudulently or dishonestly.

In your reflective statement, dated 11 June 2026, you said *'that aspects of what I witnessed at the centre were irregular and should not have occurred.'* There is no detailed account of the circumstances at the Yunnik centre or what you specifically did when taking the CBT.

In your skeleton argument, the panel noted your *'admissions'* at paragraphs 14 to 20 and the information provided by you about the *'examination environment'* at paragraphs 27 to 34. At no point do you accept acting fraudulently or dishonestly. You appear to state that the Yunnik centre was *'operating improperly'*, *'staff members interfered with examination processes'*, and *'the examination environment was irregular'*.

The only admission to acting dishonestly was made by you in answer to panel questions. In making that admission, you provided a limited account as to the circumstances and your thinking at the time. In these circumstances, the panel was of the view that this was not a full and frank admission as to acting fraudulently.

Although the panel accepted that you had reflected to some extent, it was not satisfied that you had fully admitted your dishonesty or demonstrated sufficient remediation. In particular, you had not provided enough reassurance as to how you would avoid similar conduct in future. The panel therefore did not feel reassured that your dishonesty would not be repeated.

Therefore, in light of the panel's findings, in relation to your obtaining CBT result fraudulently, the panel determined that you have not met the good character requirements as identified in the NMC guidance on health and character for admission to the register.

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 the decision, 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.