

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Hearing
Tuesday 25 – Thursday 27 August 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Appellant:	Maureen Oziegbe
NMC PRN:	1022148717
Type of case:	Registrations appeal
Panel members:	Michael Lupson (Chair, Lay member) Naomi Smith (Registrant member) Richard Carnell (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Nicholas Baldock
Hearings Coordinator:	Rebecka Selva
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Mousumi Chowdhury, Case Presenter
Ms Oziegbe:	Present and represented by Victoria Thomas instructed by Royal College of Nursing, (RCN)
Decision:	Appeal dismissed

Decision and reasons

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 12 November 2025, that you did not meet the character requirements for registration to the NMC register.

The panel decided to dismiss your appeal against the decision of the Assistant Registrar of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) dated 10 December 2025 refusing your application to join the NMC Register.

Background

Pearson VUE have a contract with the NMC as their Computer Based Test (CBT) provider which has been in place since 2014. The CBT is one part of the NMC's Test of Competence (ToC) and is used by the NMC to assess the skills and knowledge of people wanting to join the NMC's register from overseas as a nurse, midwife or nursing associate or re-join the register after a long period away from practice. The second part of the ToC is an objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) – a practical examination.

The current CBT (CBT 2021), created on 2 August 2021, is split into two parts (Part A and Part B). Part A contains a numeracy test consisting of 15 short answer questions and allows 30 minutes for the test. Part B is a clinical test consisting of 100 multiple-choice questions and allows 2 hours and 30 minutes. All questions are scored as either correct or incorrect.

Pearson VUE contracted with a third party, Yunnik Technologies Ltd, in relation to a Pearson VUE Authorised Test Centre (PVTC) in Ibadan (the Yunnik centre), Nigeria. This testing centre is where the concerns in this matter have arisen.

Pearson VUE has control over the technology, but the environment is owned/controlled by the test centre and personnel are test centre employees. PVTCs are contractually required to adhere to specific Pearson VUE standards for delivery and operations.

Pearson VUE also provide additional centres referred to as Pearson Professional Centres (PPCs) and PVTC Selects which have additional security measures including biometrics (palm vein) and CCTV footage. As the Yunnik centre was a PVTC it was not required to have these extra security measures.

Candidates are allowed up to three attempts to pass the CBT as part of one application, with a minimum of 10 days between each sitting. If they fail all three attempts, their application will close, and they must wait six months before submitting a new application to sit the CBT again.

On 15 March 2023, Pearson VUE identified that the Yunnik centre was delivering exams for multiple candidates who were completing the clinical part of the CBT in 10 minutes (2.5 hours is allowed for this part of the exam). The number of candidates was initially unknown.

The NMC was notified, and the Pearson VUE results team ran a report from January 2022, for all NMC exams that were delivered at the Yunnik centre.

Pearson VUE conducted a thorough and detailed investigation into the Yunnik centre and identified testing anomalies. They found that the data set for the period between 15 March 2019 and 31 March 2023 indicated a specific pattern of potentially fraudulent behaviour. Pearson VUE asserted that this was likely to be linked to proficient proxy test taking which was not present at other testing centres globally.

Pearson VUE's investigation also concluded that there was no technical error at the Yunnik centre that had led to the data set and alleged that human interference was involved.

The NMC commissioned a report from Richard Steele, instructed as an independent expert to analyse and report on data provided by the NMC. His conclusion was that there were a significant number of exceptionally quick test times at the Yunnik centre, compared to global averages.

On 3 August 2023, after due consideration the NMC's Registrar decided to use as a benchmark the 1 in 2,500 percentile, in order to identify tests which were taken at such a speed that it is likely that the results had been fraudulently obtained (most likely utilising a human proxy test taker). Applying this statistical threshold meant that for those individuals who sat CBT 2021, anyone who sat their Numeracy test in 5.5 minute or under and/or Clinical test in 21.5 minute or under, the Registrar considered this raised a prima facie case that the result had been obtained fraudulently.

Because of the evidence of widespread fraudulent activity at the Yunnik centre, the NMC was unable to be confident in any of the CBT results obtained at the testing centre. The Registrar therefore considered all CBT results obtained should be treated as invalid and that the safest, fairest, and most proportionate way to deal with this was to ask everyone who sat their CBT at the Yunnik centre, to take a new CBT. In the absence of a valid CBT an individual would not have been allowed entry to the NMC register.

The Pearson VUE raw data in relation to your CBT shows that you achieved a pass in your test in the following time(s):

- Numeracy: 4.43 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes).
- Clinical: 10 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes).

Following Richard Steele's analysis, excluding time taken in introductory and review screens, your actual test completion time was:

- Numeracy: 4.37 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes).
- Clinical: 9.93 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes).

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

On 12 November 2025, you were informed that the Assistant Registrar had refused your application onto the register, they took into account the following:

From the NMC:

- Your completed application
- The 'evidence bundle' consisting of:
 - o Expert reports by Richard Steele, Head of Data Analytics at OAC (now Broadstone)
 - o Witness statements of Bryan Friess, Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE
 - o Witness statements of Witness 1 and Witness 2
 - o Witness statements of Sam Foster, Executive Director of Professional Practice at the NMC
- Other test activity at Yunnik on the date you sat your test
- Letter sent to you dated 19 September 2023

From you:

- Your email response dated 26 September 2025
- Meeting notes from your meeting with Elysium Healthcare dated 8 October 2025

You appealed the decision on 10 December 2025, within the 28-day time limit.

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 of sitting an exam at Yunnik.

- Witness 2: Band 4 Pre-registration nurse in the UK who provided her experience of sitting an exam at Yunnik.

- Bryan Friess: Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.

- Darren Richards: Worked with Richard Steele, a former independent Data Analyst at Broadstone who provided the NMC with an analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE.

- Elizabeth Lamont: Assistant Director for Registrations and Investigations at the NMC and adopts the evidence of Sara Kovach-Clark.

- Sara Kovack-Clark: Assistant Director at the NMC.

- Julie Bliss: Senior Nursing Education Adviser and member of the Executive Team in the Professional Practice Directorate at the NMC.

- Wendy Fowler: Assistant Director of CBT Delivery at the NMC and adopts the witness statements of Linda Everet (Previously employed as the Deputy Director for Business Transformation and a member of the Executive Team for Professional Regulation) and Sam Foster (Previously

employed by the NMC as the Executive Director of Professional Practice).

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

- Your defence bundle which includes your CV, testimonials, academic records and certificates;
- Your witness statement dated 21 August 2026; and
- Practice materials that you used in preparation for your exams.

In addition, you provided live oral evidence on oath.

Submissions

Ms Chowdhury outlined the background to the case.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that the practice materials you provided for the panel are available globally for candidates to prepare for the test and were not unique to you.

Ms Chowdhury referred to the histograms within Richard Steele's evidence and outlined that the statistical anomalies of the test times of Yunnik as opposed to globally, reinforce suspicions of non-standard behaviour.

Ms Chowdhury referred the panel to Pearson VUE's data, which indicated that the test completion times at Yunnik were significantly faster than global benchmarks. She outlined Richard Steele's statistical analysis, which shows that there was a large, and statistically significant, difference between test times at Yunnik and those of candidates at other centres both in Nigeria and globally.

Ms Chowdhury referred to Witness 1 and Witness 2's statements which corroborated the routine nature of proxy operations at Yunnik. She submitted that this is consistent with Richard Steele's independent statement and Sarah Kovach-Clark's statement.

Ms Chowdhury referred the panel to Richard Steele's analysis of your test times and submitted that your times were exceptionally fast. Ms Chowdhury highlighted that your time for the CBT was one of the fastest achieved by any of the other candidates who sat the test globally (excluding Yunnik). She submitted that it was highly improbable that you completed the CBT without the assistance of a proficient proxy test-taker.

Ms Chowdhury referred to Bryan Friess' statement and submitted that it had been demonstrated beyond doubt that the concern around fast test times was not related to any issues or glitches with the Pearson VUE software.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that the NMC's evidence, including fast test times, high scores and admissions from other test takers, supported the conclusion that widespread fraud occurred at Yunnik. She submitted that the method of fraud was irrelevant, but the key issue was whether the test result was dishonestly obtained.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that you took your CBT in Yunnik on 25 January 2023. While no admissions have been made by individuals who took tests on the same day as yourself, three individuals have made admissions relating to dates in close proximity to the date that you took your test.

Ms Chowdhury referred to your raw and evaluated CBT times. She highlighted that no candidates globally matched your timings. She referred to Mr Steele's individual analysis of the times you took to answer each question; she outlined that you took around two to eight seconds to answer 78 of the 100 questions and 27 of the 100 completed within two to four seconds, she submitted that this is unlikely without the use of a proxy test taker.

Ms Chowdhury drew the panel's attention to the same day evidence in that there were two other candidates who sat their tests in a similarly fast time to you. She submitted that whilst it is unlikely that one person would ever achieve such fast times, it is even more

unlikely that three of the world's fastest test takers all happen to sit the CBT exam at the same test centre on the same day within a short period of time.

Ms Chowdhury referred to your resit times from 30 November 2023 (analysed by Richard Steele):

- Numeracy: 15.18 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes).
- Clinical: 50.6 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes).

Ms Chowdhury submitted that these demonstrate that you are an average candidate and support that your original CBT was fraudulent.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that nothing outweighed the compelling evidence that you obtained your CBT result through fraud, namely a proxy test taker. As such, she invited the panel to find that the Assistant Registrar's decision was reasonable, proportionate and grounded on evidence and dismiss the appeal.

Ms Thomas, on your behalf, submitted that there is no direct evidence of you having used a human proxy test taker at the test centre. She submitted the closest of such evidence before the panel is the timings recorded by Bryan Friess and evaluated by Richard Steele. She highlighted that no staff from Pearson VUE had ever visited Yunnik.

Ms Thomas submitted that the scores you achieved in January 2023 for your CBT are identical to that of your resit CBT on 30 November 2023.

Ms Thomas outlined limitations in the way the NMC has investigated your case, specifically the limitations in Bryan Friess and Richard Steele's evidence.

Ms Thomas outlined, that although the CBT has three hours allocated for candidates to complete their test, no candidates, globally, have taken that long and used the entirety of the time.

Ms Thomas submitted that although your resit times were three times slower than your original time in Yunnik, it is still incredibly fast in the context of Mr Steele's histography of global CBT times. She clarified that the reason you took three times slower was due to the anxiety caused from the suspicions raised regarding your original CBT times. She submitted that you are not among the 'fastest' test takers, and around 270 candidates were faster than yourself for the clinical test.

Ms Thomas outlined limitations in Julie Bliss' evidence.

Ms Thomas submitted that the NMC has not carried out a review of whether your practice questions (before the panel) are identical to the actual questions in your CBT taken in Yunnik (not before the panel).

Ms Thomas submitted that when looking at the generic evidence, the panel may conclude that there was fraud at Yunnik, but when looking at the specific evidence in relation to yourself, there simply is not enough evidence that the NMC can point to, to conclude that you specifically cheated. She submitted that you are simply somebody who was very fast, and very unfortunately has been caught up in a scandal with other people who may very well have used proxies.

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

You said that you booked the CBT prior to visiting your aunt in Ibadan. You said that you were revising around five to six hours a day whilst living at your aunt's house and helping her with her newborn child. You clarified that you primarily helped take care of the newborn during the night and in the daytime when the baby slept, you continued to revise via Telegram chats amongst other methods.

You said that at the time you were working as a nurse at the Federal Neural Hospital in Benin City. You said that you did not tell your colleagues about taking your CBT as you explained that this was important you.

You said that you chose the test centre after a google search which identified Yunnik as the closest centre to your aunt's home.

You said there was no particular reason for the 9am booking of your CBT. You said that on 25 January 2023, you left your aunt's home at 8am so that you could get to the test centre in good time. You said that you got on a motorbike taxi to get to the test centre, but the motorbike rider took you to the wrong venue and so by the time you got to Yunnik you were late and you were anxious.

You said that when you went to the test centre, you apologised for being late and a man who worked at Yunnik proceeded to check your international passport and carried out a fingerprint scan. You said that you did not need to wait and were ushered straight to the computer terminal to sit your CBT.

You said that you cannot recall if there was a clock in the room, but you had a wristwatch that you took off prior to going into the test room. You said that you did not look at your wristwatch prior to going into the test room as you wanted to immediately start your CBT having been late. You said that you did not check your wristwatch when you exited the centre either.

You said that in the test hall there were around 20 computer terminals, but when you sat your test there were three other test takers.

You said that you did not realise that you had spent 15 minutes on your CBT in Yunnik until the NMC had sent you the letter outlining the allegation of fraud.

You said that you did not take time to review your answers as you were familiar with the questions due to your revision.

You said that you were not pressured by anyone at Yunnik to finish your CBT.

You said that when you did your resit in November 2023, you spent more time as there were increased pressures on you such as your career which was dependant on the resit scores. You clarified that you used the same study material for your resit. You said that you only focused on passing the test as in the NMC letter to you, it did not highlight the times as the issue – hence you did not feel that you had to finish your resit in a fast time.

You said that, in reference to the pictures of Yunnik exhibited by Nazira Ashikin, that you only recognised the first image of the building and the second picture which was of the computer and desk where you gave your identification prior to starting the CBT. You said that the latter two pictures are not familiar, and this may be perhaps as the photos were uploaded onto Facebook by Yunnik in 2016 whereas you took your test in 2023.

In response to panel questions, you clarified that the highlighted practice material questions, were highlighted by the group admin on the Telegram chats.

You told the panel that despite the NMC letter dated 19 September 2023 outlining that your timing at Yunnik was the issue, you did not read it as such, and therefore you only focussed on passing your resit as opposed to matching the similar fast test time.

Closing submissions

Ms Chowdhury submitted that the evidence of the statistics to indicate that fraud was taking place at Yunnik is overwhelming.

Ms Chowdhury referred the panel to the written submissions before the panel drafted by Rory Dunlop KC.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that the methodology of the fraudulent activity is irrelevant.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that the evidence of the statistics to indicate that fraud was taking place at Yunnik is overwhelming.

Ms Chowdhury referred to the significant difference in the timings between your original CBT sat in Yunnik and your resit sat in Lagos.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that it is not plausible that you did not call the test centre to say that you would be arriving late on 25 January 2023.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that your description of the test room differs from that of the evidence before the panel, as well as the fact that at Yunnik they had no technology to take fingerprint biometrics, but you said in evidence that they did.

Ms Chowdhury invited the panel to dismiss the appeal and uphold the refusal of the Assistant Registrar based on the credible, consistent and compelling evidence that your CBT results were obtained through fraudulent means. She submitted that your results cannot be safely relied upon as evidence that you are capable of safe and effective practice, or that you meet the character requirement for entry onto the register.

In closing, Ms Thomas on your behalf, reminded the panel that there is no direct evidence of any person having witnessed you take your CBT on 25 January 2023 nor is there any CCTV. She also submitted that there are no logged admissions from other candidates on the day you took your test.

Ms Thomas submitted that, in reference to your resit times, you would still be in the top 1377 out of 56,478 candidates. She submitted that you are an incredibly fast test taker.

Ms Thomas outlined the limitations in the evidence from Bryan Friess, Richard Steele, Elizabeth Lamont, Sara Kovach-Clark and Nazira Ashikin.

Ms Thomas submitted that though the CBT at Yunnik does not require fingerprint biometrics, that does not mean that the other tests sat at Yunnik did not require them.

Ms Thomas submitted that there is no evidence before the panel of what an honest test taker would do. She submitted that there are fast test takers globally, excluding Yunnik, who have not been accused of fraud.

Ms Thomas submitted that you have never faced any such allegations in Nigeria or in the UK prior to this hearing. She submitted that English is not your first language and that you had not had the initial NMC letter that detailed concerns around your test time translated to you in your native language. She submitted that you had therefore not fully understood the letter.

Ms Thomas referred the panel to the numerous testimonials before the panel.

Ms Thomas invited the panel to allow the appeal.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Panel's decision

It is common ground between the parties that the burden of proof is on the NMC to establish on a balance of probabilities that your CBT was obtained fraudulently. However, the burden of proof is on you to satisfy the panel that you satisfy the requirement of good character to allow you to be admitted to the NMC Register.

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 Yunnik at the time you took your CBT. The panel found the evidence before it to be cogent and credible.

The panel had sight of the Pearson VUE data from Bryan Friess and the independent expert analysis provided by Richard Steele, including tables of data and graphs setting out the times taken globally and at other centres in Nigeria to complete the CBT. The panel noted the distinctly different time distribution plots when compared to the times achieved by candidates at Yunnik. The panel also referred to the statement of agreed facts between the NMC and the Royal College of Nursing (RCN):

'If one excludes Yunnik, almost no one in the entire world completed Part B of the 2021 CBT in under 20 minutes... In other words, the most common times at Yunnik were more than twice as quick as the times anywhere else in the world.'

The panel considered that Bryan Friess' findings were corroborated by Richard Steele's independent research which outlined the stark difference in the test times taken at Yunnik as opposed to globally. The panel also considered that Bryan Friess confirmed that there were no cyber-attacks or software malfunctions at Yunnik test centre.

The panel took particular note of the Pearson VUE evidence prepared by Bryan Friess which identified patterns that were 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 were indicative of the use of human proxies. The panel considered that a proxy's increased familiarity with taking the tests and absence of being discovered were more likely than not to increase their speed and use at the test centre.

Having considered all the information before it, the panel found there to be compelling generic evidence of statistical anomalies and patterns of suspicious behaviour at Yunnik. This included:

- Unusually fast test completion times, suggesting interference.
- Independent statistical analysis by Richard Steele, confirming statistically significant discrepancies between CBTs taken in Nigeria (excluding Yunnik) and globally.

The panel also noted the evidence of Bryan Friess detailing the pattern of proxy behaviour reported on days when the NMC have received admissions of fraudulent behaviour. The panel considered that the evidence of the witness statements of both Witness 1 and Witness 2, although hearsay in nature and not speaking of the day you took your test, provide contextual evidence that proxy activity was taking place at the Yunnik test centre and during the period in question. The panel also referred to Sara Kovach-Clark's statement that there were 37 other logged admissions of their experience of fraudulent activities and use of human proxies at the Yunnik test centre.

Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that it was more likely than not that there was widespread fraudulent activity taking place at the Yunnik centre.

The panel next considered whether it is more likely than not that you obtained your CBT result at Yunnik fraudulently.

The panel accepted that the test time data provided was exceptionally fast and as such more likely than not to demonstrate fraudulent activity.

The panel considered your evidence that you chose Yunnik to sit your CBT as it was prompted to you via a google search when checking for the closest test centre to your aunt's home. The panel accepted that your explanation for attending Yunnik to take your test was plausible.

The panel considered that you said that you paid for the CBT at the test centre as opposed to the Pearson VUE website. It referred to the statement of Witness 1 and a logged admission from 20 January 2023 which identified payment at the Yunnik centre to be connected to fraudulent activity, as such, it found your account in respect of this lacked credibility.

The panel had sight of the analysis provided by Richard Steele and Bryan Friess' data, including diagrams which evidence the time taken globally, including other centres in Nigeria, to complete the CBT, compared to the times achieved at Yunnik. The panel considered Richard Steele's analysis of your specific data, which provided the following odds of how achievable your test times were:

'Evaluated Clinical Timing: 9.93 minutes: Odds 1 in 56478.0.

'Evaluated Numeracy Timing: 4.73 minutes: Odds 1 in 14530.75'.

The panel noted that there were three other candidates who took the test at Yunnik on the same day as you and during the same time period in close proximity to your test. The panel noted that two other candidates who sat their test within an hour of yours were also flagged as suspicious. The panel concluded the probability of three exceptionally fast test takers being present in the same centre and on the same day within an hour window, to be highly improbable and a strong indication of fraudulent activity and that in all likelihood a proxy was being used at the centre at the time and date you took your test. The panel also noted that the three fast test times were all Mental Health nursing CBTs, with all three tests achieving full marks for numeracy and getting progressively faster for the clinical timings.

The panel considered your evidence that Yunnik contained a large exam hall with around 20 computer terminals. However, when referring to the logged admission of 1 June 2022

which described two computer terminals as well as the images provided by Nazira Ashikin showing two computer terminals the panel considered this outweighed your assertions. On this basis, the panel considered that three candidates should not have been able to sit their tests within a one-hour period with only two computer terminals at Yunnik given that each test alone should have been allocated 150 minutes.

The panel noted your evidence that you prepared very thoroughly for your CBT for around six months, with various types of practice materials. The panel considered that most of these resources would be available globally, and that this would suggest that other people globally or in other test centres in Nigeria who accessed similar practice material might have been able to complete the test fast enough to meet the fraudulent concerns threshold. However, the data provided does not indicate such frequent and fast times at any other test centre. Further, the panel has seen evidence of your resit CBT sitting and there was nothing to suggest that you are a student who could complete exams in exceptional times with exceptional results. The panel referred to Ms Thomas' assertions that your resit times were considered fast, however, it considered your resit times to be three times slower than your original test times in Yunnik.

In your documentary evidence you accepted that the CBT was an important exam for your future to progress in becoming a nurse in the UK and would not have wanted to fail. As such, the panel found it implausible that you would have completed the CBT after such a short time, without reviewing your answers and left early given that the time allocated for your test was 3 hours. The more likely explanation is that you were confident in your result because of your use of a proxy. This approach appears to be contradictory to the expected approach by a registrant sitting such a critical exam on which your future registration as a nurse in the UK depended on. The panel also took into account that the NMC Guidance on test taking which reinforces the need to check and double check answers. The panel considered that you provided no credible reason for having to finish your CBT quickly rather than using the full time allocated.

The panel approached your evidence with care, recognising the potential impact of stress, cultural factors, and the need to distinguish credibility from reliability. However, your explanation did not provide any plausible account of the extremely rapid exam times recorded. Your account did not fit with the structure and expected duration of the CBT, the

contextual evidence relating to that test day, or the wider pattern found at Yunnik. The panel considered Ms Thomas' submissions of English not being your first language which may have resulted in any confusion during your live evidence and in your understanding of the letter the NMC sent you highlighting concerns with your CBT times. However, the panel considered that you must have completed International English Language Testing System (IELTS) to practice as a nurse in the UK, and it considered that you were able to provide live evidence clearly, seemingly with no difficulty understanding the written or oral information within the hearing. As such, it did not accept Ms Thomas' assertion that you had not understood the concerns that the NMC had raised within its letter.

In view of the panel's decision that there was widespread fraud occurring at Yunnik, and the exceptionally quick time in which you completed your CBT, which made you one of the fastest candidates globally, it is highly unlikely that you could have achieved this without the assistance of a proxy test taker. When looking at the comparison between your times and those of the global candidate population, from a test centre where there was widespread fraud, the panel considered that the only plausible explanation for you achieving your pass in the time that you did, was that you either used a proxy or had the assistance of a proxy.

The panel therefore determined that it was more likely than not that you obtained your CBT result fraudulently.

The panel went on to determine whether you met the character requirements for admission to the NMC register. The panel had regard to the NMC guidance on health and character. The panel noted that it was for you to satisfy it that you meet the character requirements for successful admission on the register.

The panel took into account the numerous positive testimonials before it and your previous unblemished career. However, having found that you fraudulently obtained your CBT result and have maintained your position throughout your engagement with the NMC, your NHS employer and the panel, it could not be satisfied that you are of good character.

The panel has determined on the balance of probabilities that you had tried to gain entry to the NMC register by means of fraud. This is a significant departure from the behaviour expected of a registered nurse.

The panel had regard to 'The Code: Professional standards of practice and behaviour for nurses and midwives (2015)', in particular paragraph 20, which sets out that registered nurses are expected to uphold the reputation of the profession. The panel concluded that, in all the circumstances of your case, you were not able to demonstrate that you meet the character requirement for NMC registration.

The panel therefore decided to dismiss your appeal and 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.