

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Hearing
Tuesday, 17 March – Thursday, 19 March 2026
Monday, 20 July 2026 – Tuesday, 21 July 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Appellant:	Franca Ufuoma Rotimi-Igbasan
Type of case:	Registrations appeal
Panel members:	Neil Calvert (Chair, Lay member) Hayley Ball (Registrant member) Niall McDermott (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Alain Gogarty (17 – 19 March 2026) Natalie Byrne (20 – 21 July 2026)
Hearings Coordinator:	Dilay Bekteshi
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Mousumi Chowdhury, Case Presenter
Ms Rotimi-Igbasan:	Present (17 – 19 March and 21 July 2026) and represented by Adewuyi Oyegoke, Lay representative
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 14 December 2023, that you did not meet the character requirements for registration to 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 lasts for 30 minutes. Part B is a clinical test consisting of 100 multiple-choice questions and lasts for 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 relate.

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 testing 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 Mr 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 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 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 there to be 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 should not have been allowed entry to the NMC register.

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

- Numeracy: 7.82 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes).
- Clinical: 17.40 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes).

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

Taking into account the time in which your clinical 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.

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

- Your completed application;
- The 'evidence bundle' consisting of:
 - Richard Steele's expert report
 - Witness statement of Bryan Friess from Pearson Vue

- Witness statement of Sam Foster of the NMC
- From you:
 - Your email dated 30 November 2023.

In your materials correspondence you stated that you deny the allegations. You infer that nothing untoward occurred during your test. You say that you work hard to pass all exams and that your hard work and study have got you to where you are in your career today.

It is your case that you arrived early at the test centre but were permitted to start your test at 11:47 even though it was scheduled to start at 15:30.

The Assistant Registrar considered your explanation, including a description of the extensive preparation you undertook. However, in their view, this did not explain how you were able to obtain your test result from Yunnik in the time you did when comparing it against 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. The Assistant Registrar therefore determined that you did not meet the character requirements to be considered capable of safe and effective practice.

On 5 December 2023, you were informed that the Assistant Registrar had refused your application onto the register.

You appealed the decision on 14 December 2023, within the 28-day time limit.

Evidence

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

- Roxanne Burns: Employed by the NMC as the
Assistant Director for CBT and a
member of the NMC's Executive

Management Team for Professional Regulation

- Bryan Friess: Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.
- Richard Steele: An independent Data Analyst who provided the NMC with an analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE.

The panel also 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.
- Sam Foster: Employed by the NMC as the Executive Director of Professional Practice.
- Julie Bliss: Employed by the NMC as a Senior Nursing Education Adviser and part of the Executive Team in the Professional Practice Directorate.

The panel also had regard to bundles of evidence provided on your behalf which included your CV, copies of education certificates and numerous character references.

Your evidence

You told the panel that you completed your university nursing programme in 2022 and achieved a second-class upper grade, as shown on your transcript. You explained that, during your university training at LAUTECH, you regularly sat computer-based tests as part of your programme. These examinations included theory and CBT-style assessments across the four-year course.

You described the university CBT-style format as taking place in a large hall with multiple computers. Candidates were given tickets, logged in with a username and password, read instructions on screen, and answered multiple-choice questions. You said the format was similar to the UK CBT in that questions had four answer options, although the university questions were based on your academic syllabus rather than UK-specific nursing practice.

You said that, during the COVID-19 pandemic, some examinations were conducted remotely from home. You explained that the university required students to use laptops with webcams so that supervisors could observe them during the exam.

In relation to your first CBT on 19 August 2021, you said you had initially intended to sit the mental health CBT. However, because of an error when your NMC portal was created, you were registered for the adult nursing CBT instead. You decided to proceed with that test because of the cost, stress and delay involved in starting again. You said you prepared using legacy CBT materials and Pearson VUE practice resources, travelled to Asaba the day before the test, stayed in a hotel, and passed both Part A and Part B.

You explained that Part A involved numeracy and drug calculations, which you considered familiar because of your nursing experience. You said Part B involved clinical practice and clinical reasoning, which you also felt confident about because you had worked as a nurse in different departments since 2007.

You said you later chose the mental health route because of your professional interest and qualifications in mental health nursing. You said you were not desperate to come to the UK and had continued with your BSc programme rather than abandoning it to travel earlier.

You said you selected the Yunnik test centre because it had an available test date that fitted around your work schedule. You denied having any prior knowledge of fraud, proxy testing or assistance at Yunnik. You said you had no reason to cheat because you had recently passed the Adult CBT, still had access to study materials, and believed you had the knowledge to pass independently. You said you were familiar with the travel route to Ibadan because of your university studies and that the journey to Yunnik was compatible with your work commitments.

You disputed the NMC's recorded timings for your Yunnik CBT. You said you did not focus on timing during the test and was concerned with reading the questions carefully, selecting accurate answers, and passing. You said you believed you spent more time than the NMC recorded, including time reviewing answers.

You told the panel that you had prepared extensively using study materials, multiple-choice questions, CBT questions and answers, videos, and UK practice resources. You said you provided these materials to show that you prepared for the test yourself and did not use a proxy tester.

You told the panel that you attended the Yunnik test centre yourself on 13 July 2022. You said you travelled the day before, stayed in a hotel, arrived early, waited in reception, and used the time to review materials online. You said your identity was checked, your passport was inspected, you signed documents, and your previous photograph appeared on the system, which reassured you that the centre was connected to Pearson VUE.

You denied that anyone assisted you or sat the exam for you. You said you completed the test independently, had recently passed a CBT, were not under time pressure, and had no reason to seek assistance.

Submissions

Ms Chowdhury, on behalf of the NMC, submitted that the burden of proof rests on the NMC and that the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. The central question for the panel was whether your CBT result at Yunnik on 13 July 2022 was obtained through fraud.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that it was not necessary for the panel to determine the precise method of any fraud, such as whether a proxy tester sat beside you, gave oral instructions, or operated the computer. She submitted that the relevant issue was whether the result was more likely than not obtained through fraud.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that the NMC relied on generic evidence suggesting widespread fraud at Yunnik, including Pearson VUE evidence about the integrity of the raw data, Richard Steele's statistical analysis, and admissions or statements from other test takers. Ms Chowdhury submitted that Yunnik test times were significantly faster than the global benchmark population and that the only sensible explanation for the pattern was fraud at that centre.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that the NMC also relied on specific evidence concerning your own test timings. It submitted that your Yunnik timings were exceptionally fast, particularly in Part B, and contrasted them with your earlier Asaba CBT, where you took significantly longer. She submitted that this change could not be explained simply by preparation, prior experience, or familiarity with the CBT format.

Ms Chowdhury said that practice materials could not explain the speed of your Yunnik test because there was no meaningful overlap between practice questions and live exam questions. The NMC relied on evidence that questions were randomised and that candidates sitting again would receive a different set of questions.

Ms Chowdhury further submitted that your account was inconsistent: on one hand you said you were very fast because of preparation and previous experience, but on the other you disputed the recorded timings and said you took more than 50 minutes. Ms

Chowdhury submitted that neither explanation adequately accounted for the recorded speed.

Ms Chowdhury submitted that the generic, specific and live evidence showed that it was more likely than not that your Yunnik CBT result was obtained through fraud. She invited the panel to dismiss the appeal and uphold the Assistant Registrar's decision.

Mr Oyegoke, on your behalf, accepted that the burden of proof rests on the NMC. However, he submitted that the NMC's generic and specific evidence was not agreed and did not prove that you had acted fraudulently.

Mr Oyegoke submitted that evidence of a wider problem at Yunnik should not be applied automatically to every candidate who sat a test there. He submitted that the NMC relied heavily on statistics and probability, without sufficient additional evidence directly proving that you used a proxy or obtained assistance.

Mr Oyegoke referred to figures concerning candidates affected by the Yunnik investigation and submitted that some candidates or registrants had been treated differently. He sought to rely on an NMC-published article about the action taken following concerns about the Yunnik test centre, arguing that it was relevant to fairness and to how the NMC had dealt with the wider group of affected candidates.

Application to Admit Further Evidence

During closing submissions, Mr Oyegoke invited the panel to admit the NMC article about the action being taken following concerns about the Yunnik test centre. He acknowledged that the application was late but submitted that admitting the article would assist the panel in considering the case fairly and holistically.

Ms Chowdhury opposed the application because it was made at the conclusion of both the evidence and the NMC's closing submissions. She submitted that the article was published in September 2023 and that the investigation had moved on since then. She said that, if the document were admitted, the NMC might need to provide updated information, written submissions, and possibly recall relevant witnesses.

Panel's Decision and Directions

The panel accepted the legal assessor's advice and considered the parties' submissions. It noted that the document had not been included in the appellant's bundle, had not been put to witnesses during the hearing, and was raised only during closing submissions. The panel also noted that it had not been given a clear explanation of the document's relevance to your case.

However, in fairness to you, the panel granted the application, albeit with significant reluctance because of its lateness.

The panel directed that, within 14 days, your representative must serve the document on the NMC and provide written submissions explaining what the document is and why it is relevant to your case. The purpose of this direction is to allow the NMC to consider its position and to ensure the hearing can resume efficiently.

The panel also directed that, if the NMC wishes to adduce further evidence or recall witnesses in response, it should notify the parties and serve any documents no less than 14 days before the resumed hearing.

The hearing was listed to resume on 20 and 21 July 2026.

The hearing resumed on 20 July 2026.

Privacy application pursuant to Rule 30 of the NMC (Education, Registration and Registration Appeals) Rules 2004

Ms Chowdhury invited the panel to hear any parts of the hearing that related to your health in private, in order to protect your privacy.

Mr Oyegoke submitted that matters relating to your personal life and health should be heard in private.

The legal assessor referred the panel to the NMC's Education, Registration and Registration Appeal Rules Order 2004 (the Rules).

The panel acceded to the application and determined that any matters relating to your health would be heard in private in order to protect your privacy.

Application to adjourn

[PRIVATE]

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor, who referred it to Rule 32 of the NMC Fitness to Practise Rules 2004, NMC Guidance (Reference CMT-11), and the cases of *Crown Prosecution Service v Picton* [2006] EWHC 1108 (Admin), and *Levy v Ellis-Carr* [2012] EWHC 64 (Ch).

[PRIVATE]

The panel also considered Mr Oyegoke's submission that he would need to seek further instructions. Ms Chowdhury had indicated that, although she did not intend to recall witnesses or revisit her submissions, she wished to respond to aspects of Mr Oyegoke's closing submissions. The panel recognised that, in fairness, Mr Oyegoke should be given an opportunity to respond to any such points. The panel therefore considered whether it would be unfair for him to continue without you being present.

In assessing that issue, the panel noted that the anticipated response would appear to relate to a public-domain document referred to in submissions. On the information before it, the panel was not clear what further instructions Mr Oyegoke would need from you in order to respond to that issue. The panel also noted you had already given evidence that the case had reached the stage of final submissions.

The panel balanced fairness to you against fairness to the NMC and the wider public interest. It noted that notice of the hearing had been sent at the beginning of June 2026 and that the adjournment application was made in July 2026. It also noted the public interest in the expeditious disposal of the case, including the efficient use of the regulator's

resources and the inconvenience caused by further rescheduling. Taking all these matters into account, the panel concluded that any prejudice to you in proceeding at this late stage in the proceedings was minimal and was outweighed by the public interest in concluding the case without any further delays.

The application to adjourn was therefore refused.

Final closing submissions heard on 21 July 2026

When the panel reconvened, you were able to attend to hear the remainder of the submissions made by the parties.

Mr Oyegoke addressed the panel on the relevance of the NMC Online Article '*The action we're taking following concerns about the Yunnik centre*' dated 20 September 2023. He submitted that the NMC had not taken regulatory action against a significant number of candidates and suggested that this inconsistent approach gave rise to unfairness. He submitted that the NMC's case against you is based on statistics and that there is no clear evidence of fraudulent activity.

Mr Oyegoke said that other people sat the test on the same day as you, but no one has told the NMC that they saw you on the day in question or that you were involved in fraudulent activity or the use of a proxy tester. He submitted that, although 37 individuals had made admissions, none of them attended the Yunnik test centre on the date you completed your CBT.

Mr Oyegoke submitted that there is no CCTV, oral or documentary evidence showing that you were involved in fraud at Yunnik. He said it was possible for you to have passed, or attempted, your CBT at the Yunnik centre without engaging in fraudulent activity. He submitted that this was supported by the documents relating to candidates who attempted the CBT across the globe, including those in Nigeria who did not attend Yunnik and those who did. He noted that one document recorded your completion time as 19 minutes, while another recorded it as 17.4 minutes. The NMC did not challenge the numeracy aspect of the test, which took 7 minutes, but relied on the clinical part. Mr Oyegoke submitted that, although the NMC said you took 19 minutes, the clinical time was recorded elsewhere as

21.5 minutes. He further submitted that, globally, nine candidates achieved a pass within that timeframe and, in Nigeria, four candidates did so. Therefore, he argued that it was not impossible that you were the fifth candidate in Nigeria to pass the clinical part of the CBT within 19 minutes.

In view of all the available evidence, he submitted that there was no evidence to show that candidates who took 21.5 minutes or longer had not used a proxy tester or engaged in fraudulent activity. He submitted that the only evidence relied on against you was statistical. Even if it were found proved that only some people could achieve a pass within the stated time, he submitted that there was no reason why you could not be among that number. You were not new to CBT-style testing and, in your evidence, you stated that you had taken a CBT a year earlier at another centre and passed. You had taken three CBT tests and passed them all. He submitted that the NMC had not discharged its burden of proof in establishing that there was fraud at Yunnik on the day you took the CBT.

Mr Oyegoke said that you joined the NHS on 16 January 2023 and continue to work for the same employer. You provided character references from educational institutions in Nigeria as well as colleagues based in both Nigeria and the UK, which attest to your character and integrity.

Mr Oyegoke submitted that there was no basis to suggest that you were not a proficient CBT user and that the NMC had provided no evidence to the contrary. You gave evidence that CBT-style examinations were used during your four years at university in Nigeria. He said you gave clear evidence that you became used to this style of assessment throughout your time at university and took the CBT close to the period when you were studying.

Mr Oyegoke submitted that, although some candidates had to travel far to the centre, your university, where you had attended lectures for four years, was closer to Yunnik and you were familiar with the region. You had tried to register at Asaba, where you had taken your first CBT, but there was no suitable date available at that time.

Mr Oyegoke submitted that the NMC's evidence was that the clinical part of the CBT contained a generic element and that the questions were similar to those you had taken

before. He said it was possible for you to achieve a pass within a short period of time if you had prepared, practised, and previously taken the same type of exam. He submitted that the exam was not new to you.

In relation to character, Mr Oyegoke submitted that people who had worked closely with you described you as an honest person of integrity. He submitted that you had taken the CBT genuinely and by yourself, and that there were people who had achieved a pass within the same percentage and timeframe, both globally and in Nigeria. You said you believed you had spent longer at Yunnik undertaking the CBT than the NMC's evidence showed.

Ms Chowdhury referred the panel to Mr Oyegoke's written submissions. She submitted that those submissions formed the basis for reliance on the NMC website article dated 20 September 2023. She noted that the issue raised in the article was why some registrants had faced regulatory proceedings while others had not. She directed the panel to Ms Foster's witness statement which explains why the threshold had been set as a result of Mr Steele's analysis.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Panel's decision

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.

In making its decision, the panel first considered whether it had sufficient evidence before it to substantiate the NMC's case that there was generic widespread fraud occurring at the Yunnik Centre.

The panel had sight of the data analysis provided by Mr Steele, including diagrams comparing the time taken to complete the CBT at the Yunnik centre with completion times at other centres in Nigeria and globally. Mr Steele identified a statistically significant

difference between the test times recorded at Yunnik and those recorded elsewhere, describing the difference as “*large*”. The panel also considered that Mr Steele’s use of histograms further illustrated that the anomalies in test performance in the clinical CBT were unique to the Yunnik Centre when compared to other centres in Nigeria and globally. The panel found Mr Steele’s evidence to be credible and reliable.

The panel also took into account Mr Friess’s oral and documentary evidence. He identified a number of factors which, in his view, made it highly likely that human interference had been involved. The panel found Mr Friess’s evidence to be reliable and credible.

The panel considered the witness statements of Witness 1 and Witness 2, both of whom described attending the Yunnik Centre to sit the CBT and subsequently being pressured into using a proxy tester. The panel further had sight of information received by the NMC from over 30 other individuals about their experiences at the Yunnik centre and in particular regarding the use of proxies. Their evidence described the use of human proxies to commit fraud in a number of different ways.

Considering all this information, the panel is satisfied that the NMC has proved, on the balance of probabilities, that there is evidence of widespread fraud occurring at the Yunnik centre.

The panel next considered whether it is more likely than not that you obtained your test result from the Yunnik centre in Ibadan, Nigeria fraudulently.

The panel had regard to Mr Steele’s analysis of your specific data, which set out how achievable your clinical test time was:

‘Evaluated Clinical Timing: 17.4 minutes: Odds 1 in 8068.29’

This analysis indicated that, in light of your recorded test time, it was likely that you had used a proxy tester at the Yunnik Centre.

The panel considered your evidence and noted that your account remained largely consistent under cross-examination. The panel, however, did not consider your account to be credible or plausible.

You stated that you selected the Yunnik Centre because, at the time, it fitted with your work schedule. The panel noted that you passed the numeracy test without any concerns arising from excessive timings. In relation to the clinical test, you said that you took longer than the recorded time and estimated that you spent more than 50 minutes completing it, suggesting that the recorded timing was incorrect. The panel noted, however, that the recorded time for the clinical test was 17.4 minutes, despite 150 minutes being allocated for completion of the test. As there were 100 questions, this equated to an average of 10.44 seconds per question.

The panel considered this to be a very short time in which to read and answer each question. It also noted that you completed 57 questions in less than eight seconds which, given the nature of the questions and answers (of which it had examples of before it) appeared to be a very short amount of time. In addition, the panel noted that you answered one question in just under one minute and answered another question in 133 seconds. Collectively, therefore, you spent 18% of the total time taken on the test to answer just 2 questions, whilst answering others much more quickly, which the panel did not consider was credible.

The panel further noted that, when you had previously taken the adult test, it had taken you significantly longer to complete the clinical part – being 133 minutes. The panel did not accept your explanation that your familiarity with CBT-style testing at university, and your prior experience in taking the adult clinical test, satisfactorily explained the significant difference in the time it took you to complete the clinical test at Yunnik.

The panel noted that five other candidates sat the test on the same day as you, within a period of less than 2.5 hours, and that each of them also completed the CBT test unusually quickly. This suggests that a proxy tester may have been used on that day. The panel considered it highly unlikely that six candidates, sitting the test on the same day, could have completed it so rapidly without a proxy tester. It also noted that this pattern of multiple, extremely fast test completion times in close proximity to one another was

consistent with a number of '*days with a high incidence of quick sittings*' identified by Mr Steele in his expert report as supporting the hypothesis of proxy testing.

Taking all of this information into account, the panel concluded that the only reasonable explanation for your rapid completion was that, more likely than not, you had obtained your test result fraudulently.

Finally, the panel went on to determine whether you met the character requirements for admission to the NMC register. It 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 it that you met the character requirements for successful admission to the register.

The panel noted that you had been working as a band 4 pre-registered nurse for approximately three years and that you had provided character references addressing your honesty, integrity and professionalism. The panel also noted that only your line manager explicitly stated that they were aware of these NMC proceedings and as such, concluded that it could only attach a limited weight to the character references provided.

While the panel recognised your right to put forward a defence, it found that the account you gave was implausible, as the evidence pointed to you having committed fraud and that evidence had been tested during the hearing. The panel noted that you maintained an account it found to be implausible, and it considered the duty of candour that applies to registered nurses at all times. It determined that your use of a fraudulently acquired CBT test result in your application to join the register indicates that you do not meet the requisite good character. The panel concluded that the integrity of the NMC register must be upheld by admitting only those with recognised qualifications and who are of good character, to ensure safe and effective practice.

Therefore, the panel determined that you do not meet the required standard of character for registration. While recognising that this was a single act of dishonesty, the panel determined that it is of such seriousness that admitting you to the register could impact the integrity of the profession and undermine public confidence.

The panel therefore concluded that you are not of sufficient good character to be admitted to the Register and 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.