

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Registration Appeal Hearing
Tuesday 20 – Wednesday 21 January 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Appellant:	Omolara Motunrayo Sakeeb
NMC PRN:	1022149336
Type of case:	Registrations appeal
Panel members:	Michael McCulley (Chair, Lay member) Kathryn Evans (Registrant member) Richard Carnell (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Charles Conway
Hearings Coordinator:	Rebecka Selva
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Uzma Khan, Case Presenter
Ms Sakeeb:	Not present and not represented
Decision:	Appeal dismissed

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

The panel was informed at the start of this hearing that Ms Sakeeb was not in attendance and that the Notice of Hearing had been sent to Ms Sakeeb's registered address via recorded first class delivery and registered email address on 17 December 2025.

Ms Khan, on behalf of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), submitted that it had complied with the requirements of Rules 19 and 29 of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Council (Education, Registration and Registration Appeal) Rules 2004', as amended (the Rules).

In response to panel questions, Ms Khan clarified that there have been no issues identified in the delivery of the bundles to Ms Sakeeb's registered address despite not having a delivery number before the panel.

Ms Khan provided the panel with the recorded delivery receipt with tracking number. However, as of today Ms Khan is unable to confirm the current status of the delivered bundles. She referred the panel to Rule 19.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The panel took into account that the Notice of Hearing provided details of the appeal, the time, dates and that the hearing was to be held virtually, including instructions on how to join, and, amongst other things, information about Ms Sakeeb's right to attend, be represented and call evidence, as well as the panel's power to proceed in her absence.

In the light of all of the information available, the panel was satisfied that Ms Sakeeb has been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the requirements of Rule 19.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Ms Sakeeb

The panel next considered whether it should proceed in the absence of Ms Sakeeb. It had regard to Rule 19 and heard the submissions of Ms Khan who invited the panel to

continue in the absence of Ms Sakeeb. She submitted that Ms Sakeeb had voluntarily absented herself.

Ms Khan submitted that there had been no engagement at all by Ms Sakeeb with the NMC in relation to today's appeal hearing and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion. She clarified that the last communication from Ms Sakeeb to the NMC was in January 2024. As of 9 January 2026, her former representative confirmed that he is no longer acting on Ms Sakeeb's behalf.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

In reaching this decision, the panel has considered the submissions of Ms Khan, and the advice of the legal assessor. It has had particular regard to relevant case law and to the overall interests of justice and fairness to all parties. It noted that:

- No application for an adjournment has been made by Ms Sakeeb;
- Ms Sakeeb has not engaged with the NMC and has not responded to any of the letters, emails or telephone messages sent to her about today's appeal hearing or the last adjourned appeal hearing in November 2025;
- Ms Sakeeb has not engaged with her previously appointed representative;
- There is no reason to suppose that adjourning would secure her attendance at some future date.

In these circumstances, the panel has decided that it is fair to proceed in the absence of Ms Sakeeb.

Decision and reasons on application to admit hearsay evidence

The panel heard an application made by Ms Khan under Rule 31 to allow the written statements of Witness 1 and Witness 2. She confirmed that the statements were sent to Ms Sakeeb ahead of today.

The panel heard and accepted the legal assessor's advice on the issues it should take into consideration in respect of this application. This included that Rule 31 provides that, so far as it is '*fair and relevant*', a panel may accept evidence in a range of forms and circumstances, whether or not it is admissible in civil proceedings. In addition, the legal assessor referred the panel to the case of *Thorneycroft v NMC* [2014] EWHC 1565 (Admin).

The panel gave consideration to the application in regard to admitting Witness 1 and Witness 2's statements into evidence. The panel noted that both witness statements had been prepared in anticipation of being used in these proceedings, were signed and contained the paragraph, '*This statement ... is true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief*'.

The panel considered whether Ms Sakeeb would be disadvantaged by allowing the witness statements into evidence. It noted that that Witness 1 and Witness 2's evidence related to the background and contextual circumstances of their own experiences at Yunnik Technologies Ltd Test Centre in Ibadan Nigeria (Yunnik). Neither of these witnesses took their tests on the same day as Ms Sakeeb, and their evidence was not about her specific case. The panel took into account that both statements corroborated other information already before it.

The panel considered that the witness statements of Witness 1 and Witness 2 were not the sole and decisive evidence in the Ms Sakeeb's case. It noted that the Ms Sakeeb had not directly challenged these witness statements. The panel considered that there were no relevant factors for Ms Sakeeb to cross-examine these witnesses on.

The panel was satisfied that there was no reason to suggest that the information given by these witnesses had been fabricated. It also determined that to have both witnesses attend in person, at each and every hearing relating to Yunnik fraud cases, would be unfair and disproportionate, given the sheer volume of cases that would be heard. In addition, the panel noted that Ms Sakeeb had been given prior notice that these witnesses statements were to be read and had been supplied to her in the main hearing bundle.

In these circumstances, the panel were of the view that Witness 1 and Witness 2's witness statements were relevant, and that it would be fair to admit them into evidence. In due course the panel will determine what weight, if any, to attach to them.

Decision and reasons

The panel decided to dismiss Ms Sakeeb's appeal against the decision of the Assistant Registrar of the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC). This follows the decision by the panel that Ms Sakeeb had more likely than not sought to gain admittance to the NMC register by fraud.

This appeal is made under Article 37(1)(a) of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 (the Order). Ms Sakeeb appealed the decision of the Assistant Registrar, dated 5 December 2023, that she 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 up to 30 minutes. Part B is a clinical test consisting of 100 multiple-choice questions and lasts for up to 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.

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 Witness 5, 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 Ms Sakeeb CBT shows that she achieved a pass in two separate tests in the following raw times as identified by Witness 4:

- Numeracy: 4.27 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 30 minutes).
- Clinical: 14.23 Minutes (Time allocated for test: 150 minutes).

Comparing Ms Sakeeb's time to complete the clinical test with times taken by candidates globally, it was considered very unlikely by the NMC that Ms Sakeeb could have achieved a pass in the test within the times it took her to complete it. Taking into account the time in which Ms Sakeeb's 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 Ms Sakeeb CBT result was obtained fraudulently.

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

- Ms Sakeeb's completed application;
- Assistant Registrar's letter dated to Ms Sakeeb dated 5 December 2023

- Expert reports by Witness 5 Head of Data Analytics at OAC;
- Witness 5's evaluation of Ms Sakeeb's CBT times (Numeracy time: 3.33 minutes and Clinical time: 12.97 minutes)
- Witness statement of Witness 4, Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE;
- Witness statements of Witness 1 and Witness 2;
- Witness statement of Witness 6, Executive Director of Professional Practice at the NMC;

On 5 December 2023, Ms Sakeeb was informed that the Assistant Registrar had refused Ms Sakeeb application onto the register.

Ms Sakeeb appealed the decision on 29 December 2023, 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.
- Witness 3: The Deputy Director for Business Transformation and a member of the Executive Team for Professional Regulation.

- Witness 4: Director of Information Security and Security Services at Pearson VUE.

- Witness 5: An independent Data Analyst who provided the NMC with an analysis of the data provided by Pearson VUE.

- Witness 6: Employed by the NMC as the Executive Director of Professional Practice.

- Witness 7: Senior Nursing Education Adviser and member of the Executive Team in the Professional Practice Directorate at the NMC.

The panel drew no adverse inference from the non-attendance of Ms Sakeeb.

Submissions

Ms Khan 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 Khan referred the panel to Witness 5's analysis of Ms Sakeeb's test times and submitted that Ms Sakeeb's times were exceptionally fast. Ms Khan highlighted that Ms Sakeeb's 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 Ms Sakeeb completed the CBT without the assistance of a proficient proxy test-taker.

Ms Khan submitted that it had been demonstrated beyond doubt that the concern around fast test times was not related to any issues with the Pearson VUE software. She submitted that Witness 4 confirmed that there were no identified power outages at Yunnik during any individual test sittings which may have accounted for the timing concerns.

Ms Khan referred to the histograms within Witness 4's evidence and outlined that the statistical anomalies of the test times of Yunnik as opposed to globally, reinforce suspicions of non-standard behaviour. She submitted that this is evidence of proxies.

Ms Khan submitted that fraudulent human behaviour was responsible for the quick test times at Yunnik. She 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 Witness 5'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 Khan referred the panel to Witness 6's supplementary statement which identified 33 other logged admissions.

Ms Khan drew the panel's attention to the same day evidence in that there were four other candidates who sat their tests in a similarly fast time to Ms Sakeeb. She submitted that whilst it is unlikely that one person would ever achieve such fast times, it is even more unlikely that five 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 95-minute period. Ms Khan referred to a witness statement from a candidate who sat their test at 10:46am on the same day as Ms Sakeeb, 3 December 2022, who admitted to the use of a proxy.

Ms Khan 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 Witness 5's independent statement and Witness 6's statement.

Ms Khan submitted that nothing outweighed the compelling evidence that Ms Sakeeb obtained her CBT result through fraud. 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 Khan submitted that the NMC's duty is to the public, and they must ensure that only those who meet the character, competence and integrity standards are allowed to join the register.

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

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

In response to panel questions, Ms Khan addressed the 11 grounds of appeal as stated by Ms Sakeeb's former representative, Dr Akinoshun. The summarised grounds are:

1. The Assistant Registrar does not appear to have added weight to the earlier submissions made to them. The decision must be logical and based on proof not speculation or suspicion.
2. The Assistant Registrar has not been able to clarify whether the proxy testers were artificial intelligence or human. If a proxy tester was a human, then why could people who had prepared and read for the test undertaken pass within a short time.
3. The Assistant Registrar did not take into account that the questions were computer generated and not possible to anticipate the answer, in that case how could there be imaginary proxy testers?
4. The Assistant Registrar has not been fair to the applicant as some applicants have been allowed to retake their CBT so they could demonstrate they can practise safely. Consequently, passing these tests indicate they have the knowledge and skills required to practise safely.

5. The allegation of fraud in civil matters is serious due to the impact on person's life and reputational damage especially when there is no direct evidence against the individual, the Assistant Registrar needs to consider this.
6. The exact computers that had been used at Yunnik were not scrutinised by the investigators for any malfunction.
7. The probability analysis of the speed in which candidates could have taken their CBT undermines the evidence relied on by the NMC.
8. The Assistant Registrar has not particularised her case against Ms Sakeeb and does not take into account the time spent to review and correct the answers. This should have been part of the time spent undertaken for the CBT. The investigator has identified at least one case that was classified as an outlier with an item time of 18 minutes but the candidates spent an additional 46 minutes reviewing and potentially correcting answers. This is typical to other outlier cases and consistent with a valid exam technique.
9. The panel needs to look at the lack of concrete evidence directly linking the applicant to fraudulent activities.
10. Ms Sakeeb denies any involvement or knowledge of fraudulent activity and has demonstrated a commitment to professional integrity throughout her nursing career.
11. The Assistant Registrar is asked to review their earlier decisions and the grounds of appeal to satisfy her that Ms Sakeeb is capable of safe and effective practise to avoid further reputational damage.

Ms Khan outlined that these grounds of appeals are quite generalised and provided by Dr Akinosuhun to a number of his clients whom he represents at these NMC appeal hearings:

1. Ms Khan submitted that the evidence before the panel is not speculation; there is Pearson VUE forensic audit, the admissions from numerous individuals who recount their use of proxy test takers and independent expert analysis.
2. Ms Khan submitted that, in reference to the 33 admissions, the evidence indicates the fraud took place through human proxy and not through computerised proxy. She submitted that if artificial intelligence (AI) were involved, all answers would have been correct.

3. Ms Khan submitted that in the evidence collected from 2019 to 2023, when questions are generated for the CBT, 150 of them are sourced from a 'pool' of 1000 questions. She submitted that over time, the more times a proxy sat the test, the more they would become proficient at sitting these tests.
4. Ms Khan clarified that the option to resit their CBT was not enforced or mandatory and each appellant was entitled to rely on those resit times if they wanted to. This was recommended with the intended benefit to allow appellants to show that they are in fact fast test takers. The resit scores are not doubted. However, this does not negate that at Yunnik, fraudulent activity could still have taken place.
5. Ms Khan submitted that the Assistant Registrar did consider the impact on Ms Sakeeb's personal life and possible reputational damage, hence the Assistant Registrar allowed Ms Sakeeb the opportunity to appeal their decision.
6. Ms Khan submitted that Pearson Vue undertook extensive technological tests to ensure that they were no technological faults at Yunnik.
7. Ms Khan submitted that Ms Sakeeb's test times sit within a cohort that statistically produced abnormally fast results.
8. Ms Khan submitted that before the panel are Pearson Vue times (total test time) and the evaluated times provided by Witness 5.
9. Ms Khan reminded the panel that the civil burden of proof in this case is for the NMC to prove on the balance of probabilities that Ms Sakeeb's CBT was procured with the assistance of a proxy at Yunnik.
10. Ms Khan submitted that there is no evidential basis provided by Ms Sakeeb to prove that she has upheld ethical standards.

11. Ms Khan submitted that the NMC has provided ample opportunity for Ms Sakeeb to attend today's hearing or at least provide documentary evidence, as well as the previous hearing which was adjourned in November 2025.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

Panel's decision

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 Ms Sakeeb took to complete her CBT. The panel found the evidence before it to be cogent and credible.

The panel had sight of the Pearson VUE data from Witness 4 and the independent expert analysis provided by Witness 5, 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 had sight of statements and analysis provided by Witness 4. It had sight of Witness 5's data analysis, including diagrams which evidence the times taken globally, including other test centres in Nigeria, to complete CBT, compared to the times achieved at the Yunnik centre. The panel considered that Witness 4's findings were corroborated by Witness 5's independent research which outlined the stark difference in the test times taken at Yunnik as opposed to globally. The panel also considered that Witness 4 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 Witness 4 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 noted the 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 Witness 5, confirming statistically significant discrepancies between CBTs taken in Nigeria (excluding Yunnik) and globally.

The panel also noted the evidence of Witness 4 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 Ms Sakeeb took her test, provide contextual evidence that proxy activity was taking place at the Yunnik test centre and during the period in question. Again, the panel considered that these do not provide direct evidence of the day Ms Sakeeb took her test at Yunnik but provide further contextual evidence to support the proposition of fraudulent activity at Yunnik. The panel also referred to Witness 6's statement that there were over 30 other logged admissions of their experience of fraudulent activities and use of human proxies at the Yunnik test centre. The panel did note that one of these admissions were from a candidate who sat their test shortly after Ms Sakeeb at 10:46am at Yunnik.

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 referred to the 11 grounds of appeal and came to its own conclusion on each point:

1. The panel determined that the evidence before it is not based on speculation or suspicion and is supported by independent analysis. The panel noted that the Assistant Registrar letter that she did not have any further documents from Ms Sakeeb as of 9 November 2023.

2. The panel had sight of the 33 logged admissions, most of which refer to human proxy test takers and no reference to any computerised proxy. Furthermore, there was nothing before the panel to suggest that Ms Sakeeb could complete exams in exceptional times with exceptional results.
3. The panel referred to the recorded times from 2019 to 2023 which is consistent with proxy test takers becoming more proficient over time achieving faster times throughout that period.
4. The panel noted that Ms Sakeeb did not provide any information in regard to a resit and as such did not draw any adverse inference from this. The panel determined that the Assistant Registrar had been equally fair to all candidates who sat their CBT in the identified time period.
5. The panel determined that the Assistant Registrar did not 'single out' any candidate but was provided within an objective threshold with which to investigate any potentially fraudulent activity with their CBT result. Ms Sakeeb's CBT result at Yunnik fell within this threshold and as such was investigated.
6. The panel referred to Witness 4's statement which confirmed that there were no technological faults with the equipment or power outage at Yunnik at the time of Ms Sakeeb's test.
7. The panel determined that the analytics in relation to the Yunnik centre outlined that it was an outlier not only due to speed, but also due to the number of tests passed at the site in comparison to other Nigerian test centres and the rest of the world.
8. The panel had before it both the 'raw' times from Witness 4 but also the evaluated times from Witness 5 which still confirmed that Ms Sakeeb's CBT time was suspicious.
9. The panel referred to the logged admission of the candidate who sat their test shortly after Ms Sakeeb.

10. Prior to the Assistant Registrar opening their investigation against Ms Sakeeb there was no evidence of any previous concerns. The panel have approached this case on the basis that Ms Sakeeb is of good character.
11. The panel approached Ms Sakeeb's case on its own merit with care and independence, recognising the potential impact of stress, cultural factors, and the need to distinguish credibility from reliability.

The panel next considered whether it is more likely than not that Ms Sakeeb obtained her CBT result at Yunnik fraudulently.

The panel had sight of the analysis provided by Witness 5 and Witness 4's 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 Witness 5's analysis of Ms Sakeeb's specific data, which provided the following odds of how achievable her test times were:

'Evaluated Clinical Timing: 12.97 minutes: Odds 1 in 56478.0.

'Evaluated Numeracy Timing: 3.33 minutes: Odds 1 in 58,123.0'.

The panel noted that there were four other candidates who took the test at Yunnik on the same day as Ms Sakeeb and during the same time period that was in close proximity to her test. The panel noted that all four other candidates were also flagged as suspicious and all within a 95-minute window of each other. The panel concluded the probability of five exceptional and fast test takers being present in the same centre and on the same day, within 95 minutes of each other, is highly improbable and a strong indication of fraudulent activity and in all likelihood a proxy being in use at the centre at the time and date Ms Sakeeb took her test. Ms Sakeeb did not provide today's panel with any account of the extremely rapid exam times she achieved.

In view of the panel's decision that there was widespread fraud occurring at Yunnik, the panel found that due to the exceptionally quick time in which Ms Sakeeb achieved both of her CBT results, this made Ms Sakeeb one of the fastest candidates globally, it was highly unlikely that she could have achieved this without the assistance of a proxy. When looking

at the comparison between Ms Sakeeb times and those of the global candidate population, from a test centre where there was widespread fraud, a recorded admission of proxy usage from a candidate who sat their CBT directly after Ms Sakeeb, the panel considered that the only plausible explanation for Ms Sakeeb achieving her passes in the times that she did, was that she either used a proxy or had the assistance of a proxy.

The panel was satisfied that there is cogent evidence in relation to exceptionally fast completion times, and the same day evidence at the Yunnik centre on that day, that Ms Sakeeb had completed the test with the assistance of a proxy. The panel therefore determined that it was more likely than not that Ms Sakeeb obtained her CBT result fraudulently.

The panel went on to determine whether Ms Sakeeb 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 Ms Sakeeb to satisfy it that she meets the character requirements for successful admission on the register.

The panel had determined on the balance of probabilities that Ms Sakeeb had tried to gain entry to the NMC register by means of fraud. This is not 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 therefore concluded that, in all the circumstances of Ms Sakeeb's case, she was not able to demonstrate that she met the character requirement for NMC registration.

The panel therefore decided to dismiss Ms Sakeeb's appeal and to uphold the decision of the Assistant Registrar, thereby refusing her application to the NMC register.

Ms Sakeeb has the right to appeal this decision. If Ms Sakeeb appeals the decision, she must submit her appeal to the County Court within 21 days of this decision.

This will be confirmed to Ms Sakeeb in writing.

That concludes this determination.