

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Fitness to Practise Committee**

**Restoration Hearing
Thursday, 9 July 2026 and Wednesday, 2 September 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Applicant:	Sandra Kudenga
NMC PIN:	09C0103E
Part(s) of the register:	Registered Nurse – Adult – 20 May 2011
Relevant Location:	Sunderland
Panel members:	Nicholas Rosenfeld (Chair, lay member) Janet Williams (Registrant member) Roseann Kane (Lay member)
Legal Assessor:	Alain Gogarty
Hearings Coordinator:	Adaobi Ibuaka
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Jerome Burch, Case Presenter 9 July 2026, Represented by Teri Howell, Case Presenter 2 September 2026
Ms Kudenga:	Present and represented by Mark Walker, (Whatrights)
Outcome	Application granted

Determination of application for Restoration to the Register:

This is a hearing of your second application for restoration to the Nursing and Midwifery Council ("NMC") Register. A panel of the Fitness to Practise Committee directed on 3 *August 2018* that your name be removed from the register based on its findings with regard to the facts of your case and your impairment. This application is made by you in accordance with Article 33 of the Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001 ("the Order"), as at least five years have now elapsed since the date of the striking-off order.

On 17 April 2024 you made an unsuccessful application for restoration.

At this hearing the panel may reject your application or it may grant your application unconditionally. It may grant your application subject to your satisfying the requirements of Article 19(3) and it may grant your application and impose a conditions of practice order.

The panel has considered your application for restoration to the Council's Register.

Background

The background as set out at the substantive hearing is as follows:

'At the time of the allegations, you were employed as a registered nurse at City Hospitals Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust (the Trust) at Sunderland Royal City Hospital.

On transfer to Ward F61 of the Hospital, you requested study leave on the Wednesday of each week between January and September 2014 to allow you to attend university.

Ward Sister, Colleague A, had not previously been made aware of your study leave requirements and looked into the leave that was being taken by you.

It is alleged that:

1. *Whilst you initially advised Colleague A on two occasions that you were at university on both the Tuesday and Wednesday of each week, you later stated that this was not the case and you had actually requested to not work a Tuesday nightshift to allow you to attend university the next day.*
2. *Between January 2014 and August 2014, the two university courses you were attending officially only amounted to 8 days of directed study.*
3. *You had stated the time you were taking off was time-owing and had been agreed by Ward Sister Colleague B, your substantive manager on Ward F62. Colleague B detailed that this was not the case and you were not due any time-owing.*
4. *Colleague B offered information that whilst undertaking a course in November 2013, you had been found to have taken excessive study leave. Colleague B said this was managed informally and you made up the relevant number of hours. It was not said that this was dishonest but was background information as to your knowledge.*
5. *The university courses you were attending did not take place every week or during a summer term break. You continued to take study leave.*
6. *Whilst the Trust was conducting an investigation into the amount of study leave being taken by you, it came to light that you were undertaking secondary employment via ProHealth24.*
7. *You had not declared this secondary employer as per Trust policy and it was found that you had undertaken agency work whilst you were on sick/annual leave and study leave from your substantive position.'*

The panel at the substantive hearing 30 July 2018, considered the following charges:

That you, a registered nurse, whilst working as a Band 5 Staff Nurse at Sunderland Royal City Hospital ("the Hospital"):

1. Applied for study leave on one or more of the dates listed in Schedule 1 when you were not entitled to it.
2. Your actions at charge 1 were dishonest in that you knew that one or more of the dates applied for were not required for University.
3. Did not inform the Hospital that you had secondary employment with ProHealth agency.
4. Informed Colleague A that you attended University on two days per week when this was not the case:
 - a. On 16 July 2014;
 - b. On 25 July 2014.
5. Your actions at charge 4 were dishonest in that you were intending to create a false impression that you needed more time off than you were entitled to.
6. Stated to Colleague A on 20 August 2014 that you had time owing and/or Colleague B had agreed for you to use that time for study leave when this was not the case.
7. Were dishonest at charge 6 in that you knew you did not have time owing and/or were intending to conceal the fact you were taking more study leave than permitted.
8. Worked for ProHealth agency whilst on sick leave from the Hospital on:
 - a. 24 March 2014
 - b. 1 April 2014
 - c. 2 April 2014
 - d. 4 April 2014

e. 15 April 2014

9. Worked for ProHealth agency having requested study leave from the Hospital on:

a. 12 March 2014

b. 2 April 2014

c. 9 April 2014

10. Were dishonest at charges 8 and/or 9 in that you knew you should not be doing agency work whilst on sick/study leave from the Hospital.

AND, in light of the above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

Schedule 1

- 12 Feb 2014
- 19 Feb 2014
- 12 March 2014
- 19 March 2014
- 26 March 2014
- 2 April 2014
- 9 April 2014
- 16 April 2014
- 23 April 2014
- 30 April 2014
- 25 June 2014
- 9 July 2014
- 23 July 2014
- 30 July 2014
- 6 August 2014
- 13 August 2014
- 20 August 2014

- 27 August 2014
- 10 September 2014

You attended the substantive hearing on 30 July 2018, and you made admissions to charge 10 in relation to charge 9(a). The substantive panel found charges 1 (to some dates of schedule 1), 2, 3, 4(a), 4(b), 5, 6, 7, 8(e), 9(b), 9(c) and 10 proved.

The substantive hearing panel, determined the following with regard to impairment:

‘The panel had regard to whether your misconduct is easily remediable, whether it had been remedied and whether it is likely to be repeated. The panel bore in mind that dishonesty may be attitudinal in nature and, accordingly, difficult to remediate.

The panel recognised that you have engaged with the NMC. You have apologised and demonstrated remorse for your actions. You are currently employed as a registered nurse through a nursing agency. The panel was provided with two testimonials which were of limited help. One referred to your practice when you were a student nurse between 2009 and 2011. Neither commented on your honesty or integrity and it was not clear how aware the referees were of the full nature of your NMC referral.

The panel acknowledged that English is not your first language. Nevertheless, the panel could not be satisfied that you genuinely understood the particular need for honesty and integrity on the part of a registered nurse. The panel was concerned about the lack of evidence that you have full insight into your acts of dishonesty. You have not demonstrated a full understanding of the potential effects of your conduct on colleagues, the reputation and standing of the nursing profession and the public.

In the absence of full insight into your misconduct the panel was unable to dismiss concerns that you might repeat such, or similar, misconduct in the future.

The panel concluded that there remained a risk of you acting dishonestly in the future.

The panel has also found that your behaviour had undermined public trust and confidence in the profession.

For all these reasons, the panel determined that the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be further undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the circumstances. Accordingly, the panel determined that your current fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct on both public protection and public interest grounds.'

The substantive panel went on to determine the following with regard to sanction:

'The panel identified the following as the primary mitigating factors:

- 1. The panel was satisfied that none your actions was driven by an intention to put patients at risk of harm and indeed there was no evidence of any patient harm;*
- 2. There are no concerns raised regarding your clinical ability;*
- 3. There is no evidence of any further dishonesty subsequent to the incidents in 2014;*
- 4. You have participated throughout the regulatory process including attendance at the hearing;*
- 5. You have made some admissions and accepted the panel's findings;*
- 6. A positive reference from the agency you are currently working for regarding your clinical practice.*

The panel identified the following as the primary aggravating factors:

- 1. The misconduct involved repeated dishonesty and cover ups over several months;*

2. *You had opportunities, prior to and during the incidents, to recognise your dishonesty and rectify it;*
3. *You had previously been informed of the correct procedure for requesting study leave;*
4. *You breached the trust of your employer;*
5. *Your dishonesty was for personal and financial gain;*
6. *Lack of sufficient insight into your dishonesty.*

The panel first considered whether to take no action. It concluded that this would be wholly inappropriate because the misconduct in this case was far too serious to justify such a course. It concluded that the public interest, in terms of confidence in the nursing profession and the NMC as regulator, would not be satisfied by such an outcome.

The panel next considered whether to make a caution order. The panel bore in mind that the misconduct in this case was not at the lower end of the spectrum of impaired fitness to practise. Your dishonesty was repeated and sustained over several months. A caution order would not address the issues of public protection identified in this case. The panel also concluded that a caution order would not be sufficient to satisfy the wider public interest, in declaring and upholding the standards of the profession.

The panel considered the imposition of a conditions of practice order. It reminded itself of the factors which indicate when such an order may be appropriate. The panel was mindful that the misconduct in this case did not relate to, and has not affected, the standard of your clinical practice.

In weighing all of the information before it, the panel concluded that it could not formulate workable conditions of practice. These would normally be designed to address failings in clinical practice and were therefore not appropriate in this case and could not address your dishonest conduct. Further the panel determined that the wider public interest would not be satisfied by the imposition of a conditions of practice order.

The panel next considered whether a suspension order would be an appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case. The panel took into account the need to maintain public confidence in the profession, the NMC as regulator and also to uphold proper standards. The panel had regard to the impact that such an order would have upon you, and balanced your interests against the wider public interest.

Your dishonesty amounted to a significant breach of trust with your employer and colleagues and it was motivated, at least in part, by personal gain. The panel has found that such behaviour clearly represented significant professional failings for a registered nurse.

The panel did not lose sight of the fact that your dishonesty did not simply relate to a single instance and that there was opportunity for you to recognise and rectify your actions. The panel was aware of the importance of honesty and integrity within the nursing profession. It was concerned about the limited level of insight you have displayed in relation to the effect your misconduct had had upon others, as well as about its implications for the wider reputation of the profession. Your misconduct occurred four years ago and in the time that has passed you have not demonstrated any significant insight into your failings. The panel noted that, prior to the incidents which led to your referral, you had a previous incident with Colleague B regarding taking study leave in excess of the course attendance allowance, where you were advised it was inappropriate and you repaid the hours. However, you proceeded to act dishonestly. In assessing the evidence you gave at the hearing the panel had concerns with your credibility and honesty. The panel determined that your repeated dishonesty and lack of insight indicated a deep seated attitudinal issue.

These factors led the panel to conclude that, whilst a suspension order would protect the public for its duration, it would not sufficiently address the wider public interest of maintaining confidence in the profession and upholding proper standards of conduct. The panel considered a striking-off order. The panel had regard to the sanction guidance which made it clear that a striking-off order did not represent a default

position in cases of dishonesty. Nonetheless your dishonesty was serious and repeated. The panel has also found a lack of insight and the risk of repetition.

Your misconduct was therefore fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the nursing register. As such, a striking-off order was the only order available to the panel sufficient to protect the public and meet the wider public interest in this case.

The panel had regard to the financial impact a striking off order would have upon you. However, the panel concluded that the public interest in this matter outweighed your own interests.

The panel therefore determined to impose a striking-off order so as to maintain public confidence in the nursing and midwifery profession and the NMC as its regulator, and to declare that such dishonest behaviour is unacceptable on the part of nurses under any circumstances.'

Submissions and evidence

The panel took into account the documentary evidence, which included the contents of the application for restoration which you submitted to the NMC, four written references, your updated reflective statement, diploma certificates and training certificates.

The panel had regard to the submissions of Mr Burch, on behalf of the NMC, and those made by your representative Mr Walker. You also gave oral evidence.

Mr Burch, on behalf of the *NMC*, outlined the background of the case and the facts that led to the striking-off order. He referred this panel to the previous panel's decision which resulted in your removal from the NMC's register. Mr Burch referred the panel to the test set out in Article 33(5) of the Order.

You provided evidence under oath.

During your evidence you outlined to the panel the details about your current role as a live in carer and how you assist your client in her day-to-day life. You submitted that you had started this role in 2022, through an agency called Access Care.

You told the panel that you had been awarded a certificate of loyalty and have been successful in your re-registration as a carer.

You told the panel that you had the responsibility of managing the finances for your client's day to day life and would ensure all invoices and receipts were documented in a book, to show your client's lawyer George Stevenson (Mr Stevenson), how the finances were being spent and when. You explained that you kept two books, with the second book being for expenses related to her gardener, as this was your responsibility. You told the panel that you look after your client on your own, and that you are responsible for not only her well-being, but also her finances, which you do to the best of your ability.

You told the panel that during your interview with Access Care you were open and honest about why you had been struck-off the register as a nurse, and told them about your dishonesty. You stated that you had learned from your mistakes and want to be as transparent as possible. You told the panel that you told Access Care that you took full accountability for your actions and that everything that had happened which resulted to your removal, was your fault.

You stated you have looked after multiple vulnerable clients and have been honest and open with each of them and provided full details of why you had been struck off from the Register.

You referred the panel to the training you had completed and provided supporting certificates, including blood component transfusion training and medication awareness. You explained that you undertook this training because the care agencies for which you work are expanding and increasingly supporting clients with complex needs. In particular, some clients require assistance when attending hospital for blood transfusions, including support in understanding what is happening during their

treatment. You also confirmed that you had completed refresher training in catheter care, together with other mandatory training..

You told the panel that, as you intend to return to nursing, you have been reading articles published by the Royal College of Nursing (RCN) to remain up to date with developments in both the healthcare sector and the nursing profession. You also explained that you had joined a UK nurses' group, which provides information about continuing professional development (CPD) courses and where they are being held. You provided the panel with a written reflection on titled '*Property and Ethics, lessons Learned and My Commitment to Fitness to Practice*' where you detail the training you have undertaken and what you understood/took away from it.

You told the panel that you had reflected deeply on your actions and accepted full responsibility for the dishonesty. You explained that this experience had reinforced the importance of transparency and that you would not again let down your colleagues or employers. You further stated that personal accountability requires a nurse to place integrity at the centre of patient and client care. You recognised that the public is entitled to expect honesty from nurses and referred to the NMC Code, which makes clear that nurses are accountable for their own actions and have a duty of care towards those they support.

You told the panel that your dishonesty put the public at risk and for this you were truly sorry, particularly for the damage your dishonesty may have caused to patients, colleagues, the nursing profession and the NMC as its regulator.

During cross examination, you told the panel that if you were faced with the same situation now, you would have to inform your manager and let them know about the circumstances you are in. You told the panel that this allows your employers to be able to assist you in any way they can and you would maintain open and honest communication with them. You stated that transparency and honesty are the key to everything and when you are transparent there will always be a way of resolving issues.

The panel heard evidence under oath from Dr Ronnie Chikwama (Dr Chikwama). Dr Chikwama submitted that you had been a member of his church for a long time and have never given him any reason to not trust you. He submitted that you were leading a women's group in church where you encourage and give advice to attendees based on your experiences, so that others can learn from your mistakes.

Dr Chikwama said that you had told him everything about the concerns that led to you being struck off and he was satisfied that you understood the impact and potential damage your conduct and dishonesty caused.

The panel had regard to Mr Stevenson's written statement.

In his closing remarks, Mr Burch referred the panel to your training course, references, witnesses' evidence and your evidence.

Mr Burch submitted that in regards to your restoration application, it is a matter for the panel. He submitted that the panel will have to weigh up all the evidence, and decide whether you have demonstrated that you are capable of safe and effective practice, and whether you are a fit and proper person to be restored to the Register.

Mr Walker referred the panel to the NMC Fitness to Practice Guidance on restoration APP-2a, and invited the panel to grant your application, subject to you satisfying the NMC's return to practise standards.

Mr Walker submitted that since your removal from the Register, you have made efforts to keep up to date with your professional practice by undertaking training related to the concerns. He submitted that matters involving dishonesty are more difficult to remediate however, not impossible, and since being struck off you have worked in close proximity to vulnerable people for several years. Mr Walker further submitted that in your current role, trust and confidence is paramount as you are working in client's homes with access to their personal belongings and their money.

Mr Walker then addressed the previous restoration panel's concerns in regards to your remediation and whether you were fully transparent about why you had been struck off with your employers. He submitted that you have continued to work as a live in carer since the first restoration hearing, and the panel has before them the written witness statement of Mr Stevenson, who was your client's lawyer. Mr Stevenson in his written statement stated that he is fully aware of your situation and that you have continued to act in an open and transparent way.

Mr Walker referred the panel to the oral and written evidence of Dr Chikwama who was highly supportive of you and stated that he has never been given cause to doubt your honesty. Mr Walker submitted that the panel have had the opportunity to test your evidence along with the witnesses' evidence (albeit Mr Stevenson was not able to attend). He further submitted that the panel also have evidence of the blood transfusion and medication awareness e-learning training, which you attended virtually and the probity and ethics course you completed over a period of 2 days.

Mr Walker submitted that taking all the above into account, it is clear that you have fully developed your insight into your failings and you understood that honesty, transparency and integrity are paramount as a nurse and that your previous actions went completely against this. He further submitted that the matters found proved that led to your strike off are unlikely to be repeated and public confidence in the profession would not be undermined if the panel were to restore you to the Register.

Therefore, Mr Walker invited the panel to conclude that you are a fit and proper person, capable of safe and effective practice, and should direct that you be returned to the Register accordingly.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor.

The legal assessor referred the panel to the case of *General Medical Council v Chandra* [2018] EWCA CIV 1898 and the NMC Fitness to Practice Guidance on restoration, namely APP-2a and APP-2b. The legal assessor also referred to the panel to the test provided in Article 33(5) of the Order. Firstly, you must satisfy the panel that you satisfy the requirements of Article 9(2)(a) (approved qualification and prescribed education,

training and experience) and Article 9(2)(b) (capable of safe practice). Secondly, you must satisfy the panel whether, having regard in particular to the circumstances which led to the making of the striking-off order in 3 August 2018, you are a “fit and proper person to practise as a registered nurse”. The legal assessor advised the panel that it is for you to satisfy the panel of these matters and it is for the panel to use its own independent judgment as to whether it is so satisfied.

Decision on the application for restoration

The panel approached your application for restoration to the NMC register with care and caution. It has decided to allow the application subject to your successful completion of a return to practice course.

In reaching its decision the panel recognised its statutory duty to protect the public as well as maintain public confidence in the reputation of the profession, which includes the declaring and upholding of proper professional standards. The panel bore in mind that the burden was upon you to satisfy it that you are a fit and proper person who is able to practise safely and effectively as a nurse.

Decision on the application for restoration:

The panel had regard to all the evidence before it. In accordance with the relevant NMC restoration guidance, APP-2a, it considered whether you had demonstrated sufficient insight into, and addressed, the concerns which led to the striking-off order; the time since you were struck off and the previous restoration application; your employment history since removal from the Register; the steps taken to keep your professional practice up to date; whether you would be capable of safe and effective practice in the future; and whether public confidence in the profession would be undermined by your restoration.

The panel reminded itself that a restoration hearing is not an opportunity to revisit the findings made by the substantive panel or to reassess the appropriateness of the original striking-off order. Its task was to determine whether, having particular regard to

the circumstances that led to your removal from the Register, you had satisfied the panel that you were now a fit and proper person to practise as a registered nurse. The panel also bore in mind its overarching objective of protecting the public and promoting and maintaining public confidence in the nursing profession and proper professional standards. The burden was upon you to satisfy the panel that you were capable of safe and effective practice and that you were a fit and proper person to return to the Register.

Insight and remediation:

The panel first considered the extent to which you had addressed the concerns that led to the striking-off order. Those concerns arose from sustained and repeated dishonesty over a number of months, including the improper use of study leave, misleading statements to colleagues, failure to declare secondary employment, and agency work undertaken during periods of sick leave and study leave. The substantive panel had found that the misconduct involved a serious breach of trust, was motivated in part by personal and financial gain, and demonstrated insufficient insight at that time.

The panel initially had some concerns about your written reflective statement. In particular, it noted that the statement focused substantially on the courses you had undertaken and what you had learned from them, rather than fully addressing the underlying dishonesty and its wider consequences. However, the panel considered that your oral evidence addressed those concerns.

In your oral evidence, you accepted full responsibility for your past dishonesty. You did not seek to minimise, excuse or deflect responsibility for your actions. You acknowledged that your conduct had affected your employer and colleagues, had the potential to affect patients and the public, and had damaged the reputation of the nursing profession and the NMC as its regulator. You recognised that honesty, integrity and transparency are fundamental requirements of professional nursing practice.

The panel found it particularly relevant that you were able to explain what you would do differently if faced with similar personal or professional pressures in the future. You

stated that you would speak openly to your manager, explain the circumstances affecting you, and seek appropriate support. The panel accepted your evidence that open and honest communication with an employer is essential, both to enable appropriate support to be offered and to ensure that concerns can be resolved safely and transparently.

The panel considered that this demonstrated a developed understanding not merely that dishonesty is unacceptable, but why it is incompatible with the trust placed in registered nurses. The panel was satisfied that you understood the importance of personal accountability, the requirement to act with integrity, and the public's entitlement to expect honesty from those entrusted with the care of patients and service users.

The panel also considered the evidence of Dr Ronnie Chikwama. It found him to be a credible and reliable witness. Dr Chikwama described your openness about the circumstances of your removal from the Register and his view that you had developed a genuine understanding of the potential impact and damage caused by your conduct. The panel also took account of the written evidence from your former manager at a care agency, who described you as remorseful, accountable and proactive in seeking to improve your professional capability.

The panel attached weight to this evidence because it supported, rather than merely repeated, your own account of the development of your insight. It was satisfied that you had demonstrated genuine remorse, accepted responsibility for the dishonesty, and developed sufficient insight into the seriousness of the concerns that had led to the striking-off order.

Employment and risk of repetition:

The panel next considered the period since you were struck off, your previous restoration application, and your employment history since removal from the Register. The panel noted that the misconduct occurred in 2014 and that you were struck off on 3 August 2018. It also noted that your first application for restoration, made in April 2024, was unsuccessful. The panel treated the previous unsuccessful application as relevant

background, but considered the present application on the basis of all the evidence now available.

Since your removal from the Register, you have worked in a caring capacity, including as a live-in carer from 2022. The panel noted that this work involved caring for vulnerable clients in their homes and communities, often without direct day-to-day supervision. It considered that such work necessarily required reliability, honesty, sound judgment and respect for professional boundaries.

The panel attached particular weight to the evidence concerning your responsibility for a client's day-to-day financial expenditure. You explained that you maintained detailed records of expenditure and retained receipts for payments and purchases. The panel noted the evidence of Mr Stevenson, the client's solicitor, who described you as meticulous in your financial record-keeping and stated that you had been open with him about your removal from the Register. He confirmed that you provided receipts for expenditure and that he had complete confidence in your honesty in that respect.

The panel considered this evidence to be of significant assistance. It demonstrated that, over an extended period, you had worked in a position involving access to a vulnerable person's home, personal belongings and finances, without any allegation or indication of dishonesty. The panel also noted that you had received certificates of loyalty from Access Care and that there had been no reported concerns about your conduct, integrity or reliability during your work in the care sector.

The panel was satisfied that your subsequent employment history provided evidence of sustained, trustworthy conduct in circumstances where honesty and transparency were of particular importance. It concluded that there was no evidence of any repetition of dishonest conduct since the events that gave rise to the original proceedings.

Having considered the passage of time, your employment history, the evidence of those who had worked with or known you, and your developed insight, the panel was satisfied that the risk of repetition of the past misconduct was negligible. It concluded that you were unlikely to repeat the concerns that led to the striking-off order.

Maintaining professional competence:

The panel then considered the steps you had taken to keep your knowledge and professional practice up to date.

The panel took account of the training certificates you had provided, including blood component transfusion training, medication awareness training, catheter-care refresher training and other mandatory training relevant to your care work. It also considered your evidence that you had undertaken this training because the care agencies for which you work are supporting increasingly complex clients, including clients who require support when attending hospital for blood transfusions.

The panel also considered the ethics and probity training undertaken on 20 October 2021. It noted the possible discrepancy in the evidence concerning the duration of that course. However, having considered the detailed nature of your reflective statement, the panel did not consider that this issue undermined the reliability of your evidence or the value of the learning you had undertaken.

The panel further took account of your evidence that you had kept abreast of developments in healthcare and nursing through reading Royal College of Nursing publications and joining a UK nurses' group which provides information about available continuing professional development opportunities. It accepted that, although you have not practised as a registered nurse since September 2018, you had taken reasonable and relevant steps, within the limits of your current role, to maintain and develop your knowledge.

The panel was satisfied that you had done as much as reasonably possible to maintain your clinical knowledge while working outside registered nursing practice. It considered that your training, reading and ongoing care work provided an appropriate foundation from which to return to professional practice, subject to meeting the NMC's return-to-practice requirements.

Safe practice and public confidence:

The panel then considered whether you were capable of safe and effective practice as a nurse in the future and whether restoration would undermine public confidence in the nursing profession.

The panel noted that the original misconduct did not arise from deficiencies in your clinical competence and that there had been no concerns about your clinical ability. It also noted that the substantive panel had found no evidence that patients had suffered harm. Nevertheless, the panel recognised that the dishonesty was serious, repeated and directly engaged the fundamental professional obligations of honesty, and trustworthiness.

The panel was satisfied that you had now addressed the central concerns arising from the original misconduct. It found that you had developed full insight; accepted responsibility without minimisation; demonstrated a sustained period of honest conduct in positions of trust; provided credible evidence of transparency concerning your regulatory history; and taken relevant steps to keep your professional knowledge and skills up to date.

The panel concluded that you were capable of safe and effective practice, subject to completion of the appropriate return-to-practice requirements. It was also satisfied that, when the totality of the evidence was considered, an informed member of the public would not conclude that public confidence in the profession would be undermined by your restoration to the Register.

On the contrary, the panel considered that restoration in these circumstances would be consistent with the public interest. It would recognise that dishonesty is not excused, while also recognising that a practitioner who has demonstrated genuine insight, sustained remediation, trustworthy conduct over time and an ability to practise safely may, in an appropriate case, be restored to the Register. The panel was satisfied that you were now a fit and proper person to practise as a registered nurse.

Outcome:

The panel therefore decided to grant your application for restoration, subject to your satisfying the NMC's return-to-practice requirements and payment of the prescribed fee.

The panel noted that you have not practised as a registered nurse since 4 September 2018 and therefore do not presently meet the relevant registration requirements by reason of the length of time since you last practised. It is therefore necessary for you to complete the additional education, training and experience required by the NMC's return-to-practice standards before your registration can become effective.

The panel direct that, in accordance with NMC guidance APP-2b, that before you are restored to the Register, you must successfully complete an approved Return to Practice programme or otherwise satisfy the applicable NMC return-to-practice requirements. This is not a condition of practice order. It is a requirement that must be met before you may re-join the Register, reflecting the period for which you have been out of registered nursing practice.

The panel did not consider that a condition of practice order was necessary. It was satisfied that you had remediated the concerns that led to the striking-off order and that there was no remaining risk arising from those concerns that required management by conditions. The panel also considered that the return-to-practice requirement would appropriately address the need for you to update and demonstrate your professional knowledge and competence before resuming registered nursing practice.

Accordingly, upon your successful completion of the required return-to-practice requirements and payment of the prescribed fee, the Registrar shall restore your name to the relevant part of the Register.

That concludes the determination.

This decision will be confirmed to you in writing.