

**Nursing and Midwifery Council
Investigating Committee**

**Fraudulent/Incorrect Entry Hearing
Monday, 3 August 2026
Resumed: Wednesday, 30 September 2026**

Virtual Hearing

Name of Registrant:	Rashidat Olufunmilayo Sonekan
NMC PIN:	01I4673E
Part(s) of the register:	Sub Part 1 – Registered Nurse - Adult
Relevant Location:	London
Type of case:	Incorrect/Fraudulent entry
Panel members:	Mahjabeen Agha (Chair, Lay member) Alison Fisher (Lay member) Yvonne Thomson (Registrant member)
Legal Assessor:	Angus McPherson (3 August 2026) Lizzy Acker (30 September 2026)
Hearings Coordinator:	Teige Gardner
Nursing and Midwifery Council:	Represented by Chengetai Mupara (3 August 2026) and Pamela Muniya (30 September 2026), Case Presenter
Mrs Sonekan:	Present and represented by Dr Abbey Akinoshun
Outcome:	Incorrectly made
Direction:	Remove from the register
Direction:	No interim order

Details of charge

That you:

1. On your Notification of Practice form dated 26 August 2010, you did not indicate that you had been convicted on 15 April 2009 at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offences:
 - a) Obtaining a money transfer by deception
 - b) Proceeds of Crime – money launder, convert criminal property
2. On your Notification of Practice form dated 3 September 2013, you did not indicate that you had been convicted on 15 April 2009 at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offences:
 - a) Obtaining a money transfer by deception
 - b) Proceeds of Crime – money launder, convert criminal property
3. On your online revalidation application dated 26 August 2016, you did not indicate that you had been convicted on 15 April 2009 at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offences:
 - a) Obtaining a money transfer by deception
 - b) Proceeds of Crime – money launder, convert criminal property
4. On your online revalidation application dated 27 August 2019, you did not indicate that you had been convicted on 15 April 2009 at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offences:
 - a) Obtaining a money transfer by deception
 - b) Proceeds of Crime – money launder, convert criminal property
5. On your online revalidation application dated 15 September 2022, you did not indicate that you had been convicted on 15 April 2009 at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offences:
 - a) Obtaining a money transfer by deception
 - b) Proceeds of Crime – money launder, convert criminal property

And thereby an entry on Sub Part 1 of the NMC register in the name of Mrs Rashidat Olufunmilayo Sonekan, PIN 01I4673E, was fraudulently procured and/or incorrectly made.

Background

The NMC received a referral on 15 February 2024 regarding you, a registered nurse working at King's College Hospital (the Trust). It is alleged that you failed to declare that you had been convicted for obtaining a money transfer by deception and proceeds of crime – money launder, covert criminal property on 15 April 2009 at Woolwich Crown Court on your revalidation application on five occasions, namely:

- 26 August 2010
- 3 September 2013
- 26 August 2016
- 27 August 2019
- 15 September 2022

It is alleged by the NMC that you fraudulently procured entry onto the NMC register.

Decision and reasons on the facts

At the outset of the hearing, the panel heard from Dr Akinoshun, who informed the panel that you made full admissions to charges. He informed the panel that you also admit to the charges being an incorrect entry, however you deny that you fraudulently procured entry onto the NMC register.

The panel therefore finds charges 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 proved in their entirety, by way of your admissions. The panel also accepted that your entries were incorrect. It went onto consider if your actions were also fraudulent.

Decision on Incorrect/Fraudulent Entry

In reaching its decision, the panel heard submissions from Mr Mupara, Dr Akinoshun and also your live evidence.

Mr Mupara provided a brief background to the case and submitted that you incorrectly and fraudulently procured your entry onto the NMC register. He submitted that the NMC is seeking your removal from the register. He submitted that you had a duty to declare this convictions before re-registering onto the NMC register, and you breached your duty of candour in not declaring it.

Mr Akinoshun invited you to give evidence under oath.

You told the panel about your employment history. You told the panel you believed that because your convictions had nothing to do with your clinical work or patient care you did not need to declare your convictions on your revalidation. You never meant to mislead the NMC and it was purely down to your lack of understanding surrounding declaring convictions and you are truly sorry for this. You told the panel that you disclosed the convictions to your employer because you had to do community service and needed time off. You explained what had happened, you said your husband got you to sign an agreement which you did not read and then you got in trouble. You told the panel that you had informed your employer in 2009 about your convictions in order to complete community service.

You told the panel you have learned your lesson from this experience. You told the panel that you love being a registered nurse and delivering care to patients. You told them that you understand the impact your actions may have on patients. You said these proceedings have had a big impact on you and you are really sorry for your actions. In the future you said you know now to ask more questions if you don't understand something. You have reread the NMC code of conduct and understand your responsibilities better now. You have reflected on your actions. You explained the importance of honesty and integrity within the nursing profession, especially when you are directly caring for patients. You understand you hold a position of trust and maintaining that trust is important. You told the panel that you would never repeat your actions.

In response to questions from Mr Mupara, you told the panel that during your nursing training you read the NMC code of conduct. You told the panel that the mortgage application was in your name and you signed the mortgage application. You told the panel

that your husband was charged and sentenced to prison for 10 to 12 years, however you did not provide evidence for this as you were not asked to. You told the panel that you pleaded guilty to the charges and it did not go to trial. You said that you pleaded guilty on the advice of your lawyer at the time. You said that you mentioned your convictions to your employer in 2009 in order to get time off work to complete your community service. You told the panel that you always mentioned your convictions to your managers whenever you revalidated and when you were promoted to a Band 6 nurse in 2018. You told the panel that you believed at the time of the letter in 2024, as you had a protected convictions, you did not need to disclose it to the NMC after 11 years. You said that you did not understand the process for declaring convictions as you had never been in this situation before.

You informed the panel that you had familiarised yourself with the NMC code of conduct regarding duty of candour for nurses. However, you said you did not understand that criminal convictions related to your personal life needed to be disclosed to the NMC when re-registering and revalidating. You said you are sorry and you would declare this in the future. Mr Mupara took you to your revalidation application from 28 August 2010, a year following your convictions, in which you did not check the box which asked about whether you had a convictions. You told the panel that you did not check the box because the case had closed as you had completed your community service and it was a personal matter the convictions related to. You said you asked the police if you should tell your work about your criminal convictions, and they said that it had nothing to do with your work as a registered nurse. Mr Mupara showed you the guidance provided by the NMC regarding filling out the form and declaring convictions. You told the panel that the guidance was clear, however you said you did not have a good understanding of whether you had to declare your convictions as it related to your personal life.

Mr Mupara took you to the guidance on whether all police charges, cautions or convictions need to be declared. You told the panel that you did not do this on purpose, you genuinely did not think you had to declare your convictions as they did not relate to your nursing practice. You told the panel that you understood the question asked in the revalidation application regarding checking the box for a police convictions. You said that, with your current understanding, that you should have disclosed your convictions and that with your current understanding, your answer was dishonest. Mr Mupara took you to all the

revalidation applications in which you did not declare your police convictions and asked the same questions, to which you responded the same answer.

Mr Akinoshun referred you to an email dated 14 January 2025, you said that you informed your manager in 2018 as you had been promoted to a Band 6 nurse. You told your former employer, Bromley South NHS Trust, in 2009 that you had received a convictions.

In response to questions from the panel, you said that you cannot remember if there was a DBS check in 2018 when you applied for a promotion as a Band 6 nurse. You told the panel that your revalidation in 2024 was completed with your manager, and you had told her that you had been convicted. Your manager said she was disappointed that you had not ticked the box to declare this. You told the panel that you had a lack of knowledge and understanding as to what to do with declaring your convictions. You accepted that it was negligent on your part and you should have sought further advice. You told the panel that, when you told Bromley South NHS Trust that you were convicted in 2009, they did not give you any advice regarding whether you need to report it to the NMC and there was no further action taken by your employer at the time. You said you had spoken to other managers about your convictions at the time of your later revalidation applications, but they also did not advise you on any further actions you should take in regard to declaring your convictions to the NMC.

Mr Mupara submitted that nurses, midwives and nursing associates have a duty to declare any convictions made against them. He submitted that the wording within the revalidation application surrounding declaring convictions is very clear and, in your oral evidence, you told the panel that you understood it. He submitted that you said that you had answered the question around whether you had a convictions dishonestly in 2013, 2016, 2019 and 2022 when you failed to tick the yes box. You said in your evidence that you had answered the question dishonestly. Therefore, he submitted that you fraudulently procured entry onto the NMC register in relation to charges 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Mr Mupara submitted, in relation to charge 1, that he does not accept your evidence that you told your manager that you were convicted in 2009. He submitted that it is more likely you had not told your manager so that the NMC would not be informed of your convictions and you concealed this information so you could continue working as a registered nurse.

He invited the panel to also find you fraudulently procured entry onto the NMC register in 2010.

Mr Akinoshun submitted that you were clear in the reason why you did not declare your convictions; because you did not believe that a convictions pertaining to your personal life needed to be declared to the NMC. He submitted that you were consistent in your evidence that you were not clear with the process. Further, he submitted that you did inform your manager about your convictions when you took time off to complete community service and no further action was taken. He submitted that you have shown insight and significant remorse for your actions and have explained how you would handle a similar situation in the future.

The panel accepted the advice of the legal assessor who referred it to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67, in which Lord Hughes stated:

'When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of his belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest.'

The panel first considered what you had thought or believed at the time. The panel was of the view that you consistently stated that you did not understand that anything that occurred outside of work needed to be declared on your revalidation forms. You told the panel that you first told your employer in 2009 about your convictions and they took no further action. The panel noted that there is no evidence before it that would indicate that you had informed your employer at this time. However, the panel noted that since 2009 there had been considerable changes to management in Kings College Hospital NHS

Foundation Trust (the Trust) and the documentation was unavailable. The panel noted the email from the Associate Director of Nursing for the Trust to the NMC, dated 14 January 2025, which states:

'How did Kings College NHS decide to proceed with the information that RS had declared a convictions?

We understand that no local investigation took place but were there any meetings to discuss this? We are unable to confirm or provide any evidence of any discussions or meetings that may have taken place. There have been multiple organisational and line manager changes during this time'

The panel noted that you again declared your convictions to the Trust in 2018, and no further action was taken. The panel noted that this was confirmed by the Associate Director of Nursing for the Trust in an email to the NMC, dated 14 January 2025, which states:

"What date did RS declare the 2009 convictions to them and to whom?

To her then ward manager during the recruitment process for her Band 6 promotion in early 2018"

The panel determined that you genuinely did not understand that you had to declare your convictions. The panel bore in mind that your evidence has been consistent, in that you stated throughout these proceedings that you were not aware that you needed to declare your convictions to the NMC as they related to your personal life, not your professional life as a registered nurse. The panel also noted the other evidence in relation to this case, namely that you had informed your managers in 2018 about your convictions and that previous records were unavailable due to organisational change. The panel determined on the balance of probabilities that you did inform your manager about your convictions in 2009 when you needed time off to complete your community service. The panel determined that you had been open about your convictions with your employer between 2009 and 2022, which further supports that you genuinely did not know that you should have declared your convictions on your revalidation form. The panel also accepted the evidence from your character references, including from a line manager who has worked

with you for 8 years and a matron who has known you for 14, who describe you as being a reliable and trustworthy nurse.

The panel accepted that, through these proceedings with the NMC, you now understand that you should have declared your convictions on your revalidation form. The panel noted that, during cross examination, you made admissions of dishonesty. However, the panel noted that these admissions were made in hindsight of your understanding now that you had a duty to declare your convictions on your revalidation form. The panel determined that on all the dates listed in the charges you were not aware of your duty to disclose all convictions, in both private and public life, for re-registration and revalidation.

The panel accepted that you now understood you should have disclosed your convictions to the NMC but at the time you genuinely believed you did not need to disclose matters within your private life/not relating to your professional work as a registered nurse. In assessing your account, the panel accepted your evidence that you did not hide your convictions from your employers. The panel considered that an objective observer would not consider it dishonest to not have disclosed your convictions in circumstances where you believed it was not required of you, albeit this understanding was incorrect. The panel acknowledged that for your actions to have been fraudulent, it would imply a level of dishonesty that it did not find here. Therefore, the panel considered your actions to be incorrect rather than fraudulent.

The panel therefore found that the entry on Sub Part 1 of the NMC register in the name of Mrs Rashidat Olufunmilayo Sonekan, PIN 0114673E was incorrectly procured.

The panel invited submissions on direction.

Decision and reasons on direction

Having determined that you had incorrectly made an entry on the NMC's register, the panel went on to decide what direction, if any, to make under Article 26(7) of the 'Nursing and Midwifery Order 2001' (the Order).

Article 26(7) states:

‘...If the Investigating Committee is satisfied that an entry in the register has been fraudulently procured or incorrectly made, it may make an order that the Registrar remove or amend the entry and shall notify the person concerned of his right of appeal under article 38.’

Ms Muniya referred the panel to the guidance issued by the NMC and reminded the panel of its powers. She submitted that she would be requesting the panel to remove your entry onto the NMC register. She submitted that, even though it was an incorrect entry on your part, you should be removed from the register because the Registrar was not in a position to make a value judgement or balancing exercise about the registration based on the correct information. She submitted that your convictions are serious, as they related to dishonesty and fraud. Therefore, she invited the panel to remove your entry from the register.

Dr Akinoshun submitted that the only appropriate and proportionate direction for the panel is to take no further action. He submitted that the panel have found that the entry was incorrectly made and you did not fraudulently procure entry onto the NMC register. He submitted that, as shown by the positive character references you have provided, you are a good nurse who is reliable and trustworthy. He submitted that you have demonstrated insight and remorse for your actions and you would never do this again. He submitted that it would be disproportionate to remove you from the register.

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

The panel considered its findings. It noted that it has found that your entry on the NMC register was incorrectly procured. It determined that it would be inappropriate to take no action having regard to the guidance and that these were not minor convictions. The panel considered that this was not the case of a clerical error which could be corrected by an amendment.

The panel noted that your convictions are serious, as they relate to dishonesty and fraud. The panel took into consideration the NMC guidance and determined that the Registrar

was not in a position to make a value judgement or balancing exercise about the registration based on the correct information as a result of you not declaring your convictions.

In all the circumstances the panel decided that the only appropriate order is to direct the Registrar to remove your entry from the register.

You will be notified of the panel's decision in writing. You have the right to appeal the decision under Article 38 of the Order. This order cannot take effect until the end of the 28 day appeal period or, if an appeal is made, before the appeal has been concluded.

The panel invited submissions on interim order.

Decision and reasons on interim order

Having directed that the Registrar remove your entry from the register, the panel then considered whether an interim order was required under Article 26(11) of the Order, during the appeal period.

The panel heard and accepted the legal assessor's advice.

The panel took account of the submissions made by Ms Muniya. She submitted that the panel should impose an interim suspension order for a period of 18 months. She submitted that an interim suspension order is necessary on both grounds of public protection and public interest. She submitted that you pose a risk to the public as the Registrar has not been able to make a value judgement or balancing exercise about the registration based on the correct information. She submitted that public confidence in the professions would be seriously damaged if you are allowed to practice without restriction considering the seriousness of your convictions.

The panel also took into account the submissions of Dr Akinoshun. He submitted that an interim suspension order is not necessary in this case. He submitted you have been working safely and effectively for 17 years since you were convicted. He referred the panel

to the positive testimonials that you have received and submitted that you are a good nurse. He submitted that there are no public protection issues present in this case.

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

In reaching its decision on whether to impose an interim order, the panel had regard to the reasons set out in its decision on the facts and its decision to direct the Registrar to remove your entry from the Register. It also had regard to the NMC's published Guidance on incorrect entry cases. It noted that the imposition of an interim order is not an automatic outcome but is a matter for the panel's discretion in the circumstances of the case, having regard to the public interest in maintaining the integrity of the register. It also had regard to Article 31 of the Order and the NMC's Guidance on interim orders.

The panel was of the view that you do not pose a risk to the public. The panel took into consideration the positive testimonials you have provided which express that you are a trustworthy and good nurse. Therefore, the public protection ground is not engaged. The panel determined that public confidence in the profession would not be seriously damaged if you are allowed to continue practicing without restriction. The panel noted that you have worked for 17 years without any further issues raised regarding your character and integrity. Also, the panel noted that it found you had incorrectly made your entry onto the NMC register, rather than fraudulently procured. It determined that a well-informed member of the public, cognisant of all the evidence in this case, would not have their confidence in the profession undermined by the absence of an interim order, given the nuance of the circumstances of this case (including an absence of a finding of dishonesty in relation to the re-registration and revalidation, and a period of safe clinical practice for 17 years).

Therefore, the panel determined that no order was the only appropriate and proportionate decision in this case.

That concludes this determination.