

## Care Standards

### The Tribunal Procedure Rules (First-tier Tribunal) (Health, Education and Social Care) Rules 2008

**HEARD** 2 - 4 November 2015 at  
HMCTS Employment Tribunals, Civil & Family Court, Liverpool L2 2BX

#### BEFORE

Mr Laurence Bennett (Tribunal Judge)  
Mrs Pat McLoughlin (Specialist Member)  
Mr Graham Harper (Specialist Member)

#### BETWEEN

Mrs Michelle King

Appellant

-v-

Care Quality Commission

Respondent

[2015] 2444.EA

#### DECISION

##### Appeal

1. Mrs King appeals under Section 32 of the Health & Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) against a decision of the Care Quality Commission (CQC) dated 13 May 2015 to cancel her registration as Registered Manager in respect of regulated activity Woodheath Care Limited (Woodheath) Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care. Treatment of disease, disorder or injury.

##### Hearing

2. The hearing was held in Liverpool on 2 – 4 November 2015. Evidence was given on oath or affirmation. Ms Chambers gave her evidence by video link. Mr Regan's evidence was not challenged, his witness statement was accepted and he did not attend the hearing.
3. Mrs King was present throughout the hearing and was represented by Mr Lee Gledhill, a directly instructed Barrister.
4. The CQC was represented by Mr Kevin Slack, a Barrister. His CQC instructing Solicitors were present throughout the hearing.

##### Preliminary

5. Mrs King's appeal is dated 10 June 2015.
6. On 20 July and 2 October 2015 directions were made for the hearing of the appeal.
7. In compliance with directions the parties submitted an agreed bundle of documents. Further documents received prior to the hearing included an updated Scott Schedule, a timetable of witnesses and a brief statement of case.
8. Additional witness statements were admitted at the hearing.

## **The Law**

9. Section 17(1) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (the Act) gives the Respondent the discretionary power to cancel the registration of a person as a manager in respect of a regulated activity. The Respondent relies upon the ground contained in Section 17(1)(e) namely "*on any grounds specified by regulations.*"
10. The "*relevant requirements*" for the purposes of section 17 of the 2008 Act are "*any requirements or conditions imposed by or under this Chapter*" and "*the requirements of any other enactment which appears to the Commission to be relevant*" (section 17(4) of the 2008 Act). The requirements imposed under that Chapter include requirements in Regulations. These are found in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010 (SI 2010/781) (the Regulations).
11. Regulation 6 states:
  - (1) A person (M) shall not manager the carrying on of a regulated activity as a registered manager unless M is fit to do so
  - (2) M is not fit to be a registered manager in respect of a regulated activity unless M is:
    - (a) Of good character
    - (b) Is physically and mentally fit to manage the carrying on of the regulated activity;
    - (c) Has the necessary qualifications, skills and experience to do so; and
    - (d) Is able to supply to the Commission, or arrange for the availability of, information relating to themselves specified in Schedule 1.

All of the criteria for the registration as a manager within Regulation 6(2) are required to be met in order to comply with the Regulations.

12. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Schedule 1 to the Regulations require:
  - (3) Satisfactory evidence of conduct in previous employment concerned with the provision of services relating to
    - (a) health or social care; or
    - (b) children or vulnerable adults
  - (4) Where a person (P) has been previously employed in a position whose duties involved work with children or vulnerable adults, satisfactory verification, so far as reasonably practicable, of the reason why P's employment in that position ended

13. Section 32 of the Act states that the Tribunal may either confirm a decision of the Respondent or direct that it is not to have effect. The Tribunal is empowered to direct any discretionary condition it finds appropriate.
14. The Tribunal is required to consider the appeal on the evidence available at the time of the hearing.

### **Background**

15. Mrs King was registered as Manager of Woodheath on 13 August 2013. Prior to that she had been the Registered Manager of Bebington Christian Home.
16. Mrs King submitted several application forms to CQC for registration.
17. Issues arise from information within the forms and Mrs King's obligation to disclose.
18. A Notice of Proposal to cancel Mrs King's registration was sent to her on 18 December 2014, the subsequent Notice of Decision is dated 13 May 2015.
19. The agreed chronology presented by the parties provides a brief description of the relevant events and is annexed to this decision for reference.

### **Evidence at the hearing**

20. Mr Robert Tovey, CQC Head of Inspection for Adult Social Care North West Region detailed the information he received which led him to conclude that on 3 occasions in successive application forms Mrs King failed to disclose that she was subject to an investigation by the Nursing & Midwifery Council (NMC). He had regard to other circumstances including her failure to submit the name of a referee who was her last employer. He said that he considered these failures to disclose indicated a defect in character and he decided he did not have confidence or trust in Mrs King in her function as Manager. This gave rise to unacceptable risk to the public. Notwithstanding the reasons for disciplinary action by the NMC he concluded it necessary to cancel Mrs King's registration and he issued a provisional notification. He was not aware of correspondence from Mr Bartlett, the registered provider of Woodheath which gave background details including information about the allegations and Mrs King's response to the NMC nor was he aware of any prior mention of the NMC actions by Mrs King to CQC inspectors with whom she came in contact at Woodheath.
21. Mrs Alison Murray, CQC Head of Inspection for Adult Social Care South Region explained CQC's policy of review by a Manager not previously involved. The information she took into account included the provisional notification, Mrs King's response and the evidence filed. She was not aware of the letter from Mr Bartlett nor of any information given to CQC Inspectors relating to Mrs King's current and previous appointments.
22. Mrs Murray explained why she reached the view that the failure to disclose within the 3 application forms was determinative that Mrs King was not suitable to be registered as a Manager of Woodheath and she confirmed the cancellation. Information provided to the Inspection Department would not have been put before the Registration Department and the issue of the employer's reference was

considered a secondary matter and not fundamental to her decision. The overriding reason for cancellation was the failure to disclose. Mrs Murray said she is reinforced in this view by NMC's findings and sanction. Particulars of the NMC decision identify dishonesty and a sanction of suspension is severe. In the light of the information put to her at the hearing and within the bundle she is satisfied that the decision to cancel remains appropriate.

Miss Wendy Smith

23. Miss Smith is an Adult Social Care Inspector with CQC. She was formerly responsible for Woodheath. She gave information about her inspection visits to the home over the relevant period and conversations with the CQC Inspector of the home Mrs King previously managed, Bebington Christian Home (Bebington), run by Southern Cross and after that company's demise, Four Seasons. She has researched all the material she could find available at CQC and said she had neither found nor was she aware that Mrs King had disclosed the NMC disciplinary action. She became aware of it from an article in the Liverpool Echo. Immediately having seen the article, she referred to her managers at CQC as the necessary action was beyond her remit.
24. Miss Smith was clear that she had not been told by Mrs King about the NMC investigation or proceedings prior to the first Liverpool Echo article. She has searched records and said that had it been mentioned it would have been so serious she would have taken action. She referred to Mrs Dennett, her Line Manager when she became aware of the Echo article. She acknowledged she had conversations with Mrs King about Bebington, her problems with Four seasons and Mrs King's Employment Tribunal claim for constructive dismissal against that Company which Miss Smith commented was taking a long time. That comment related to the Employment Tribunal proceedings, definitely not to NMC proceedings. She confirmed that she made 2 visits to Woodheath before another Inspector took over as the provider wanted a more constant contact and Miss Smith only worked part time. In between these visits in February and September 2013 she would have had telephone contact with Mrs King.

Mrs Victoria Chambers

25. Mrs Victoria Chambers gave evidence by video link. She is a CQC Registration Inspector. She reviewed Mrs King's application form and held an assessment interview by telephone with her, lasting around 38 minutes. Mrs Chambers said that no mention was made of an investigation by NMC or action taken by them. She could not recall any mention or discussion about the dispute with Four Seasons as no point was taken about her referee not being her last employer. Mrs Chambers could not recall any mention of this. She stated that the application was considered low risk because of Mrs King's specific experience as a Registered Manager and she recommended registration. Mrs Chambers was precise in stating that had matters been raised such as an NMC investigation, she would have endeavoured to find further information from the NMC website or if necessary, by contact under the Interagency Memorandum of Understanding, this would then have been considered but it did not arise in this case. She repeated in response to questions that she had no recollection of any discussion with Mrs King about her previous employment or NMC reference.

Mrs Julie Porter

26. Mrs Porter is a CQC Adult Social Care Inspector, prior to that she was a Registered Manager in a care home and Education Centre for Adults with Learning Disabilities. She was assigned by CQC to the Wirral area and became the Inspector for Woodheath. She has inspected Woodheath on 3 occasions and as Inspector for Bebington was involved in the request for Mrs King to cancel her registration as Manager of that home to allow the appointment of a new Manager. She first became aware of Mrs King's NMC proceedings as a result of the Echo article. She asked Mrs King for details at that time but had not had previously received information from her about this. Mrs Porter was asked to telephone Mrs King to enquire whether she had told CQC about the proceedings; she was told she had not. Mrs Porter said that if it had been previously mentioned she would have immediately referred to her Line Manager, as this is a significant issue. Mrs Porter later obtained evidence from Miss Siobhan Deane of Four Seasons.

Mr Jasper Bartlett

27. Mr Bartlett is the Director and Proprietor of Woodheath. He recounted his awareness of the issues. He first became aware when he was notified about the NMC Interim Orders Committee meeting and supplied references for that Committee. He became involved in Mrs King's representations to the Fitness to Practice Committee. Once aware of the outcome and Mrs King's suspension he continued her employment as Registered Manager but not involving RGN activities. He commented unfavourably on Four Seasons' management and administrative practices relating to the underlying matters, subject of the NMC findings and was supportive of Mrs King. He has found her a very efficient and capable manager. She is resilient, has dealt with issues and improved the Home.

Mrs Michelle King

28. Mrs King spoke to her 3 statements and answered questions about both her actions and underlying intentions. In essence, she considers she disclosed the fact of the NMC proceedings in conversation with Mrs Chambers during the telephone interview and Mrs Smith during an inspection. She accepted that she had not completed the 3 application forms appropriately; her explanation was that a first form posted but not received by CQC in 2012 was prior to the NMC letter notifying involvement which therefore could not have been disclosed. Later versions of the form sent electronically because the original form had not been received and to make amendments as suggested by CQC's Registration Team followed in similar form. Whilst she amended some details as pointed out by Mr Slack; she did not address the relevant question 1.13 which she left as "No."

29. Mrs King acknowledged on several occasions that she made mistakes both in not taking sufficient steps in the NMC proceedings and in hindsight not notifying CQC about their involvement on the application forms. She believes she was misdirected by ambiguous correspondence from NMC whilst she was notified by letter dated 4 January 2013 of an investigation, the same letter referred to further notification whether the investigation would proceed. The DBS and Police had not continued their investigations. After the NMC Interim Orders Committee did not impose any conditions of practice, Mrs King felt this was the end of the proceedings and her explanation had been accepted. She felt her explanation would be accepted in the substantive proceedings although she responded to the proceedings and submitted material. Mrs King did not attend the Conduct and Competence Committee which found her fitness to practice impaired and made a finding of dishonesty.

Subsequently she realised the seriousness of the position and she attended the Sanctions hearing with the support of Mr Bartlett and was legally represented.

30. When asked what she would do if similar circumstances had arisen in respect of a member of staff Mrs King said that if she found they had failed to mention a professional conduct investigation, she would immediately report the matter to CQC.

## **Submissions**

### CQC

31. Mr Slack's closing submissions on behalf of CQC reviewed the chronology of events. He emphasised that Mrs King did not contend that the information on the Registration Application Forms submitted electronically on 3 occasions was incorrect and posed the question whether this was an innocent mistake or deliberate. Mr Slack drew attention to the Registered Manager's duty to disclose information even if it is adverse and would lead to problems for the care home or Registrant.
32. Mr Slack submitted that CQC must be able to rely on the accuracy of documents and it is of fundamental importance that the Manager is reliable. Deliberate dishonesty in dealings with CQC directly brought into question the Appellant's fitness as a Manager. The initial correspondence from NMC included clear statements that an investigation had commenced. He matched the chronology of the NMC events with the dates of the Registration Application Forms and submitted that as other alterations had been made to the forms, Mrs King had reviewed them at the time each was submitted.
33. Mr Slack drew attention to Mrs Chambers' evidence that the NMC investigation had not been mentioned by Mrs King and what Mrs Chambers would have done had this been the case. He commented on Mrs King's concentration on her referee, which had not proved to be an issue. Similarly, Mrs Smith's evidence was that she was not aware of the NMC reference until the Echo report and the action she would have taken had she been aware at an earlier stage. The alleged conversations with Mrs Porter, Mrs Chambers and Mrs Smith were not mentioned in Mrs King's written response to the notice of proposal by CQC. This was not a case of Mrs King burying her head in the sand. Mr Slack submitted there had been a deliberate concealment of the investigation from CQC and the answers in the application for registration were not mistakes. There was deliberate non-disclosure in the telephone interview.

### Appellant

34. Mr Gledhill spoke about Mrs King's long career in healthcare, her good character and competence. Her primary focus was to be effective in her job and improvements had been made in the homes she managed. She had demonstrated a good knowledge of relevant codes and requirements and was a strong manager. He submitted that it was not unusual for someone to be professionally competent but "fail in their own world." Mrs King failed to properly manage her own affairs and underestimated the seriousness of the NMC investigation.
35. The first draft of Mrs King's application for registration was completed in November 2012 but this was prior to the NMC proceedings. She had failed to amend the

subsequent electronic forms; this was an oversight. The letters she received from NMC about the investigation were ambiguous and there was firm evidence how she had read and understood them. Indeed, on a number of occasions she telephoned NMC for guidance. Her errors were innocent and made in good faith. He highlighted the discussions within the telephone registration interview with Mrs Chambers about the referee, which would have brought in the Four Seasons position. He submitted that Mrs Chambers did not record Mrs King's mention of NMC involvement. Similarly, Mrs Smith may not have recalled the full conversations she had with Mrs King about Four Seasons which included references to NMC.

36. Mr Gledhill submitted that whilst Mrs King takes responsibility for the errors she has made, they are not dishonest nor was there an attempt at concealing the position. He made comments on the NMC findings although they have not appealed and stand. He submitted that this Tribunal could take into account procedural deficiencies in the NMC hearings set out in a letter from Mrs King's Barrister, Ms Maudsley. Mrs King was not aware that a Four Seasons' witness would be called nor had a statement been produced.
37. Mr Gledhill submitted that the sanction imposed by NMC, 4 months suspension was at the shorter end of the spectrum and for that reason Mrs King had not appealed, to do so would be disproportionate. She had remained the Registered Manager at Woodheath without carrying out RGN duties.

### **Tribunal's findings**

38. Although the parties provided a detailed Scott Schedule, scant reference was made during the hearing nor was its order specifically followed in submissions. We have not done so in these conclusions but have made findings which cover each of the issues contained.
39. We accept that Mrs King was the highly regarded Registered Manager of Bebington but that circumstances arose following a change in management, which led her to leave the Home. Whilst the word "untenable" has been used about her continuation as Manager, no further explanation was given. We note, however, Mrs King initiated Employment Tribunal proceedings based on constructive dismissal although we are not aware of the outcome.
40. Mr Bartlett employed Mrs King as Manager of Woodheath and has throughout documentation and these proceedings expressed satisfaction with her services. He mentioned her turning around a home with failings, to one that has been inspected as satisfactory on several occasions. He has overtly provided support for Mrs King both in NMC proceedings once he became aware and in this appeal. By all accounts she is a good and competent manager, this was clear from Mrs Smith and Mrs Porter and no contrary evidence was given.
41. We observe that the Four Seasons' issues include an allegation relating to residents' allowances which led to referral to the Police. We have noted the letter from the Police confirming that an interview and caution took place but investigation did not continue as it was found there was no case to answer. Subsequently, the Interim Orders Panel of the NMC described events as poor administration of patient's' affairs not requiring further supervision. This is,

however, inconsistent with the substantive finding of dishonesty by the Fitness to Practice hearing which would have had the benefit of testing evidence and which has a different purpose. Their finding of dishonesty and resultant sanction has not been appealed and remains despite Mrs King's awareness of the issues raised by her representative at the final hearing.

42. Mrs King by her own account contacted NMC to clarify communications she had received. She made representations and submitted documentation both for the IOC and the Conduct and Competence Committee. She was active in the proceedings although because of holidays and other commitments, she notified NMC and did not attend. Her evidence is that she felt the Conduct and Competence Committee was a foregone conclusion and would adopt the IOC finding and she was unaware that a Four Seasons' witness would attend. We find her first assumption disingenuous bearing in mind she said she was in contact with NMC for clarification but Ms Maudsley has confirmed the procedural defects, particularly notification of witness evidence. Mrs King took a full part in the sanctions hearing.
43. Against this background and as set out in the agreed chronology Mrs King made application for Registration as Manager of Woodheath. It was not disputed that she posted an application form for registration prior to the NMC notification of investigation, although we did not see a copy. We heard explanation that post may not always reach the intended recipient at CQC. As the postal application would fit in with the expected times for registration we have no reason to doubt it. Three further applications were made electronically; we accept Mrs King's explanation that this was initiated by her after the CQC failed to respond to the postal application. There is no dispute that the March and June 2013 forms contained an error in paragraph 1.13. We find as acknowledged by Mrs King that she revised the forms in certain places. The date was changed, other responses relating to references and the ET Tribunal were also altered. From this we find the forms were reviewed by her as there could be no other explanation for alterations and that she was conscious of their content.
44. Mrs King submits that correspondence from NMC was ambiguous; we have looked at the relevant notification and do not find them equivocal, they clearly state an investigation has commenced. This is reiterated in subsequent documents she received in July. The January 2013 letter sets out a series of possible outcomes, it does not negate the fact that an investigation is underway and we find this an unlikely conclusion for a reader. We conclude that Mrs King was aware of the continuing investigation; her own evidence is she made telephone calls to NMC for an explanation.
45. We accept the evidence of Mrs Chambers and Mrs Smith; they were sure in their recollection and records of contact with Mrs King. They said she did not mention the NMC proceedings. We find this is the case, not least as we are satisfied they stated that any such mention would have led to immediate action as a serious issue which they are professionally required to take further. Mrs Smith, a nurse herself would have been particularly aware of the significance of NMC involvement. For the same reason we find the records of contemporaneous contact which they produced comprehensive, accurate and reliable. Mrs Smith's clearly expressed shock at hearing about the NMC proceedings from the Liverpool Echo article was telling. We find she had no knowledge of this beforehand.



## Conclusions

46. Having noted the evidence both oral and statement and bearing in mind our findings from that evidence, we have considered Mrs King's explanations.
47. Mrs King had a clear memory of some things but not others. Whilst this was submitted as a mark of honesty, we found the particular blind spots self-serving and not credible. Mrs King in effect admitted naivety and oversight and said she did not pay sufficient attention to NMC communications. We find this not credible. She made phone calls to NMC, made representations, assembled information and made a conscious decision whether or not to attend proceedings. She chose her priority. Whilst she may have relaxed somewhat in her approach because of the Police findings we do not accept that an experienced Registered Nurse and Manager of a care home who necessarily meets and has to comply with regulators, who claims familiarity with regulations would not be aware of the seriousness of the position. She answered without hesitation what would do if she became aware of a member of her staff in similar circumstances. Mrs King is demonstrably aware of a Registered Manager's duties and responsibilities as shown by her experience and record.
48. Whilst we have found that the NMC's letter notifying investigation unequivocal we have further considered whether Mrs King subjectively might have thought that there was no investigation. For the reasons above relating to her experience and competence we do not accept she was either so naïve or unsophisticated as to believe otherwise. As a result of the Police decision Mrs King may have considered her position would be vindicated and that any further investigation by NMC would inevitably reach the same conclusion but speculation or belief in the outcome of the NMC investigation cannot override her duty to disclose.
49. Mrs King sought to establish that despite her lack of mention on the registration application forms that she had disclosed the NMC proceedings at the relevant time. At best we consider this is wishful thinking. She contends that conversations about her failure to provide a reference from Four Seasons to Mrs Chambers and subsequently with Mrs Smith when talking informally about what had happened to Four Seasons at Bebington would have included mention of NMC. We do not accept there was disclosure, moreover these conversations occurred precisely at a time when there should have been disclosure. Even if alluded to in a conversation this would not have been sufficiently specific as required in the circumstances. We do not consider Mrs King is naïve or unsophisticated to the point where this could possibly have been considered a disclosure.
50. In summary we find Mrs King did not explicitly report or notify the NMC investigation and even if as she alleged, she implicitly so reported, it was not apparent to the communicants nor could be relied upon. To the contrary we conclude that the answers within the registration forms were deliberate, false and misleading. Her regret with the benefit of hindsight about what she referred to as mistakes cannot be vitiated by her new insight about the severity of this conduct.
51. The Appellant's failures took place over an extended period during which an NMC investigation commenced, an Interim Orders Committee met and deliberated and the Conduct and Competence Committee reached its conclusion of dishonesty, this

was subsequently reported in the local press which we find was the trigger for Mrs King's own enforced disclosure of the NMC investigation.

52. Mention was made of the leniency of the NMC sanction; suspension for 4 months but evidence was not presented about the scale of sanctions. We find suspension itself significant and do not find the period a mitigating factor in our considerations about the non-disclosure.
53. Having found Mrs King failed in her duty to disclose and that this related to a serious issue, an NMC investigation, we conclude that this reflects on her good character for the purpose of regulation. Mr Tovey and Mrs Murray emphasised the central role of a Registered Manager and the need for confidence in that Manager to act with integrity and protect the public. We agree. The failure we have identified and the reservations it casts upon Mrs King's character are such that confidence cannot be assumed and is misplaced. She failed at a point when she was under personal pressure notwithstanding that she may have had a view of the underlying issues that led her to believe the outcome of proceedings would be favourable. We find that she is no longer suitable as a Registered Manager and that it is proportionate for the above reason that her registration cannot continue.
54. We have considered the imposition of conditions upon registration but bearing in mind that the duty to disclose is continuous and our findings are indicative of the judgement Mrs King might make in different but analogous circumstances, we conclude conditions inappropriate.
55. At best Mrs King may have been trapped by an initial error and then drawn further, in effect consciously repeating and reinforcing that error with denials and unacceptable and deliberately misleading explanations. Notwithstanding Mr Bartlett's and Mrs Atkinson's highly supportive comments and statement, cancellation is proportionate in the circumstances.

## **Order**

56. The decision of the Care Quality Commission dated 13 May 2015 to cancel Mrs Michelle King's registration as Registered Manager in respect of regulated activity Woodheath Care Limited (Woodheath) Accommodation for persons who require nursing or personal care. Treatment of disease, disorder or injury is confirmed.
57. Mrs King's appeal is dismissed.

**Tribunal Judge Laurence Bennett**  
**Care Standards**  
**First-tier Tribunal Health Education and Social Care Chamber**

**Date Issued: 16 November 2015**

## ANNEX

**Mrs Michelle King**

**Appellant**

-v-

**Care Quality Commission ('CQC')**

**Respondent**

**[2015] 2444.EA**

---

### Chronology

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>
15 November 2012	Nursing and Midwifery Council ('NMC ') receive notification from the Independent Safeguarding Authority about a referral regarding Appellant and were considering adding her to their children and adults barred lists
04 January 2013	Letter from the NMC notifying Appellant that NMC had commenced investigation following receipt of correspondence from Disclosure and Barring Service
21 March 2013	Appellant submits first application to CQC to become a Registered Manager with the CQC for the registered location of Woodheath Care Home. Application dated 5 March 2013
26 March 2013	Appellant's application returned by CQC due to being incomplete
28 March 2013	Letter from NMC notifying Appellant that her case had been referred to the Investigating Committee Interim Order Panel to convene on 9 April 2013
03 April 2013	Telephone call between Appellant and NMC Case Officer in relation to attendance at the panel hearing on 9 April
4 April 2013	Disclosure and Barring Service Investigation concluded
9 April 2013	NMC Investigating Committee Interim Order Panel hearing
12 April 2013	Letter from NMC to Appellant in relation to Investigating Committee Interim Order Panel hearing
18 April 2013	Appellant's Employment Tribunal hearing
18 June 2013	Appellant re-submits application to CQC (second application) to become a Registered Manager with the CQC for the registered location of Woodheath Care Home. Application dated 5 March 2013
19 June 2013	Appellant re-submits application to CQC (second application) to become a Registered Manager with the CQC for the registered location of Woodheath Care Home. Application dated 5 March 2013
26 June 2013	Appellant re-submits application to CQC (third application) to become a Registered Manager with the CQC for the registered location of Woodheath Care Home.
12 August 2013	Appellant is registered as a manager for the registered location of Woodheath Care Home by the CQC
24 October 2013	NMC Investigating Committee panel decide that there was a case for Appellant to answer and case referred to the Conduct and Competence Committee
19 December 2013	Conduct and Competence Committee refer the matter to a hearing
15-17 April 2014	Conduct and Competence Committee meet to determine Mrs King's

	fitness to practice
27 May 2014	Resumed hearing of Conduct and Competence Committee hearing
1 June 2014	CQC inspector notices article in the Liverpool Echo newspaper detailing the outcome of a NMC investigation into Appellant's conduct whilst working as a registered nurse at Bebington Nursing Home
19 June 2014	Resumed hearing of Conduct and Competence Committee hearing. Panel imposed a 4 month suspension order and determined that Fitness to Practice impaired
16 October 2014	Conduct and Competence Committee Substantive Order Review. Appellant's Suspension Order is allowed to expire on the first review
18 December 2014	CQC issue Appellant with Notice of Proposal to cancel her registration as registered manage
16 January 2015	Appellant submits written representations to CQC in response to Notice of Proposal
13 May 2015	Notice of Decision to cancel Mrs King's registration
10 June 2015	Mrs King submits appeal to Care Standards Tribunal