

Fitness to Practise Determination

The following case was heard by a Fitness to Practise Panel. It is presented here to give an example of one possible outcome of breaching a principle in *Good Medical Practice*. It is not intended to give a clear threshold between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. Each case which comes before a Fitness to Practise Panel is judged on its own merits and assessed on the particular circumstances of the case.

Summary

The doctor was cautioned by police for obtaining property by deception: writing 14 prescriptions for diazepam for her own use using false names.

Relevant paragraphs of *Good Medical Practice*

The case relates to the *Probity* section of GMP, specifically paragraphs 63 and 65 on signing documents and paragraph 73 on financial and commercial dealings. It also relates to the *Health* section, specifically paragraph 77.

Determination on impaired fitness to practise

Dr X: You have admitted and the Panel has found proved that on *[date removed]*, at XXXX Police Station, XXXX, you were interviewed under caution during which you admitted to obtaining property by deception which was contrary to Section 15 of the Theft Act 1968. On the same date you consented to a Caution for these offences.

The Panel has been informed of the circumstances leading to your Caution. The Panel has heard that between *[date removed]* and *[date removed, 7 months later]* you wrote 14 prescriptions on your hospital FP10 forms for Diazepam in 5 mg tablets for your own use using false patient details. You entered names for the recipients and your own name as the prescribing doctor. Concerns were raised regarding your prescribing in *[date removed]* when a pharmacist to whom some of the prescriptions had been presented became suspicious that the handwriting of the prescriber and the “patient” appeared to be the same and the police were contacted.

The Panel has heard that by the time of your arrest on *[date removed]* you had obtained a total of 364 5mg Diazepam tablets through this dishonest method. Mr G has confirmed that this amounted to an average dosage of 1.5 tablets per day, which is within normal prescribing limits. No suggestion has been made by the GMC that you were dependent on, or abusing this drug. When interviewed by police, you immediately made full and frank admissions regarding the offences and accepted

