

# Meeting of the s.40A Panel to consider the case of Dr Chitlapalli Sathyanath (4484525)

Held on 15 July 2025

## Panel members present ('the Panel')

Charlie Massey, Chief Executive (in the Chair)

Pushpinder Mangat, Medical Director and Director, Education and Standards

Anthony Omo, General Counsel and Director of Fitness to Practise

## In attendance

Jim Percival, Deputy General Counsel and Principal Legal Adviser

Lewis Stubbs, Senior Legal Adviser

Katherine Ince, Head of Office of the Chair and Chief Executive (Panel Secretary)

## Purpose of this note

- 1 This meeting note records a summary of the Panel's consideration of the relevant decision of the Medical Practitioners Tribunal ('MPT') which considered the Doctor's case ('the decision'), and the Panel's decision on behalf of the General Medical Council as to whether or not to exercise the power to appeal the decision pursuant to section 40A Medical Act 1983 (as amended) ('the Act').

## The relevant decision

- 2 The Deputy General Counsel confirmed that the decision was a relevant decision for the purposes of s.40A of the Act. The decision not to find the doctor's fitness to practise impaired and to issue a warning was a decision not to give a direction under s35D of the Act, and accordingly fell within the meaning of s40A(1)(d) of the Act as confirmed by the Court of Appeal in its judgment in the case of *Raychaudhuri v General Medical Council* ([2019] 1 WLR 324, at [47]-[53]).

## Consideration

- 3 The Panel considered the record of the MPT's determination and the legal advice in detail.
- 4 The Panel was troubled by the tribunal's conclusions on the factual elements of the case, and was concerned that the tribunal did not adequately consider the combination of issues that

---

occurred within the context of potential sexual misconduct, including whether each element of the examination as alleged and found proven was clinically indicated, the failure to seek consent, and the failure to offer a chaperone.

- 5 Given the experience of Dr Sathyanath, the Panel was not satisfied that he would have not followed procedure in recognising the examination was an intimate one, and thereafter ensuring consent was obtained and a chaperone was made available if the examination was clinically indicated.
- 6 The Panel had concerns regarding the Tribunal's conclusions in respect of insight. The Panel felt that Dr Sathyanath had not shown sufficient insight, but had simply reported that he has changed his practice. There was limited evidence and no recognition that Dr Sathyanath had considered the impact on the patient.
- 7 Based on their assessment of all the relevant information, the Panel concluded that the imposition of a warning was not sufficient to ensure there was no future risk to patient safety.
- 8 The Panel therefore decided to appeal the MPT's decision pursuant to section 40A of the Act.



.....  
**Charlie Massey (Chair)**

28 July 2025

**Dated**

### **Background**

- 9 This case concerns the determination of an MPT, which concluded on 23 June 2025, considering the matter under Part 4 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 ('the Rules').
- 10 The determination of the MPT, which includes the background, allegations and the MPT's determinations on Facts, Impairment and Sanction, can be accessed [here](#).

### **The General Medical Council's power to appeal pursuant to s.40A**

- 11 With effect from 31 December 2015, the General Medical Council acquired the power to appeal to the High Court (or equivalent courts in Scotland and Northern Ireland where relevant) against relevant decisions of a MPT if it considers that the decision is not sufficient (whether as to a finding or a penalty or both) for the protection of the public.
- 12 The basis upon which the GMC will consider whether or not to exercise this power to appeal is described in "Appeals by the GMC pursuant to s.40A of the Medical Act 1983 ('s.40A appeals') – Guidance for Decision-makers" ('the Guidance').

- 
- 13** Decisions concerning the exercise of the s40A power to appeal were originally delegated by the Council to the Registrar. However, following recommendations from Sir Norman Williams' Review Council agreed that decision-making in prospective appeals involving decisions of MPTs be delegated to a three person Executive Panel comprising: the Chief Executive and Registrar as Chair; the Medical Director and Director of Education and Standards; and the Director of Fitness to Practise (or their nominated Deputies if not available).
- 14** As the Guidance makes clear, when considering whether to bring a s.40A appeal in a particular case, it will be necessary to consider the following questions:
- a. Based on their assessment of all of the information held, and in the particular circumstances of the case, and having regard to the factors set out in the Guidance, does the Panel consider that the MPT's decision is not sufficient to protect the public?
  - b. If the Panel is of the view, on its assessment of all the information held, in the particular circumstances of the case, that there are grounds to consider that the MPT's decision is not sufficient, it will consider whether exercising the power of appeal would further, rather than undermine, the achievement of the over-arching objective.
  - c. If the answer is yes, then the GMC may exercise its power of appeal.
  - d. In considering that question the Panel will be required to consider and weigh a number of competing factors (including its assessment of the prospects of success of the appeal, and the nature and importance of the issues which would be aired).