

Meeting of the s.40A Panel to consider the case of Dr Ramkali Kaur (7947796)

Held on 23 December 2025

Panel members present ('the Panel')

Charlie Massey, Chief Executive (in the Chair)

Sue Carr, Deputy Medical Director, Education and Standards

Elizabeth Jenkins, Assistant Director of Legal, Fitness to Practise

In attendance

James McDermott, Senior Legal Adviser

Amy Codling, Legal Adviser (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 Senior Legal Adviser confirmed that the decision was a relevant decision for the purposes of s.40A of the Act. The decision was a decision under s.35D giving a direction for suspension, within the meaning of s.40A(1)(a)(i).

Consideration

- 3 The Panel considered the record of the MPT's determination and the legal advice in detail.
- 4 The Panel noted the MPT's inconsistent approach regarding the finding that Dr Kaur had 'buried her head in the sand'. The Panel considered that whilst this may have mitigated the 2016-2018 misconduct relating to the failure to notify DWP of a change in circumstances, it did not appear relevant to the findings that Dr Kaur had dishonestly misled both her employer and the GMC in 2022.

-
- 5 The Panel was concerned that this error of approach may have led to the MPT imposing a sanction (four months' suspension) that was unduly lenient, in circumstances where the GMC submitted that a suspension of 9-12 months was required. The Panel also noted that the dishonesty was repeated and involved concealment, which was very worrying, and would be difficult for Dr Kaur to remediate.
 - 6 However, the Panel was mindful of the other mitigating circumstances as relied upon by the MPT, which included the age of the doctor at the time of the misconduct, and the time that had since elapsed. The Panel also acknowledged that a review had been directed, which would allow a reviewing tribunal to test the concerns regarding Dr Kaur's insight and remediation, with all options remaining open to that tribunal. The Panel considered that the fact there will be a review hearing, which will take place soon and potentially prior to the date that any appeal hearing would be heard, was relevant to the question of whether the outcome was sufficient to protect the public.
 - 7 Notwithstanding the Panel's view that the four-month suspension period was unduly lenient, based on their assessment of all the relevant information, the Panel concluded that the outcome could not be said to be insufficient to protect the public.
 - 8 The Panel therefore decided not to appeal the MPT's decision pursuant to section 40A of the Act.



.....
Charlie Massey (Chair)

29 December 2025

Dated

Background

- 9 This case concerns the determination of an MPT, which concluded on 28 November 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).