General Medical Council

Meeting of the s.40A Panel to consider the case of Dr Ravikumar Ravindran (6119217)

Held on 19 October 2026

Panel members present ('the Panel')
Charlie Massey, Chief Executive (in the Chair)
Pushpinder Mangat, Medical Director and Director, Education and Standards
Elizabeth Jenkins, Assistant Director - Legal Team

In attendance
Jim Percival, Deputy General Counsel and Principal Legal Adviser
Aarti Rowland, Senior Legal Adviser
Sophie Brookes, Assistant Director - Corporate (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 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 that the allegations, in particular the dishonesty in completing a firearms licensing medical form without adequate checks, were very serious. The Panel was concerned by the MPT's conclusion that Dr Ravindran's response to the allegation reduced the level of *seriousness* (as opposed to reducing the *risk* to public protection) but was satisfied overall that the MPT had addressed the question of ongoing risk to public protection by reference to

The GMC is a charity registered in England and Wales (1089278) and Scotland (SC037750).

the required factors.

5 Based on their assessment of all the relevant information including the legal advice received, the Panel did not note any errors of fact or principle in the MPT's decision such as would give rise to grounds of appeal which would be likely to have a reasonable prospect of success or to achieve greater public protection.

6 The Panel took the overall view that a sanction of six months' suspension and a review was not an insignificant outcome and Dr Ravindran's insight and remediation will be assessed at the review hearing.

7 The Panel concluded that an appeal would not further the GMC's overarching objective.

8 The Panel therefore decided not to appeal the MPT's decision pursuant to section 40A of the Act.



…….
Charlie Massey (Chair)

6 November 2026
Dated

Background

9 This case concerns the determination of an MPT, which concluded on 22 September 2026, 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).

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).