

# Reviewing the case of Dr Manjula Arora

## Terms of reference

### About the review

To carry out a review of Dr Manjula Arora's case to understand whether there are lessons to learn and apply in future cases.

### Background

In February 2020, Dr Arora's employer raised concerns to the GMC. Following an investigation, we referred two matters to a medical practitioners tribunal. The tribunal found one matter, relating to dishonesty, was proved; that Dr Arora's fitness to practise was impaired, and that she should be suspended for one month.

We have heard strong views expressed by the profession about this case. As a regulator it is absolutely right that our decisions are open to scrutiny, and we believe there is always room to improve the way that we carry out our duties. Our Chief Executive, Charlie Massey, asked for a review of this case to understand whether there are lessons to learn and apply for future cases.

### The role of external oversight

Professor Iqbal Singh CBE and Martin Forde QC will oversee the review. Their role includes:

- advising on the scope of the review, and appropriate lines of enquiry
- reviewing information gathered from files, fieldwork, and interviews; and ensuring progress to agreed milestones
- reviewing the draft findings and scrutinising conclusions and recommendations

Professor Iqbal Singh CBE is a hugely experienced consultant clinician specialising in care of the elderly. He is a dedicated pioneer in ethnic health and diversity and is Chair of the GMC's BME doctors forum. He is also Chair of the Centre of Excellence in Safety for Older People and the Centre for Remediation and Support.

Martin Forde QC's practice covers all aspects of health law. His recent work also includes leading the independent investigation into a report into antisemitism within the Labour Party in 2020;

---

and acting as the independent adviser to the Windrush Compensation Scheme from 2018 to 2021.

## Scope

### The following areas are within scope of the review:

- The referral into the GMC
- The decision to promote the investigation
- The point at which allegations are put to a doctor for their response (Rule 7)
- The case examiner decision
- The legal team's input, including instructions to counsel, and counsel's input before the tribunal hearing
- The presentation of the GMC's case at the tribunal hearing
- Information sharing between employers, who are not working within designated bodies, and Responsible Officers

### The following areas are not within scope of the review:

- The tribunal's determination in this case
- The GMC's position on Dr Arora's appeal against the tribunal's determination
- Consideration of the GMC's existing guidance, policies, and processes

## Approach

Stage	Activity
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Scope and terms of reference agreed</li></ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Fieldwork: review of file and supporting information, including<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● the referral</li><li>● details of the investigation process</li><li>● the case examiner decision</li><li>● instructions to counsel</li></ul></li><li>● Conducting interviews</li></ul>

---

Stage	Activity
3	● Develop draft findings, conclusions and recommendations
4	● Quality assurance and scrutiny
5	● Report finalised and submitted to Chief Executive and Chair
6	● Publication of review's findings, conclusions and recommendations

## Governance

Dr Arora's case is not subject to a formal Significant Event Review. It therefore won't automatically go before the GMC's Audit and Risk Committee. However, we will ask the Committee to consider the report to facilitate scrutiny and provide assurance to our Council.

## Sharing the findings

We take the feedback we've heard about this case extremely seriously. We will complete this review as swiftly as possible. We will share the findings with the profession and stakeholders by publishing it on our website. And if the review identifies learnings, we will implement them.