

PUBLIC RECORD

Date: 30 June 2025

Doctor: Dr Nimrit DHILLON

GMC reference number:	7271166
Primary medical qualification:	MB ChB 2012 University of Leeds
Type of case	Outcome on impairment
Conviction/ Caution	Not impaired

Summary of outcome

Order revoked

Legally Qualified Chair:

Legally Qualified Chair:	Mr Nathan Moxon
--------------------------	-----------------

Review on the Papers

This case was reviewed on the papers, with the agreement of both parties, by a Legally Qualified Chair.

Overarching Objective

Throughout the decision making process the chair has borne in mind the statutory overarching objective as set out in s1 Medical Act 1983 (the 1983 Act) to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public, to promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession, and to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of that profession.

Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers

Chair's determination

1. I have noted the background to Dr Dhillon's case, which was first considered by a fitness to practise medical practitioners tribunal in November 2024 ("the 2024 Tribunal").
2. Dr Dhillon qualified as a doctor in 2012 and, in 2023, was working as a General Practitioner and also in aesthetic medicine.
3. She was convicted at Liverpool Magistrates' Court on 21 August 2023 of three offences of theft by an employee, as follows:
 - i. On 23 May 2023 Dr Dhillon stole one box of Belotero Intense and three one-hundred unit boxes of Bocouture botox to the value of £450;
 - ii. On 1 June 2023 Dr Dhillon stole three one-hundred-unit boxes of Bocouture botox, one box of fifty-units of Bocouture, one box of Belotero Balance and one box of Belotero Volume to the value of £700; and
 - iii. On 8 June 2023 Dr Dhillon stole four boxes of Bocouture one-hundred units to the value of £450.
4. Dr Dhillon was sentenced to a 12-month Community Order with requirements to undertake up to 15 Rehabilitation Requirement days and 200 hours unpaid work. She was also ordered to pay £1,450 compensation.
5. Dr Dhillon admitted the convictions before the 2024 Tribunal and the matters were therefore found proved.
6. In considering whether Dr Dhillon's fitness to practise was impaired, the 2024 Tribunal found that Dr Dhillon had developed insight but had not fully remediated, and that there remained a risk, albeit low, of repetition of the offending behaviour.
7. The 2024 Tribunal concluded that Dr Dhillon's fitness to practise was impaired on account of her conviction and stated:

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers**

"69. In considering whether Dr Dhillon's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the Tribunal balanced its assessment of her insight, remediation and the risk of repetition against the statutory overarching objective. It concluded that Dr Dhillon's offending behaviour had seriously undermined public trust and confidence in the medical profession and brought the medical profession into disrepute.

70. The Tribunal concluded that a finding of impairment in respect of Dr Dhillon's conviction was required in order to promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession, and to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of that profession."

8. The 2024 Tribunal agreed with the submissions of both the GMC and Dr Dhillon that the appropriate sanction was one of suspension.

9. It noted that Dr Dhillon's behaviour was aggravated by the fact that it constituted serious dishonesty which amounted to criminal conduct; had occurred on three separate occasions; was in the course of Dr Dhillon's employment and so amounted to a breach of trust; took place during her work as a doctor; and the effects that the offending had upon the victim.

10. Mitigating features identified by the 2024 Tribunal included Dr Dhillon's personal circumstances at the time of the offending, which had resulted in poor consequential thinking; the absence of harm or risk of harm to patients; the lack of concern about Dr Dhillon's clinical practice; her guilty plea to the criminal court and self-referral to GMC; her admittance to the allegations before the 2024 Tribunal; her previous good character; her expressions of regret and remorse; the development of significant insight; her engagement with professional support at an early stage; and the efforts to remediate, albeit further remediation was necessary.

11. In imposing the suspension, the 2024 Tribunal acknowledged that there had been a serious departure from Good Medical Practice but that there was no evidence that remediation was unlikely; there was no evidence of repetition; and there had been a development of insight.

12. The 2024 Tribunal determined that an order for eight months would be sufficient to allow Dr Dhillon time to demonstrate remediation. It also considered that the period would

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers**

be sufficient to maintain public confidence in the medical profession and promote proper professional standards.

13. The 2024 Tribunal outlined that a review Tribunal would likely be assisted by Dr Dillon providing the following:

- i. A reflective log detailing her coping strategies and examples of how she has used them in the period of suspension;
- ii. Further evidence of remediation, which might include attendance on relevant courses; and
- iii. Evidence demonstrating that Dr Dhillon has kept her clinical knowledge and skills up to date.

14. In preparation of the review, Dr Dhillon provided the following:

- i. A reflective statement dated 22 May 2025;
- ii. Ethics and Probity Course Reflection - January - May 2025;
- iii. Wellbeing Reflective Log - January - May 2025;
- iv. Insight Course Reflection - January - May 2025;
- v. Remediation Course Reflection - January - May 2025;
- vi. Evidence of Remediation - January - May 2025;
- vii. Fitness to Practise Course Reflection - January - May 2025;
- viii. Ensuring No Repetition Course Reflection - January - May 2025;
- ix. Course certificates;
- x. Clinical Learning Log January - May 2025;
- xi. GP Placement Reflective Log April to date;
- xii. South Wigan Medical Practice GP Clinical Observership Report - 21 May 2025;
- xiii. Character Reference from GP at Fernville Surgery, Hemel Hempstead - 20 May 2025; and
- xiv. XXX.

15. Dr Dhillon and the GMC have agreed that this review should be considered on the papers in accordance with Rule 21B of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004. They provided agreed terms of a decision which I could make at this review.

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers**

16. In written submission, the GMC proposed that Dr Dhillon's fitness is no longer impaired and that the suspension be revoked:

"Dr Dhillon's reflective statement appears to demonstrate the doctor's genuine remorse and insight into her misconduct. In this she states:

'I accept full responsibility for my actions. I was dishonest and I stole property. These actions were wholly unacceptable and fell far below the standards expected of any medical professional. I deeply regret the harm caused to those I colleagues that I stole from as well as the harm that my actions could have caused the reputation of the profession, to public trust, and to those who relied on me to act with honesty and integrity. I have used the suspension period to reflect extensively, to rebuild my ethical understanding and to ensure that I never repeat these mistakes'

In accordance with the recommendations of the previous tribunal, Dr Dhillon's remediation bundle includes a reflective log of coping strategies to protect her wellbeing and prevent any future repetition of her actions. She has also provided a letter from [XXX] who confirms Dr Dhillon has continued to engage [XXX], and that they believe it to be: 'highly unlikely that Dr Dhillon would engage in any similar type of behaviour in the future'.

Dr Dhillon also provides confirmation that she has attended an Ethics and Probity Course (as well as completing several other relevant courses online). She also evidences how she has kept her skills and knowledge up to date, including significant CPD evidence and attending a GP observer placement. It's also of note that around the time of her offences Dr Dillon was sentenced to a 12-month community order. As this time-period has now elapsed with no evidence of any further offending we can assume that Dr Dhillon's conviction is now spent."

17. The GMC and Dr Dhillon agreed, in writing signed by both parties on 25 June 2025, that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of her conviction and that the suspension imposed should be revoked for the remainder of the current period of suspension.

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers**

18. Nevertheless, as outlined at paragraph 163 of the Sanctions Guidance, no doctor is allowed to resume unrestricted practice following a period of suspension unless the tribunal considers that they are safe to do so.

19. I have considered all of the evidence presented to me, and the agreed submissions. I have borne in mind the statutory overarching objective which is to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public, to promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession, and to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for the medical profession.

20. I have taken into account that, since the 2024 Tribunal imposed the period of suspension, Dr Dhillon has demonstrated significant remediation as outlined within the submissions from the GMC. She has not reoffended. I am satisfied, from careful consideration of all of the documentation she has provided, that the risk of repetition of the behaviour that led to her conviction is so low as to be negligible. XXX.

21. I have determined that Dr Dhillon's fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of her misconduct. She has developed significant and sufficient insight and remediation. The risk of repetition is negligible. A finding of impaired fitness to practise is no longer necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession or promote proper professional standards. Reasonable members of the public and the medical profession will understand that Dr Dhillon has undergone a rigorous regulatory process during which she was suspended from practice and, during that period, developed her remediation as required of her by the 2024 Tribunal.

22. Dr Dhillon has therefore satisfied the persuasive burden that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

23. In light of my decision, I direct that Dhillon's current period of suspended registration be revoked with immediate effect.

24. Notification of this decision will be served on Dr Dhillon in accordance with the Medical Act 1983, as amended.