

**PUBLIC RECORD****Date:** 17/10/2025

**Doctor:** Dr Belinda AGOE

**GMC reference number:** 5151701

**Primary medical qualification:** Vrach 1989 Peoples' Friendship University,  
Moscow

Type of case	Outcome on impairment
Review - Misconduct	Not Impaired

**Summary of outcome**  
Suspension to expire

**Tribunal:**

Legally Qualified Chair	Mrs Nessa Sharkett
Lay Tribunal Member:	Ms Sirah Abraham
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Charlotte Jones

Tribunal Clerk:	Mr Michael Murphy
-----------------	-------------------

**Attendance and Representation:**

Doctor:	Present, represented
Doctor's Representative:	Mr Oluwaseyi Ojo, instructed by Taylor Wood Solicitors
GMC Representative:	Mr Lewis Kennedy, Counsel

**Attendance of Press / Public**

In accordance with Rule 41 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 the hearing was held in public.

## Overarching Objective

Throughout the decision making process the tribunal 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.

## Determination on Impairment - 17/10/2025

1. At this review hearing the Tribunal now has to decide in accordance with Rule 22(1)(f) of the General Medical Council (GMC) (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004, as amended ('the Rules') whether Dr Agoe's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

## Background

2. Dr Agoe qualified in 1986 from the Peoples' Friendship University in Moscow. She joined the Staunton Group Practice ('the Practice') as a GP Trainee in August 2005, becoming a GP partner with seven other GPs in 2008. By 2013 the Practice had reduced to having four Partners including Dr Agoe.
3. The facts found proved at Dr Agoe's hearing, which concluded in March 2024, can be summarised as between 1 November 2018 and 6 November 2018, whilst the Staunton Group Practice's registration with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) was suspended, Dr Agoe obstructed the transfer of provision of patient services to an alternative caretaker provider (Federated 4 Health). It was also found that, on more than one occasion, she organised and/or delivered patient services when she knew it was unlawful for her to do so. The 2024 Tribunal found that Dr Agoe had given oral evidence under oath to the First Tier Tribunal that she was unaware until 1 November 2018 that there was to be a handover to a caretaking practice. The 2024 Tribunal also found that Dr Agoe knew that an application to cancel the Staunton Group Practice's CQC registration was to be made to the Magistrates Court on 6 November 2018.
4. The 2024 Tribunal found that Dr Agoe's conduct amounted to misconduct and was not satisfied that she had developed any meaningful insight into her misconduct and how it undermined patient safety, public confidence in the profession and proper professional standards. Given the lack of insight and remediation, the 2024 Tribunal could not be satisfied that Dr Agoe would not repeat her misconduct if such similar circumstances

arose in the future. As such, it determined that Dr Agoe's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of misconduct on all three limbs of the overarching objective.

5. The 2024 Tribunal determined to suspend Dr Agoe's registration for a period of three months in order to mark the nature and the seriousness of her misconduct and impairment. It suggested that it may assist the reviewing Tribunal if Dr Agoe provided a reflective statement, evidence of having kept her medical knowledge and skills up to date, up to date references and testimonials along with any other information that she considers will assist.

## The Evidence

6. The Tribunal has taken into account all of the evidence received. The documentary evidence included, but was not limited to:
  - The determinations of the March 2024 Tribunal;
  - A letter from the High court and sealed claim form, dated 15 April 2024;
  - Dr Agoe's reflective statement;
  - Patient and Colleague Feedback;
  - Appraisals for 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025;
  - Numerous testimonials;
  - Evidence of continuing professional development (CPD).

## Submissions

7. On behalf of the GMC, Mr Kennedy referred the Tribunal to the background of this case, Dr Agoe's reflections and the positive testimonials received in support of her. He submitted that on the basis of the new body of evidence, which included evidence of Dr Agoe's remediation and insight, the GMC's position is neutral on the matter of impairment. He stated that in order for the Tribunal to find no impairment it must be satisfied that Dr Agoe's actions have sufficiently addressed the impairment found by the previous Tribunal.
8. On behalf of Dr Agoe, Mr Ojo also referred to Dr Agoe's reflective statement and stated that if Dr Agoe's fitness to practise was still impaired then the GMC's position would not be neutral. As such, he submitted that Dr Agoe's fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

## The Relevant Legal Principles

9. The Tribunal reminded itself that the decision of impairment is a matter for the Tribunal's judgement alone. As noted above, the previous Tribunal set out the matters that a future Tribunal may be assisted by. This Tribunal is aware that it is for Dr Agoe to satisfy it that she would be safe to return to unrestricted practise.
10. This Tribunal must determine whether Dr Agoe's fitness to practise is impaired today, taking into account her conduct at the time of the events and any relevant factors since then such as whether the matters are remediable, have been remedied and any likelihood of repetition.
11. In its deliberations, the Tribunal had regard to the questions posed by Dame Janet Smith in the Fifth Shipman Report, as referred to in the case of *CHRE v NMC and Grant [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin)*, as follows:

*'Do our findings of fact in respect of the doctor's misconduct... show that his/her fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that s/he:*

- a. has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or*
  - b. has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or*
  - c. has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession*
- ....'*

## The Tribunal's Determination on Impairment

12. In its deliberations, the Tribunal noted the findings of the 2024 Tribunal that Dr Agoe's misconduct was serious but not serious enough to warrant a suspension of over three months or for her name to be erased from the medical register. It also noted that the 2024 Tribunal did not find dishonesty in relation to Dr Agoe's misconduct and imposed a three month suspension in order to maintain and uphold public confidence and proper professional standards of conduct, and to enable Dr Agoe to develop further insight into her misconduct.

13. The Tribunal took account of all the evidence received in this case, along with the submissions from both parties. It noted the evidence of remediation provided by Dr Agoe which included her reflective statement in which she said:

*'I appear before this Tribunal with a deep sense of humility and responsibility. Since my suspension, I have had the time and space to fully reflect on the events that led to my removal from the medical register. I acknowledge, without reservation, that my actions in obstructing the safe handover of patient services during the CQC's suspension of my practice in November 2018 were inappropriate, professionally indefensible, and ultimately harmful to the trust that patients, colleagues, and the public place in the medical profession. At the time, I believed I was acting in defence of what I saw as a flawed and unjust process. However, I now recognise that my actions were not only a breach of professional conduct, but they also significantly disrupted patient care. I did not engage properly with the interim arrangements; I failed to support the caretaker provider; and I hindered the transfer of access to premises and patient records. These decisions created risk and uncertainty for vulnerable patients, many of whom relied on continuity of care. The Medical Practitioners Tribunal and the High Court were right to hold me accountable. The findings against me were not merely technical breaches—they went to the core of professionalism: placing patient welfare above all else and complying with lawful regulatory processes. I fully accept those findings...*

*...I now understand that disagreement with a regulatory body does not entitle one to disregard its authority...*

*...I fully acknowledge the serious reputational harm that my conduct caused to the profession and the erosion of public confidence. I am committed to acting in a way that rebuilds trust and models the accountability I failed to uphold previously.'*

14. Based on the evidence received, the Tribunal was satisfied that, immediately after the 2024 hearing, Dr Agoe had continued to take steps to develop her insight and to remediate. It noted that she didn't accept the findings of the 2024 Tribunal until her appeal of the decision before the High Court was dismissed. However, since then Dr Agoe has fully accepted the March 2024 Tribunal's findings and has now demonstrated a positive attitudinal change.
15. The Tribunal had regard to Dr Agoe's appraisals, positive feedback, testimonials and the numerous CPD certificates. It noted that the testimonials and feedback indicated that Dr Agoe was well liked and valued as a doctor by both her colleagues and patients.

16. Based on the evidence received, the Tribunal was satisfied that Dr Agoe has provided everything recommended by the 2024 Tribunal and that she could not have provided any more evidence of her insight or remediation. It noted that no further concerns have been raised and considered the risk of repetition to be low.
17. This Tribunal has therefore determined that Dr Agoe's fitness to practise is not impaired by reason of misconduct. The current order of suspension, imposed by the 2024 Tribunal for three months, will remain in place until its expiry.
18. Case concluded.