

PUBLIC RECORD**Dates:** 19/09/2025**Doctor:** Dr Kauser ALI**GMC reference number:** 4070900**Primary medical qualification:** MB BS 1994 University of London**Type of case**

Review - Misconduct

Outcome on impairment

Not Impaired

Summary of outcome

Suspension to expire

Tribunal:

Legally Qualified Chair	Mrs Alison Storey
Lay Tribunal Member:	Mr Amit Jinabhai
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Ann Wolton

Tribunal Clerk:	Mrs Rachel Horkin
-----------------	-------------------

Attendance and Representation:

Doctor:	Present, represented
Doctor's Representative:	Dr Mr Oluwaseyi Ojo, Taylor Woods Solicitors
GMC Representative:	Ms Susannah Proctor, 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 - 19/09/2025

Background (the 2024 Tribunal)

1. Dr Ali qualified in 1994 from the University of London and went to train as a General Practitioner. He joined the Staunton Group Practice ('the Practice') where he became a GP Partner. By 2013 the Practice had reduced to having four Partners, one of whom was Dr Ali.
2. The allegations related to concerns that the 2024 Tribunal found proved that, between 1 November 2018 and 6 November 2018, whilst the Staunton Group Practice's registration with the Care Quality Commission (CQC) was suspended, Dr Ali obstructed the transfer of provision of patient services to an alternative caretaker provider (Federated 4 Health) nominated by NHS England and on more than one occasion organised and/or delivered patient services when he knew it was unlawful to do so, following guidance and advice from several sources. Further there were allegations (which the 2024 Tribunal found proved) that, on 26 September 2019, Dr Ali submitted his annual appraisal form and failed to declare that he was under investigation by the General Medical Council.
3. The 2024 Tribunal found that Dr Ali's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of misconduct in relation to the 2018 matters and determined to impose an order of suspension for a period of 2 months to mark the seriousness of the misconduct. The 2024 Tribunal determined that an immediate order was not necessary and revoked the interim order.
4. The 2024 Tribunal directed a review and considered that a reviewing tribunal may be assisted by Dr Ali providing;
 - a reflective statement;
 - evidence of having kept his medical knowledge and skills up to date;
 - up to date references and testimonials;
 - any other information that he considers will assist.

Today's hearing

5. 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 Ali's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

6. The Tribunal received documentation which included;

- The previous Record of Determination;
- A reflective statement by Dr Ali;
- Testimonials;
- CPD certificates;
- Appraisal for 2022-23 and 2024-2025.

Submissions

7. On behalf of the GMC, Ms Susannah Proctor, Counsel submitted that Dr Ali's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of misconduct. Ms Proctor accepted that Dr Ali has acknowledged his conduct and has listed the ways he has remediated. She acknowledged that Dr Ali had reflected and explained that at the time he had been driven by fear, frustration and a sense of injustice, but now accepted he had been wrong and that trust in and integrity of the profession were affected by his misconduct. However, Dr Ali has not provided specific evidence that he has completely remediated the misconduct.

8. On behalf of Dr Ali, Mr Oluwaseyi Ojo submitted that the reflective statement provided shows that Dr Ali has insight into the conduct that led to a finding of impairment at the initial hearing. Mr Ojo submitted that Dr Ali has shown insight and this is evidenced in his reflective statement. Dr Ali has reflected on a number of factors that led to the misconduct at the time. Mr Ojo stated that he does not see how a lack of material can be more important than the reflective statement and the evidence of his reflections in his appraisal forms. Mr Ojo stated that Dr Ali has shown remorse and insight and reminded the Tribunal that the GMC has acknowledged this. Mr Ojo invited the Tribunal to find that Dr Ali's fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of misconduct.

9. Upon being questioned by the Tribunal, Mr Ojo advised that the tailored remediation programme referred to in Dr Ali's reflections is one of continuous professional development where he continues to work with his mentors as to how to deal with matters if he finds himself in such situations again. Mr Ojo reminded the Tribunal that, at the time of the misconduct, Dr Ali was a partner in a practice. However, he is no longer a partner of a practice and has not been for some time. There has been no repetition of the conduct that lead to the 2024 Tribunal.

The Relevant Legal Principles

10. 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 the doctor to satisfy it that he would be safe to return to unrestricted practise.

11. This Tribunal must determine whether Dr Ali's fitness to practise is impaired today, taking into account Dr Ali's 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.

The Tribunal's Determination on Impairment

Misconduct

12. In reaching its decision the Tribunal had regard to the submissions of both parties and the evidence provided. The Tribunal reminded itself of the findings of the 2024 Tribunal and the evidence that it considered would assist a reviewing Tribunal:

252. The Tribunal considered whether to direct a review hearing. It bore in mind the guidance at paragraph 164 of the SG which advises that:

'..in most cases where a period of suspension is imposed... the tribunal will need to be reassured that the doctor is fit to resume practice – either unrestricted or with conditions or further conditions. A review hearing is therefore likely to be necessary, so that the tribunal can consider whether the doctor has shown all of the following (by producing objective evidence):

- a) they fully appreciate the gravity of the offence*
- b) they have not reoffended*
- c) they have maintained their skills and knowledge ...*

...

254. The Tribunal wishes to clarify that at the review hearing, the onus will be on Dr Ali to demonstrate that he fully appreciates the gravity of the misconduct and has gained insight and has remediated. It therefore may assist the reviewing Tribunal if Dr Ali provides a reflective statement, evidence of having kept his medical knowledge and skills up to date, and up to date references and testimonials. Dr Ali will also be able to provide any other information that he considers will assist.

13. The Tribunal went on to consider Dr Ali's reflective statement in which he wrote:

"I accept in full the findings of the Medical Practitioners Tribunal and the High Court...

At the time, I made a series of poor decisions that were driven by frustration, fear, and an overwhelming sense of injustice. However, I now understand that my motivations do not excuse my conduct. By impeding the lawful and essential handover of care to a caretaker provider, I failed in my duty to ensure continuity of patient care. I prioritised my perspective over the clear and pressing needs of my patients. That was wrong.

I accept without qualification that my actions fell far below the standards expected of a doctor.

...

I see now that the consequences of my actions were not unimportant—they had the potential to cause real harm to patients who relied on our practice for safe and timely care.

...

I also understand that my actions—though not malicious—had the effect of eroding trust in both my integrity and the professions more broadly. That is something I deeply regret.”

14. The Tribunal is satisfied that in his reflections Dr Ali does show insight into why he acted as he did and has fully accepted responsibility for his conduct and expressed regret. He has demonstrated that he has reflected on the impact of his conduct on patient safety and the reputation of the profession. His remorse and insight appears genuine. Dr Ali has also provided up to date references and testimonials which were requested by the 2024 Tribunal.

15. The Tribunal had some concern that Dr Ali did not provided supporting evidence of some of the ‘*serious and structured remediation*’ that he referred to in his statement. The Tribunal considered that it would have been assisted in seeing evidence of the ‘*tailored professional remediation programme*’ that Dr Ali referred to. However, the Tribunal reminded itself of the submissions of Mr Ojo which indicated that this was not a formal programme and consisted of continuing development and discussions that Dr Ali completed with his mentor. However, the Tribunal is satisfied that Dr Ali has provided what was requested by the 2024 Tribunal and demonstrated that he now fully appreciated the gravity of his conduct.

16. The Tribunal was further concerned that, in his 2024-2025 appraisal, Dr Ali did not demonstrate sufficient insight into the findings of the 2024 Tribunal. However, the Tribunal acknowledged that Dr Ali was appealing these findings at the time and, therefore his demonstration of lack of insight at that time was understandable. Further, the Tribunal considered that it was not unreasonable that Dr Ali has reflected after the appeal process had concluded. The Tribunal was satisfied that Dr Ali’s insight and remorse were genuine.

17. The Tribunal reminded itself that Dr Ali continued to work during the appeal process and acknowledged that there has been no repetition of the conduct, at a time when he was under investigation by the GMC and involved in High Court proceedings which would have been a stressful period.

18. The Tribunal also bore in mind the number of very positive testimonials which speak highly of Dr Ali in relation to his clinical skills and working with colleagues. Further, the Tribunal acknowledged the evidence provided of Dr Ali's CPD and that there is no evidence that his clinical skills were ever a concern. The Tribunal is therefore satisfied that Dr Ali has kept his clinical skills and knowledge up to date.

19. This Tribunal has therefore determined that Dr Ali's fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of misconduct.

20. The Tribunal has determined to allow the currently imposed order of suspension to expire on 3 October 2025. The Tribunal reminded itself that the 2024 Tribunal imposed the suspension to mark the seriousness of the misconduct and send a message to the wider profession. Once this has expired, Dr Ali may return to unrestricted clinical practice.

21. This concludes the case.