

**PUBLIC RECORD****Dates:** 26/08/2025 - 27/08/2025**Doctor:** Dr Sarah MORWOOD**GMC reference number:** 7285658**Primary medical qualification:** MB ChB 2012 The University of Warwick**Type of case**

Review - Misconduct

Review - Conviction

XXX

**Outcome on impairment**

Not Impaired

Not Impaired

XXX

**Summary of outcome**

Conditions, 12 months.

Review hearing directed

**Tribunal:**

Legally Qualified Chair	Mrs Remi Alabi
Lay Tribunal Member:	Mr David Propert
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr John Baxendale
Tribunal Clerk:	Miss Maria Khan

**Attendance and Representation:**

Doctor:	Present, represented
Doctor's Representative:	Mr Paul Renteurs, Counsel, instructed by Weightmans
GMC Representative:	Mr Oliver Carr, 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 private.

### 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 - 27/08/2025

1. This determination will be read in private. However, as this case concerns Dr Morwood's misconduct and conviction, a redacted version will be published at the close of the hearing.
2. 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 Morwood's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of any of misconduct, conviction XXX.

### The Outcome of Applications Made during the Impairment Stage

3. The Tribunal granted the GMC's application, made pursuant to Rule 41XXX of the Rules, that the entirety of the hearing be held in private. XXX. He submitted that this fell squarely within the test for the Tribunal to sit in private.
4. On behalf of Dr Morwood, Mr Paul Renteurs, Counsel, did not oppose the GMC application. XXX
5. The Tribunal accepted the legal advice of the LQC which was in accordance with Rule 41 of the Rules.
6. The Tribunal considered its obligation to be accountable and transparent to the public and was mindful of the public interest in the outcome on the matters before it. It took into account that this review hearing did not involve XXX but also Dr Morwood's misconduct and conviction. XXX.
7. The Tribunal concluded that conducting this hearing in private in its entirety would allow for its smooth running and for it to be coherent to members of the public when the

Tribunal's determinations are published. Accordingly, the Tribunal granted the GMC application to hold this hearing entirely in private.

## Background

8. Dr Morwood graduated from The University of Wales Institute, Cardiff with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Biomedical Science in 2004, before going on to attain a PhD in Immunology from the University of Bristol in 2007. They attended the University of Warwick Medical School, thereafter, graduating with an MBChB in 2012. At the time of the events that led to Dr Morwood's Medical Practitioners Tribunal ('MPT') hearing in January 2025, Dr Morwood was practising as a Trust Grade doctor in Emergency Medicine at the Royal United Hospitals Bath Foundation Trust ('the Trust').

### The January 2025 Tribunal

9. Dr Morwood's case was first considered by an MPT from 27-30 January 2025.

10. The Allegation can be summarised as follows. Between August 2017 and November 2023, whilst employed at the Trust, Dr Morwood removed items for personal use when not permitted to do so. It was alleged that these actions were dishonest.

11. It was also alleged that, on 9 October 2023 at Taunton Magistrates' Court, Dr Morwood was convicted of three offences: driving a vehicle whilst unfit through drugs, theft from the Trust, and fraud by false representation between 22 and 27 February 2023.

12. In relation to the driving offence and fraud, it was alleged that Dr Morwood was sentenced concurrently to two weeks' imprisonment, suspended for 12 months, a Rehabilitation Activity Requirement of 10 days, and an Unpaid Work Requirement of 120 hours. They were also disqualified from driving for 18 months. For the theft offence, it was alleged that Dr Morwood was sentenced to 12 weeks' imprisonment, suspended for 12 months, with the same community requirements. All sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

13. XXX

14. Dr Morwood admitted the entirety of the Allegation at the outset of the hearing, and the Tribunal accordingly announced the facts of the Allegation as admitted and found proved in full.

15. In considering Dr Morwood's insight and remediation, the Tribunal took into account Dr Morwood's witness statement, reflective statement and ongoing CPD. The Tribunal was impressed by Dr Morwood's thorough reflections and significant insight into their XXX, misconduct and conviction. The Tribunal also noted there was no evidence that Dr Morwood had repeated the behaviours since the conviction and was satisfied that the risk of repetition was low. XXX. It was also mindful that repeated dishonesty is difficult to remediate and

concluded that the insight and reflection which Dr Morwood had shown did not outweigh the seriousness of the Allegation when taken as a whole.

16. The Tribunal concluded that Dr Morwood’s unpredictable and risk-taking behaviours may place members of the public at unwarranted risk of harm, and that public confidence and trust in the profession and the maintenance of proper professional standards had been undermined, engaging all three limbs of the statutory overarching objective. It determined, therefore, that Dr Morwood’s fitness to practise was impaired by reason of misconduct, conviction, XXX.

17. The Tribunal was mindful that there is a strong need to deter doctors from stealing drugs from their place of work and driving whilst under the influence of drugs and as such, this misconduct and the conviction needed to be marked. It considered that nothing less than a period of suspension would adequately mark the seriousness of Dr Morwood’s conduct while upholding the statutory overarching objective.

18. The Tribunal determined to suspend Dr Morwood’s registration for six months and directed a review. It emphasised that the onus would be on Dr Morwood to demonstrate to the reviewing Tribunal how they have kept their medical skills and knowledge up to date and XXX. Dr Morwood would also be able to provide any other information that they considered would assist.

### **Today’s Review Hearing**

19. This is the first review hearing of Dr Morwood’s case.

### **The Evidence**

20. This Tribunal has taken into account all the evidence received.

21. XXX

22. XXX

23. The Tribunal also received:

- Record of Determinations of the January 2025 MPT hearing;
- XXX
- Correspondence between Dr Morwood’s legal team and the GMC, XXX, various dates from 21 March 2025 – 5 August 2025;
- Dr Morwood’s CPD bundle;
- Dr Morwood’s reflective statement dated 29 July 2025.

### **Submissions**

24. On behalf of the GMC, Mr Carr invited the Tribunal to have regard to the paragraphs of *Good medical practice* ('GMP') (January 2024 edition) that, he submitted, were relevant in this case:

XXX

25. XXX

26. XXX

27. XXX

28. In relation to Dr Morwood's misconduct and conviction, Mr Carr submitted that Dr Morwood had shown insight into those matters and they had been addressed by the previous Tribunal. XXX

29. On behalf of Dr Morwood, Mr Renteurs submitted that the question of impairment was about looking forward and the ability of Dr Morwood to resume clinical practice now, and in the future. Mr Renteurs submitted that the basis on which the Tribunal may find impairment had narrowed, as the previous Tribunal had determined that a six-month period of suspension was proportionate, sufficient and a fair means to address the misconduct and conviction. This Tribunal may take a similar view.

30. He further submitted that Dr Morwood presented now as someone who has served a significant period of suspension as well as a custodial sentence which has been served. As serious as those matters were, they were matters of background and context and the question now was XXX.

31. Mr Renteurs told the Tribunal that there was no dispute that Dr Morwood was not in a position today to return to unrestricted practise and this was not what Dr Morwood or Professor A were suggesting.

32. Mr Renteurs closed his submissions by underlining "the significant and substantial insights and remedial work" undertaken by Dr Morwood. He submitted that they have worked tirelessly not only for the previous hearing but also for this one but they accepted this was not sufficient to get them to a stage where they were fit to practise without restrictions.

### The Relevant Legal Principles

33. The Tribunal reminded itself that the decision of impairment is a matter for the Tribunal's judgement alone. As noted above, this Tribunal is aware that it is for the doctor to satisfy it that they would be safe to return to unrestricted practise.

34. This Tribunal must determine whether Dr Morwood’s fitness to practise is impaired today, taking into account Dr Morwood’s conduct XXX 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.

35. The Tribunal bore in mind that whilst there is no statutory definition of impairment, it is assisted by the guidance provided by Dame Janet Smith in the Fifth Shipman Report, as adopted by the High Court in *CHRE v NMC and Paula Grant* [2011] EWHC 297 Admin. The Tribunal noted that any of the following features are likely to be present when a doctor’s fitness to practise is found to be impaired:

- 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 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; and/or*
- d. Has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.’*

36. The Tribunal was mindful of the need to take into account the overarching objective which is to protect the public and which includes to:

- a. protect and promote the health, safety and wellbeing of the public;*
- b. promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession;*
- c. promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the profession.*

### The Tribunal’s Determination on Impairment

37. The Tribunal first considered the seriousness of both the misconduct and criminal conviction and bore in mind paragraph 65 of GMP (2013):

*65 You must make sure that your conduct justifies patients’ trust in you and the public’s trust in your profession.*

### Misconduct

38. The Tribunal considered the misconduct to be significantly serious. It had involved planned and sophisticated actions which undermined trust in the profession and professional ethics, causing potential risks to patients. While there were aggravating factors, the Tribunal noted that the misconduct was not for personal gain but instead motivated by XXX. The Tribunal took into account Dr Morwood’s reflective statement in which they stated:

*“I now have a clear and comprehensive understanding of how my actions, marked by poor decision making, lapses in judgment, and dishonesty, were wholly incompatible with the standards and values expected of a medical professional. I fully accept that the suspension of my licence was both necessary and proportionate in order to uphold public confidence in the medical profession, preserve the integrity of medical practice, and ensure the protection of patient safety.”*

*“Over the past six months, I have revisited and consolidated the learning I previously undertook in medical ethics and professionalism. This has strengthened my ability to understand and apply these principles consistently within my practice. I have also undertaken deep personal reflection on my conduct, identifying the specific failings that led to my suspension and the steps I must take to ensure that such behaviour is never repeated.”*

*“This period of suspension has further reinforced how important my role as a doctor is to me, both professionally and personally. I recognise that in order to return to practice safely and responsibly, I must take every possible step to prevent any recurrence of past behaviours.”*

39. Based on the previous Tribunal’s findings and the evidence presented today before it at this hearing, the Tribunal was satisfied that Dr Morwood had sufficient insight into their misconduct. It considered the misconduct was remediable and that Dr Morwood had remedied the issues to a satisfactory level as noted above in their reflective piece. The Tribunal concluded that while there remained a limited risk of repetition, this would be reduced even further if XXX.

40. Accordingly, the Tribunal that Dr Morwood’s fitness to practise was no longer impaired by reason of their misconduct.

#### Conviction

41. The Tribunal also considered the conviction was regarded as serious. It had crossed the threshold for a custodial sentence, and the actions had occurred on more than one occasion. This raised concerns about maintaining public trust and being honest as a doctor. However, the Tribunal took into account that there was no evidence of any prior recidivistic or concerning behaviour before or after the XXX, and the Tribunal viewed the conviction as a consequence of XXX. The Tribunal further noted that Dr Morwood had served the suspended prison sentence, XXX, and had demonstrated insight by apologising and acknowledging wrongdoing. As with its findings on misconduct, the Tribunal concluded that while there remained a limited risk of repetition, this would be reduced even further particularly if XXX.

42. Accordingly, the Tribunal determined that Dr Morwood’s fitness to practise was no longer impaired by reason of their conviction.

XXX