

PUBLIC RECORD

Date: 02/10/2025

Doctor: Dr Praveen ALLA

GMC reference number: 6075593

Primary medical qualification: MB ChB 2003 University of Sheffield

Type of case	Outcome on impairment
Review - Conviction XXX	Not Impaired XXX

Review - Conviction
XXX

Summary of outcome

Conditions, 18 months.
Review hearing directed

Tribunal:

Legally Qualified Chair	Mr Graham White
Lay Tribunal Member:	Mrs Maeve Holland
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Joanne Topping
Tribunal Clerk:	Keely Crabtree

Attendance and Representation:

Doctor:	Present, represented
Doctor's Representative:	Mr Alan Jenkins, Counsel, instructed by Clyde & Co LLP
GMC Representative:	Mr Neil Shand, Counsel

Attendance of Press / Public

In accordance with Rule 41 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 the hearing was held partly in public and partly 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 - 02/10/2025

1. At the outset of this hearing, the Tribunal announced that the entirety of the hearing should be heard in private in accordance with Rule 41 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 (the Rules) XXX.
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 Alla's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of XXX a conviction or caution for a criminal offence.

Background

3. Dr Alla qualified as a doctor in 2003 from the University of Sheffield and went on to train in General Practice (GP). He completed GP training in 2009 and became a salaried GP at the Welbeck Road Practice ('the Practice'). At the time of the index events, Dr Alla was working as a GP partner at the Practice. He has not worked as a GP since November 2018 and in March 2019 he resigned from the Practice XXX.

The 2022 Tribunal

4. Dr Alla's case was first considered by a medical practitioners' tribunal between 31 October to 4 November 2022. It was alleged that his fitness to practise was impaired on XXX grounds: misconduct, conviction XXX.
5. Dr Alla's conviction arose from events on 16 November 2018 when he was confronted by his colleagues at his practice in relation to their concerns about his prescriptions of XXX. It was alleged that he had misdirected prescriptions and that his response to colleagues had been dishonest.
6. On 7 October 2020, Dr Alla was convicted at Northern Derbyshire Magistrates' Court of fraud by abuse of position. On 8 December 2020, at Derby Crown Court, he was sentenced

to 12 months' imprisonment suspended for 24 months and directed to undertake rehabilitation activities.

7. XXX

8. Dr Alla made admissions to the entirety of the Allegation. The 2022 Tribunal found Dr Alla's fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of the conviction XXX, accepting that the dishonest actions that resulted in the misconduct were XXX. It decided that, notwithstanding the fact that Dr Alla had demonstrated insight, and had expressed genuine remorse, he had been convicted of a serious criminal offence and was still at that time serving his suspended sentence.

9. XXX. The 2022 tribunal therefore concluded that all three limbs of the overarching objective were engaged.

10. The 2022 Tribunal considered sanction and determined to suspend Dr Alla's registration for a period of three months with a review.

The 2023 Tribunal

11. Dr Alla's first review hearing was on 27 February, 7 March and 3 April 2023. The 2023 Tribunal noted that Dr Alla's suspended sentence had expired and there had been no further offending. It heard oral evidence from Dr Alla and considered XXX. It determined that there remained concerns about XXX and concluded that there was still a significant risk that he might commit similar fraudulent acts if XXX. It therefore considered that he remained impaired by XXX his conviction XXX.

12. The 2023 Tribunal considered sanction and determined that all three limbs of the overarching objective were still engaged. It therefore imposed a further four-month suspension on Dr Alla's registration with a review.

Review on the papers August 2023

13. A review on the papers took place on 29 August 2023. Agreed submissions had been made by the GMC and those representing Dr Alla that his registration should be subject to a further suspension for a period of six months. XXX

14. The LQC determined that Dr Alla's fitness to practise remained impaired and

determined that the proposed period of suspension of six months was appropriate to protect the public and the public interest.

Review on the papers March 2024

15. A further review on the papers took place on 12 March 2024. Again, agreed submissions had been made by the GMC and those representing Dr Alla.

16. Dr Alla's representative submitted that his registration be subject to a further suspension for a period of nine months.

17. XXX

18. A further period of suspension was proposed by the GMC, to allow Dr Alla more time to XXX, and fully address the concerns of the previous Tribunal.

19. Due to the fact that there had been no material change since the last review, the LQC determined that a finding of impairment remained necessary to protect the public, maintain trust in doctors, and declare/uphold professional standards.

20. When considering sanction, the LQC determined that a further period of suspension was necessary and that the period of nine months would allow Dr Alla to XXX demonstrate further insight, remediation, and take other steps to minimise any risk of repetition.

Review on the papers November 2024

21. A further review on the papers took place on 29 November 2024. Dr Alla's representative and the GMC submitted that Dr Alla's registration should be subject to a further period of suspension of nine months.

22. The LQC noted that on 19 April 2024, an Assistant Registrar had directed XXX and a review. It was recommended that:

'The reviewing tribunal will need to see objective evidence so they can assess Dr Praveen Alla's insight and remediation. This can include evidence that Dr Praveen Alla has kept their skills up to date, and that their return to unrestricted practice won't put patient safety at risk.'

23. The LQC had regard to an email sent in May 2024 from Dr Alla's representative to the GMC. XXX. In a further email dated 18 September 2024, Dr Alla's representative made a proposal to '*...extend the suspension by agreement, as we did before, XXX.*'

24. The LQC therefore XXX. There had also been no new evidence to demonstrate what, if any, progress Dr Alla had made to XXX gain further insight into his actions XXX, in order to minimise any risk of repetition.

25. The LQC noted XXX. Therefore, the LQC determined that Dr Alla's fitness to practise remained impaired on the grounds that it was necessary to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold professional standards.

26. The LQC was satisfied that a further period of suspension was proportionate and would be sufficient to protect the public and the public interest. Therefore, the LQC determined that Dr Alla's registration be suspended for a further period of nine months. This would allow Dr Alla time to XXX and fully address the concerns of the previous Tribunals.

The Evidence

27. The Tribunal has taken into account all the evidence received, both oral and documentary.

28. Dr Alla provided a reflective statement dated 26 September 2025 and also gave oral evidence at the hearing.

29. XXX

30. XXX

31. The Tribunal had regard to the documentary evidence provided by the parties. This evidence included, but was not limited to, the following:

- Record of Determination of the MPT hearing dated 31 October 2022 to 4 November 2022;
- Record of Determinations of the MPT hearing dated 27 February 2023, 7 March 2023 and 3 April 2023;
- Record of Determinations of the MPT review on papers dated 29 August 2023, 12 March 2024 and 29 November 2024;
- Assistant Registrar Decision dated 9 January 2025;

- Communication between Dr Alla, his representative and the GMC;
- XXX;
- Four testimonials on behalf of Dr Alla.

Submissions

32. On behalf of the GMC, Mr Neil Shand rehearsed the background to the case and provided the chronology of events to date. XXX

33. Mr Shand said that the GMC remain neutral in respect of the question of whether there is impairment by reason of the conviction. He said that the suspended sentence had long since expired. However, the Tribunal will also have regard to the previous comments of the 2023 Tribunal and the views that it reached in relation to the conviction.

34. XXX

35. XXX

36. XXX

37. In regard to the conviction, Mr Jenkins reminded the Tribunal that Dr Alla pleaded guilty to fraud by abuse of position in October 2020. He was then subsequently dealt with by Derby Crown Court in December 2020 when a suspended sentence of 12 months imprisonment was imposed, which was suspended for two years. Mr Jenkins said that will, very soon, be five years ago.

38. Mr Jenkins referred the Tribunal to Dr Alla's reflective statement as follows:

'The recognition of the harm I caused to my patients, my colleagues, my loved ones, and to the medical profession that I care for so deeply is something that weighs heavily on me. That guilt and regret remain with me, and I hope they continue serving as a constant reminder that [XXX] and work in alignment with my values and return to the work I love.'

39. Mr Jenkins said that whilst this does not directly address the conviction, it was clearly in the same territory. He said that in all the circumstances, you could now say XXX, the conviction is no longer a proper basis for a finding of impairment of Dr Alla's fitness to practise.

The Relevant Legal Principles

40. The Tribunal reminded itself that the decision of impairment is a matter for the Tribunal's judgement alone. This Tribunal is aware that it is for the doctor to satisfy it that he would be safe to return to unrestricted practise.

41. Applying the principles set out in the case of *Abraheen v GMC* 2008 the critical issue is this. Have all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment been sufficiently addressed. In practical terms, there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged what was involved in the conviction XXX, and sufficiently addressed those concerns.

42. The last Tribunal considered that the tribunal conducting this review would be assisted by Dr Alla providing:

- XXX;
- A further Reflective Statement;
- XXX;
- Evidence that he has kept his medical skills and knowledge up to date;
- Any other evidence that Dr Alla wishes to put before the Tribunal.

43. The Tribunal needs to satisfy itself that Dr Alla has fully appreciated the gravity of the conviction, has fulfilled requirements under the suspended sentence, has not re-offended, XXX and has maintained his skills and knowledge such that patients and colleagues will not be placed at risk by resumption of practice or by the imposition of conditional registration (paragraph 164 in the Sanctions Guidance) and also that the public interest will not be adversely affected by a resumption of unrestricted practice.

44. Among the matters to be considered are whether the issues encompassed by the conviction XXX have been remedied and whether they are likely to be repeated. In reaching a decision, the Tribunal should take into account the current published Principles of Good Medical Practice (GMP). Matters of personal mitigation are not relevant to the question of impairment. They are relevant only to sanction and should not be used to downgrade what would otherwise amount to impairment.

45. In reaching its determination, the Tribunal should take into account all the information before it, including the documentary material, Dr Alla's oral evidence and submissions made on his behalf today and the submissions made on behalf of the GMC.

46. The Tribunal should have at the forefront of its mind the overarching objective set out in S1 (A) of the Medical Act 1983. This is to (a) to protect, promote and maintain the health safety and well-being of the public (b) to promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession and (c) to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for the medical profession.

The Tribunal's Determination on Impairment

Conviction or Caution

47. The Tribunal considered Dr Alla's conviction, XXX.

48. During his evidence, Dr Alla demonstrated insight, referring to his behaviour as abhorrent.

49. The Tribunal noted that Dr Alla's conviction at Northern Derbyshire Magistrates Court was on 7 October 2020 which essentially was five years ago, and the index events happened two years prior to that. There is no evidence that Dr Alla did not fulfil his sentencing requirements, and the sentence is now spent. There is no evidence that Dr Alla has re-offended since the index events.

50. The Tribunal was of the view that there was little more it could require of Dr Alla in terms of remediation relating to his conviction XXX.

51. The Tribunal was satisfied that there was no likelihood of repetition, and that a member of the public would no longer be concerned if impairment were not found in relation to Dr Alla's conviction.

52. The Tribunal has therefore determined that Dr Alla's fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of a conviction or caution for a criminal offence.

XXX