

**PUBLIC RECORD****Date:** 14/05/2025**Doctor:** Dr Thangavelu SENTHIL KUMAR**GMC reference number:** 5198183**Primary medical qualification:** MB BS 1996 Annamalai University**Type of case**

Misconduct

**Summary of outcome**

Suspension for 8 weeks

**Tribunal/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.

**LQC Determination:**

1. I have noted the background to Dr Senthil Kumar's case, which was first considered by a Fitness to Practise Medical Practitioners Tribunal between 15 April and 8 May 2024 ('the Tribunal').

**Background**

2. Dr Senthil Kumar qualified as a doctor in 1996 at Annamalai University, India and has been a General Practitioner registered with the GMC since 2008, working in a number of clinical roles prior to the events which led to the Tribunal hearing. At the time the Allegation arose, Dr Senthil Kumar was a full-time student undertaking third level study.
3. The Allegation related to conduct occurring around March to June 2020, when Dr Senthil Kumar falsely presented himself as Dr A online and used a social media profile in the name of that doctor to gain access to a private online group ('the Covid group'), for doctors who had been out of clinical practice and who sought to return to work to assist the NHS as part of the Covid-19 response. It was alleged that Dr Senthil Kumar accessed the Covid group using Dr A's GMC number without permission and represented that the account held by Dr A was Dr Senthil Kumar's personal profile. It further alleged dishonesty on Dr Senthil Kumar's part.
4. The Tribunal concluded that in providing Dr A's details, Dr Senthil Kumar intentionally sought to deceive the organisers and members of the Covid group, by falsely presenting himself as a different doctor and by using that person's name and GMC registration number. The Tribunal concluded that such actions were dishonest.
5. In considering impairment, the Tribunal determined that the facts found proved amounted to serious misconduct and found Dr Senthil Kumar's fitness to practise impaired on the basis of that misconduct. It imposed an immediate order of suspension for a period of eight months.
6. Dr Senthil Kumar appealed that determination, pursuant to section 40 of the Medical Act 1983, as amended ('the Act'). The appeal was listed for hearing on 19/20 February 2025.
7. XXX

### **The First Paper Review**

8. The case was first listed for a review hearing on 11 February 2024. On that date, Dr Senthil Kumar's representative applied to adjourn the hearing under Rule 29(2) to await the outcome of the appeal. Further submissions were made on behalf of Dr Senthil Kumar

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

regarding the potential for XXX, but these were not further advanced at that stage. The Tribunal determined to grant an adjournment under Rule 29(2) of the Rules.

9. Dr Kumar and the GMC subsequently agreed that the review should be considered 'on the papers' in accordance with Rule 21B of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004, rather than by way of the oral hearing which was scheduled to commence on 6 March 2025.
10. The review was therefore considered upon the papers by a Legally Qualified Chair ('the March 2025 LQC') on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2025.
11. The March 2025 LQC outlined that the parties were awaiting the outcome of Dr Kumar's High court appeal and that they agreed it was appropriate to grant an adjournment of the review hearing for a period of eight weeks and for the suspension to be extended for the same period.
12. The March 2025 LQC concluded that it was fair and in the interests of justice to accede to the parties' agreed proposal. The suspension was therefore extended to 19 May 2025.

**The Present Paper Review**

13. Since the March 2025 review, the High court has handed down judgment, striking out Dr Senthil Kumar's appeal against the Tribunal's finding of impaired fitness to practise and against the sanction of suspension, and alternatively dismissing each ground of appeal.
14. I have considered all of the material presented to me, and the submissions made on behalf of Dr Senthil Kumar and the GMC.
15. By email from the GMC to Dr Senthil Kumar's representatives, dated 14 April 2025, it was outlined that the GMC is XXX. The GMC proposed an adjournment of the review and an extension of the order of suspension for a further period of eight weeks. It was also proposed that the review be considered upon the papers instead of an oral hearing.
16. By email from David Morris, representative of Dr Kumar, to the GMC, dated 6 May 2025, the GMC's proposal was approved.

17. Therefore, both parties considered it appropriate for there to be an adjournment of the review hearing under Rule 29(2) of the Rules for a period of eight weeks, and for there to be an extension of Dr Senthil Kumar's current order of suspension for a period of eight weeks, in pursuance of section 35D(5)(a) of the Act.

## Decision

18. When conducting a review on the papers a Tribunal or Tribunal Chair will consider the documents provided by the parties. They can make an order in accordance with the parties' agreement or decide that an oral hearing should take place.

19. In reaching a decision, 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 the reasons why an adjournment is sought and the fact that it is not opposed. I have accepted the agreed submissions of both parties and determined that it is fair and in the interests of justice to both parties; will allow for effective case management and minimise costs; and is in the wider public interest, that the requested adjournment for a period of eight weeks be granted, pursuant to Rule 29(2).

21. In light of my decision, I direct that Dr Senthil Kumar's current period of suspended registration be extended for a further period of eight weeks pursuant to section 35D(5)(a) of the Medical Act 1983, as amended. This is required in order to ensure that the overarching objective is met in the interim. Again, it is noted that there was agreement between the parties that this is the appropriate course of action.

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