

PUBLIC RECORD**Date:** 10/10/2025**Doctor:** Dr Azhari AHMED**GMC reference number:** 5186569**Primary medical qualification:** MB BS 1986 University of Khartoum**Type of case** **Outcome on non-compliance**

Review - Non-compliance with a performance assessment Non-compliance not found

Summary of outcome

Interim Order of Suspension for 12 months

Tribunal:

Legally Qualified Chair	Barrie Searle
Lay Tribunal Member:	Sirah Abraham
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Charlotte Jones
Tribunal Clerk:	Keely Crabtree

Attendance and Representation:

Doctor:	Not present, not represented
GMC Representative:	Mrs Janet Ironfield, 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 consideration of Non-compliance 10/10/2025

1. This is the third review of Dr Ahmed's case following a Medical Practitioners Tribunal (MPT) hearing which concluded in September 2022. The order was reviewed in September 2023 and October 2024.

The outcome of applications made at the outset of proceedings.

2. 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) as the matters under consideration relate to XXX.

3. The Tribunal determined that the service of the notice of this hearing has been effected in accordance with Rules 15 and 40 of the Rules. The tribunal determined to proceed with the hearing in Dr Ahmed's absence in accordance with Rule 31 of the Rules. The Tribunal's full decision on this matter is included at Annex A.

Background

4. Dr Ahmed qualified (MBBS) in Khartoum, Sudan, in 1987. He obtained MRCPI whilst working in the Republic of Ireland in 2004. He obtained MRCPS from Glasgow in 2006. Dr Ahmed has worked predominantly in short term/locum posts throughout the United Kingdom (UK).

5. Between September and November 2021, the GMC received information from several different sources, raising concerns about Dr Ahmed's clinical performance, timekeeping and communication with patients.

6. On 21 January 2022, the GMC directed Dr Ahmed to undergo a performance assessment in accordance with Rule 7(3) and Schedule 1 of the Rules. Dr Ahmed was informed of this decision in a letter sent by post on 27 January 2022. The letter requested that Dr Ahmed submit the Assessment Portfolio by 23 February 2022. Following further correspondence to Dr Ahmed he responded on 4 March 2022, and informed that he was living in the Sudan. The deadline for the submission of Dr Ahmed's Assessment Portfolio was extended to 15 March 2022. Three reminder emails were sent by the GMC to Dr Ahmed in March, April and May 2022 and an attempt was made to contact him via telephone.

7. On 9 June 2022, having received no response from Dr Ahmed, the GMC took the decision to refer the matter to a non-compliance Tribunal, which took place on 8 September 2022.

The 2022 Tribunal

8. Dr Ahmed was not present or represented at the non-compliance hearing in September 2022.

9. The 2022 Tribunal considered whether Dr Ahmed had failed to comply with the direction to undergo a Performance Assessment. The 2022 Tribunal was satisfied that the GMC had properly notified Dr Ahmed of the requirement to undergo an assessment of his performance. Despite all reasonable efforts by the GMC, Dr Ahmed failed to respond.

10. The 2022 Tribunal found that it had no explanation from Dr Ahmed as to why he had not supplied the information requested. It concluded that Dr Ahmed had disengaged from the process.

11. Taking into consideration Dr Ahmed's lack of engagement, the serious concerns being raised and his non-compliance with the GMC's direction, the 2022 Tribunal concluded that an order of conditions would not be sufficient to satisfy the overarching objective. The 2022 Tribunal therefore determined to suspend Dr Ahmed's registration for a period of 12 months and directed a review, with the onus being on Dr Ahmed to demonstrate compliance and undergo a Performance Assessment.

The 2023 Review Tribunal

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal**

12. Dr Ahmed was not present or represented at the non-compliance review hearing in September 2023.

13. The 2023 Tribunal found that the GMC had taken all reasonable steps to encourage Dr Ahmed to comply with its direction to undergo a Performance Assessment. It noted Dr Ahmed had not engaged with the GMC since the last hearing and that his last reply to the GMC was an email in March 2022.

14. The 2023 Tribunal was satisfied that there had been no progress since the last hearing, and Dr Ahmed had continued to fail to comply with the direction to undergo a Performance Assessment. The 2023 Tribunal found that there was no explanation or good reason from Dr Ahmed for his non-compliance. The 2023 Tribunal therefore determined that non-compliance had been found.

15. The 2023 Tribunal considered that, given Dr Ahmed's non-compliance with the GMC's request to undergo a Performance Assessment, it was reasonable to conclude that there was no evidence that he would comply with any conditions placed on his registration. Further, in the light of the serious and wide-ranging concerns about his clinical abilities, and in the absence of a Performance Assessment, conditions could not be formulated to manage the risks.

16. The 2023 Tribunal was satisfied that, given Dr Ahmed's continued non-compliance, lack of any evidence of mitigation, and lack of independent reassurance that Dr Ahmed was currently safe to treat patients, the only appropriate and proportionate sanction was suspension.

17. The 2023 Tribunal therefore determined to suspend Dr Ahmed's registration for a further period of 12 months to give him time to re-engage with the GMC and for a Performance Assessment to be arranged and completed.

18. The 2023 Tribunal directed a review hearing with the onus on Dr Ahmed to demonstrate compliance.

The 2024 Review Tribunal

19. Dr Ahmed was not present or represented at the non-compliance review hearing in October 2024.

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal**

20. The Tribunal noted the extensive correspondence sent to Dr Ahmed since the previous hearing in September 2023. It noted that Dr Ahmed was aware of the GMC's direction to undertake a Performance Assessment but had failed to do so.

21. The 2024 Tribunal took account of the email dated 2 October 2024 from XXX, Mr D, in which he indicated that Dr Ahmed XXX, was living in a war zone in the Sudan and had no passport to return to the UK.

22. The 2024 Tribunal noted that the email had not come from Dr Ahmed himself but from [Mr D], with no explanation as to why Dr Ahmed could not correspond himself. Whilst the 2024 Tribunal acknowledged Dr Ahmed's difficult circumstances, it had received no objective evidence from him or [Mr D] about XXX. Nor was there any objective evidence regarding correspondence with the Home Office about the issuance of an emergency travel document or any independent evidence as to when such documents may be issued. As such, the 2024 Tribunal determined that Dr Ahmed had failed to provide a good reason why he had not complied with the direction to undergo a Performance Assessment. The 2024 Tribunal therefore determined that non-compliance had been found.

23. The 2024 Tribunal considered that a period of conditional registration would not adequately reflect the untested clinical concerns and determined that conditions could not be formulated which would protect the public, maintain public confidence in the medical profession and uphold professional standards and conduct.

24. The 2024 Tribunal determined that it was necessary, for the protection of patients and in the wider public interest, to suspend Dr Ahmed's registration for a period of 12 months. It considered that a period of 12 months would be sufficient time for Dr Ahmed to return to the UK and for the Performance Assessment to be arranged and completed.

Today's proceedings

25. The Tribunal has convened to consider Dr Ahmed's case. It is required to consider, under Rule 17ZA of the Rules, whether Dr Ahmed has failed to comply with an assessment under Schedule 1 of the Rules which relates to Performance.

The Evidence

Documentary Evidence

26. The Tribunal received documentary evidence which included but was not limited to:

- MPTS Determinations of Non-Compliance dated 8 September 2022, 21 September 2023 and October 2024;
- GMC Telephone note of call received from Dr Ahmed dated 16 December 2024;
- Email from the GMC to Dr Ahmed dated 17 December 2024 and 27 January 2025;
- Letter from the GMC to Dr Ahmed re undergoing a Performance Assessment dated 28 January 2025;
- Email from Dr Ahmed to the GMC agreeing to undergo a Performance Assessment dated 2 February 2025;
- Performance Assessment report date May 2025;
- Letter from the GMC to Dr Ahmed disclosing the Performance Assessment report dated 14 July 2025;
- Email from Dr Ahmed to the GMC dated 27 July 2025;
- Emails and attachments received from Dr Ahmed since the Performance Assessment report was disclosed on 14 July 2025;
- XXX
- XXX
- IOT determinations dated 20 December 2021 and 5 January 2022;
- Dr Ahmed's submissions re the IOT dated 25 December 2021 and 31 December 2021.

Submissions

27. On behalf of the GMC Ms Ironfield rehearsed the background to the case and provided the chronology of events to date. She stated that following the review in October 2024 Dr Ahmed made contact with the GMC.

28. Ms Ironside stated that Dr Ahmed had now undertaken a Performance Assessment in May 2025. She submitted that by reason of the completion of that Performance Assessment there had now been compliance.

The Tribunals' approach

29. In reaching a decision on the matter of non-compliance, the Tribunal has given careful consideration to the Non-Compliance Guidance for medical practitioners tribunals ('the Guidance') and all of the evidence adduced in this case. It has also taken account of the submissions made by Ms Ironfield, Counsel, on behalf of the GMC. Whilst the Tribunal bore in

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal**

mind the submissions made, the decision regarding non-compliance is one for the Tribunal to reach, exercising its own judgement.

30. The Tribunal is aware that the burden of proof rests on the GMC and that it is for the GMC to prove non-compliance. Dr Ahmed does not need to prove anything. The Tribunal is also aware that the standard of proof is that applicable to civil proceedings, which is the balance of probabilities.

The Tribunals' Decision on Non-Compliance

31. The Tribunal had regard to the documentary evidence. On 2 February 2025, Dr Ahmed confirmed to the GMC by email that he consented to undergo a Performance Assessment. Following this, Dr Ahmed underwent a Performance Assessment in May 2025 and a Performance Assessment report was completed.

32. From the evidence, the Tribunal was satisfied that Dr Ahmed has complied with the request to undergo a Performance Assessment.

33. In the circumstances, the Tribunal has therefore determined that continued non-compliance has not been found.

Determination on Sanction 10/10/2025

The current order of suspension

34. Having determined that there is no continued non-compliance, the Tribunal must now consider the current order of suspension imposed on Dr Ahmed's registration.

Submissions

35. Ms Ironfield submitted that having found there is no continued non-compliance the Tribunal can revoke the suspension currently in place.

The Tribunal's decision regarding the order of suspension

36. In deciding whether the current order of suspension should be revoked, the Tribunal has borne in mind its previous finding that Dr Ahmed has now complied with the GMC

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal**

direction to undergo a Performance Assessment. Further, the Tribunal acknowledged the submission of Ms Ironfield that the order of suspension can be revoked.

37. The Tribunal has determined that the order of suspension should be revoked as this order is no longer necessary or proportionate given that Dr Ahmed has now complied with the Performance Assessment. The order of suspension is hereby revoked.

XXX

ANNEX A – 10/10/2025

Service and Proceeding in Absence

Service

38. Dr Ahmed is neither present nor legally represented at this hearing.
39. At the outset of these proceedings, on behalf of the General Medical Council ('GMC'), Ms Janet Ironfield, counsel, made submissions in relation to service. The Tribunal was also provided with a copy of a GMC Service bundle which contained the following:
- Screenshot of Dr Ahmed's registered address/email address;
 - Rule 34(9) letter sent by first class, and special delivery post and email dated 4 September 2025;
 - Proof of delivery of the Rule 34(9) letter dated 9 September 2025;
 - MPTS Notice of hearing (NOH) letter sent by email dated 5 September;
 - MPTS NOH letter sent by first class post dated 9 September 2025;
 - MPTS NOH letter sent by special delivery post dated 9 September 2025;
 - Proof of delivery of the NOH letter dated 12 September 2025;
 - XXX;
 - XXX.
40. Ms Ironfield, referred to the relevant documentation and submitted that service of the notice of hearing had been effected. She said that the necessary information had been provided to Dr Ahmed, which included the date, time and venue of this hearing.
41. Ms Ironside submitted that the GMC is not required to prove that the notice of hearing was put into the hands of the registrant himself but is required to prove that it was delivered to his proper address.
42. Having considered all the documentation contained within the service bundle as set out above, the Tribunal determined that notice of this hearing had been served on Dr Ahmed in accordance with Rules 15 and 40 of the Rules' and paragraph 8 of Schedule 4 to the Medical Act 1983, as amended.

Proceeding in Absence

43. The Tribunal then went on to consider whether it would be appropriate to proceed with this hearing in Dr Ahmed's absence pursuant to Rule 31 of the Rules. The Tribunal was conscious that the discretion to proceed in the absence of a doctor should be exercised with the appropriate care and caution, balancing the interests of the doctor with the wider public interest.

44. Ms Ironfield invited the Tribunal to proceed with the hearing in Dr Ahmed's absence. She referred the Tribunal to the two further documents in the service bundle from XXX which were principally relevant to the absence of Dr Ahmed.

45. Ms Ironside said that a telephone call was received by the MPTS Case Management team on 8 October 2025 XXX.

46. Ms Ironside said that on the 9 October 2025 the GMC emailed XXX for further information. XXX

47. Ms Ironside said that this essentially dealt with two issues. Firstly, that Dr Ahmed was not at his registered address at the time service was affected and secondly provided an explanation for his absence. However, she said that the Tribunal could nevertheless proceed if it was satisfied that all reasonable efforts had been made to serve the practitioner with the notice of hearing in accordance of the rules.

48. Ms Ironside submitted that it was in the public interest for this Tribunal to proceed with the hearing today and that consideration outweighs Dr Ahmed's interests. She said that in terms of the evidence to be presented in respect of the non-compliance review, there had now been compliance and therefore Dr Ahmed did not, in these circumstances, face the prospect of a further sanction for non-compliance but rather, the revocation of his non-compliance order.

49. Ms Ironside submitted that in these circumstances, Dr Ahmed would not be prejudiced, nor would his interests be overridden by the matter proceeding in his absence. She stated that if the hearing was to proceed today, she would be inviting the Tribunal to consider and indeed seek an interim order of suspension.

50. Ms Ironside stated that the non-compliance order is due to expire on 11 October 2025. She stated that, as Dr Ahmed is now compliant, the Tribunal would not be able to extend the current order. In those circumstances, if the case was not to be considered today,

Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal

there would be a gap between the expiry of the order and the imposition of any future interim order.

51. In deciding whether to proceed with this hearing in Dr Ahmed's absence, the Tribunal carefully considered all the information before it and the submissions provided by Ms Ironside. XXX

52. The Tribunal noted that Dr Ahmed had undertaken a Performance Assessment, and the non-compliance order is currently due to expire on 11 October 2025.

53. The Tribunal concluded that it did not wish for any period of time where Dr Ahmed's registration is without restriction. The Tribunal was conscious of its role and the need to protect patients and the public.

54. The Tribunal determined that it was appropriate to proceed in Dr Ahmed's absence in the specific circumstances of this case. The Tribunal was of the view that any adjournment would be unlikely to result in Dr Ahmed's participation in the hearing XXX The Tribunal concluded that the interests of Dr Ahmed were outweighed by the public interest and it is therefore in the public interest for this hearing to proceed in Dr Ahmed's absence.