

**PUBLIC RECORD****Dates:** 06/06/2025**Doctor:** Dr Abeer MURSI**GMC reference number:** 7979037**Primary medical qualification:** MB BS 2003 University of Khartoum

Type of case	Outcome on impairment
Review - Misconduct	Not Impaired

**Summary of outcome**

Suspension revoked

**Tribunal:**

Legally Qualified Chair	Mrs Alison Storey
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Bryn Davies
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Helen McCormack
Tribunal Clerk:	Ms Olivia Gamble

**Attendance and Representation:**

Doctor:	Present, not represented
GMC Representative:	Mr John Morrison, 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 - 06/06/2025

1. 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 Mursi's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of misconduct.

## Background

2. Dr Mursi qualified as a doctor in 2003 from the University of Khartoum, Sudan. Prior to the events which are the subject of the hearing Dr Mursi held various medical posts in Sudan from 2004 to April 2014. She then commenced a post in the United Arab Emirates ('UAE') from April 2014. At the time of the events, Dr Mursi was practising as an Internal Medicine Specialist at the University Hospital Sharjah, UAE.

## May 2024 Tribunal

3. At the outset of Dr Mursi's hearing, which took place in May 2024, she admitted the Allegation in full and the May 2024 Tribunal found it proved. In her written statement Dr Mursi acknowledged her misconduct and dishonest actions. She offered her apologies for engaging in plagiarism and said that she recognised that her conduct was unacceptable. The initial concerns were raised with the GMC on 29 September 2022 by Dr A, Regional Postgraduate Dean for HEE Southwest area.

4. The facts found proved by the May 2024 Tribunal are summarised that on one or more occasions, between April and July 2022, Dr Mursi submitted an article which contained plagiarised material, and of which she was cited as an author, to the International Journal of Health Sciences.

5. Furthermore, it was found proved that, on or around 1 September 2022, Dr Mursi submitted an online application form to Health Education England (HEE) for Speciality Training Year 4, in which she provided details of the article in support and made certain declarations. It was found proved that the article contained plagiarised material and the declarations Dr Mursi made were untrue. The May 2024 Tribunal found that Dr Mursi's actions were dishonest.

6. The May 2024 Tribunal noted that Dr Mursi admitted the Allegation in its entirety. However, it also noted that Dr Mursi only admitted her dishonesty at the Rule 7 stage after previously providing untruthful accounts to HEE and the GMC.

7. The May Tribunal considered that the following paragraphs of Good Medical Practice (GMP) were engaged in Dr Mursi's case.

*'1 Patients need good doctors. Good doctors make the care of their patients their first concern: they are competent, keep their knowledge and skills up to date, establish and maintain good relationships with patients and colleagues, are honest and trustworthy, and act with integrity and within the law.*

...

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

*66 You must always be honest about your experience, qualifications and current role.*

*67 You must act with honesty and integrity when designing, organising or carrying out research, and follow national research governance guidelines and our guidance.*

...

*71 You must be honest and trustworthy when writing reports, and when completing or signing forms, reports and other documents. You must make sure that any documents you write or sign are not false or misleading.*

*a You must take reasonable steps to check the information is correct.*

*b You must not deliberately leave out relevant information.'*

8. The May 2024 Tribunal found Dr Mursi's conduct, in appropriating the research of others and claiming responsibility for it in her own name was not only unacceptable but deplorable. It found that her subsequent decision to cite her own plagiarised article in application for speciality training had the clear potential to undermine the integrity of the system by which doctors are trained and to put patients at risk through exposure to a doctor whose purported experience and expertise was not genuine.

9. The May 2024 Tribunal determined that Dr Mursi's conduct was serious, that her actions had brought the medical profession into disrepute, and that she had breached fundamental tenets of GMP, namely probity and integrity. The May 2024 Tribunal determined that Dr Mursi's dishonest actions amounted to misconduct that was serious, both when considered individually and cumulatively.

10. In relation to insight, the May 2024 Tribunal noted that Dr Mursi qualified as a doctor in 2004 and was therefore an experienced doctor. It noted that, whilst Dr Mursi had admitted the misconduct and had demonstrated some understanding of the nature of her dishonest conduct, she had exhibited only limited insight into the impact of her actions on the wider scientific community and on other researchers.

11. The May 2024 Tribunal was also concerned by Dr Mursi's admission, in written answers during the course of the hearing, that she had not properly considered the risks of her conduct. It was not persuaded by Dr Mursi's written evidence that she understood how she could have failed to appreciate the ethical implications of her actions. The May 2024 Tribunal determined that, while Dr Mursi had demonstrated some insight, her current insight remained limited.

12. The May 2024 Tribunal considered that dishonesty is difficult to remediate. It found that Dr Mursi had demonstrated some remediation, in that she admitted the entirety of the Allegation and offered repeated apologies within her reflective statement and written answers. The May 2024 Tribunal acknowledged that Dr Mursi had undertaken steps to remediate, such as relevant probity and ethics courses and a number of meetings with her mentor. It noted, however, that the plagiarised material was still online and at that time had not been withdrawn. It considered that Dr Mursi therefore continued to take the credit for a piece of purported research which she did not carry out. The May 2024 Tribunal therefore determined that, whilst there was some evidence of remediation, it was far from adequate.

Given Dr Mursi's current limited insight and remediation, the May 2024 Tribunal considered that there was a risk of repetition in similar circumstances.

13. The May 2024 Tribunal determined that the public expects to be able to trust doctors. The public expects doctors to act with integrity. They expect doctors to adhere to the principles set out in GMP. Where doctors fail to do so in a significant way, public trust in the profession is undermined and a finding of impairment of fitness to practise is required.

14. The May 2024 Tribunal found that a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would expect a finding of impairment to be made in this case, both to mark the seriousness of the misconduct and to uphold proper standards across the medical profession. Therefore, the May 2024 Tribunal determined that Dr Mursi's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of misconduct in order to uphold the overarching objective.

15. The May 2024 Tribunal considered that there were no exceptional circumstances to justify taking no action in Dr Mursi's case.

16. Given the nature of Dr Mursi's misconduct, which involved dishonesty, the May 2024 Tribunal took the view that appropriate conditions could not be formulated which would be workable. It did not consider that conditions would be sufficient to mark the gravity of the misconduct. The Tribunal considered that an order of conditions would not be appropriate or proportionate and would not be in the public interest.

17. The May 2024 Tribunal considered paragraphs 92, 93, 97, 120, 125, 126 and 127 of the Sanction Guidance (the SG) to be relevant. It was in no doubt that Dr Mursi's dishonest conduct was unacceptable for any medical practitioner. While it noted that Dr Mursi's misconduct did not relate directly to her clinical practice, it was committed by her in order to facilitate her entry to a specialist training programme in the UK.

18. The May 2024 Tribunal considered the potential consequences of Dr Mursi's actions to be both extensive and seriously damaging to the trust that both the public and profession have in medicine as a science. The May 2024 Tribunal also noted its previous finding that Dr Mursi's proven misconduct was not a 'one-off' and that she had acted dishonestly both in knowingly submitting a plagiarised article for publication in a learned journal and in knowingly relying on that plagiarised article in her application to HEE. It also noted that, at least until today's date, the plagiarised article remains online, and that Dr Mursi can still be

credited or cited for it despite having undertaken none of the research it purported to present.

19. The May 2024 Tribunal considered that suspension for 12 months was the appropriate sanction to reflect the seriousness of Dr Mursi's dishonest conduct. The Tribunal considered that a shorter period of suspension would not give Dr Mursi sufficient time to remediate, given her current level of insight. The May 2024 Tribunal considered that a period of 12 months would give Dr Mursi the opportunity to develop insight and demonstrate remediation in relation to her dishonest actions. It determined that a lengthy period of suspension was also required in order to maintain confidence in the profession, and to declare and uphold proper professional standards.

20. The Tribunal determined that a 12-month suspension was the appropriate and proportionate sanction required to uphold the overarching objective.

21. The May 2024 Tribunal directed a review of Dr Mursi's case, clarifying that the onus will be on Dr Mursi to demonstrate how she has remediated and developed insight into her dishonest actions. It considered that it may assist the reviewing Tribunal if Dr Mursi provides the following:

- Evidence of demonstrating further insight and remediation;
- A full and detailed reflective statement: Dr Mursi may wish to reflect on her past actions, her dishonesty, and the impact upon public confidence in the medical profession and wider scientific process as well as on her colleagues;
- Evidence of the plagiarised article being successfully withdrawn;
- Evidence of using her experience to educate others as to the risks, consequences and impact of similar dishonest conduct;
- Evidence that she has kept her clinical knowledge up to date during her period of suspension;
- Evidence of any relevant training, mentoring or Continuing Professional Development courses undertaken;
- Any other information which Dr Mursi considers would assist the reviewing Tribunal.

### The Evidence

22. The Tribunal has taken into account all the evidence received.

23. The Tribunal received the following documentary evidence which included but was not limited to:

- Record of Determination 9 May 2024;
- Dr Mursi's reflective statement, undated;
- Letters of recommendation from Dr B, Nephrologist and Dr C, Associate Professor of Community Medicine, University Hospital Shahjah, United Arab Emirates, dated 28 April 2025;
- Certificates of Continuing Professional Development (CPD), dated March – May 2025;
- Performance Appraisal form, University Hospital Shahjah, dated 22 May 2025;
- Multi Source feedback forms, undated;
- Dr Mursi's letter of apology, dated 1 June 2025;
- Certificate of appreciation, dated 12 June 2022;
- Continuing Education Evaluation Forms, undated.

### Submissions

24. On behalf of the GMC, Mr John Morrison, Counsel, submitted that the GMC are neutral on the matter of impairment in this case.

25. Mr Morrison did however submit that the Tribunal should consider a couple of points. Mr Morrison stated that some of the CPD evidence that Dr Mursi submitted was outdated, in that it occurred before the original hearing took place. Additionally, Mr Morrison asked the Tribunal to consider the content of Dr Mursi's reflective statement and consider whether it focused on the core issues in this case such as dishonesty and what has now changed, rather than just amounting to Dr Mursi accepting what she did and apologising.

26. Dr Mursi submitted that she fully accepted her misconduct and apologised for it. In response to Mr Morrison's comment regarding some of her CPD being outdated, Dr Mursi apologised for this and reminded the Tribunal that she is not legally trained.

27. Dr Mursi submitted that she fully understands that her previous sanction was fair, and necessary to maintain public trust and uphold the standards of the profession. She stated that she is trying hard to be a good person and would like the chance to be a 'professional person' again.

28. Dr Mursi submitted that her misconduct was a lapse in her judgement, and although serious was an isolated incident. However, she has now taken the time to examine why it happened and had learned a lot. Dr Mursi outlined how she understands that she needs to work hard to earn the trust of her patients, colleagues and the GMC. She stated that she is willing to work hard to regain this trust.

29. Dr Mursi submitted that during the time where the misconduct occurred, she was very stressed, however she noted that there are ‘no excuses’. She concluded that the misconduct which occurred was her mistake and she takes full responsibility for it. She stated that being honest is the ‘cornerstone of a good doctor.’

30. She explained that she had devised and delivered two training courses for medical students which dealt with plagiarism and medical ethics. She had admitted to the students that she had made a mistake although she had not gone into details. She had found this embarrassing but had worked through that as she wanted to teach them so that they did not make the same mistake as her.

31. She had had mentoring from her consultant about how to improve and avoid acting unethically in the future.

32. She said that she had tried to keep herself updated in the period of suspension. She did not have a paid clinical post, but had undertaken voluntary work, as an instructor for students preparing for their MRCP (Membership of the Royal College of Physicians) exams. She had undertaken online learning with modules on cardiology as she had considered this a potential direction for her future career. She had also been undertaking a course in endocrinology/diabetes and this was due to finish this year, but she had not yet completed the final exam.

### **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, 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 she would be safe to return to unrestricted practise.

34. This Tribunal must determine whether Dr Mursi’s fitness to practise is impaired today, taking into account her 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**

35. In reaching its decision, the Tribunal bore in mind that its primary responsibility is to uphold the statutory overarching objective which is as follows:

- To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public;
- To promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession;
- To promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of that profession.

36. The Tribunal considered the determination of the 2024 Tribunal, the submissions of both parties, and the recent documentary evidence from Dr Mursi as to her reflections and the steps she has taken to remediate her misconduct since the last hearing.

37. The Tribunal reminded itself of the items which the 2024 Tribunal considered would assist today’s reviewing Tribunal.

38. The Tribunal considered Dr Mursi’s submissions at this hearing and the documentary evidence she has provided. It was of the view that she had submitted what the 2024 Tribunal had recommended.

39. In relation to evidence of further insight and remediation, the Tribunal considered that Dr Mursi’s reflective statement, although at times self-centric, was sufficiently detailed. She had addressed the impact of her dishonesty on the medical profession and in particular the impact it could have on the public’s trust of doctors and research, and the impact on other professionals particularly those carrying out research. The Tribunal considered that this, taken together with her oral submissions, had shown that she had sufficient insight into the impact of her misconduct on the medical profession and the public.

40. The Tribunal considered that it was to Dr Mursi’s credit that she had given a presentation to medical students on the subject of plagiarism and ethics. This demonstrated to the Tribunal that Dr Mursi took her misconduct seriously and wanted to do what she could to ensure junior doctors did not end up in the same situation. She had had to admit to these

students that she had erred on this topic. The Tribunal considered that this was evidence of insight and an attempt to remediate her misconduct.

41. The Tribunal also took into account that Dr Mursi has undergone mentoring throughout the period of suspension which it considered further evidence of remediation.

42. The Tribunal took into account testimonials from Dr B and Dr C, Dr Mursi's supervisors, that indicated no probity concerns.

43. The Tribunal also noted the evidence Dr Mursi provided in relation to CPD courses, including on the subject of probity and ethics, which she undertook in April 2025.

44. When considering the evidence it has before it, the Tribunal determined that Dr Mursi's current level of insight is sufficient, and she has remediated her misconduct. In all the circumstances of this case, the Tribunal was satisfied that the risk of repetition of Dr Mursi's misconduct is now low.

45. The Tribunal went on to consider whether Dr Mursi had kept her clinical skills and knowledge up to date. It took the view that Dr Mursi had provided CPD certificates and had provided an outline in her oral submissions of her attempts to keep her knowledge up to date. It noted that she has remained engaged in professional development by training others on clinical matters and undertaking research as well as the CPD courses.

46. On the whole, the Tribunal considered that there was enough evidence that Dr Mursi's clinical knowledge has been sufficiently maintained during the period of suspension.

47. The Tribunal considered what it has before it in this review hearing. It determined that Dr Mursi has provided what the 2024 Tribunal has asked of her. It considered that Dr Mursi has reflected, developed adequate insight into her misconduct, and taken the appropriate steps toward remediation. It considered that her clinical skills and knowledge are sufficiently up to date. It further noted that the GMC are neutral on the matter of her current impairment.

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

**Record of Determinations –  
Medical Practitioners Tribunal**

49. The Tribunal noted that Dr Mursi's suspension is due to expire on 26 June 2025. The Tribunal acknowledged that the 2024 Tribunal imposed a 12-month suspension on Mursi's registration in order to send a signal to her, the profession and the wider public that her actions were unacceptable and should never be repeated. However, having found that Dr Mursi's fitness to practise is not currently impaired, and in the light of the remediation she has undertaken, the Tribunal directed that the suspension be revoked with immediate effect.

50. That concludes this case.