

**PUBLIC RECORD****Dates:** 11/07/2025**Doctor:** Dr Thangavelu SENTHIL KUMAR**GMC reference number:** 5198183**Primary medical qualification:** MB BS 1996 Annamalai University

Type of case	Outcome on impairment
Review - Misconduct	Not Impaired

**Summary of outcome**  
Suspension revoked**Tribunal:**

Legally Qualified Chair	Mrs Sarah Hamilton
Lay Tribunal Member:	Mr David Propert
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Sarah Marwick

  

Tribunal Clerk:	Ms Keely Crabtree
-----------------	-------------------

**Attendance and Representation:**

Doctor:	Present, represented
Doctor's Representative:	Mr David Morris of Morris Law
GMC Representative:	Mr Ian Brook, 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 - 11/07/2025

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 Senthil Kumar's fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

## Background

2. Dr Senthil Kumar qualified as a doctor in 1996 at Annamalai University, India and has been a General Practitioner (GP) 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. Dr Senthil Kumar's case was first considered by a Medical Practitioners Tribunal between 15 April and 8 May 2024 ('the 2024 Tribunal').

4. 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. The GMC further alleged that Dr Senthil Kumar's actions in this regard had been dishonest.

5. The 2024 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 2024 Tribunal concluded that such actions were dishonest.

6. In considering impairment, the 2024 Tribunal determined that the facts found proved amounted to serious misconduct and found Dr Senthil Kumar's fitness to practise to be impaired. It suspended Dr Senthil Kumar's registration for eight months.
7. 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 in the High Court on 19/20 February 2025.
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. 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 Rules and a Legally Qualified Chair considered this on 6 March 2025 ('the March 2025 LQC').
10. The March 2025 LQC outlined that the parties were awaiting the outcome of Dr Kumar's High Court appeal and 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. The suspension was therefore extended to 19 May 2025.
11. The High Court 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.
12. A further review was considered upon the papers by a LQC on 14 May 2025 ('the May 2025 LQC').
13. It was requested by both parties 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. The May 2025 LQC granted this request.

## The Evidence

14. The Tribunal has taken into account all the evidence received, both oral and documentary.
15. The Tribunal had regard to the documentary evidence provided by the parties. This evidence included, but was not limited to, the following:

- Determinations dated 8 May 2024, 11 February 2025, 6 March 2025 and 14 May 2025;
- MPTS Notification of s40 Appeal /Immediate Order dated 13 June 2024;
- GMC email notification of out of time s40 appeal / substantive sanction in effect dated 13 January 2025;
- Email exchange regarding adjournment of review hearing dated 13 to 14 January 2025;
- Dr Senthil Kumar's email agreeing adjournment dated 27 January 2025;
- Dr Senthil Kumar's BMJ Portfolio of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) points for the period 11 March 2025 to 6 May 2025 , and various CPD certificates dated between 8 February 2024 and 14 May 2025;
- Dr Senthil Kumar's Reflective Journals dated 10 August 2024 to 2 November 2024, and Record of Daily Journals dated 13 May 2024 to 4 August 2024; and
- Testimonial and Character letters provided on behalf of Dr Senthil Kumar;
- Report of Dr B dated 7 July 2025.

16. Dr Senthil Kumar provided his own witness statement dated 1 July 2025 and also gave oral evidence at the hearing. He apologised for his conduct and gave evidence as to the steps he has taken to remediate since the last hearing. He also answered the Tribunal's questions regarding his understanding of Good medical practice (GMP) and the impact his dishonesty has had on the public and the reputation of the profession.

## Submissions

17. On behalf of the GMC, Mr Brook stated that Dr Senthil Kumar's knowledge of GMP was a cause for concern based upon the answers he gave to the questions asked by Dr Marwick.

18. Mr Brook submitted that so far as impairment was concerned, the GMC's position was one of neutrality and it would leave it entirely in the Tribunal's hands.

19. On behalf of Dr Senthil Kumar, Mr Morris referred the Tribunal to the 2024 Tribunal's determination. He said that 2024 Tribunal was of the opinion that whilst dishonesty can be difficult to remediate, Dr Senthil Kumar's misconduct was capable of remediation. It considered that in regard to the evidence of reflection and insight, there had been a significant volume of activities undertaken since the index events, including CPD relating to dishonesty, mentoring reflections, and it was also acknowledged that Dr Senthil Kumar had made significant admissions (in 17 of the 18 allegations). Furthermore, Dr Senthil Kumar accepted the misconduct entirely and was extremely remorseful and it was acknowledged that he had apologised multiple times.

20. Mr Morris said that the 2024 Tribunal had acknowledged that Dr Senthil Kumar had made great efforts, but it was concerned that he had sought to try and minimise and/or deflect the blame for his deliberate and persistent dishonesty, and those were the areas which were cause for concern. The 2024 Tribunal determined that a key component to remediation of dishonesty was insight. Whilst Dr Senthil Kumar at the time had identified some triggers such as isolation, impulsiveness, overworking and stress, and had taken the proceedings seriously and made efforts to address his dishonesty, it felt that that journey was not complete and there was still an inability or unwillingness to acknowledge the seriousness of his misconduct and the impact on others.

21. Mr Morris said that in effect Dr Senthil Kumar had been, to a certain degree, looking at the misconduct from his own perspective and his own point of view. He did not have sufficient insight at the time into how his misconduct affected others such as the doctor whose identity he had used, his professional colleagues, the public and the impact his actions had on the reputation of the profession. Mr Morris said that it was entirely appropriate for the 2024 Tribunal to find that Dr Senthil Kumar's remediation was a journey, and that journey was not complete at that time.

22. Mr Morris referred the Tribunal to Dr Senthil Kumar's new witness statement dated 1 July 2025. He submitted that this statement evidences that Dr Senthil Kumar has demonstrated a willingness to address those concerns found by the 2024 Tribunal. Mr Morris said that Dr Senthil Kumar had tried his very best to articulate the differences between his understanding and insight at the time of his misconduct and now. He also acknowledged that at the time of the 2024 hearing he had not fully remediated and did not have full insight. He gave evidence today about the steps that he has taken since.

23. Mr Morris submitted that Dr Senthil Kumar has now acknowledged that he had let down the profession and the public.

24. Mr Morris said that in his oral evidence today, it was quite clear that Dr Senthil Kumar was very nervous due to the nature of this process and that some allowance should be given to him in this regard. He stated that this review hearing was extremely important to Dr Senthil Kumar and that he had not rushed the process. Mr Morris reminded the Tribunal that there had been a series of adjournments and extensions to the substantive suspension. He said that the suspension was imposed by way of an immediate order which meant that there had been an initial 28-day immediate suspension before the substantive suspension came into effect. This was due to last for a further eight months, so nearly nine months in total. Mr Morris stated that Dr Senthil Kumar had now been suspended for a period of 14 months, which is beyond the nine months that was anticipated.

25. Mr Morris stated that Dr Senthil Kumar has acknowledged both in his witness statement and oral evidence that it has been a journey and he has taken time to put himself in the shoes of others to understand the true impact of his misconduct. He referred the Tribunal to the witness statement as follows:

*‘There is no justification for my behaviour. I accept that my decision to create and operate a false profile and misrepresent my identity was dishonest and wholly inappropriate. I profoundly regret the distress, confusion, and loss of trust that my actions have caused to Dr [A], my colleagues, the wider profession and the public.’*

...

*‘I see now, with absolute clarity, that in trying to solve what I perceived as a short-term obstacle, I committed an act that had much deeper and wider implications. I violated the trust placed in me by my profession. I harmed a fellow doctor whose identity I misused. And perhaps most damaging of all, I harmed the integrity of the profession itself, which relies so completely on public trust.’*

26. Mr Morris stated that Dr Senthil Kumar’s witness statement sets out the steps that he has taken both before the hearing and after the hearing to give a full picture of his remediation journey. He referred the Tribunal to Dr Senthil Kumar’s remediation plan which included undertaking a medical ethics programme. He said that Dr Senthil Kumar had taken time to reflect on all the courses that he has undertaken. Mr Morris said that Dr Senthil Kumar had not just undertaken CPD courses, he had also had mentoring and coaching

totalling 16 sessions. In particular Dr Senthil Kumar had received significant coaching and mentoring from Dr B and Mr Morris referred the Tribunal to his report dated 7 July 2025. Mr Morris stated that Dr Senthil Kumar had reflected on the concerns of the 2024 Tribunal and has identified ways to ensure that this does not happen again in the future.

27. Mr Morris stated that Dr Senthil Kumar no longer tries to deflect his misconduct but accepts full responsibility. Further, he submitted that Dr Senthil Kumar knows the difference between honesty and dishonesty and knows the difference between right and wrong.

28. Mr Morris stated that Dr Senthil Kumar had also received ethical mentoring from vicar Ms C.

29. Mr Morris referred the Tribunal to the testimonials written on behalf of Dr Senthil Kumar.

30. Mr Morris stated that Dr Senthil Kumar acknowledges that his behaviour was completely unacceptable and was ashamed of it but his understanding of the severity of his misconduct is now fully understood. He stated that there was a clear difference between Dr Senthil Kumar's insight at the time of his initial hearing and his insight now. Mr Morris submitted that given Dr Senthil Kumar's insight and the commitment that he has shown to address the concerns of the 2024 Tribunal, the risk of any repetition must be considered minimal. Mr Morris said that Dr Senthil Kumar has a network of support from professional colleagues, which perhaps he did not rely upon last time.

31. Mr Morris stated that Dr Senthil Kumar has been out of the profession for 14 months which has been sufficient time to adequately reflect on his behaviour and develop a better understanding, a better level of insight and to fully remediate. Furthermore, a message has been sent to both Dr Senthil Kumar and to other professionals that misconduct of this type will not be tolerated and professional standards demand more of doctors. Mr Morris submitted that when assessing Dr Senthil Kumar's fitness to practise as of today, he is no longer impaired and should be given the opportunity to return to the profession.

### **The Relevant Legal Principles**

32. 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 practice.

33. This Tribunal must determine whether Dr Senthil Kumar's fitness to practise is impaired today, taking into account his 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

34. The Tribunal had regard to the findings of the 2024 Tribunal, including the further evidence that it thought might be of assistance for Dr Senthil Kumar to provide. It also had regard to the conclusions of the 2024 Tribunal in respect of the level of insight and remediation that Dr Senthil Kumar had shown at that point.

35. The Tribunal had regard to Dr B's report dated 7 July 2025, which included the following

*'Dr Kumar has developed full self-awareness of his limitations and has accepted responsibility for his failing back in 2020 and has been working very hard on CPD to address the concerns raised by the MPTS panel in May 2024.*

*Dr Kumar has reflected on the concerns by the panel about the potential to put professional reputation at risk and we have identified ways he can ensure this does not happen in the future by Dr Kumar continuing to reflect on his self-awareness before his actions. He has also attended a detailed training on Probity in professional practise and continue with CPD in line with the GMC Good Medical Practice.*

*Dr Kumar has expressed throughout our sessions that he accepts and takes full responsibility that in the past his actions had placed the reputation of the profession at risk of harm, and he has since worked hard to correct this by reflecting over courses and real-world case studies with me as well as colleagues and by keeping the issue of honesty and integrity at the forefront of his mind throughout.*

*Dr Kumar has shown genuine remorse, sustained commitment, and a high degree of engagement with the coaching process. His progress is evident not only in cognitive insight, but in observable shifts in his language, attitude, and*



*decision-making. He has integrated the principles of integrity, honesty, and accountability into both his professional outlook and personal conduct.*

*...*

*I believe Dr Kumar is now fully trained about his ethical and appropriate honest behaviour at all times. His risk of repetition is low.'*

36. The Tribunal also noted that Dr Senthil Kumar has undertaken recent relevant CPD, including “*Probity in professional practice*” courses and a “*Master course of professional ethics*”.

37. The Tribunal was of the opinion that Dr Senthil had sought to address the specific outstanding concerns of the 2024 Tribunal. It was satisfied that he has complied with the suggestions made in an effective and meaningful way. The Tribunal considered that Dr Senthil Kumar’s insight and remediation of matters is reflected by his identification and completion of appropriate training courses, mentoring, journals and by his expressions of regret and remorse. The Tribunal also acknowledged that Dr Senthil Kumar had demonstrated that he knows what he did was wrong and accepted full responsibility for his actions.

38. The Tribunal considers that Dr Senthil Kumar has demonstrated that he has accepted fully the findings of the 2024 Tribunal, has learnt from his experiences, gained insight and has identified appropriate strategies to assist and support him when he encounters difficulties in the future. This includes a network of support from professional colleagues.

39. The Tribunal determined that Dr Senthil Kumar appreciates the gravity of the 2024 Tribunal’s findings and has demonstrated that he has fully reflected upon them and taken positive action to ensure that his misconduct is not repeated. His reflections are very detailed and address specific sections of the 2024 Tribunal’s decision. It was clear to the Tribunal that Dr Senthil Kumar has taken a great deal of time and effort to reflect upon those findings, and consider the impact upon Dr A, the public and the profession. Although there is no evidence that Dr Senthil Kumar has personally apologised to Dr A, he did include an apology in his oral and written evidence. The Tribunal is therefore satisfied that, given Dr Senthil Kumar’s insight and remediation, it is unlikely that his misconduct will be repeated.

40. The Tribunal has determined that Dr Senthil Kumar’s fitness to practise is not impaired by reason of misconduct and that he is therefore safe to return to unrestricted practice. The Tribunal has concluded that this decision is in accordance with the statutory overarching objective to promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession,

to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of that profession.

41. The Tribunal noted that the order of suspension on Dr Senthil Kumar's registration is due to expire on 13 July 2025. The Tribunal was clear that the order of suspension had, as set out by the 2024 Tribunal, marked the seriousness of Dr Senthil Kumar's misconduct and upheld the demands of the overarching objective at the time. It had allowed Dr Senthil Kumar adequate time and opportunity to complete his process of insight and remediation such that it was now safe and appropriate for him to return to practice. In the light of its findings on impairment, the Tribunal therefore determined to revoke the order of suspension with immediate effect. It was of the view that this was both appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances.

42. That concludes this case.