

General Pharmaceutical Council

Fitness to Practise Committee

Principal Hearing

Remote videolink hearing

30-31 May 2024

Registrant name:	Ramesh Chuthraj
Registration number:	2052462
Part of the register:	Pharmacist
Type of Case:	Conviction
Committee Members:	Jill Crawford (Chair) Gail Curphey (Registrant member) Paul Barton (Lay member)
Legal Adviser:	Neville Sorab
Committee Secretary:	Zainab Mohamad
Registrant:	Not present and not represented
General Pharmaceutical Council:	Represented by Catriona Thomson, Case Presenter
Facts proved:	All
Facts proved by admission:	None
Facts not proved:	None
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Removal
Interim measures:	Suspension imposed

This decision including any finding of facts, impairment and sanction is an appealable decision under *The General Pharmaceutical Council (Fitness to Practise and Disqualification etc. Rules) Order of Council 2010*. Therefore, this decision will not take effect until 1 July 2024 or, if an appeal is lodged, once that appeal has been concluded. However, the interim suspension set out in the decision takes effect immediately and will lapse when the decision takes effect or once any appeal is concluded.

Particulars of Allegation (as amended)

You, a registered pharmacist,

1. On 28th June 2022, were convicted at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offence:

1.1. Theft by Employee

By reason of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your conviction.

Documentation

Document 1- GPhC hearing bundle

Document 2- GPhC skeleton argument

Document 3- Registrant's compilation of evidence updated

Document 4- Registrant's compilation of evidence

Document 5- GPhC PIA bundle

Document 6- Proof of service bundle

Document 7- Registrant's comments for Principal Hearing

Determination

Introduction

1. This is the written determination of the Fitness to Practise Committee at the General Pharmaceutical Council ("the Council").
2. The hearing is governed by *The Pharmacy Order 2010* ("the Order") and *The General Pharmaceutical Council (Fitness to Practise and Disqualification etc. Rules) Order of Council 2010* ("the Rules").
3. The statutory overarching objectives for these regulatory proceedings are:

- a. To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public;
 - b. To promote and maintain public confidence in the professions regulated by the Council; and
 - c. To promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of those professions.
4. The Committee also has regard to the guidance contained in the Council's *Good decision making: Fitness to practise hearings and sanction guidance* as revised March 2024.
 5. A Principal Hearing has up to three stages:
 - Stage 1. Findings of Fact – the Committee determines any disputed facts.
 - Stage 2. Findings of ground(s) of impairment and impairment – the Committee determines whether, on the facts as proved, a statutory ground for impairment is established and, if so, whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired.
 - Stage 3. Sanction – the Committee considers what, if any, sanction should be applied if the Registrant's fitness to practise is found to be impaired.

Service of Notice of Hearing

6. The Committee has seen a letter dated 5 April 2024 from the Council headed "Notice of Hearing" addressed to the Registrant. The Committee was satisfied that there had been good service of the Notice in accordance with Rules 3 and 16.

Application to proceed in the absence of the registrant

7. The Registrant was not in attendance at this hearing, nor was someone attending on their behalf. The Committee heard submissions from Ms Thomson under Rule 25 to proceed in the absence of the Registrant.

8. The Committee noted that the Registrant had not responded directly to the Notice of Hearing. He has, however, made submissions in email form in relation to the case on 23 May 2024. The Committee noted this was after the Notice of Hearing was issued and a week before the Principal Hearing commenced.
9. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, which included reference to Rules 3 and 17 and to the cases of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL5*; *General Medical Council v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*.
10. The Committee decided to proceed in the absence of the Registrant for the following reasons:
 - The Committee has found good service of the Notice of Hearing by email. Therefore the Registrant is, or should be, aware of today's proceedings. The Notice of Hearing and Principal Hearing documents were also sent to the Registrant by special delivery and were signed for. It appears therefore that he has chosen not to attend;
 - The Registrant has been in contact with the Council on 23 May 2024 and has not asked for an adjournment;
 - The GPhC contacted the Registrant on 5 April 2024 requesting that he indicates whether he would be attending the Principal Hearing, and on 28 May 2024 with the Zoom links to the Principal Hearing. The Registrant has not responded to these emails;
 - There was no information to suggest an adjournment would result in the Registrant's attendance in future; and
 - There is a public interest in the expeditious disposal of cases, given the seriousness of the allegation, that the incident took place in 2019, and the Registrant was convicted two years ago.

Application to amend the particulars of allegation.

11. The Committee heard an application under Rule 41 from Ms Thomson to amend Particular 1 from:

1. *On 28th June 2022, were convicted at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offence:*

1.1. *Theft by Employee*

By reason of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.

to

1. *On 28th June 2022, were convicted at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offence:*

1.1. *Theft by Employee*

By reason of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your conviction.

12. Ms Thomson submitted that the above amendment to the Particulars of Allegation corrects a minor error in the wording to the gateway for impairment. Ms Thomson further submitted that this amendment to the Particulars is important in order to reflect the correct impairment, and that the amendment would not prejudice the fairness of these proceedings.

13. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that subject to the requirements not to prejudice the fairness of these proceedings, the allegations should reflect the gravity of the Registrant's alleged conduct or behaviour (*PSA v HCPC and Doree [2017] EWCA Civ 319*). However, to introduce late an entirely new case requiring extensive investigation would potentially be unfair (*Bittar v FCA [2017] UKUT 82 (TCC)*).

14. The Committee was of the view that the amendment to the allegation is important in order to reflect the correct impairment, and that the amendment would not prejudice the fairness of these proceedings.

Registrant's response to Particulars of allegation

15. The Registrant was not present to accept or deny Particulars of allegation, and did not provide any written correspondence directly addressing this issue.

Background

16. On 7 January 2020, the Council received an online referral from Well Pharmacy ("Well") in relation to the Registrant. Well informed the Council that the Registrant, who worked as a locum at the Welling branch ("the Pharmacy"), had been subject to an internal investigation regarding theft of medicines.
17. On 17 August 2023, the Council sought disclosure from Woolwich Crown Court ("the Court"). The Council received the Certificate of Conviction, dated 25 August 2023, which confirmed that the Registrant had been convicted of "*Theft by Employee*" and was sentenced to "*45 weeks imprisonment suspended for 24 months. [He] Must undertake Rehabilitation Activity Requirement for 20 days. [He must] Carry out unpaid work for 150hrs. [He must] Pay compensation of £2384 and victim surcharge of £149*".
18. The Council sought further disclosure from the Court on 01 September 2023, specifically for the transcript of the judge's sentencing remarks. The Council received the sentencing transcript, which detailed that whilst the Registrant was employed as a locum pharmacist at Well Pharmacy, from at least August 2019 to November 2019, the Registrant stole perfume items of the value of at least £2,384. The Registrant also took patient returned medication, first aid and dental products, as well as cash from the till. The Registrant pled guilty, however, the sentencing plea discount was reduced from 25% to approximately 13% on the basis that the Registrant's acceptance was only for actions over a short period of time, was for items with a value of up to £500 and was for items from the reduced to clear bin.

19. Upon consideration of the sentencing guidelines, Mrs Recorder Lewis KC stated that the offence was committed *“over a sustained period of time”*, which was an aggravating factor. Another aggravating factor considered by Mrs Recorder Lewis KC was that the Registrant took products, medicines, and cash. Mrs Recorder Lewis KC also noted that: *“Your culpability is high because you committed this offence in breach of a high degree of trust and responsibility. You were the responsible person at the branch for the period of time in which you offended.”*

Decision on Facts

20. The allegation in this case is a conviction. The Committee had sight of the certificate of conviction and therefore found the facts proved in accordance with Rule 24(4).

Impairment

21. Having found the Particulars of allegation proved, the Committee went on to consider whether the Registrant’s fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of their conviction.
22. The Committee took account of the guidance given to the meaning of *“fitness to practise”* in the Council’s publication *“Good decision-making”* (Revised March 2024).
23. The Committee took into account the submissions made by Ms Thomson, who submitted:
- a. The thefts carried out by the Registrant took place over a period of months, from at least August 2019 to November 2019. This conduct was premeditated and sustained. It is therefore, submitted that this conduct has brought the profession of pharmacy into disrepute. The particularised conduct suggests there is an attitudinal failure on the Registrant’s part which has not been redressed and resolved by evidence of full insight and remediation.
 - b. The allegation against the Registrant is significant. He has committed a criminal offence which was so serious he received a suspended custodial sentence at a

crown court. The offence also took place whilst the Registrant was carrying out his duties as a pharmacist.

- c. It is clear that integrity is linked to the manner in which registrants serve the public, and it is during the course of the Registrant's employment, where he was serving the public, that he committed the criminal offence of theft from his employer. The Registrant's conduct also demonstrates a serious attitudinal problem where he places his priorities above others and lacks insight into his own failings. Unless the Registrant is able to demonstrate he has recently engaged in remediation to address this issue, the Council is of the opinion the current risk of repetition is high. This level of risk is unlikely to change until the Registrant has addressed this attitudinal deficit. The Council has not received any evidence to suggest that the Registrant has accepted/has insight that his actions were wrong and there are no excuses for his actions. The reason cited by the Registrant during the Police interview as to why he committed this offence, exposes a dysfunctional mindset/decision making process. The Registrant must demonstrate that he has addressed this before he can be deemed fit to practice. During the sentencing, Mrs Recorder Lewis KC stated the following:

"It is disappointing that for a man with your qualifications and trusted role in society that you have shown so little understanding of the level of dishonesty involved in your behaviour, and as far as I can see, no remorse"

- d. the Registrant's integrity can no longer be relied upon for the above reasons. Due to the serious nature of the allegation, a finding of current impairment is required in order to uphold the public confidence in the profession.
24. The Registrant did not directly make any comment whether his fitness to practise is currently impaired, but provided to the Committee the following written submissions from 23 May 2024:
- a. He no longer has legal representation because of financial difficulties and incompetence of legal counsel.

- b. The police have abused their power and taken all his belongings without producing an itemised receipt of everything they have requested over the years.
- c. The Registrant was forced into accepting the police terms due to lack of appropriate counsel as both his senior solicitor and original barrister were not present at the court hearing.
- d. The Registrant stood his ground and spoke the truth despite being scared and manipulated into this conviction, as from the very start of this trial he was being threatened with imprisonment for no less than 2 years.
- e. The judge decided on “her belief” rather than factual evidence.
- f. The Registrant had become the sacrificial lamb for the store that was already in deep water with several issues built up over the years.
- g. Patients were appreciative of the Registrant’s consistency and praised him on his hard work and efforts which was reiterated to head office through their own phone calls. The patients were disgusted with how the Registrant was treated and disappointed to see him leave. These were items which the Registrant had appropriately had in his possession, bought at various outlets including duty free shops, abroad, sales and personal gifts.
- h. Some foreign currency seized by the police was not returned. British currency was taken from the Registrant’s home and deposited into his bank account.
- i. During questioning from the police, the Registrant was scared, emotionally, physically and psychologically incapable of answering questions coherently as he had not eaten or drank liquids from that morning after been held in a freezing cold police cell for over 12 hours. He was literally traumatised and shivering with cold, stressed, exhausted and extremely nervous and anxious.
- j. Well’s Area Manager was homophobic, bullying and demonstrated threatening behaviour towards the Registrant. Well’s Area Manager threatened the Registrant that he will make sure that the Registrant will never get Locum opportunities at Well again if he did not do what was asked and that the Registrant could not choose which store he wanted to work in.

- k. When the Registrant first got to Welling, it was in a total mess, no order but chaos, no SOPs, no proper processes and procedures were in place, no formal cashing up process and change was made by removing cash from the till or safe and going to the bank next door, no one trained on cashing up process, hence always discrepancies which after spending hours.
 - l. Prescription Pricing Authority started to phone every month to state that a large number of prescriptions were missing and the amount claimed is in excess.
 - m. The entire Welling branch had to be re-merchandised as it was operating on a planogram that was over three years old which resulted in a large quantity of merchandise being discontinued or expired. These had to put into the reduced to clear bin for quick sale, disposed of, offered to staff a tradition known since I started working as a pharmacist or it would create a health and safety hazard in the work place.
 - n. The Registrant was never given any proper training whilst at Welling branch on the installation of the new PMR, he was handed the manual and told to get on with it.
 - o. The Area Manager was jealous and envious of the Registrant's knowledge and experience as the Registrant was able to restore the store despite his blatant lack of support.
25. The Committee accepted the advice of the legal adviser, which included that the Committee must have regard to whether or not the Registrant's conduct or behaviour:
- a. presents an actual or potential risk to patients or to the public;
 - b. has brought, or might bring, the profession of pharmacy into disrepute;
 - c. has breached one of the fundamental principles of the profession of pharmacy; or
 - d. shows that the integrity of the Registrant can no longer be relied upon.

Whether the Registrant's conduct or behaviour presents an actual or potential risk to patients or to the public

26. The Committee considered that the Registrant stole returned patient medication and behaved dishonestly in the workplace over a sustained period of time in a manner that

caused financial loss to his employer. The Committee considered that a willingness to behave dishonestly in the workplace and to disregard standards of conduct expected by his employer and regulator for reasons of self-interest poses a risk of harm to patients and the public.

27. The Committee is of the view that the Registrant has not demonstrated any insight on the basis that:
 - a. At the criminal trial, partially admitted some of the theft (actions over a short period of time; items with a value of up to £500; and only items from the reduced to clear bin). This account was dismissed by the Crown Court Judge and he was found to have stolen items over a longer period of time and of a higher value.
 - b. In his submissions to the Committee dated 23 May 2024, the Registrant seeks to “go behind” the Crown Court Judge’s sentencing remarks by stating that he was forced to plead guilty under a threat of a minimum two-year custodial sentence.
 - c. The Registrant has admitted that he felt that he did not get paid enough, and therefore helped himself to property.
 - d. The Committee did not have before it any evidence of insight from the Registrant. The submissions raised by the Registrant on 23 May 2024 focus on the perceived wrongs that he has suffered at the hands of others, including Wells, the police and judiciary. He appears to minimise the offence, challenge the basis of the sentencing remarks, and fails to express any remorse or address the impact of his offending behaviour on others.
28. The Committee did not have before it any evidence of remediation or remorse from the Registrant. The Committee did not receive any references or testimonials.
29. The Committee has no evidence before it that the Registrant has insight, expressed remorse, or has undertaken any remediation, so as not to present a risk to patients or the public in the future. [It noted the health information put before the Committee by the registrant but did not consider it to be relevant to the offending behaviour or his current fitness to practise.]

Whether the Registrant's conduct or behaviour has brought, or might bring, the profession of pharmacy into disrepute

30. The Committee considered that the Registrant's conduct and behaviour has brought the profession of pharmacy into disrepute on the basis that:
- a. The Registrant committed a crime – theft – during the course of his employment.
 - b. The crime was serious enough that the Registrant received a custodial sentence.
 - c. The crime is one of dishonesty, where the Registrant was in a position of trust.
31. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 30-32, the Committee does not consider that the Registrant has demonstrated any insight, expressed any remorse, or undertaken sufficient remediation so as not to bring the profession of pharmacy into disrepute in the future.

Whether the Registrant's conduct or behaviour has breached one of the fundamental principles of the profession of pharmacy

32. Through being found guilty of theft by employee, the Committee considered that the Registrant's conduct and behaviour has breached one of the fundamental principles of the profession of pharmacy, namely the requirement to be trustworthy.
33. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 30-32, the Committee does not consider that the Registrant has demonstrated any insight, expressed any remorse, or undertaken sufficient remediation to reduce the likelihood of him behaving dishonestly again and so breaching this fundamental principle of the profession of pharmacy in the future.

Whether the Registrant's conduct or behaviour shows that the integrity of the Registrant can no longer be relied upon

34. Through pleading guilty of theft by employee and being sentenced to a term of imprisonment (albeit suspended for two years), the Committee considered that the Registrant's conduct and behaviour showed that the integrity of the Registrant could not be relied upon.

35. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 30-32, the Committee does not consider that the Registrant has demonstrated any insight, expressed any remorse, or undertaken sufficient remediation such that his integrity can now be relied upon.

Committee's conclusion on impairment

36. In light of the above, the Committee considered the Registrant's fitness to practise to be impaired on all three limbs, namely: public protection; maintaining public confidence; and upholding professional standards.

Sanction

37. Having found impairment, the Committee has gone on to consider the matter of sanction. The Committee's powers are set out in Article 54(2) of the Order. The Committee should consider the available sanctions in ascending order from least restrictive, take no action, to most restrictive, removal from the register, in order to identify the appropriate and proportionate sanction that meets the circumstances of the case.
38. The purpose of the sanction is not to be punitive, though a sanction may in fact have a punitive effect. The purpose of the sanction is to meet the overarching objectives of regulation, namely the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence and to promote professional standards. The Committee is therefore entitled to give greater weight to the public interest over the Registrant's interests.
39. The Committee had regard to the Council's "*Good decision making: Fitness to practise hearings and outcomes guidance*", published in March 2024, to inform its decision.
40. On behalf of the Council, Ms Thomson submitted:
- a. The aggravating factors in this matter consist of the following:
 - i. The criminal act of theft was premeditated and sustained over the course of months/on numerous occasions;
 - ii. The theft was discovered by others, not through the Registrant's admittance;

- iii. Theft involves being dishonest;
 - iv. Theft by an employee involves a breach of trust between the pharmacy and Registrant; and
 - v. The Registrant has stated that he stole the items from the premises because he was not paid enough money by his employer. He therefore placed monetary gain and his own needs above that of others, including the public.
- b. The mitigating factors in this matter consist of the following:
- i. The Registrant pled guilty to one count of theft on 28 June 2022. However, it is noted that the Registrant's sentencing discount was reduced from 25% to 13% as the guilty plea related to actions for a limited time and a limited amount/value of goods.
 - c. A warning or advice would be insufficient to reflect the seriousness of the Registrant's criminal conviction.
 - d. No conditions of practice are suitable, as this is not a case involving the Registrant's clinical failings which need to be remediated or addressed with supervision.
 - e. The appropriate and proportionate starting point for sanction is suspension. The Registrant's custodial sentence, albeit suspended, reflects the seriousness of this offence. Any lesser sanction risks undermining public confidence within the profession and the Regulator. The Council submit that suspension for a maximum of 12 months would be sufficient to secure the public interest.
41. The committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
42. The Committee first considered what, if any, mitigating and aggravating factors there may be. The Committee identified no mitigating factors. It considered whether the Registrant's guilty plea was a mitigating factor, namely whether it indicated that the Registrant accepted some accountability for his actions. However, it noted that the basis of his admission was rejected by the judge in the sentencing remarks, who found the dishonesty was sustained over a longer period and involved a higher value than

asserted by the Registrant at his trial. It further noted that in his email of 23 May 2024 the Registrant states that he was “*manipulated into this conviction*” and that he “*kept being brainwashed into sentencing guidelines and being threatened with imprisonment of no less than 2 years*”. The Committee concluded that, in these circumstances, the Registrant’s guilty plea does not, any longer, demonstrate that the Registrant has taken accountability for his dishonest actions, and is therefore not a mitigating factor.

43. The Committee identified the following aggravating factors:
- a. The Registrant committed numerous thefts from an employer – who was a pharmacy – over a prolonged period of time. As such, there was a breach of trust with an employer who was within the pharmacy profession.
 - b. The thefts were premeditated.
 - c. The thefts were for monetary gain.
 - d. The Registrant has been dishonest through his actions of theft.
 - e. The Registrant has offered no insight.
 - f. The Registrant has not expressed any remorse.
 - g. The Committee has not seen any evidence of remediation from the Registrant.
 - h. The Registrant’s blaming others for the events which took place demonstrates an attitudinal issue.
44. The Committee also considered the following factors to be relevant:
- a. Although the Registrant made claims about the highly positive role he played at Wells in other regards during the time of his dishonesty, there was no other evidence before the Committee to support these claims. In any event, any such evidence would not remove the obligation on him to behave honestly.
 - b. No personal testimonial or referee evidence was placed before the Committee.
 - c. The Committee did not have evidence before it of any recent volunteering or employment of the Registrant, nor any feedback in relation to the 20 days rehabilitation or 150 hours unpaid work the Registrant was required to undertake

as directed by the Court. Therefore, the Committee does not know the position on these issues.

45. The Registrant's conviction for theft was deemed so serious by the courts that a term of imprisonment was imposed (albeit suspended for two years). In light of this, the Committee finds that taking no action, issuing advice or issuing a warning would not adequately protect the public. Further, these sanctions would not adequately meet the wider public interest of maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
46. The Committee next considered the imposition of conditions of Registration. A conditions of registration Order would allow the Registrant to practise albeit with restrictions. However, the Committee did not consider that conditions would be appropriate as no relevant or proportionate conditions could be formulated given the Registrant's lack of insight, remorse and remediation. Further, the Committee did not consider that conditions are the appropriate vehicle to address a behavioural problem and attitudinal issue: dishonestly in the form of theft by employee.
47. The Committee next considered whether suspension would be a proportionate sanction. The Committee noted the Council's guidance which indicates that suspension may be appropriate where:

"The Committee considers that a warning or conditions are insufficient to deal with any risk to patient safety or to protect the public, or would undermine public confidence. It may be required when necessary to highlight to the profession and to the public that the conduct of the registrant is unacceptable and unbecoming a member of the pharmacy profession. Also, when public confidence in the profession demands no lesser sanction."
48. The Committee considered that a suspension may have been appropriate if the Registrant had shown some insight, expressed some remorse or conducted some remediation. This is given that no patients were harmed and the theft value was not excessive. The suspension period would have enabled the Registrant to develop full insight, express complete remorse and remediate. The thefts took place in 2019, and the Council's investigation commenced in 2020, the conviction following in 2022. In

his latest submissions, in May 2024, the Registrant appears to indicate in his submissions that his guilty plea was a result of poor representation, police misconduct and a desire to minimise his sentence rather than an acceptance of guilt. The Committee concluded that the Registrant has not demonstrated any insight into his offending behaviour. The Registrant has never expressed remorse or provided evidence of any remediation. The Committee considered it highly unlikely that the Registrant will develop any insight, express any remorse, or undertake any remediation during a suspension period. The Committee considered that, given the above, a suspension would not instil public confidence in the profession. The Committee considered that the Registrant has demonstrated persistent attitudinal issues and breached a fundamental tenet of the profession, namely the requirement to be trustworthy. Suspension would, therefore, not adequately protect the public or sufficiently uphold public confidence, or maintain professional standards.

49. Given the above conclusions, and taking account of the seriousness of the matter, the Committee concluded that the appropriate and proportionate sanction was one of removal. The Committee considered that removal was the only sanction that could meet the public interest in this case.
50. The Committee therefore directs that the Registrar remove the Registrant from the Council's Register.

Interim Order

51. The Committee considered that, pursuant to Article 56(10) of the Pharmacy Order 2010, as it has been determined that the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired, that the interim order which was in place is revoked.

Decision on Interim Measure

52. Ms Thomson made an application for an interim measure of suspension to be imposed on the Registrant's registration, to take effect from today's date, pursuant to Article 60 of the Pharmacy Order 2010, pending the coming into force of the Committee's

substantive order. She submitted that in a case of a theft conviction such as this case it is sensible for the Committee to consider imposing an interim measure to cover the appeal period because the Registrant's conduct directly impacted upon the confidence of the public. She submitted that an interim measure would be consistent with the substantive order imposed by the Committee.

53. In considering Ms Thomson's application, the Committee took account of its decision to remove the Registrant's name from the register will not take effect until 28 days after the Registrant is formally notified of the outcome, or until any appeal is concluded.
54. The Committee has found that there remains a risk that the Registrant might repeat his conduct, if permitted to return to work unrestricted, and therefore an interim measure of suspension is necessary to protect the public. It accepts the submissions of Ms Thomson that his unrestricted registration would have an impact on public confidence, and it was satisfied that it was necessary for an interim measure to be put in place to safeguard the wider public interest during the appeal period.
55. The Committee is satisfied that it is therefore appropriate for an interim measure to be in place prior to the taking effect of the substantive order.
56. The Committee hereby orders that the entry of the Registrant in the register be suspended forthwith, pending the coming into force of the substantive order.
57. This concludes the determination.