

**General Pharmaceutical Council
Fitness to Practise Committee
Principal Review Hearing
Remote videolink hearing
13 April 2026**

Registrant name:	Tom Hennebry
Registration number:	5040378
Part of the register:	Pharmacy Technician
Type of Case:	Misconduct and conviction
Committee Members:	Neil Calvert (Chair) Moriarn Bartlett (Lay member) Jignesh Patel (Registrant member)
Legal Adviser:	Andrew Clemes
Committee Secretary:	Gemma Staplehurst
Registrant:	Not present or represented
General Pharmaceutical Council:	Represented by Mike Ko, Case Presenter
Order being reviewed:	Suspension 6 months imposed on 19 September 2024 and 12 months at first review on 1 April 2025.
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Removal
Interim measures:	Interim Suspension order

This decision including any finding of 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 11 May 2026 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 Allegations found proved at the Principal Hearing:

You, a registered Pharmacy Technician, whilst employed at St Pancras Hospital, 4 St Pancras Way, London NW1 0PE (“the Trust”)

1. *On dates on or before the 10 May 2023, attended the Trust under the influence of cocaine; [PROVED]*
2. *On dates on or before 10 May 2023, used cocaine on Trust premises; [PROVED]*
3. *On 24 August 2023, were convicted at Highbury Corner Magistrates’ Court of possessing a controlled drug of class A in that on 10 May 2023 you had in your possession a quantity of cocaine; [PROVED]*

By reason of the matters above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of (a) your misconduct and / or (b) your conviction

Documentation

Exhibit 1- Council’s hearing bundle (129 pages)

Exhibit 2- Council’s skeleton argument dated 7 April 2026

Exhibit 3- Council’s proceeding in absence application

Exhibit 4 – Proof of Service bundle (2 pages)

Introduction

1. This is the written determination of the Fitness to Practise Committee at the General Pharmaceutical Council (‘the Council’).
2. This 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 Hearings and Outcomes Guidance March 2024.
5. At a Review Hearing the Committee must decide whether the Registrant’s fitness to practise remains currently impaired and, if so, what should be the appropriate

outcome. If the Committee find that the Registrant's fitness to practise is no longer impaired the current order will lapse on expiry.

Service of Notice of Hearing

6. The Committee has seen an email dated 4 March 2026 from the Council to the Registrant, notifying him of the need for a hearing to be held to review the order imposed on him, with the proposed hearing date of today. In an email to the Council dated 2 April 2026, the Registrant confirmed that he would not be submitting any documents for this review. In a further email dated 3 April 2026, in response to the Council's enquiries into his attendance, he indicated that he was content for the Council to proceed with this review in his absence. The Committee was also made aware that, on 10 April 2026, the Hearings Co-ordinator also had confirmation from the Registrant that he would not be attending.
7. The Committee was satisfied that there was service on the Registrant which complied with the Rules.

Application to proceed in the absence of the Registrant

8. The Registrant was not in attendance at this hearing, nor was anyone attending on his behalf. The Committee heard submissions from Mr Ko, on behalf of the Council under Rule 25 to proceed in the absence of the registrant.
9. The Committee noted the correspondence from the Registrant which stated that he would not be attending this hearing.
10. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
11. The Committee decided to proceed in the absence of the Registrant for the following reasons:
 - The Committee has found good service of the Notice therefore the Registrant is, or should be, aware of today's proceedings. The Committee have therefore considered that the Registrant has chosen to voluntarily absent himself from this hearing.
 - Correspondence from the Registrant as set out above which indicated he would not attend and in which he did not ask for an adjournment
 - There was no information to suggest an adjournment would result in the Registrant's attendance in future.
 - There is a public interest in the expeditious disposal of cases.

- Not proceeding today might result in the current order lapsing on 28 April 2026 without a Committee being in a position to consider whether the Registrant remains impaired and whether any further action is required to protect the public or address the public interest.

Hearing history

- Principal Hearing 18-19 September 2024 – suspension order 6 months
 - Review hearing 1 April 2025 – suspension order 12 months
 - The current suspension is due to expire on 28 April 2026.
12. The Committee at the last hearing determined that the Registrant’s misconduct and conviction meant he remained impaired on public protection and public interest grounds. In finding the Registrant impaired, that Committee referred to the following:
- Lack of any information to suggest that the Registrant’s drug use had been addressed or mitigated
 - Lack of remediation
 - The need to uphold proper standards and maintaining public confidence in the profession
13. The Committee at the last hearing also determined the following with regard to sanction:

“...63. The Committee first considered whether to take no action. That would mean that on the expiry of the current order for suspension, the Registrant would be free to return to unrestricted practice. Given the ongoing risk identified in the event of a further relapse, the Committee concluded that taking no action would be inappropriate and would fail to meet its overarching objective.

64. The Committee then considered whether to impose conditions on the Registrant’s registration.

65. The Committee must determine whether a conditions of practice order would be appropriate given the concerns identified regarding the Registrant’s practice, in particular whether conditions would protect the public from harm, be sufficient to mark the seriousness of the matter so as to maintain public confidence in the Registrant, the profession and the regulator, and sufficient to promote professional standards within the profession.

66. If conditions are to be imposed, the conditions must be relevant and proportionate to the concerns identified regarding the Registrant’s practice. Conditions must be

workable and susceptible to being monitored. The Committee must also be satisfied that the Registrant will comply with any conditions imposed.

- 67. In discounting this as an appropriate outcome, the Committee noted the Registrant's lack of evidence in relation to the extent of his engagement in rehabilitation from drug misuse, together with his stated intention not to continue his career in pharmacy. Given that, the Committee had no confidence that the Registrant would be willing or able to comply with any conditions that may be imposed on his registration, or that such an outcome would be practicable or workable. Furthermore, the Committee concluded that, in the absence of any independent up to date information regarding the Registrant's misuse of drugs, it could not formulate practicable and workable conditions in any event.*
- 68. In the circumstances, the Committee concluded that imposing conditions on the Registrant's registration would not be sufficient to address the public protection and public interest concerns identified.*
- 69. The Committee determined that a further period of suspension of 12 months was a proportionate period of time to be able to demonstrate, should he wish to do so, sustainable progress in addressing his drugs use PRIVATE.*
- 70. The Committee considered removing the entry from the Register. The Committee concluded that such an outcome would be disproportionately punitive at this stage, given the suitability of a further suspension. The Committee was mindful that, should the Registrant wish to return to practice at the conclusion of the further period of suspension, he would have to satisfy a reviewing Committee that his fitness to practise was no longer impaired. Whilst this Committee cannot bind a future reviewing Committee, the Registrant should be mindful that, in the event that he does not avail himself of the opportunity to address his drug use, and demonstrate progress in relation to it, removal would remain a very real possibility when this matter comes up for review at the conclusion of this further period of suspension..."*
14. The Committee at the last hearing further suggested that today's Committee may be assisted by:
- a. A submission of a reflective piece in which the Registrant would reflect on his past conduct and how that engaged the relevant professional Standards as well as how his conduct had impacted on public confidence in himself as a pharmacy technician.
 - b. Proof that he has rehabilitated himself PRIVATE.
 - c. Proof that he is no longer using illicit drugs.
 - d. The Registrant attending future review hearings.

Determination

Decision on Impairment

15. The Committee considered whether the Registrant's fitness to practise remains impaired.
16. The Committee has taken into account all of the documentation before it and submissions on behalf of the Council.
17. The Committee recognised and applied the following guidance in *Abrahaem v GMC* [2008] EWHC 183:
"...the review has to consider whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment through misconduct have been sufficiently addressed to the Panel's satisfaction. In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments."
18. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
19. The Committee was satisfied that – although not easy to remediate – the findings in this case are remediable. The suggestions of the two previous Committees were that – if the Registrant took the actions outlined – that this might amount to evidence of remediation. However, the Registrant has taken none of the suggested action and indeed the Committee noted his admission that he had not read the suggestions advanced by the first reviewing Committee. There is no information from the Registrant about whether or not he is still using illicit drugs or any detail about what steps he has taken to rehabilitate himself, e.g. reflective practice, CPD or other training, treatment etc.
20. There is no evidence that the Registrant has shown insight into the circumstances that led to the findings above – other than acknowledging what happened. There is no evidence that he understands why it happened or understands the impact of what happened. Furthermore, the Registrant has provided no reflection of the impact of his behaviour on public safety or on the reputation of the profession. These failures on his part cause the Committee a great deal of concern that the risk of repetition remains high.
21. The Committee is satisfied that there is a risk of repetition and finds that such a repeat of the misconduct and criminal offending could cause harm to others. The allegations reveal potential harm to members of the public. A repetition is likely to

present a risk of causing harm. As there is a risk of repetition that could cause harm, a finding of current impairment is appropriate.

22. The wider public interest (i.e. Maintaining Public Confidence and upholding professional standards) also requires a finding of impairment because there is both a risk of future harm and, irrespective of any future risk of harm, a finding of impairment is still necessary to mark the seriousness of what has occurred. This will maintain public confidence and promote professional standards by making it clear to other professionals what is expected and by deterring other professionals from failing to meet standards.
23. The Committee has had regard to the evidence in the bundle supplied, including the two prior determinations from the Committees in 2024 and 2025, and the arguments advanced by the Case Presenter today. There is little information from the Registrant beyond a vague expression that he enjoyed being a pharmacy professional and that he might wish to return to it as a career.
24. The Committee therefore finds the Registrant's current fitness to practise to be impaired on public protection and interest grounds.

Decision on Sanction

25. Having found impairment, the Committee has gone on to consider the matter of sanction. The Committee's powers are set out in Article 54(3) of the Order. The Committee should consider the available sanctions in ascending order from least restrictive, namely take no action, to most restrictive, namely removal from the Register, in order to identify the appropriate and proportionate sanction that meets the circumstances of the case.
26. 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.
27. The Committee had regard to the Council's Hearings and Outcomes Guidance 2024 to inform its decision.
28. The Committee has taken into account the submissions made on behalf of the Council. There were no submissions received from the Registrant.
29. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

30. To take no action/issue a warning. The involvement of class A drugs, coupled with little or no remediation and an uncertainty as to the Registrant's PRIVATE status makes taking no action or imposing a warning inappropriate.
31. Conditions of Practice. The Committee next considered the imposition of conditions of practice. A conditions of Practice Order would allow the Registrant to practise albeit with restrictions. The Committee must determine whether a Conditions of Practice Order would be appropriate given the concerns identified regarding the Registrant's conduct, in particular whether conditions would protect the public from harm, be sufficient to mark the seriousness of the matter so as to maintain public confidence in the Registrant, the profession and the regulator, and sufficient to promote professional standards within the profession.
32. If conditions were to be imposed, the conditions would need to be relevant and proportionate to the concerns identified regarding the Registrant. Conditions would also need to be workable and susceptible to being monitored. The Committee must also be satisfied that the Registrant will comply with any conditions imposed.
33. The Committee decided that Conditions of Practice were not appropriate. The Committee had regard to the unknown current status of the Registrant's use of illicit drugs. It also considered that it was unlikely that any conditions which could be formulated would be workable given the seriousness of the proven allegations or be adequate to mitigate any risks posed by the Registrant. Given the absence of any significant remediation at this time, conditions would not sufficiently mark the seriousness of the conviction and misconduct.
34. The Committee also took into account the response of the Registrant when it was asked of him (by the Council prior to the hearing) if he intended to continue as a professional. In a telephone note provided by the Council, the Registrant both indicated that he no longer wished to practise as a pharmacy technician but also spoke of his enjoyment of his time as a professional and a possible wish to return at some point. This ambiguity did not satisfy the Committee that he would adhere to any Conditions that it might impose.
35. Suspension Order. 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 unbefitting a member of the pharmacy profession. Also, when public confidence in the profession demands no lesser sanction.”

36. The Committee noted that, not only was suspension the outcome imposed by the two prior Committees, but it was also the outcome advanced as appropriate by the Council. The Committee reminded itself that the question of outcome was a matter for its own independent judgment based on the evidence at the hearing. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant’s conduct needed to be highlighted as unacceptable and unbefitting a member of the pharmacy profession and that public confidence in the profession demanded no lesser sanction.
37. The Committee was satisfied that there had been no reduction in the gravity of the misconduct and criminal offence committed by the Registrant and the aggravating and mitigating features identified by the two prior Committees remained the same. However, the Committee noted that the Registrant had made no attempt to display any insight since the first hearing of this matter and, despite the conduct being remediable, there was no evidence before the Committee that he had made any realistic effort to take steps to remediate.
38. The Committee was not satisfied that public confidence in the profession would be properly protected by a further term of suspension. Accordingly, such an outcome would no longer be sufficient to maintain professional standards. Furthermore, the Registrant had had opportunities to follow suggested courses of action from the two previous committees, neither of which had been taken by him. Accordingly, the Committee concluded that an order of suspension was no longer an appropriate outcome to protect the public or the public interest.
39. Removal. Given the above conclusions, and taking account of the seriousness of the matter, the Committee concluded that the appropriate and proportionate sanction was of removal. The Committee took particular account of the following. The Registrant had served two terms of suspension which totalled cumulatively 18 months. In that period he had failed to engage with the regulatory process in any meaningful way. He had not responded to suggested courses of action from both Committees. The original misconduct was serious and he had provided no evidence to demonstrate remediation of his behaviour or to address the possibility of risk to the public and the public interest. He had been given ample opportunities to do so

by way of suggested steps by previous Committees and from the Council itself. Although there was merit in attempting to retain a pharmacy professional whose clinical skills were not in question, the Committee found that there was little prospect of him ever taking remedial action or showing insight into his conduct. The Committee noted the breaches of Standards identified at previous hearings and considered that these still applied, noting also the wording of Standard 6:

“People expect pharmacy professionals to behave professionally. This is essential to maintaining trust and confidence in pharmacy. Behaving professionally is not limited to the working day, or face-to-face interactions. The privilege of being a pharmacist or pharmacy technician, and the importance of maintaining confidence in the professions, call for appropriate behaviour at all times.”

40. The Committee was satisfied that the appropriate outcome, bearing in mind the two previous orders of suspension and the failure to respond in any meaningful way by the Registrant was one of Removal. The cumulative effect of his misconduct and criminal offending together with the lack of any steps to show remediation despite opportunities to do so led the Committee to conclude that the Registrant’s behaviour was fundamentally incompatible with being a registered pharmacy professional.
41. The Committee therefore directs that the Registrar removes the Registrant’s entry from the Register.

Decision on Interim Measure

42. The decision to remove the Registrant will not take effect until 28 days after the Registrant is formally notified of the outcome, or until any appeal, if made, is concluded. The Committee sought submissions on whether interim measures should be imposed to cover this period.
43. Mr Ko applied for an interim measure on the basis that it was necessary for the protection of the public and was otherwise in the public interest. Failure to impose an interim measure would potentially permit the Registrant to return to practice after the current order of suspension expires (on 28 April 2026) should he appeal this decision.
44. The Committee has carefully considered the submissions made and has considered them in the light of its earlier determination. In imposing its substantive sanction, the Committee has identified that only the removal of the Registrant from the Register was sufficient to address the ongoing risk to the public and the public interest. That,

the Committee concluded, was essential to protect both the public and the public interest for the reasons set out in its determination on sanction.

45. Should interim measures not be put in place, that objective would be undermined as the Registrant would be able to practise without restriction pending not only the appeal period, but for an extended period of time if the decision of this Committee is appealed. That, the Committee concluded, would not meet the overarching objective as set out earlier in this determination.
46. The Committee was therefore satisfied that an interim measure of suspension is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest in order to maintain public confidence in the pharmacy profession and the regulatory process. The Committee imposes the interim measure of suspension for the same reasons as it imposed the removal of the Registrant in its substantive decision on sanction.
47. This concludes the determination.