

General Pharmaceutical Council

Fitness to Practise Committee

Principal Hearing

Remote videolink hearing

Monday 29 – Tuesday 30 June 2026

Registrant name:	Goncalo De Melo Rodrigues
Registration number:	2081610
Part of the register:	Pharmacist
Type of Case:	Conviction
Committee Members:	Penelope Titterington (Chair) Sukvinder Bhamra (Registrant member) Fahmina Begum (Lay member)
Committee Secretary:	Chelsea Smith
Registrant:	Not present and not represented
General Pharmaceutical Council:	Represented by Christopher Hamlet, Case Presenter
Facts proved:	Particular 1
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Removal from the Register
Interim Measure:	Interim suspension

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 29 July 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 Allegation

You, a registered pharmacist,

- 1. Were convicted at Inverness Sheriff Court and Justice of the Peace Court on 31 July 2025 of three offences in contravention of the Sexual Offences (Scotland) Act 2009, Section 6.*

As a result of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of conviction

Documentation

Document 1- Council's hearing bundle (61 pages)

Document 2- Proof of Service bundle

Document 3- Council's skeleton argument

Document 4 – Bundle of correspondence with the Registrant

Determination

Introduction

1. This is the written determination of the Fitness to Practise Committee at the General Pharmaceutical Council ('the Council').
2. This is the Principal Hearing of Mr Goncalo De Melo Rodrigues, a registered pharmacist under registration number 2081610 ('the Registrant').
3. 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').
4. The statutory overarching objectives for these regulatory proceedings ('the Objectives') are:
 - To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public;
 - To promote and maintain public confidence in the professions regulated by the Council; and
 - To promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of those professions.

5. The Committee also has regard to the guidance contained in the Council's *Good decision making: Fitness to practise hearings and outcomes guidance* as revised March 2024 ('The Guidance').
6. 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 – 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

7. The Committee has seen a letter dated 21 May 2026 from the Council headed 'Notice of Hearing' addressed to the Registrant and sent to his registered email address noted on the Register. The Committee noted that this was more than the 28 days required by Rule 16. The Committee saw the entry on the register where the Registrant had been marked as saying yes to receiving important communications via email and noted that he had replied to emailed correspondence. The Committee considered that the Registrant had agreed to receiving correspondence via email.
8. The Committee was therefore satisfied that there had been good service of the Notice of Hearing ('Notice') in accordance with Rules 3 and 16 of the Rules.

Application to proceed in the absence of the Registrant

9. The Registrant was not in attendance at this hearing, nor was someone attending on their behalf. The Committee heard submissions from Mr Hamlet, on behalf of the Council to proceed in the absence of the Registrant under Rule 25. He submitted that the Registrant had given a clear indication by email that he had no intention of attending. It was appropriate and fair to proceed in the absence of the Registrant. The allegations are sufficiently important for there to be an imperative to proceed given that there is no reason to adjourn. Mr Hamlet submitted that the Registrant had an obligation to update the GPhC as to their contact details and could not "*put their head in the sand*" so as to derail the proceedings.
10. The Committee noted the following record of communication with the Registrant.

- 22 January 2026 email from GPhC to the Registrant requesting response to enable service
 - 26 January 2026 – follow up email from GPhC to the Registrant
 - 27 January 2026 – Documents sent to the Registrant by special delivery
 - 02 February 2026 09:52 email from GPhC to the Registrant to say access to online documents would be emailed.
 - 02 February 2026 12:08 – notification that the Registrant had accepted the invitation to the shared online document folder
 - 02 February 2026 12:11 email from Registrant in response to earlier email from GPhC
 - 06 February 2026 email from GPhC to the Registrant detailing available support services
 - 08 June 2026 email from GPhC to the Registrant serving the Council's bundle
 - 16 June 2026 email from GPhC to the Registrant asking if there was anything he would wish to provide to the Committee
11. There had been one email from the Registrant in response to an email about service of documents on 02 February 2026 which said *"I don't live in the UK. I've not been able to work since 2024, how do you expect me to pay or attend anything? Please don't bother me any longer, I've dealt with a well over-exaggerated penalty for something I'm not to blame for. This is pure harassment and excuses to hide racism....., my family has suffered enough, I have no money in my account, please stop. STOP"*
12. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legally Qualified Chair.
13. The Committee decided to proceed in the absence of the Registrant for the following reasons:
- The Committee consider that the Registrant has responded to an email dated 02 February 2026 that would mean he is aware of the existence of the Fitness to Practise proceedings. The Committee has found good service of the Notice, therefore the Registrant is, or should be, aware of the hearing today.
 - The Registrant has not responded to multiple further emails from the Council despite being aware of the proceedings. The Committee finds that the one response from the Registrant clearly indicates that he does not wish to engage with the Council. The Notice of Hearing indicates that this hearing is taking place remotely so the Registrant could have attended even if he is not

in the UK. The Committee have therefore considered that the Registrant has chosen to voluntarily absent himself from this hearing.

- The Registrant did not indicate that any other date would be more suitable for the hearing and did not request that the hearing be adjourned. The Committee finds that there is 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 especially as these allegations are of a serious nature.

Background

14. The Registrant is a registered Pharmacist who was, at the relevant time, working as a locum at Boots Pharmacy in West Scotland.
15. The case concerns the Registrant's conviction on three counts of "*intentionally causing another to look at a sexual image without consent*" under Section 6 of the Sexual Offences (Scotland) Act 2009. The offences concerned three female colleagues and occurred between May 2023 and October 2023.
16. Witness 1 in an interview with a Manager at Boots, on 10 August 2023, states that she was approached by Colleague A. The account provides that Colleague A showed Witness 1 a video sent to her by the Registrant of a "*woman having an orgasm*". Witness 1 states that Colleague A was visibly upset and said she did not want to work with him as a result.
17. Colleague B gave an interview to a Store Manager on 10 August 2023. She describes meeting the Registrant through Facebook and thereafter he began to send her pictures of himself that became increasingly inappropriate, culminating in him sending her photos of his penis. She states that she was very upset.
18. Colleague C has provided a detailed written account, undated. She states that the Registrant messaged her and complimented her, despite her making it clear that she was married. The messages became increasingly personal, culminating in him 'sexting' her and making sexually explicit comments. These included a comment that "*He'd like to bend me over the desk at work and that work was a 'kink' of his*". She describes being sent a disappearing message by the Registrant and being encouraged to open it. Upon opening it, she found it was a picture of his erect penis. She described feeling sick and violated.
19. Concerns in respect of the Registrant's conduct were originally raised with the Council by a Superintendent Pharmacist at Boots in October 2023, who relayed reports from female members of staff in the West Scotland area that the Registrant had sent them unsolicited videos and images via social media. It is reported that the

local area manager attempted to make contact with the Registrant to discuss the concerns and the response was to deny any wrongdoing.

20. The Registrant was arrested by Police Scotland on 11 November 2023 and convicted on 31 July 2025. He received a concurrent Community Payback Order, supervised over 6 months.

Decision on Facts

21. The allegation in this case is a conviction. The Committee had sight of the full extract conviction report of the three offences and therefore found the convictions and facts proved in accordance with Rule 24(4).
22. 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.

Decision on Impairment

Council's Submissions

23. Mr Hamlet directed the Committee to the Guidance. Mr Hamlet's oral submissions can be summarised as follows:
24. Mr Hamlet submitted that the offences took place within a professional context. The nature of the offending amounted to the targeting of female colleagues and persistent pursuit of them even when they had been clear that they were not interested. Mr Hamlet suggested there was a clear risk to members of the public from a repeat of this type of behaviour. He submitted that the fact that the Registrant has targeted colleagues and having formed an appropriate relationship has then persistently imposed unwanted inappropriate behaviour showed a modus operandi that illustrates a risk to the public. Mr Hamlet submitted that the Registrant's email on 02 February 2026 showed that the Registrant was in denial of his wrongdoing, he considered that he was not to blame which showed that he had a continued lack of insight. Mr Hamlet submitted that this increased the risk to the public.
25. Mr Hamlet submitted that this type of offending brings the profession into disrepute. He further submitted that the offending has breached the fundamental principles of pharmacy namely treating colleagues with respect. He suggested that the Registrant has persistently targeted young female colleagues.
26. Mr Hamlet said that although there is very little conduct that is totally beyond remediation, this behaviour shows a particular attitude. He said that the Registrant has not provided evidence that he understands the nature of the wrongdoing or the impact of the behaviour on his colleagues and the public. He pointed out that the Registrant has not engaged with the proceedings except to deny his wrongdoing, he attacks the punishment he received. He submitted that the Registrant claimed that

he was being harassed and subjected to racism which Mr Hamlet suggested meant he was putting himself as the victim. Mr Hamlet further suggests that this email shows that the Registrant has no insight, which heightens the risk of repetition. Mr Hamlet suggested that the Registrant has not reflected or repented.

27. Mr Hamlet submitted that a finding of current impairment is necessary to restore and uphold the standard of the profession and also to maintain public confidence. He submitted that the Committee could find impairment on each of the three Objectives.

Registrant's position

28. The Registrant was not present and had not submitted any written submissions for the hearing. The Committee noted from the email of 02 February 2026 that the Registrant appears to continue to deny any blame and the Committee considered that the Registrant did not accept that he was impaired.

Decision

29. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legally Qualified Chair.
30. 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 2017). Paragraph 2.11 reads:

"A pharmacy professional is 'fit to practise' when they have the skills, knowledge, character, behaviour and health needed to work as a pharmacist...safely and effectively. In practical terms, this means maintaining appropriate standards of competence, demonstrating good character, and also adhering to the principles of good practice set out in our various standards, guidance and advice."

31. In considering whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired the Committee considered whether the particulars found proved show that actions of the Registrant:

- *present an actual or potential risk to patients or to the public;*
- *has brought, or might bring, the profession of pharmacy into disrepute;*
- *has breached one of the fundamental principles of the profession of pharmacy;*

32. The Committee also considered whether:

- *the conduct which led to the complaint is able to be addressed*
- *the conduct which led to the complaint has been addressed*

- *the conduct which led to the complaint is likely to be repeated*
- *a finding of impairment is needed to declare and uphold proper standards of behaviour and/or maintain public confidence in the profession.*

33. The Committee considered that the Registrant's offences caused harm to all three colleagues. Colleague C describes feeling anxious, angry, violated, traumatised and physically sick. She has subsequently experienced recurring sexual assault dreams as a result of the Registrant's behaviour. The other two colleagues were said to be upset with Colleague A being observed to be distressed. The Committee considers that this behaviour would have created a risk of harm to the public because harm was caused to colleagues and working relationships would be impacted. Colleague A said that she did not want to work with the Registrant at all. The Committee considered that Colleagues had been made to feel uncomfortable in their place of work. The Committee considered that this can cause a lack of focus on patients that could thereby cause them harm. The Committee considers that sexual misconduct of this nature, intentionally imposing sexual images on colleagues without their consent, clearly breaches professional boundaries and the relationship of trust between colleagues. In one case the victim was aged only 19 and therefore the Registrant would have been in a position of relative power over her as a result. The behaviour was repeated and was persistent in the face of a clear lack of consent and was repeated with multiple colleagues over a significant time period. The behaviour was repeated despite concerns being raised with the Registrant by an area manager in 2023. The Committee considered that these elements of the behaviour mean that there is a risk of repetition with an accompanying risk of harm to the public and to colleagues.
34. The Committee considers that the offences have breached the fundamental principles of the pharmacy profession treating people with dignity and respect. The Registrant repeatedly pursued this conduct despite a clear lack of consent. The Committee considers that behaviour of this nature brings the profession of pharmacy into disrepute. The Registrant has 3 convictions for sexual offences against different victims who were his pharmacy colleagues resulting in a community sentence. The Registrant has repeatedly breached the trust put in him by colleagues and the public to act professionally and maintain professional boundaries. This type of behaviour undermines trust in the profession as vulnerable patients need to be able to rely on professionals that care for them not breach the boundaries of the position of trust they are placed in.
35. *The Committee considered that the Registrant's behaviour breached Standard 6 of the GPhC's Standards for Pharmacy Professionals May 2017 - 'Pharmacy professionals must behave in a professional manner, are trustworthy and act with honesty and integrity.' That standard specifies "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." The Committee consider that the offences of this nature are the antithesis of the professional behaviour expected and the registrant has behaved in a way that will undermined trust and confidence in the pharmacy profession.

36. The Committee considers that sexual offending of this nature is difficult to remediate. The Committee has no information about the completion of the Registrant's criminal sentence. The Registrant has not engaged with the Fitness to Practise proceedings. The Committee has had no evidence of remorse, remediation, insight or anything that would address the concerns outlined above. The only communication has been a statement from the Registrant four months after his criminal sentence was imposed that he was not to blame, which the Committee finds does not evidence insight. The Committee finds that the Registrant has not remediated or addressed his offending behaviour. The Committee therefore considers that there remains a real risk of repetition of the behaviour which has an accompanying risk of harm to the public and colleagues. The Committee considers that a finding of impairment is necessary to protect the public.
37. The Committee further finds that a repetition of such behaviour would bring the profession into disrepute and breach the fundamental principles of pharmacy. The Committee considers that the serious nature of this criminal conduct, that has not been in any way remediated would mean that a finding of impairment is necessary in the wider public interest to mark the seriousness of what has occurred and therefore to uphold and maintain professional standards and public confidence in the profession.
38. The Committee therefore finds the Registrant's current fitness to practise to be impaired on public protection and public interest grounds.

Decision on Sanction

39. 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.
40. 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.

41. The Committee had regard to the Council's *Good decision making: Fitness to practise hearings and outcomes guidance* as revised March 2024 ('The Guidance') to inform its decision.

Council's Submissions

42. The Committee took into account the submissions made by Mr Hamlet which can be summarised as follows:
43. Mr Hamlet confirmed to the Committee that the reference on the extract of conviction to "Sexual Offences Act 2003" certification was a reference to the fact that the nature of the convictions and sentence meant that the Registrant was subject to notification requirements and would therefore be on the Sex Offenders Register for a period of 5 years from the date of his conviction.
44. Mr Hamlet referred the Committee to the following sections of the Guidance:
- 5.2 - Key factors to consider
 - 5.3 – Proportionality
 - 5.7 – Public interest
 - 5.10 – Mitigating/Aggravating factors
 - 5.13-5.14 Circumstances
 - 5.17 – Behaviour and Attitude
 - 5.19 – Insight and remediation
 - 6.2-6.7 Sexual Misconduct
45. Mr Hamlet submitted that this case had the following aggravating factors:
- the gravity of the conduct underlying the convictions
 - the multiple victims involved
 - the status of the victims as work colleagues
 - the period over which the conduct occurred
 - the absence of evidence of any acknowledgement of wrongdoing, insight or remorse
 - the absence of evidence of any attempt at remediation
 - the risk of repetition
46. Mr Hamlet submitted there were no mitigating factors in the case. Mr Hamlet went on to address the outcomes as outlined in section 4.3 of the Guidance. He submitted that taking no action and giving a warning were not suitable outcomes given the seriousness of the offences and the risk to the public that had been identified. Mr

Hamlet submitted that conditions were not appropriate as they would fail to reflect the gravity of the offending and the imposition of conditions would not send an appropriate message to the public or to the profession. He further submitted that there were practical considerations relating to what conditions would be workable given the risk to the public identified.

47. Mr Hamlet submitted that suspension may protect the public and might meet the gravity of the wrongdoing. However, as a suspension is only for up to 12 months, to consider a suspension the Committee would need to see evidence of remorse and be able to envisage a pathway back to unrestricted practice. In the absence of those things a suspension order would be bound to fail if no lesser risk would be posed at its conclusion.
48. Mr Hamlet submitted that removal was the only appropriate outcome in this case because the seriousness of the behaviour meant that it was fundamentally incompatible with being a registered professional.

Registrant's position

49. The Registrant had not provided the Committee with any evidence or submissions. The Committee noted that his position was that he was not to blame.

Decision

50. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legally Qualified Chair.
51. The Committee first considered what, if any, aggravating and mitigating factors there may be. The Committee identified the following aggravating factors:
 - Three convictions which involved three different victims
 - Harm was caused to victims
 - Persistent breach of the trust between colleagues
 - One victim aged 19
 - Conduct repeated over 2 years, despite the Registrant being spoken to by an area manager about his behaviour in 2023
 - The absence of any evidence of remorse, insight or remediation
52. The Committee did not identify any mitigating factors on the information before it.
53. The Committee went on to consider the available outcomes in ascending order starting with the least restrictive. The Committee must identify the least restrictive and proportionate outcome that in the particular circumstances adequately

addresses the overarching objectives of regulation; the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence and the need to promote professional standards.

54. To take no action: The Guidance indicates that *“This may apply even when impairment is found, but there is no risk to the public or need to decide on a different outcome.”* The Committee considered that this outcome would not be appropriate given the seriousness of the matter and the fact that the Committee has identified a risk to the public.
55. Advice: The Guidance indicates that *“Advice can only be given to a professional when no impairment is found.”* The Committee therefore found that this outcome was not available in this case as impairment was found.
56. Warning: The Guidance indicates that this outcome may apply when: *“There is a need to demonstrate to a professional, and more widely to the profession and the public, that the conduct or behaviour fell below acceptable standards. There is no need to take action to restrict a professional’s right to practise, there is no continuing risk to patients or the public, but there needs to be a public acknowledgement that the conduct was unacceptable.”* The Committee finds that this outcome would not reflect the seriousness of the behaviour given that there are criminal convictions for sexual offences and the continuing risk identified by the Committee.
57. Conditions of Registration: The Guidance indicates that this outcome may be appropriate where: *“ There is evidence of poor performance, or significant shortcomings in a professional’s practice, but the committee is satisfied that the professional may respond positively to retraining and supervision. There is not a significant risk posed to the public, and it is safe for the professional to return to practice but with restrictions.”*

The Committee considers that this outcome is not appropriate. There is a significant risk posed to the public and the nature of the risk involving overstepping boundaries is not one that can be addressed by conditions and the nature of the behaviour itself raises issues of compliance. As the Registrant is not engaging, the Committee does not consider that there is evidence there is a willingness or ability to comply with conditions and the Committee cannot identify any workable conditions. The Committee also considers that the seriousness of the offending and the fact that the Registrant is on the Sex Offenders Register would mean that conditions would not satisfy the public interest.

Suspension

58. The Guidance suggests suspension may be appropriate when: *“The committee considers that a warning or conditions are not sufficient to deal with any risk to patient safety or to protect the public, or would undermine public confidence. When it is necessary to highlight to the profession and the public that the conduct of the professional is unacceptable and unbefitting a member of the pharmacy profession. Also when public confidence in the profession demands no lesser outcome.”*
59. A suspension would protect the public for the period that it is in force. Under Article 54(2) of the Order a Committee can impose a suspension for up to 12 months. The Committee notes that the Registrant is on the Sex Offenders Register until July 2030. The Committee considers that this indicates that a risk to the public will remain for at least this time period. The Committee notes that the Registrant has not demonstrated any remorse remediation or insight 8 months after the imposition of his criminal sentence, which further suggests that a risk to the public will remain. Even though orders can be reviewed and extended if a review committee considers that the Registrant remains impaired, the Committee do not consider that there is a likelihood of the Registrant being able to return to safe practice after a period of suspension.
60. The Committee further considers that confidence in the profession and the regulator would not be upheld by the imposition of a 12 month suspension for someone who has multiple criminal convictions for sexual offending against his colleagues and is on the Sex Offenders Register and has shown no remorse, insight or remediation. Treating people with dignity and respect goes to the very core of the principles of the profession and this offending cannot be reconciled with those principles.

Removal

61. In relation to removing a pharmacist from the register, the Guidance states: *“Removing a professional’s registration is reserved for the most serious conduct. The committee cannot choose this outcome in cases which relate solely to the professional’s health. The committee should consider this outcome when the 13 professional’s behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with being a registered professional”*
62. The Committee has also considered the following paragraphs of the Guidance relating to sexual misconduct at 6.2 -6.5:
- “Sexual misconduct – whatever the circumstances – undermines public trust in the profession and has a significant impact on the reputation of pharmacy professionals. In some circumstances it can present a significant and immediate risk to patient safety. It covers a wide range of behaviour, including sexual harassment, sexual*

assault, physical examinations of patients that are without consent or unnecessary, and serious sexual offences which lead to criminal convictions.

The GPhC believes that some acts of sexual misconduct will be incompatible with continued registration as a pharmacist or pharmacy technician. Removal from the register is likely to be the most appropriate outcome in these circumstances, unless there is evidence of clear, mitigating factors that cause a committee to decide that such an outcome is not appropriate. The misconduct is particularly serious if:

- there is a conviction for a serious sexual offence*
- there is an abuse of the special position of trust that a professional has*
- it involves a child (including accessing, viewing, or other involvement in images of child sexual abuse) or a vulnerable adult*
- the professional has been required to register as a sex offender or has been included on a barred list*

This is not a full list. It is meant to show that in cases of this type, given the risk to patients and the impact on public confidence in the profession, removal from the register is likely to be the most necessary and proportionate outcome.

The misconduct can take place in many settings. This can be:

- in a private setting with family members*
- in a social context, or*
- in the course of a professional's work with patients and colleagues.*

It is therefore important that the committee carefully considers each case on its merits, and takes decisions in the light of the particular circumstances of the case and the risk posed to patients and the public...."

63. The Committee considers that the serious nature of the repeated offending and the fact that the Registrant is on the Sex Offenders Register until 2030 presents a substantial ongoing risk of harm to the public and to colleagues that has not been in any way addressed since the commission of the offences.
64. The Committee considered that there are three convictions for sexual offences that resulted in a Community Payback Order and in the Registrant being on the Sex Offenders Register for 5 years. These offences involved multiple colleagues, so were connected to the Registrant's practice, and resulted in a breach of the trust in the relationship between colleagues and harm to the victims. One of the colleagues was only 19 years old. The Registrant's behaviour was persistent, despite a clear indication that the behaviour was unwanted, the Registrant later repeated his behaviour despite being spoken to by a manager in 2023. He has not demonstrated any insight, remorse or remediation. The Committee considers that treating people with dignity and respect goes to the very core of the principles of the profession and

this offending cannot be reconciled with those principles. The Committee considers that the behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with being a registered professional. It is vital to the profession that the public can have confidence and trust in pharmacists to recognise, respect and uphold principles of dignity and consent. The Registrant repeatedly demonstrated a persistent disregard for these principles with his colleagues. The Committee therefore considers that only removal could uphold public confidence in the profession and uphold professional standards. █

65. The Committee considers removal from the register to be the only necessary and proportionate outcome the circumstances of this case. The Committee considered the impact that such an outcome would have on the Registrant but also noted the case of *Bolton v Law Society* [1991] 1 WLR 512 CA in which it was said that: “*The reputation of the profession is more important than the fortunes of any individual member. Membership of a profession brings many benefits, but that is part of the price.*” The Committee has considered principles of proportionality and finds that in this case the only outcome that would protect the public, uphold proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession is removal from the register.
66. **The Committee therefore directs that the Registrar removes Mr Goncalo De Melo Rodrigues from the Register.**

Interim Measure

67. The findings of this Committee mean that the previous interim order is revoked. The Committee went on to consider interim measures. Interim measures are provided for under Article 60 of the Order and may be imposed after an order for removal, suspension or conditions of registration. A committee can only impose interim measures if it is satisfied that they are needed to protect the public, or are otherwise in the public interest or in the interests of the professional. Any interim measures will take effect immediately and can cover the 28-day ‘appeal period’. If the decision is appealed, the measures will stay in force until that appeal is decided.
68. Mr Hamlet submitted on behalf of the Council that an interim measure of suspension was required for public protection and public interest reasons given the findings of the Committee
69. The Committee did not have any evidence or submissions from the Registrant.
70. The Committee considered that the ongoing risks it has previously identified relating to repeated sexual offences against colleagues, the fact that the Registrant is on the Sex Offenders Register and having not remediated his offences, mean that an interim suspension measure is necessary for public protection. The Committee considers that there are immediate risks posed to the public and to colleagues. Further given this

position and the reasons outlined above, the Committee considers public trust and confidence in the profession, and the regulator would be undermined if the Registrant was not restricted from practicing before being removed from the register. The Committee is satisfied that it is necessary for an interim measure to be put in place to protect the public and safeguard the public interest during the appeal period. The Committee is satisfied that it is therefore appropriate and proportionate for an interim suspension to be in place prior to the Registrant being removed from the register.

71. 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.
72. This concludes the determination.