

General Pharmaceutical Council

Fitness to Practise Committee

Principal Review Hearing

Remote videolink hearing

21 August 2026

Registrant name:	Pradyuman Gadaria
Registration number:	2051582
Part of the register:	Pharmacist
Type of Case:	Misconduct
Committee Members:	Hannah Bows (Chair) Cristian Ioanas (Registrant member) Fahmina Begum (Lay member)
Legal Adviser:	Andrew Clemes
Committee Secretary:	Ivana Raimundova
Registrant:	Present and represented by Miranda Lickert
General Pharmaceutical Council:	Represented by Mary Poku-Catani, Case Presenter
Order being reviewed:	Suspension 12 months
Fitness to practise:	Not impaired
Outcome:	Order to lapse on expiry, 9 September 2026

Particulars of Allegations found proved at the Principal Hearing:

"You, a Registered Pharmacist, whilst working as a Pharmacist at Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust ('the Trust'):

3. In respect of Colleague C, you:

3.1 In or around 2015 to 2018, on one or more occasions:

3.1.1 Hugged Colleague C;

3.1.2 Hugged Colleague C without her permission;

3.1.3 Opened your arms for a hug making it difficult for Colleague C to pass you;

3.2 Sent Colleague C messages on Instagram, including:

3.2.1 On 6 March 2019, stating: " As always, you get a proper hug when I actually see you!";

3.2.2 On 2 June 2019, stating: "wife material";

3.2.3 On 8 October 2019, stating: "If u still about and fancy a drink let me know".

4. In respect of Colleague D, you:

4.1 Between approximately 2015 to 2019, on one or more occasions hugged Colleague D without her permission;

4.1.1 From behind;

4.1.2 For a prolonged period;

4.2 Between approximately 2018 to 2019, on one or more occasions you:

4.2.2 Sent Colleague D a message on Instagram complimenting her physical appearance.

5. In respect of Colleague E, between approximately 2016 to 2021, you:

5.1 Frequently hugged Colleague E;

5.1.1 Intensely;

5.1.2 For a prolonged period of time;

5.3 On one or more occasions, removed Colleague E's bleep from her person/clothing in order to hug her.

6. In respect of Colleague F, between approximately 2017 to 2020, you:

6.1 On one or more occasions hugged Colleague F without her permission;

6.2 Liked Colleague F's photographs on Instagram;

6.3 On one or more occasions, sent private messages to Colleague F on Instagram, including complimenting Colleague F's physical appearance.

9. In respect of Colleague J, between approximately March 2019 to August 2020, you:

9.1 On one or more occasions:

9.1.1 Put your hand over Colleague J's bra strap in the middle of their back;

9.1.2 Rubbed the area in 9.1.1 slowly; -

9.2 On one or more occasions hugged Colleague J;

9.3 Sent Colleague J messages on Instagram in which you:

9.3.1 Commented "Witt woo" in relation a photograph of Colleague J's hair;

9.3.2 Told Colleague J "Maybe don't resist" in relation to sleeping, with a wink emoji at the end of the message;

9.3.3 Told Colleague J "I'm lucky to have seen you recently".

10. You:

*10.1 On 16 December 2020, were advised about your hugging and/or touching of colleagues and how they were perceived by members of staff by the Trust;
and*

10.2 In spite of the advice given to you, continued to hug and/or touch members of staff.

12. Your actions set out at 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and/or 10.2:

12.1 Were sexually motivated; and/or

12.2 Transgressed proper professional boundaries"

The Committee noted that:

Allegations 3, 3.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3 were found proved by the Committee. Allegations 3.2, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 had admitted by the Registrant and found proved.

Allegations 4, 4.1.1, 4.1.2 were found proved by the Committee. Allegation 4.1 had been admitted by the Registrant and was found proved.

Allegations 5, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.3 were found proved by the Committee. Allegation 5.1 had been admitted by the Registrant and found proved.

Allegation 6 was admitted by the Registrant in its entirety and found proved.

Allegations 9, 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 were found proved by the Committee. The Registrant had admitted 9.2, 9.3, 9.3.1, 9.3.2 and 9.3.3 and these were found proved.

Allegations 10, 10.1 and 10.2 were admitted by the Registrant and found proved.

Allegation 12.1 was found proved by the Committee in relation to allegations 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.3.1, 9.3.2, 9.3.3 only. Allegation 12.2 was admitted by the Registrant and found proved.

Documentation

Exhibit 1- Council's hearing bundle

Exhibit 2- Council's skeleton argument (undated)

Exhibit 3- Registrant's bundle

Exhibit 4 – Summary of allegations found proved/admitted/not proved from the Council

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 *Good decision making: Fitness to practise hearings and sanction guidance* as revised March 2017. Hearings and outcomes guidance 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 16 June 2026 from the Council headed 'Notice of Hearing' ('Notice') addressed to the Registrant and sent to them via their email address as noted on the Register. No issue was taken on service by either party.
7. The Committee was satisfied that there had been good service of the Notice in accordance with Rules 3 and 16.

Hearing history

8. The Principal Hearing took place between 29 May - 5 June 2025 and 4 August - 8 August 2025. The Committee found the Registrant's fitness to Practice impaired by reason of misconduct. The Committee imposed a suspension of 12 months which came into force on 10 September 2025 and is due to expire on 9 September 2026. The Committee at the last hearing noted that the Registrant had admitted that his actions amounted to misconduct. The Committee also determined that the Registrant's misconduct meant they were impaired on public protection and public interest grounds. In finding the Registrant impaired, that Committee referred to the following:

- The Registrant had demonstrated only limited insight. He had chosen not to give evidence and he could not be cross-examined. He had not shown any insight into the impact of his actions on female colleagues who were both younger and more junior than him. His integrity was therefore called into question. He showed no understanding of the effect of those of his actions which had taken place in the Covid 19 pandemic.
- Lack of remorse
- Lack of remediation. The Registrant had been given a warning by his employer prior to the conduct which led to these allegations. He failed to follow that advice and gave no explanation for that failure. The Committee noted that he had attempted limited remediation and reflection by way of CPD courses and therapy. The Committee could not assess what value these had given to the Registrant as he had not given evidence.
- The failure by the Registrant to adhere to the previous warning by the Trust led to a finding by the Committee that he had attitudinal problems and found that he had tried to minimise his actions.
- The Committee found that the Registrant had fallen below relevant Standards and showed a failure of leadership. There had been a marked escalation in his conduct over time.

9. The Committee at the last hearing suggested that today's committee may be assisted by:
- References from the Registrant's current workplace.
 - References from any person over whom the registrant has supervision responsibilities.
 - Evidence of any further training around maintaining professional boundaries.
 - Detailed reflections on maintaining professional boundaries

Determination

Decision on Impairment

10. The Committee had to first consider whether the Registrant's fitness to practise remains impaired. The Committee has considered all of the documentation before it and submissions on behalf of the Council and on behalf of the Registrant.
11. The Case Presenter explained that the Council did not accept that there had been adequate reflection or remediation. She relied on her Skeleton Argument. She pointed out that there were no testimonials from female colleagues or colleagues that were junior to the Registrant and he had not focussed on the most serious of the factual findings (Colleague J). She submitted that a further 6 month suspension order was desirable so that these shortfalls could be addressed.
12. Counsel for the Registrant submitted that he had addressed the areas identified by the previous Committee by a full reflective statement, the participation in CPD courses and the provision of references from his current workplace. She pointed out that one of the testimonials was from a junior colleague and that the Registrant happened to be in a workplace with no female colleagues, a position that he could do nothing about and which should not be held against him. Counsel asked that the current suspension be allowed to lapse as the order had served its purpose.
13. 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.”

14. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that the review committee should ask whether the Registrant's fitness to practise remained impaired. This reviewing committee should note the particular areas of concern set out by the original committee and examine what steps, if any, the Registrant has taken to allay them during the period of his suspension. It will be highly relevant in determining if the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired to analyse: first whether his conduct which led to the charge is easily remediable; second that it has been remedied; and third that it is highly unlikely to be repeated.
15. The Committee noted that attitudinal issues had been identified by the previous Committee. Although these were harder to remediate, it was not impossible to do so. The allegations had been serious, with findings of inappropriate and unwelcome touching of colleagues in the workplace by the Registrant, some of which were sexually motivated. The Committee noted that at the previous hearing each of the witnesses had given evidence and it was satisfied that the experience of seeing their testimony had had a constructive and telling effect on the Registrant. He could appreciate the 'dread' that his colleagues must have been feeling when they were preparing to go to work with him. The Committee accepted that the Registrant's reflective statement was genuine and remorseful. He had shown insight. He understood the impact of his misconduct on the victims of it as well as the wider public interest. He also was adamant that he alone was to blame for his behaviour. The findings and concerns at the principal hearing were remediable and the Registrant had addressed and remediated them.
16. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant had shown insight into the circumstances that led to the findings at the principal hearing. In his reflective statement, the Registrant had acknowledged what happened, shown an

understanding that the reason for it happening came from choices he alone had made and he now understood the impact of his misconduct. The Committee gave weight to testimonials from current colleagues which spoke of his conduct at work and which were uniformly positive. His manager spoke of direct customer contact that the Registrant would carry out and noted no concerns had arisen. There were no concerns from his employer that the Registrant presented any risk to members of the public who he encountered.

17. The Committee found that the Registrant had also remediated the circumstances by demonstrating regret and taking steps to prevent a repetition, through his reflective statement and relevant CPD courses. Those courses both pre-dated and post-dated the principal hearing. The Committee also noted that he had undertaken therapy prior to the principal hearing.
18. There was some evidence that these steps had had a positive effect. The Registrant was able to demonstrate from his statement and the testimonials that the training he had undertaken had been put into practice.
19. The Committee was satisfied that there was no realistic risk of repetition. The Registrant had been unable to practise for several years and had found the regulatory experience to be a salutary one. The steps taken by the Registrant by way of training and therapy had been effective which will reduce the risk of repetition.
20. The Committee went on to consider whether the wider public interest (i.e. maintaining public confidence and upholding professional standards) required a finding of impairment either because there is a risk of future harm or, irrespective of any future risk of harm a finding of impairment is necessary to mark the seriousness of what has occurred and thereby maintain public confidence and promote professional standards by making clear to other professionals what is expected and deterring other professionals from failing to meet standards. The Committee concluded that the removal from practice for 12 months (and for a substantial period beforehand) would serve to make it clear to fellow professionals that such behaviour was wholly unacceptable and reprehensible and would serve as a general deterrent. The public – in seeing the removal of the Registrant from the profession in the order

of suspension – would have confidence and reassurance that standards were being upheld by the Regulator.

21. The Committee had regard to the submission made by the Council that the Registrant remained impaired and that a further 6 month suspension order was appropriate. For the reasons set out above, the Committee concluded that the Registrant's fitness to practise was not currently impaired and did not accept that anything would be achieved by an extension of the current order.
22. Having found that the Registrant's fitness to practise is no longer impaired, the current suspension will lapse on expiry, namely 9 September 2026.
23. This concludes the determination.