

General Pharmaceutical Council

Fitness to Practise Committee

Principal Review Hearing

Remote hearing

2 September 2026

Registrant name:	Shane Dixon
Registration number:	5100734
Part of the register:	Pharmacy Technician
Type of Case:	Misconduct
Committee Members:	Lubna Shuja (Chair) Jignesh Patel (Registrant member) Stephanie Hayle (Lay member)
Legal Adviser:	Alice Robertson Rickard
Committee Secretary:	Ivana Raimundova
Registrant:	Not present and not represented
General Pharmaceutical Council:	Represented by Gareth Thomas, Case Presenter
Order being reviewed:	Suspension (6 months with a review)
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Removal
Interim Measures:	Suspension

*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 **1 October 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 forming basis of finding of misconduct at the Principal Hearing

You at the relevant time a registered Pharmacy Technician,

2. On one or more occasions made discriminatory comments and/or demonstrated bullying behaviour towards Colleague 2, in that you referred to him as a 'mong'.

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

Documentation

Exhibit 1- Council's Principal Hearing Review Bundle (120 pages)

Exhibit 2- Council's Skeleton Argument dated 21 August 2026 (9 pages)

Exhibit 3- Proof of Service Bundle (3 pages)

Exhibit 4- Proceeding in Absence Bundle (52 pages)

Exhibit 5- Extract from Council's register showing the Registrant's registered address

The Committee was also provided with the cases of *GMC v Adeogba [2016] EWCA Civ 162*, *Annon v NMC [2017] EWHC 1879 (Admin)* and *Abbas v NMC [2019] EWHC 971*.

Introduction

1. This is the written determination of the Fitness to Practise Committee ('the 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 outcomes guidance*, 2024 ('the Guidance').
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 finds 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 a letter dated 5 August 2026 from the Council headed 'Notice of Review Hearing' ('Notice') addressed to the Registrant and sent to him by secure email on 5 August 2026 to his registered email address. A letter of Notice of the Review Hearing was also sent by special delivery to the Registrant's registered address on 10 August 2026 and re-sent on 21 August 2026, but it is the email service that is relied upon by Mr Thomas, on behalf of the Council, due to the notice period required.
7. In response to a question from the Committee, Mr Thomas submitted that in accordance with Rule 3(4) of the Rules, the notice, having been sent by email, is to be treated as having been served on the day on which it was sent, namely 5 August 2026. Counting 5 August as day one of the notice period, day 28 was 1 September 2026 and today's date is therefore 'no less than 28 days before the date fixed for the hearing', as required by Rule 16(1).

8. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It also accepted the submissions of the Council. 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

9. The Registrant was not in attendance at this hearing, nor was he represented. The Committee heard submissions from Mr Thomas, under Rule 25, to proceed in the absence of the Registrant.
10. The Committee noted that the Registrant had not responded to the Notice of Hearing or indeed engaged with the Council for some considerable period of time.
11. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
12. The Committee decided to proceed in the Registrant's absence for the following reasons:
 - The Committee has found good service of the Notice. Although it appeared the Registrant had not accessed that email, it was sent to his registered email address and the Council is not required to demonstrate the Registrant has received the email. It is up to the Registrant to access emails sent to his registered email address and to keep his details on the register up to date. Therefore, he is probably, or should be, aware of today's hearing.
 - The Council has made significant attempts to contact the Registrant: by telephone on 7 August 2026 (when the number did not connect); by email on 10, 13 and 21 August 2026; and again by telephone on 20 and 24 August 2026 and 1 September 2026, when voice messages were left for him. The Council has also sent two letters by Special Delivery to the Registrant on 10 August 2026 and 21 August 2026. He had not responded to any of these communications. The Committee was satisfied that all reasonable efforts had been made by the Council to attempt to engage the Registrant with these proceedings.
 - The Council's last correspondence from the Registrant was an email dated 19 April 2023 when he wrote to the Council's Case Officer informing them that

he was starting his new job *“outside the world of pharmacy”* and was *“considering leaving the GPhC register”* (though in fact he remains on the Register even though he has not actively renewed his registration since 30 July 2022). He did not attend the Principal Hearing of this case in October 2025 and nor did he attend the first Principal Review Hearing on 4 March 2026.

- The Committee considered that the Registrant has chosen to voluntarily absent himself from this hearing.
- There is nothing to suggest an adjournment would result in the Registrant’s attendance in future. He has not requested an adjournment or communicated with the Council at all.
- The existing suspension order is due to expire on 30 September 2026. If the case were adjourned beyond that date, the order would lapse without due review which effectively would frustrate the regulatory process which is not in the public interest and would not maintain public confidence in the regulator.
- There is a public interest in the expeditious disposal of this review.

Hearing history

- The Principal Hearing (27-29 October 2025) - impairment was found on the grounds of the wider public interest; the Registrant was suspended for a period of four months, coming into force on 28 November 2025.
- The First Review Hearing - On 4 March 2026 he was found to remain impaired on the same grounds and suspended for a further six months.
- The current suspension order is due to expire on 30 September 2026.
- This is the second Principal Review Hearing.

Decision of the Principal Hearing Committee

13. An allegation was found proved that the Registrant had, on one or more occasions, referred to Colleague 2 (who was autistic) as a “mong”.

14. Although the Registrant was not in attendance at the Principal Hearing, the Committee had sight of his earlier responses to that allegation including that:

“I do not recall ever calling him a mong and I can’t believe I would have done so repeatedly and in front of other staff members.” The Registrant had enjoyed a good relationship with Colleague 2 until he believes Colleague 2 was told that he (the Registrant) had implicated him in an incident of graffiti. He believes Colleague 2 had been turned against him and that parts of his statement are “completely fabricated”.

15. The Principal Hearing Committee heard oral evidence from Colleague 2. The Committee considered that the Registrant’s conduct had breached Standards of the profession, in particular Standard 6 (professionalism) and Standard 9 (leadership). The Committee took account of the evidence that Colleague 2 was upset by the comments and eventually made a complaint to his manager. Neither the Registrant’s struggles (Redacted) nor wider evidence of a poor workplace culture excused his conduct. The Principal Hearing Committee found that making discriminatory comments and demonstrating bullying behaviour towards Colleague 2 on one or more occasions amounted to misconduct.

16. In relation to impairment, the Principal Hearing Committee *“was of the view that the Registrant’s conduct which led to the charge was capable of being addressed”*. However, it *“could not be sure that the Registrant understands the seriousness of his misconduct and how it would have affected Colleague 2’s experience at work, and confidence in the Registrant’s profession more widely”*. Nevertheless, some aspects of the Registrant’s written responses suggested a degree of insight into the seriousness of the allegation (he did take responsibility for his negative behaviour generally and its effect on colleagues). The Committee further noted that the Registrant was otherwise said by one of the witnesses to be a competent Pharmacy Technician, and that the misconduct occurred some years ago.

17. The Principal Hearing Committee determined that the Registrant's conduct had engaged Rule 5(2)(b) (brought the profession of pharmacy into disrepute) and (c) (breached one of the fundamental principles of the profession of pharmacy). Furthermore, the Committee was *"bound to conclude"* that there remained a risk that he could repeat his misconduct.
18. In relation to outcome, the Principal Hearing Committee concluded that taking no action or issuing a warning would be inappropriate in light of that Committee's finding in relation to the risk of repetition and the need to mark the seriousness of the misconduct. Conditions of practice were also considered to be inappropriate, given the Registrant's non-engagement with the Council and its process. The Principal Hearing Committee decided that Removal of the Registrant's name from the register would be disproportionate at that time, as his conduct was capable of being addressed and was *"not fundamentally incompatible"* with continued registration *"provided he takes the necessary steps to address it"*.
19. The Principal Hearing Committee imposed a suspension for 4 months for the following reasons:
- "... taking into account the circumstances of this case, that a short period of suspension would be appropriate and proportionate. A suspension would ensure that until the Registrant has demonstrated his learnings from this Committee's findings, he would be prevented from taking up work as a pharmacy technician; and it would also send a message to his profession and the public that the conduct which the Committee found proved was unacceptable for a registered professional."*
20. The Principal Hearing Committee considered that a future review would give the Registrant *"an opportunity to attend a hearing and demonstrate that there is no longer a risk that he might repeat his conduct at work in future."* Four months would be sufficient for him to reflect and remediate his conduct *"should he wish to do so"*.

21. The Principal Hearing Committee suggested that a future reviewing committee may be assisted by:
- The Registrant's attendance at the review
 - A reflective statement from the Registrant demonstrating that he has insight into the seriousness of the Committee's findings against him and the effect of his conduct on Colleague 2, on the culture in his workplace more generally, on other members of the profession and on the wider public interest
 - Attendance at training about Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
 - Testimonials or references

Decision of the First Review Hearing Committee

22. At the first review hearing on 4 March 2026 the Committee (the First Review Committee) found that the Registrant's fitness to practise remained impaired.
23. That committee found that as the Registrant had not been in contact with the Council and had provided no information for that review hearing, he had done nothing to discharge the persuasive burden on him to demonstrate that he had addressed the Principal Hearing Committee's concerns or remediated his misconduct sufficiently, or indeed at all.
24. The Registrant had provided nothing to show that he had done any of what was recommended by the Principal Hearing Committee. There was no reflective statement to demonstrate insight into the seriousness of the findings against him and the effect of his conduct on Colleague 2 and more widely on the culture of his workplace, other members of the profession and the wider public interest. The First Review Committee had no evidence that he had attended any of the suggested training and he had not supplied any testimonials or references.
25. That committee therefore found that the Registrant's fitness to practise remained impaired on public interest grounds.

26. Having found impairment, that committee went on to consider the matter of outcome. That committee concluded that a further period of suspension for six months was the appropriate and proportionate outcome. It was stated that a period of six months should be ample time for the Registrant to re-engage with the Council and take steps to demonstrate that he had remediated his misconduct. That committee had nothing to add to the list of recommendations which the Principal Hearing Committee indicated would be helpful for the Registrant to provide for a future review hearing.

Submissions

27. Mr Thomas, on behalf of the Council, submitted the Registrant's fitness to practise remained currently impaired as he had not had any contact with the Council at all for some considerable time and therefore there had been no change since the previous hearings.

Decision on Impairment

28. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
29. The Committee finds that the Registrant's fitness to practise remains impaired as he has not been in contact with the Council since April 2023. He has provided no new information for this review hearing. He has again done nothing to discharge the persuasive burden on him to demonstrate that he has addressed the Principal Hearing Committee's concerns or remediated his misconduct.
30. The Registrant has provided nothing to show that he has done any of what was recommended by the Principal Hearing Committee and reiterated at the first review hearing. There is no further reflective statement to demonstrate insight into the seriousness of the findings against him and the effect of his conduct on Colleague 2 and more widely on the culture of his workplace, other members of the profession and the wider public interest. This Committee, like the previous committees, has no evidence that he has attended any training and he has not supplied any testimonials or references.

31. The Committee concluded that in the absence of any information from the Registrant and a complete lack of engagement with these regulatory proceedings, it had no option but to find that the Registrant's fitness to practise remains impaired on public interest grounds, as found by the previous committees.

Decision on Outcome

32. The Committee therefore considered the appropriate and proportionate outcome.
33. The Committee's powers are set out in Article 54(3) of the Order. The Committee should consider the available outcomes 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 outcome that meets the circumstances of the case.
34. The purpose of the outcome is not to be punitive, though an outcome may in fact have a punitive effect. The purpose of an outcome 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.
35. The Committee took into account the submissions made on behalf of the Council. Mr Thomas submitted that it may now be proportionate to remove the Registrant from the register as reviews such as this could not continue indefinitely and to allow them to do so could undermine confidence in the regulator. He submitted that a further period of suspension would serve no purpose in light of the Registrant's lack of engagement, and it would now be appropriate to consider removal. In support of this submission, he referred to the cases of *Abbas v NMC [2019] EWHC 971* and *Annon v NMC [2017] EWHC 1879 (Admin)*.
36. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser and had regard to the Guidance.

37. The Committee agreed with the previous committees that this is a case in which the misconduct in question is potentially remediable, but that it had not been remedied. The Registrant had not provided any reason why he had not engaged or had any contact with his regulator for over 3 years. The Committee concluded that an outcome remains necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold the standards expected of members of the profession. Whilst previous committees considered that a suspension order was sufficient at that time to allow the Registrant ample time to demonstrate remediation, he has chosen not to use this opportunity.
38. The Committee found that due to the continued absence of the Registrant's engagement, conditions would be wholly impracticable as there is nothing to suggest that he would comply with them. On the contrary, he was considering leaving the profession altogether, and he has not renewed his registration since July 2022. Furthermore, the concerns raised by the Principal Hearing Committee are attitudinal in nature and it would be difficult to formulate appropriate conditions to manage such misconduct. In any event, the seriousness of the matter has not diminished as the Registrant has not attempted to remediate. There is still no evidence of sufficient insight, regret, remorse or any recent reflections and he has shown no intention to remediate.
39. The Committee also gave serious consideration to whether a further period of suspension would suffice to maintain public confidence and allow time for remediation.
40. The Committee found that a further period of suspension would serve no purpose, in circumstances where the Registrant had not engaged with the Council for over three years and has indicated an intention to leave the profession. It had regard to the indication of the First Review Committee, which had made it clear to the Registrant that *'a time must come when there is so little realistic prospect of remediation that it may be proportionate to remove a Registrant from the register, even though the underlying conduct is capable of remediation'*.

41. The Committee was satisfied that the time had now come to remove the Registrant from the register as there was no realistic prospect of remediation due to his complete lack of engagement with his regulator. Indeed, he had shown disinterest and a disregard for these proceedings. In the Committee's judgement, it was therefore now appropriate and proportionate to remove the Registrant from the Register. In reaching this conclusion, it had regard to the relevant caselaw, which indicates that professionals should not be left indefinitely 'in limbo' and that there comes a point where a lack of progress and total absence of remediation over a long period leads a panel to conclude that removal of a registrant from the register is necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold professional standards. It is also a disproportionate use of the regulator's resources to continue to hold review hearings where there appears to be little prospect of any engagement from a registrant, in the absence of any explanation for their past lack of engagement.
42. The Committee therefore directs that the Registrar Remove the name of Shane Dixon (registration number 5100734) from the Register.

Interim Measures

43. Mr Thomas applied for an interim measure of suspension under Article 60 of the Order. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
44. The direction for the Removal of the Registrant from the Register will not take effect until 28 days after the date on which the decision letter is served, by which time the existing suspension, due to expire on 30 September 2026 may have expired. Should the Registrant lodge an appeal, there could potentially be a period within which he may be free to practise unrestricted, until such time as any appeal is determined.
45. The Committee concluded that it is necessary that the Registrant should not be free to practise during any appeal period, as it would not be in the public interest or maintain public confidence in the profession, or declare and uphold standards during an appeal period for the same reasons given in relation to the Removal Order.

Accordingly, the Committee grants the application for an Interim Measure of Suspension.

46. This concludes the determination.