General Pharmaceutical Council

Fitness to Practise Committee

Restoration Hearing

Remote videolink hearing

29 July 2026, 14 September 2026 & 30 October 2026

Applicant name:	Faraz Cheema
Registration number:	2061122
Part of the register:	Pharmacist
Committee Members:	Neil Calvert (Chair) Cristian Ioanas (Registrant member) Joanne Hird (Lay member)
Legal Adviser:	Graeme Henderson
Secretary:	Evie Davies (29 July 2026) Marjorie Maghinay (14 September and 30 October 2026) Francesca Viney (30 October 2026)
Applicant:	Present and not represented on 29 July 2026 and 30 October 2026 Absent and not represented 14 September 2026
General Pharmaceutical Council:	Represented by Ayshe Sevdan, Case Presenter
Outcome:	Application granted with Conditions

The following Conditions were imposed for a period of 10 months (with review)

1. You must:

• give the GPhC the contact details of your place of employment and anyone who is likely to be the manager or persons supervising you (employer, pharmacy owner, agency, superintendent pharmacist responsible pharmacist)

• tell the GPhC before you take on any position for which you must be registered with the GPhC

• give the GPhC details of the role and the hours you will work each week, including locum or relief work

• tell the GPhC if any of the above details change

2. You must notify the following people in writing of these conditions before you commence any work, in relation to any paid or unpaid work for which registration with the GPhC is required:

   • All employers or contractors

   • Agents acting on behalf of employers and locum agencies

   • Superintendent Pharmacists

   • Responsible Pharmacists

   • Line Managers

   • Workplace supervisors

   • Accountable Officer for Controlled drugs

   • Prospective employers (notification should be given at the time of applying) You must provide the GPhC with a copy of the notification(s)

3. You must tell the GPhC if you apply for work as a pharmacist outside Great Britain

4. You must, prior to commencing employment as a registered pharmacist:

   • find a workplace supervisor and ask the GPhC to approve your workplace supervisor

   • put yourself, and stay, under their close supervision

   • give the GPhC your permission to exchange information with your workplace supervisor about your progress and professional development

5. You must arrange for your workplace supervisor to send a report on your progress and development directly to the GPhC every three months or when the GPhC ask for one.

Introduction

1. This is a hearing in respect of an application for restoration made by Mr Faraz Cheema (2061122) ("the Applicant"). The Applicant was present but not represented. The Council was represented by Ms Sevdan, Case Presenter.

2. The Applicant was registered with the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain on 25 July 2005, following which the Applicants' registration transferred to the General Pharmaceutical Council ("the Council").

3. On 1 August 2016, he was convicted at Manchester Crown Court of fraud, contrary to section 1 of the Fraud Act 2006. He was sentenced to 20 months' imprisonment, suspended for 24 months, and required to complete 150 hours of unpaid work. He self-referred to the Council and professional disciplinary proceedings were commenced against him.

4. The Committee noted that the criminal activity commenced when, Dr A was approached by the Applicant about a business opportunity in October 2012. Dr A considered the Applicant to be a friend. The purported business opportunity related to buying medication which would later be sold to Iraq. The Applicant guaranteed a 50% return on any investment and that, if the investment failed to make a return, the monies invested would be returned by May 2013. Dr A borrowed £50,00 from Dr M to invest with the Applicant, and his brothers and Dr M also made investments of £10,000 and £5,000 respectively. At the time of investments, no loan agreements were signed, each investor relied on oral discussions.

5. In December 2012, Dr A was again approached by the Applicant with the opportunity for a further investment into a smaller investment, but with a quicker return which would be in March 2013. This was to be a local investment with a 50% return and again, if the investment failed to make a return, the full amount of any monies invested would be returned. As a result of this discussion, Dr A again spoke with his friend and family members, and further investments were made by Dr A's wife, his brother, and Dr M. Again, no loan documentation was ever produced.

6. A total £198,000 was invested. After the funds were invested, Dr A heard nothing from the Applicant. In March 2013, Dr A was able to contact the Applicant. The Applicant apologised for the delay in getting the money across and promised that it would be coming soon; Dr A informed the Applicant that his brother needed some of the money back that he had invested and the Applicant arranged for a friend of his to visit Dr A's home address a few days later and give him £1,500 to give to his brother.

7. There was no further contact from the Applicant until Dr A managed to contact him again in May 2013 when he received a text from the Applicant informing him that the

Applicant would be getting the money across to the UK very soon and apologising for the delay.

8. In August 2013, the Applicant admitted to Dr A that there was never an investment for medications to Iraq and that he misrepresented what he intended to use the money for. In fact, the funds were used to participate in 'spread trading'. This is a highly volatile means of investing money where it is possible to make, or lose, substantive sums of money. His fraud was discovered after he lost all of his investments in this volatile market.

9. The Principal Hearing, in respect of the disciplinary proceedings, commenced on 19 May 2017. The particulars of allegation that the Applicant admitted were that on 1 August 2016, he was convicted at Manchester Crown Court of fraud, contrary to section 1 of the Fraud Act 2006. In finding impairment the original Committee stated:

   'We have to say that we do have concerns, even now, that the registrant appreciates the seriousness of what he did in misleading his victims and therefore we do have concerns as to whether he does have full insight into what he did.'

10. Having found that his fitness to practise was impaired the original Committee considered sanction. The Principal Hearing resumed on 17 July 2017 to consider sanction. The Committee considered the full range of sanctions available to it and concluded that no sanction short of removal from the register would be proportionate or sufficient to protect the public interest, including public confidence in the profession.

11. On 20 November 2025, the Council received the Applicant's restoration application. It is not in dispute that a period of five years has lapsed since his removal from the Register. Accordingly, this application is competent.

Relevant Legislation

12. The Committee's powers on an application for restoration arise under Article 57 of the Order. In summary:

13. A person whose entry has been removed from one or more parts of the Register following a direction of a Fitness to Practise Committee may apply for restoration.

14. An application may not be made before five years from the date of removal, and not within 12 months of an earlier restoration application relating to the same entry.

15. If the Committee grants restoration, it may direct that the Applicant's restored entry is subject to conditions for a period not exceeding three years (Article 57(6)).

16. If the Committee refuses, Article 57 also provides (in tightly defined circumstances involving previous refusals) a power to direct that no further application may be made.

17. The Committee also had regard to the GPhC's overarching objective in Article 6(1A) of the Order, namely:

- to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and wellbeing of the public;
- to promote and maintain public confidence in the profession; and
- to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of the profession.

Relevant Rules

18. The Committee had regard to Rule 35 of the 2010 Rules (procedure at restoration hearings), which sets out the typical order of proceedings, including preliminary matters, the presenter's opening, the Applicant's evidence and submissions, any further evidence/submissions, and the Committee's obligation to announce its decision and give reasons.

Relevant Guidance

19. The Committee had regard to the GPhC guidance: "Restoration to the register: Guidance for applicants and committees" ("the Restoration Guidance").

20. The Restoration Guidance makes clear that the burden rests on the applicant to satisfy the Committee that restoration is appropriate; and

21. The Restoration Guidance identifies a number of factors that may be relevant when considering restoration, including (non-exhaustively):

- the circumstances that led to removal;
- the reasons given by the original committee;
- the applicant's response to the original findings;
- evidence of insight into the seriousness of the matters leading to removal;
- evidence of remediation and learning;
- evidence of up-to-date skills and knowledge (accepting the applicant must not have practised unlawfully during removal);
- relevant evidence of current fitness to practise;
- the impact on the applicant of not being restored;
- proportionality; and
- relevant character evidence (references/testimonials).

22. The Committee also had regard to the GPhC Conditions Bank, as a resource for conditions that may be appropriate, workable, proportionate and capable of monitoring.

Relevant Case Law

23. The Committee was referred to the following authorities as informing the general approach to restoration:

24. **Townrow v Financial Services Authority [2014] EWCA Civ 1099**, confirming (in the context of a prohibition order) that, once an order is in place, the burden lies on the applicant to demonstrate that it is appropriate for the order to be lifted/varied. The Committee accepted the relevance of the principle to restoration applications, notwithstanding the different statutory context.

25. **Bolton v Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512**, emphasising the importance of maintaining public confidence and professional standards; and that a profession's collective reputation may outweigh the interests of an individual.

26. **GMC v Nooh [2017] EWHC 2948 (Admin)** where it was stated that whilst dishonesty is always serious it is appropriate for the Committee to consider where, on the spectrum, the level of seriousness should be placed. In some cases there will come a point when it will no longer be necessary to continue the sanction.

27. **GMC v Chandra [2017] EWHC 2556 (Admin)** and **GMC v Chandra [2018] EWCA Civ 1898**, confirming that the correct question is whether, against the backdrop of the regulator's overarching objective, the practitioner is fit to practise. The balancing exercise is not qualitatively different between sanction and restoration; the focus is fitness to practise in the public interest.

28. **GMC v Lamming [2017] EWHC 3309 (Admin),** explaining that a restoration tribunal should keep at the forefront the reasons for the original removal and ask whether the evidence now before it sufficiently resolves the concerns identified by the original tribunal.

Application to receive further documents

29. The Hearing Commenced on 29 July 2026 with the Applicant confirming his name in accordance with Rule 35 (3) of the General Pharmaceutical Council (Fitness to Practise and Disqualification etc) Rules 2010. (The Rules).

30. The Case Presenter then addressed the Committee with regard to the background of the case and the circumstances of the Applicant's removal in accordance with Rule 35 (4)

31. The Applicant then began to provide the Committee with live evidence under affirmation.

32. Prior to this hearing the Council commissioned an Expert Report by a Dr Cartwright. This report was served on the Applicant on 14 May. The Report contained an assessment of the Applicant's portfolio and contained an opinion that the material, provided by the Applicant to the Council, may not be sufficiently up to date to satisfy the Committee that the Applicant should be admitted to the Register. On that basis a hearing, which was planned for June was postponed in order for the Applicant to produce this material.

33. During the course of cross examination on the first day the Case Presenter raised the issue that there were a number of certificates demonstrating work undertaken in 2022. There is, however, a four-year gap between that work and the date of the hearing.

34. The Applicant explained that he had further material which he wished to furnish to the Committee. Accordingly, an application was made, by him, for the material to be received, albeit it was late. It was later explained, by him, that the failure to produce this material involved a mix up between himself and his Solicitors. He informed the Committee that the material had been sent by him to the Solicitors.

35. The Applicant informed the Committee that the material consisted of 5-6 pages of his own reflections which were in the same format as documents which had previously been lodged.

36. The Case Presenter opposed the application for the receipt of these documents on the basis that it came far too late and that he had ample opportunity to lodge them earlier. The Council's fall-back position was that, if the Committee was minded to admit these documents the Council would wish time to consider them. She informed the Committee that the anticipated turnaround time for obtaining a further expert assessment would be in the region of two weeks.

37. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It retired to consider this issue and had regard to Rules 35 and 37 of the Rules.

38. The Committee recognised that, in terms of Rule 35(3) of the rules it should consider the public interest in the expeditious disposal of the case. However, the Committee considered that, despite him having been given several opportunities already, there may be some unfairness to the applicant if he was not allowed to produce documentation that may provide an answer to the criticism of his portfolio that was made by Dr Cartwright. In any event the delay would be for a matter of around eight weeks.

39. Although there was some inconvenience to the Council that was not sufficient to tip the balance in favour of refusing the Applicant's request for the admission of documents.

40. Having been informed that the failure to produce the documents earlier was as a result of a mix up with his Solicitors the Committee did not consider that the Applicant's conduct should be called into question.

41. In balancing all of these issues the Committee determined that it should grant the application for the late admission of documents and accepted the alternative submission, of the Council, that the hearing should be adjourned.

42. Rule 35(8) of the Rules confers a discretion upon the Committee to issue directions upon adjourning.

43. In light of the foregoing the Committee directed that :

44. The Applicant must send all the new documents, that he relies on, to the Council prior to 5pm on Friday 31 July 2026.

45. The Council must obtain a further expert report from a trained expert evaluator in good time and intimate it to the Applicant as soon as reasonably practicable.

Resumed hearing – 14 September 2026

46. When the remote hearing resumed on 14 September 2026 the Applicant was neither present nor represented.

Documents

47. The Committee had regard to the following documents at the resumed hearing. No further documents were issued.

- Restoration bundle
- Council's Statement of Case and Skeleton Argument
- Supplementary statement by Ruth Cartwright (22/8/26)
- Updated Evaluation report by Ruth Cartwright (8/8/26)
- CPD Table 2
- CPD Table 3
- Proceeding in Absence bundle
- Proof of Service Bundle

Application to adjourn

48. At the start of the resumed hearing Ms Sevdan referred the Committee to the bundle of documents containing an application by the Applicant for adjournment.

49. She indicated, whilst that the Council did not oppose this application, it was for the Committee to consider whether or not the application should be granted.

50. She invited the Committee to have regard to Rule 37 (3) of the Rules:

'(3) In considering whether or not to grant a request for postponement or adjournment, the chair or the Committee must, amongst other matters, have regard to—

(a) the public interest in the expeditious disposal of the case;

(b) the potential inconvenience caused to a party or any witnesses to be called by that party;

(c) the conduct of the party seeking the postponement or adjournment; and

(d) fairness to the parties.'

51. She commenced by confirming that the factors that the Committee must have regard to was a non-exhaustive list.

52. Although there was public interest in the expeditious disposal of the case it was not a Fitness to Practise case but Mr Cheema's case for restoration. There were no public protection concerns. The Applicant had a greater interest in the disposal of the case.

53. Additional resources of the Council would be required to arrange a further hearing. However, there were no live witnesses who would be inconvenienced. If anything, an adjournment would inconvenience the Applicant.

54. The application to adjourn was as a result of an unexpected medical procedure affecting a close family member. Whilst the burden of providing supporting evidence rests with the Applicant there is evidence that an earlier appointment had taken place. There was then a last-minute appointment for a follow up medical procedure, to take place on the day of the resumed hearing, which was arranged through telephone. Whilst there is no written evidence of the medical procedure taking place this day it might be said that the Applicant had done all that he reasonably could. The Council was mindful that the principle of fairness should apply to the Applicant.

55. In reaching its decision the Committee had regard to the submissions made by the Council and the documents produced in support of the application. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

56. It decided to grant the application of the Applicant and adjourn the case to 30 October 2026.

57. It was mindful that the only alternative to adjourning would be to proceed to hear the case in the absence of the Applicant in accordance with Rule 25.

58. In a hearing such as this the burden is not with the Council but with the Applicant to satisfy the Committee that he is fit to practise. It would be unfair to consider his

application solely on the papers without him either giving evidence or making submissions in response to Cross Examination and Committee questions.

59. Although other parties are inconvenienced, an adjournment also inconveniences the Applicant. His application for restoration remains on hold.

60. The Committee had no reason to doubt the factual basis for him seeking an adjournment. His position is that a close family member is undergoing surgery on the same day as the resumed hearing. There is written evidence of an earlier appointment to attend an anaesthetic assessment on 7 September. There was then a last-minute cancellation on 10 September 2026 which resulted in a last-minute appointment for surgery becoming available on 14 September 2026. The Committee accepted that whilst there is no written evidence it was unrealistic to expect the Applicant to be able to provide such evidence on 14 September 2026. He had no incentive to frustrate proceedings as it was in his interest to progress his application.

61. Accordingly, the Committee granted the application to adjourn and announced that 30 October 2026 would be the resuming date.

Resumed Hearing - 30 October 2026

62. When the hearing resumed on 30 October 2026 it was the Council's position that cross examination should resume and that any comment on additional documentation that had been produced following the openings submissions should be left to closing submissions.

Documents

63. The Committee had regard to the following documents at the resumed hearing. No further documents were issued.

- Restoration bundle
- Council's Statement of Case and Skeleton Argument
- Supplementary statement by Ruth Cartwright (22/8/26)
- Updated Evaluation report by Ruth Cartwright (8/8/26)
- CPD Table 2
- CPD Table 3
- Proceeding in Absence bundle
- Proof of Service Bundle

Applicant's evidence

64. The Applicant provided live evidence.

65. In his live evidence, the Applicant, informed the Committee that he accepted that he had been dishonest. He also told the Committee that he accepted that his right to seek restoration the Council's Register was a 'privilege and not an entitlement'.

66. He informed the Committee that he no longer considered himself to be a victim of circumstances but that he was the cause of the behaviour that resulted in his conviction.

Applicant's Submissions

67. The Applicant submitted that restoration was appropriate. He relied upon:

- the significant passage of time since the original events;
- his acceptance of wrongdoing and remorse;
- his asserted insight into the impact of his actions on public trust and the profession;
- evidence of rehabilitation since removal; and
- supportive testimonials and his intention to return to safe practice through a structured process.

68. The Applicant accepted that the burden was on him to satisfy the Committee that he should be restored.

69. The Applicant also accepted that, if the Committee were to grant restoration, it could do so with conditions, as a proportionate means of protecting the public and maintaining confidence while he re-established himself in professional practice.

The Council's Submissions

70. The Council confirmed that its position on the application was neutral. The Council also confirmed that the Applicant had not made any previous restoration applications.

71. The Committee understood that the Council's neutrality did not shift the burden from the Applicant, and it remained a matter for the Applicant to satisfy the Committee that restoration was appropriate.

DECISION

The Committee's approach

72. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser and reminded itself that:

- the burden is on the Applicant;
- the Committee's task is not to punish the Applicant again, but to determine whether he has satisfied the Committee that he is now fit to practise and that restoration would be consistent with the overarching objective in Article 6(1A).

73. The Committee adopted a structured approach consistent with the Restoration Guidance In particular, the Committee:

- considered the seriousness of the original misconduct and why removal was imposed;
- evaluated the Applicant's evidence of insight and remediation;
- considered whether the Applicant had demonstrated current fitness to practise and a sufficiently low risk of repetition; and
- considered the wider public interest, including maintaining confidence in the profession and proper standards.

Findings and evaluation

74. The Committee regarded the original conviction which led to a finding of impairment as serious. The Committee appreciated that it should adopt a nuanced approach to his dishonesty. The Committee appreciated that the Original Committee considered that removal was the only appropriate sanction. The Original Committee found that he had continued to deny that he was dishonest despite pleading guilty to an offence of fraud. This Committee considered that the dishonesty, that resulted in the conviction, was highly serious. There was a large sum of money involved and a number of people were deceived. The money was obtained for personal gain. The Applicant misrepresented the position from October 2012 to August 2013.

75. The Committee then went on to consider whether there had been a demonstration of insight since the Substantive Hearing. The Original Committee had grave concerns regarding the Applicant's level of insight. The Original Committee made the following observation at the impairment stage:

'*We listened with care to what the registrant said to us in evidence, in addition to the statement which he placed before us. We invited him to show us where in his statement he had accepted that he had been dishonest. He could not point to anything in the statement confirming that. In answering questions, he did accept that he had deliberately defrauded Dr A and that he was guilty of dishonesty. We found that there was a reluctance of the registrant to accept that in misleading Dr A he was dishonest*.

…..

We have to say that we do have concerns, even now, that the registrant appreciates the seriousness of what he did in misleading his victims and Therefore, we do have concerns as to whether he does have full insight into what he did.'

76. This Committee carefully assessed whether the evidence now before it demonstrated that these concerns relating to insight had been sufficiently addressed. The Committee noted that the Applicant provided a written witness statement in which he said*:*

'I would like to express my deep remorse for my actions. I fully acknowledge the seriousness of my behaviour, and accept complete responsibility. Reflecting on my past decisions, I recognize that my drive for quick financial success clouded my judgment and led me away from the ethical standards I was expected to uphold.

My ambition for rapid financial gain stemmed from a desire to build a successful business and achieve financial security. This misplaced priority pushed me towards decisions that I wrongly believed would accelerate my progress. My involvement in spread trading was motivated by the hope of large, fast profits that I thought would help to secure my future as well as a contribution to boost the efforts in the field of growing sector of pharmacy.

77. The task for this Committee was to consider whether or not he has now demonstrated genuine insight and remorse. In doing so, the Committee placed particular weight on whether the Applicant demonstrated:

- clear acceptance of responsibility;
- genuine insight into why the conduct was wrong and its impact on the public and the profession;
- meaningful and sustained remediation; and
- a credible plan for return to practice.

78. The Committee had regard to; '*the circumstances that led to the removal. The reasons given by the original committee for the decision to remove and the Registrant's response at the original hearing.*' This Committee noted that there were strong public interest reasons in removing the Applicant and that his level of insight, at the time, was low.

79. The Committee then went on to consider the issue of whether the criminal conduct that resulted in the removal was '*likely to be repeated*'. The Committee considered that there was a low risk of repetition. There have been no further concerns raised. The fact that he had been removed from the Register was likely to create greater financial hardship. He has worked in positions of trust in the pharmacy sector without any reported incident.

80. The Committee then considered whether there was evidence of remediation and activities designed to help the applicant learn from the original concern. The Committee was informed that the Applicant has apologised to all of his victims but one (who did not want to speak to him). The Applicant has continued to work in the pharmacy sector despite the notoriety of his conviction and his removal. He has had to explain why he was removed from the Register. He has demonstrated genuine remorse and appreciates that he, and not the surrounding circumstances, were the reason for his downfall. His circumstances have changed and he is not in the same place.

81. The Committee next considered evidence of learning activities designed to keep the Applicant's skills and knowledge up to date, and to keep up with developments in practice (accepting that they must not have practised during that time). The Committee had regard to the addended report of Dr Cartwright who was able to comment on all of the information supplied in support of this application. Having reviewed this material it was stated that:

'*Sixteen summary CPD elements are briefly captured across the 6 pages. They range in date from March 2023 to April 2026, with five of the elements having been completed in 2026 and nine in 2025.*

The activities described are relevant to the applicant's current work as a community pharmacy dispenser and the skills needed to work as a pharmacist. However, my review of these learning activities is necessarily hampered by the brevity and lack of detail provided for each.

Though some of the elements indicate that structured learning was completed no certificates of learning are evident.'

82. The Committee accepted the Applicant's explanation that he would be excluded from attendance from most CPD courses as he was not on the register. The Committees took into account the fact that, as well as submitting CPD reports, the Applicant remained in the pharmacy sector. He was well aware of the problems and challenges facing pharmacists and had not lost touch with the challenges that members of the profession would face in the future. The Committee noted that he anticipated requiring to pass several courses before being signed off in more advanced competencies required of him. His ambition was to work in a community pharmacy.

83. The Committee had regard to the lapse of time since the applicant was removed and considered that this factor was in his favour. There had been a long gap between his offending behaviour and his application for Restoration. His continued engagement with the pharmacy sector, and his proactive approach to keeping up to date with and observing pharmacy practice during the period, had reduced the impact of the lapse of time on his clinical knowledge and skills.

84. The Committee considered all relevant evidence to demonstrate whether the applicant is fit to practise This included references or testimonials from people who worked with him in pharmacies. Three of them were registered pharmacists. They speak highly of his abilities in operating under a role not requiring registration.

85. The Committee then considered the overarching objectives

- to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and wellbeing of the public
- to promote and maintain public confidence in the profession
- to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for the profession.

86. The Committee considered that all of the objectives would be met by restoring the applicant to the Register. His removal was not due to him being an unsafe practitioner. There was a public benefit in restoring a competent practitioner to the Register. A well-informed member of the public would not be concerned if knowing all of the facts they knew of the Applicant being rehabilitated after a significant period of time.

87. Having heard the Applicant's oral evidence and considered his written material, the Committee was satisfied that the Applicant had demonstrated sufficient insight and remediation to justify restoration, provided that appropriate safeguards were put in place through conditions.

88. The Committee determined that conditions (with a review) should be in place for a period of 10 months. It considered whether to impose conditions of mentoring but accepted the Applicant's evidence that he has a strong network of support already in place. He provided reassurance that he had ongoing contact with a number of Pharmacists who could provide mentoring support. Similarly, it noted his evidence of a current personal development plan and his commitment to maintain his approach to CPD. It therefore considered there was no requirement for a formal order in relation to these issues.

89. It therefore directed the Registrar to restore the Applicant to the Register subject to the conditions set out above.

90. A review must take place prior to the order expiring.

91. That concludes this determination.