General Pharmaceutical Council

Fitness to Practise Committee

Principal Hearing

Remote video-link hearing

16-19 November 2026

Registrant name:	Eghosa Adams Odeh
Registration number:	2084351
Part of the register:	Pharmacist
Type of Case:	Misconduct/Conviction
Committee Members:	Hannah Poulton (Chair) Joanne Jenkins (Registrant member) Tanya Kynaston (Lay member)
Legal Adviser:	Charlotte Mitchell-Dunn
Committee Secretary:	Adam Hern (16 & 17 November) Evie Davies (18 & 19 November)
Registrant:	Present and not represented
General Pharmaceutical Council:	Represented by Mary Poku-Catani, Case Presenter
Facts proved:	N/A
Facts proved by admission:	1, 2, 3, and 4
Facts not proved:	N/A
Fitness to practise:	Impaired
Outcome:	Removal
Interim measures:	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 17 December 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. On 4 March 2021 you were arrested by Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary on suspicion of fraud. **ADMITTED**

2. On 14 June 2021, 13 June 2022 and 13 June 2023, upon renewal of your registration with the General Pharmaceutical Council, when asked whether you were currently under investigation by any other regulatory body or criminal enforcement authority e.g. the police, you answered "no" on your declaration. **ADMITTED**

3. Your actions in all or some of the incidents in paragraph two were dishonest in so far as you knew that you were under investigation by the police and yet you declared that you were not. **ADMITTED**

4. On 24th October 2023, you were convicted at Southampton Crown Court of the Possession of Criminal Property, contrary to Sections 329(1) and 334 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. **ADMITTED**

5. Upon registering with Michael Page Pharmacy recruitment agency, you failed to declare the conviction set out above in 4 when asked on their registration form. **COUNCIL OFFERED NO EVIDENCE**

6. Upon applying for the role of Pharmacy Manager at Lincolnshire Co-Operative Pharmacy Saxilby branch you failed to declare the conviction set out above in 4 to

    a. Michael Page Pharmacy recruitment agency and/or

    COUNCIL OFFERED NO EVIDENCE

    b. Lincolnshire Co-Operative Pharmacy Saxilby

    COUNCIL OFFERED NO EVIDENCE

until you were informed that a CRB check would be carried out.

7. Your actions in all or some of the incidents in paragraphs five and six were dishonest in so far as you knew that you had previously been convicted of a criminal offence, yet you failed to declare that fact until you had realised it would come to light through other means. **COUNCIL OFFERED NO EVIDENCE**

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

Documentation

Document 1- Council's hearing bundle

Document 2- Council's Case Statement and skeleton argument

Document 3- Registrant's character reference

Document 4- Case of PSA V GPhC & Anor [2024] EWHC 3335 (Admin) (1)

Document 5- Case of PSA v NMC & X [2018] EWHC 70 (Admin) (1)

Determination

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 outcomes guidance* as revised March 2024.

5. 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 and 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. Outcome– the Committee considers what, if any, outcome should be applied if the Registrant's fitness to practise is found to be impaired.

Background

6. On 4 March 2021, the Registrant was arrested by Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary on suspicion of fraud. On the 24 October 2023, the Registrant pleaded guilty (the day before trial) at Southampton Crown Court to the offence of: Possession of Criminal Property, contrary to sections 329(1) and 334 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.

7. The conviction related to an offence that occurred in July 2020. The basis of the Registrant's plea, submitted a day before the trial was due to commence, was that a friend called RA asked the Registrant if he could use his bank account to apply for a loan in 2019-2020. The Registrant agreed to this and gave him his bank details. The

Registrant was given £20,000 out of £50,000 in return for allowing the friend to use his account.

8. The Registrant said he later learnt his friend used the bank details to apply for a business bounce back loan to the value of £50,000. The Registrant said he would not have agreed to it if he knew the full facts. He chased his friend for the rest of the loan, and eventually the sum of £43,432.93 appeared in his bank account. The Registrant admitted he suspected the money was illegitimate; however, he did not question his friend about this.

9. A company called The Travel Professional had been defrauded of £42,432.93 during the Covid-19 crisis and contacted the police via fraud action line. It was at a time when companies were trying to reimburse customers for cancelled bookings. Emails between the travel company and a client, Cello Health was intercepted, and a refund of £42,432.93 that was due to Cello Health was diverted to the Registrant's bank account. The funds were then very quickly dispersed through personal and business accounts belonging to the Registrant that was linked to a separate business that the Registrant ran alongside his practice.

10. The Registrant is alleged to have refused to give the police the PIN code for his telephone to be interrogated which is alleged to have delayed the investigation for 18 months. However, the Registrant does not accept that he refused to provide the PIN. Once messages were downloaded it became clear that the Registrant had indicated that he needed to make £600,000 very quickly.

11. Following his guilty plea the Registrant was sentenced by the Crown Court on 21 November 2023. During the sentencing hearing, it was highlighted to the Judge that the Registrant told the police during his interview under caution in January 2021, that he had allowed his cousin to use his account to pay his wages into the account because his cousin was having problems with his own bank account. The Registrant said he was unaware of £43,000 being paid into the account and denied benefiting from the money. The Registrant appeared to have then changed his version of events in his

basis of plea the day before the trial was due to start. The basis of plea indicated that a friend called RA used his bank account in return for a share of the money. This account was repeated in an email to the GPhC on 9 September 2024.

12. The Judge imposed a prison sentence of 22 months suspended for a period of 12 months. The Registrant was required to complete 15 days of a rehabilitation program and 200 hours of community unpaid work.

13. Having been sentenced by the Crown Court on 21 November 2023, the Registrant did not notify the GPhC of the police investigation, his arrest or conviction, until 2024 when he applied online to renew his registration.

14. On 23 May 2024, the Crown Court made a confiscation order in the sum of £1,756.28 which was required to be paid by the 23 of August 2024.

15. On 25 June 2024, the Registrant renewed his registration with the GPhC and answered "yes" to the question: 'Have you previously been convicted of or cautioned for a criminal offence in the British Islands or elsewhere?'

Application to offer no evidence

16. At the outset of the hearing the Council made an application to offer no evidence in respect of allegations 5, 6(a), 6(b) and 7. The Council formally invited the Committee to accept the application on the basis that the Registrant would be making admissions to particulars 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the allegation, and the matter could then progress to Stage 2 of the proceedings.

17. The provisions under Rule 31 of the Rules do not provide a specific power permitting the Council to offer no evidence. However, it is recognised in fitness to practise proceedings that regulators should be permitted to offer no evidence in appropriate cases (see PSA v NMC & X [2018] EWHC 70 (Admin) at paragraph 55-57).

18. In such cases, the regulator is required to open the case fully and to furnish the Committee with sufficient knowledge of the facts to enable it to make a decision as to whether offering no evidence is appropriate or whether it should refuse and require the regulator to seek further evidence. Ultimately, the Committee must be put in a position where it can adequately scrutinise the regulator's application.

19. The Council provided a case statement and skeleton argument setting out the background to this matter in full as set out above. The Council also provided submissions in respect of offering no evidence in relation to allegations 5, 6a and 6b and 7 as follows;

"GPhC investigation

Upon receiving the information, the Council begun to investigate the background to the criminal conviction and saw that in 2021, 2022 and 2023, the Registrant failed to declare that he had been subject to a police investigation.

The Registrant renewed his registration online with the GPhC on the following dates;
14 June 2021
13 June 2022
13 June 2023
At the time of renewing his registration on 25th June 2024 and on all the above dates, the Registrant made a false declaration that he was not under investigation by a regulatory body or criminal enforcement authority. It is anticipated that the Registrant will admit particulars 1,2,3 and 4.

The GPhC confirmed on 08 May 2026, that the manual renewal form of the Registrant's registration from 2022 specifically asks "Are you currently under investigation by any regulatory body (other than the GPhC) or criminal enforcement authority (e.g. police or NHC Counter Fraud Service) in the British Islands or elsewhere?" The rules have therefore not changed between 2022 and 2025 on an initial search. The only caveat being that the numbers on the manual renewal form differ from the online renewal system, however the wording would have been consistent.

Allegations 5, 6(a), 6(b) & 7

The Council contacted Michael Page Pharm, ("MP"), a recruitment agency for pharmacists as part of its investigation into the disclosure made by the Registrant on 24th June 2024 about his previous conviction. Micheal Page ("MP") initially alleged in July 2025, that the Registrant failed to disclose his conviction to the agency at the time of seeking employment from them.

Michael Page later informed the Council that the Registrant disclosed the conviction to them. The extent of disclosure is uncertain as Michael Page have been unable to produce the officials that the disclosure was made to, however they have provided a screenshot of their CRM record which states "has 1 investigation- Minor lockdown times, setting up a business- wanted to sell PPE to pharmacies- was business so has gone back to him in a bad way". This is not an accurate reflection of the Registrant's conviction however it is uncertain whether the entry is an exact quote from the Registrant, or a summation of his disclosure.

The Council also contacted Lincolnshire Co-Operative Pharmacy, Saxilby, who had offered the Registrant employment as a Pharmacy Manager through Michael Page. Neither the Registrant nor the agency disclosed the conviction during the recruitment process. The offer of employment was rescinded after the pharmacy was informed in July 2025 that the Registrant had recently disclosed the conviction to Michael Page.

At the time of the investigation, the Registrant was working irregular shifts as a locum pharmacist. He had also been offered employment as a Pharmacist Manager with another employer, due to commence in February 2026, following a postponement of the original start date to allow for overseas travel.

In any case, Michael Page has refused to assist with the investigation and when asked to clarify the statement at paragraph 26, have not provided any response. In the light of this, the Council does not have any evidence to substantiate allegations 5-7 that pertains to Michael Page and Lincolnshire Co-Operative Pharmacy, Saxilby.

It is submitted that there is no reasonable prospects of particulars 5, 6(a), 6(b) and 7 being proved.

Evidence submitted by Registrant

The Registrant sent an email on 8th May 2026. In summary he said "I fully accept my failure to disclose my conviction and police arrest to the GPhC. This was a serious error of judgement, and it is something I deeply regret. I also accept responsibility for the poor associations and decisions I made in the past. However, I have worked hard to reflect on my actions, take accountability, and make meaningful changes in my life……The past six months have been among the most difficult of my life (REDACTED). Despite this, I am grateful that I have been able to use this time productively and in a positive way."

The Registrant also attached correspondence he had with Michael Page adding "I never intended to conceal information from any potential employer, as has been alleged." This amounted to an outright denial of counts 5, 6(a), 6(b) and 7. The Registrant then produced documentary evidence in support of his denials.

Relevant chronology- Michael Page concern

• January 2025-A Michael Page Director confirmed the Registrant told him about the conviction, and he told a colleague called AP. AP subsequently notified Co-op. The declaration came to light when AP discussed DBS checks with the Registrant in January 2025. AP has since left Michael Page.
• 02 July 2025- A Michael Page Consultant, AP, stated that the Registrant informed him of the conviction on a weekend prior to 02 July 2025
• 08 July 2025 – A Michael Page Director informed Co-op that during their screening stage, they ask clients whether they had criminal convictions however the Registrant did not declare any conviction directly to Co-op at this time.

• 3 Sept 2025 - DH of the GPhC spoke with Michael Page (Pharm) Director. He said the Registrant did not answer questions about whether he had criminal convictions on their application form. He confirmed the Registrant made the declarations about his conviction around the time of being notified Co-op were going to carry out DBS checks in January 2025. Lincolnshire Co-Op had requested the application form from Michael Page which was not provided.

• 10 Nov 2025 – Michael Page (Pharm) Director informed the GPhC once again that the Registrant had declared his criminal conviction around the time he completed his registration in January 2025. It was recorded on their CRM system which he had viewed ahead of his call with the GPhC. Michael Page (Pharm) Director further confirmed that the Registrant had initially spoken with another member of the team, W, before he completed the registration form where he had disclosed his criminal conviction. Michael Page (Pharm) Director confirmed that AP immediately contacted Co-Op when the Registrant disclosed the conviction. Michael Page (Pharm) Director said the registration form did not show a declaration about a criminal conviction, however clients may not complete their vetting forms for up to 6 months after an initial vetting discussion, even if they were sent the form at that early stage.

• 11 Nov 2025 – Michael Page Director sent an email to the GPhC reiterating that the Registrant disclosed his conviction to the agency in January 2025.

Text of email from the Director of Michael Page pharmacy to the Council.

11 Nov 2025-From MP Pharm Director: "I am writing to inform you about an update on Mr Odeh's file. It was stated that Mr. Odeh failed to respond to communications or disclose his criminal conviction. Although it wasn't on the reg form we send to candidates, he did mention it to a predecessor that he had a conviction in January.

The facts are as follows:
Mr. Odeh fully disclosed his conviction to AP at the time of engagement, just as he had done previously with another client (Morrison's Pharmacy).

The reason Mr. Odeh did not respond at the time was not due to the DBS check, as claimed, but because he had just become aware of new information concerning a fitness to practise hearing.

For accuracy and context, it should also be noted that. AP no longer works for Michael Page Recruitment Agency.

These are the true and accurate facts. It is important that this clarification is recorded and considered to ensure that no unjust or misleading impression is left regarding Mr. Odeh's honesty or professionalism.

Lastly, when we put Mr Odeh in contact with Morrisons we were transparent from our side and Mr Odeh was transparent about the conviction. Mr Odeh had made us aware of the conviction in January this year – notes on our CRM."

Conclusion on offering no evidence

Overall, the Committee is invited to consider whether allowing the Council's application to offer no evidence against the Registrant as articulated above, would undermine the Council's overarching objective, such that it could be said to be insufficient to protect the public. The council's position is that it would not be because of the reasons set out above. The concerns above are not supported by evidence, such that findings of current impairment are not warranted.

In all the above circumstances, the Council submits that its application to offer no evidence should be accepted and the proceedings brought to a conclusion in relation to allegations 5, 6(a), 6(b) and 7."

20. Ms Poku-Catani in oral submissions set out the Council's position. She was asked questions by the Committee in respect of the steps taken by the Council to ascertain the identity of the former consultant within Michael Page, and the reasons that that individual could not be summonsed by the GPhC. Ms Poku-Catani explained that the individual was AP who no longer works for Michael Page Recruitment Agency and there was no means of ascertaining his whereabouts due to the time that had lapsed since he left the agency. Ms Poku-Catani noted the content of the message from the

Director of Michael Page pharmacy to the Council and the admission in respect of the Registrant informing AP of his conviction. Ms Poku-Catani was asked whether the position advanced by Michael Page, that it was unable to share the individual's contact details due to data protection, had been properly scrutinised by the Council. Ms Poku-Catani confirmed that this matter had been escalated within the GPhC and it was satisfied with the response provided by Michael Page.

21. The Committee received legal advice and were provided with copies of the cases of PSA V GPhC & Anor [2024] EWHC 3335 (Admin) (1) and PSA v NMC & X [2018] EWHC 70 (Admin) (1).

22. The Committee considered the application with care, mindful of its duties to ensure the case was not under prosecuted. The Committee accepted that the GPhC had reached a limit with regard to its attempts to ascertain the whereabouts of AP, and there were no further reasonable lines of enquiry which could be pursued.

23. In respect of the message received by the Director of Michael Page, the Committee noted the reassurances provided that the Registrant fully disclosed his conviction to AP at the time of engagement, just as he had done previously with another client (Morrison's Pharmacy). It therefore considered that even if further enquiries were made in respect of AP, his evidence was unlikely to support particulars 5, 6a and 6b and 7 of the allegation.

24. The Committee accepted the submissions of the GPhC that there was no realistic prospect of the GPhC proving its case in respect of particulars 5, 6a and 6b and 7 of the allegation.

25. The Panel considered that, even if the GPhC offer no evidence in respect of particulars 5, 6a and 6b and 7 of the allegation, if granted, a viable fitness to practise case remains and the charges that are most serious continue to be pursued by the GPhC. The Committee also noted that the Registrant suffers no prejudice by the Committee allowing the GPhC's application.

26. In all the circumstances, the Committee decided it was appropriate to grant the application of the GPhC and allow them to offer no evidence in respect of particulars 5, 6a and 6b and 7 of the allegation.

Admissions

27. When read out, the Registrant admitted to the following allegations: 1, 2, 3 and 4. The Committee accepted that the Registrant has admitted to these allegations.

28. By the application of Rule 31(6), the admitted factual allegations were found proved.

29. On the basis that all of the remaining allegations were admitted by the Registrant the Committee proceeded to stage 2 to consider 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.

Evidence on Grounds and Impairment

30. Having found allegations 1,2,3 and 4 proved, the Committee went on to consider whether the particulars found proved amounted to misconduct and/or the statutory ground of conviction and, if so, whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

31. The Registrant gave evidence under oath. The below is a summary of the evidence he gave.

32. The Registrant stated that he had taken responsibility for his wrongdoing and wanted to explain how his life and decision making had changed since his criminal conviction. He noted that he knowingly failed to disclose the police investigation during his registration renewals. He stated the truth was that he was afraid of the consequences for his career, however this did not justify his dishonesty.

33. The Registrant noted that he experienced financial and personal pressure at the time of the criminal conduct, he stated this was not however an excuse. The Registrant noted that public confidence in the pharmacy profession would have been undermined by his actions.

34. He accepted he failed to notify the GPhC of his conviction within seven days despite being told to do so by his legal representative. He submitted he felt overwhelmed by the criminal proceedings and forgot to make the notification.

35. He stated that in 2023, he gave his life to Jesus Christ and began his journey of personal change in faith which challenged him to confront his past and turn away from his dishonest wrongdoing. He stated he had reflected on his actions and when he completed his registration renewal in 2024, he realised that he had not disclosed his conviction. The Registrant noted that he then declared his conviction despite knowing that it would have serious consequences for his registration and before the GPhC contacted him about it. The Registrant submitted that he previously allowed fear to determine his actions, but he has changed his behaviour and knows that honesty is fundamental to being a pharmacist.

36. The Registrant noted he deprived his regulator of the opportunity to assess his circumstances and noted how dishonesty damages public trust and confidence in the profession. He noted he had been suspended for a 12-month period, and this had caused him to reflect on his professional responsibilities. He submitted that it was not enough to say he was no longer dishonest, but he had to demonstrate consistent behaviour and had an obligation to disclose reportable matters promptly even if he feared the consequences.

37. The Registrant submitted he was now aware of his reporting obligations and would seek guidance from the GPhC in relation to any matters which he was unsure about from now on. He stated he understood that rebuilding professional trust required continuing accountability. He submitted he was deeply remorseful for his past

dishonesty and the failure to fulfil his professional obligations; however, he had learnt from his past behaviour which is why he disclosed matters in June 2024.

38. The Registrant submitted that he understood that the panel had a responsibility to protect the public and uphold professional standards but asked that the panel deal with him fairly and review his commitment to changing and acting with integrity.

39. The Registrant was asked questions by the Committee. He was asked to set out the nature and circumstances of his criminal conviction. The Registrant explained that his friend had reached out to him, wanting to collect a business loan, but he didn't have a business account, and it was at a time that he was struggling financially. He stated he would help provided his friend gave him a 40% cut of the loan. The loan was intended to be £50,000.

40. The Registrant stated he was actually given £20,000 and later received a text from Barclays Bank thanking him for obtaining a bounce back loan. He stated he had not known that his details had been used to apply for the loan, so he reached out to his friend asking him why he had been misled. He asked his friend to pay him back and then his friend later called him and made a payment into his Barclays account. He stated when he saw the payment he did question the source of the funds, but he was desperate to receive what he was owed.

41. The Registrant stated in January 2021 the police came to his house and asked about the transaction that had come into his bank account and acknowledged that he lied to the police, telling them it was from his cousin. He said he was trying to protect his friend at the time. He accepted lying to the police about the money being for his cousin and stated that it was only when he was later interviewed that he explained that the money was not for his cousin and what had actually happened.

42. The Registrant explained he waited a significant period of time before the matter was brought before courts and during that time he remained in contact with his lawyer. He stated he pled not guilty in the magistrate's court and in the crown court at the first

appearance. He then instructed new legal representation, who he was able to have a lengthy conference with and following this conference he decided to plead guilty to the offences. In respect to the messages about £600,000, he stated he wanted to start up a business to supply PPE and masks and had got carried away about matters.

43. He stated after the Crown Court hearing he was very excited about the matters concluding and went to his church. He noted that although he had been told to inform the GPhC of his conviction, by his legal representative, he forgot to inform the GPhC.

44. He was asked about the impact on the pharmacy profession of his conviction and the failure to disclose matters and he accepted that these were serious offences, that he had broken important professional standards and that what he had done was completely unacceptable. He stated he felt ashamed and since the conviction he has had to face telling people about what he has done, which has not been easy. He stated the public puts a lot of trust in pharmacists and that he had broken that trust.

45. He was asked to describe the impact of the episode. He stated he took trust very seriously and understood the need for integrity and honesty within the profession. He stated since the incident he had been overpaid by one pharmacy and had spoken up when this happened, which made his relationship with that pharmacy stronger as it enhanced their trust in him.

46. In respect of reflection, he stated if he was faced with a similar situation in the future the first thing he would do was check because if something seems too good to be true it usually is. He stated he would question the source of funds no matter his level of desperation and ensure that if anything looked “dodgy” he would not participate in it. He stated he now chooses his friends carefully.

47. It was put to him that 40% was a very high fee for the use of his bank account, and he accepted that this was the case and stated that he felt his friend knew about his business venture ideas.

48. The Registrant was asked about any training and development that he'd undertaken. He noted that as part of his probation he was required to conduct personal and professional development courses about the importance of honesty. He stated that he is completing a foundation programme with his church and continues to grow his faith.

49. The Registrant was cross examined. It was put to him that he had lied to the police and had said that the money entering his bank account was for his cousin. He acknowledged that this was correct. It was put to him that it was very serious lying to the police and that despite having concerns about the funds he had received he had continued to protect his friend. He acknowledged that this was the case.

50. He was asked about when he intended to tell the GPhC that he had lied to the police about matters he stated that he had not been asked to clarify this matter surrounding his arrest and that he didn't know that he needed to explain this detail when he responded to the allegation. He acknowledged he had a duty of candour and that he should have told the GPhC about the lie to the police.

51. He was asked about the messages sent and why he was seeking to make £600,000. He stated that he reflected back on those messages and that he was a “greedy” person at the time he was carried away about the idea of developing a business around PPE distribution and that's what the messages reflected.

52. He acknowledged that he was seeking to build a business from funds which he accepted he was aware may not be legitimate. He stated in hindsight he understands that every part of that was completely wrong.

53. He was asked why it took until 2024 to declare matters, and he explained that he was consumed by fear and afraid about making a declaration. It was put to him that he ought to have realised that he should disclose matters when he was convicted in the criminal courts and told to do so by a lawyer. He stated that the honest truth was he forgot to declare but he knows he has “messed up big time”.

Submissions on Grounds and Impairment

54. The Committee heard oral submission from Ms Poku-Catani who addressed the Committee in respect of the statutory ground of conviction, misconduct and impairment. Ms Poku-Catani also relied upon her skeleton argument, submitted prior to the final hearing, which set out the following;

Submissions on Misconduct

The admitted facts and the modus operandi of the Registrant's misconduct cannot be seen in any other way than that it was deplorable behaviour, when one considers his modus operandi at paragraphs 11 to 20.

The Council submits that the Registrant's conduct fell short of the following Standards for Pharmacy professionals, including:

Standard 6 Pharmacy professionals must behave in a professional manner: The Registrant clearly breached this condition through his dishonest conduct.

Standard 9 Pharmacy professionals must demonstrate leadership: The Registrant failed to uphold this standard when he engaged with a financial transaction despite having concerns about its legitimacy.

To the extent that the Registrant's conduct was dishonest, and calls into question his professionalism, his actions can rightly be described as deplorable and amounting to misconduct.

....

Submissions on Impairment

The essence of the wrongdoing in this case is dishonest conduct.

The main focus of the regulatory concern is on subsections (b) (c) and (d) of Rule 5(2) (above). The Registrant's dishonest actions would have continued without intervention; it could have led to more frauds being perpetrated against struggling businesses during the Covid-19 pandemic. 5(2) (b)

The Registrant's actions inevitably caused reputational damage to the profession as dishonesty underpins most of the allegations and the sum involved was significant. 5(2)(c)

The Registrant gave inconsistent accounts regarding his involvement and did not fully co-operate with the police during their investigation by withholding his mobile telephone PIN code which delayed the investigation by 18 months. 5(2)(d)

The Council acknowledges that the Registrant may admit some of the allegations.

The Registrant has admitted dishonesty, which can be an attitudinal problem that tends to be more difficult to remediate.

It is further submitted that this is a case in which the wider principle in ***Grant*** *(above) applies – public confidence and the maintenance of proper standards would be undermined if no finding of impairment were made."*

55. The Committee took into account all of the evidence provided by the Registrant and the relevant testimonials he provided including the testimonial from Crest Pharmacy.

56. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Decision on Grounds

57. Article 51(1) of the Order set out the possible grounds or "gateways" to a finding of impairment. One of the relevant gateway in this matter is:

• "a conviction in the British Islands for a criminal offence" (Article 51(1)(e)

58. The Committee was satisfied that the ground at Article 51(1)(e) were met by the convictions set out at particulars 4 of the allegation.

59. When considering whether the remaining particulars found proved amounted to misconduct, the Committee took into account the Good Decision Making Guidance and the Fitness to Practise Hearings and Outcomes Guidance 2024.

60. The Committee first considered whether the Registrant had breached the Standards for Pharmacy Professionals (May 2017). The Committee determined that there had been breaches of the following Standards:

<u>Standard 6 – Pharmacy professionals must behave professionally.</u>

The Committee noted that the Registrant's conviction for possession of criminal property had been found proved at this hearing by admission. Furthermore, the Committee concluded that the Registrant's failure to disclose that he was under investigation by the police over a three-year period, with multiple opportunities to do so. The Registrant's actions were seriously dishonest and fell significantly below the standards of behaviour expected of a pharmacy professional and risked undermining public trust and confidence in the profession. The Committee considered that this breaches the standard that pharmacy professionals must behave professionally.

<u>Standard 8 – Pharmacy professionals must speak up when they have concerns or when things go wrong.</u>

The Committee concluded that the Registrant as a pharmacy professional did not disclose his conviction nor the fact that he was the subject of a criminal investigation for a significant period of time and in doing so prevented the regulator from taking appropriate action. The Registrant failed to act openly and honestly both by the nature of his conviction and in his actions of failing to disclose matters. Therefore, the Committee found Standard 8 breached.

Standard 9 – Pharmacy professionals must demonstrate leadership

The Committee considered that the Registrant failed to take appropriate responsibility for his actions in failing to disclose the criminal investigation, his arrest and his conviction to his regulator. He received a criminal conviction for a dishonesty offence and has therefore failed to lead by example and demonstrate the leadership expected of a Registrant.

61. In summary, the Committee found that the Registrant had breached standards which fall within standard 6, 8 and 9.

62. The Committee bore in mind that a breach of the Standards does not automatically amount to misconduct.

63. The Committee considered the seriousness of the Registrant's conduct. The Committee noted that the case involved two distinct matters. These matters are a conviction for Possession of Criminal Property, a serious dishonesty offence and the Registrant dishonestly failing to disclose that he was the subject of a criminal investigation for a significant period of time and only disclosing his conviction in June 2024, having been sentenced by the Crown Court on 21 November 2023 and having been under police investigation since 2021.

64. The Committee determined that the nature of the dishonesty in this case is particularly serious given that it relates not only to obtaining criminal property dishonestly but also acting dishonestly toward the Registrant’s own regulator.

65. The Committee found that the Registrant's conduct creates a risk to patient safety and the public. The Committee considered that patients and members of the public are entitled to expect a Pharmacist to act with honesty and integrity and own up to their own failings. The Committee considered that the Registrant's conduct represented a pattern of serious dishonesty over a period of time, namely several years. The Committee considered that this afforded time for him to disclose matters, but he failed to do so. A member of the public whether they be an informed member or otherwise, would not expect a pharmacist to engage in multiple acts of dishonesty.

66. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant's conduct represented a serious departure from the standards properly expected of a registered pharmacist and amounted to serious misconduct.

67. The Committee therefore concluded that the facts found proved amount to misconduct.

68. The Committee next went on to consider whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Decision on Impairment

69. Having found misconduct, the Committee went on to consider whether the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

70. The Committee considered Rule 5(2) of the Rules which provides:
"In relation to evidence about the conduct or behaviour of the registrant which might cast doubt on whether the requirements as to fitness to practise are met in relation to the registrant, the Committee must have regard to whether or not that conduct or behaviour –

a) presents an actual or potential risk to patients or to the public;

b) has brought, or might being, the profession of pharmacy into disrepute;

c) has breached one of the fundamental principles of the profession of pharmacy;

d) shows that the integrity of the registrant can no longer be relied upon."

71. Guidance on this issue was set out by Mr Justice Silber in Cohen v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) at paragraph 65:

"It must be highly relevant in determining if a [practitioner's] fitness to practise is impaired that first … her conduct that led to the charge is easily remediable, second that it has been remedied and third that it is highly unlikely to be repeated".

72. These principles are echoed in the Council's "Good decision making: Fitness to practise and outcomes guidance (2024) ("the Outcomes Guidance") at paragraph 2.15:

"The committee should [..] consider 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".

73. The Committee was of the view that this case is one in which the Registrant's behaviour will not be "easily remediable". The Committee considered that there was a pattern of dishonesty demonstrated by the registrant in this case. His dishonesty involved significant sums of money and entailed a degree of planning. It also included a series of repeated dishonest representations to the GPhC the Registrant's own regulator.

74. Having established that the Registrant's criminal conviction and misconduct would not be easy to address, the Committee turned to consider all of the evidence before it, in order to ascertain whether it has in fact been "remedied" or "addressed"

75. The Committee took into account the testimonials from professional colleagues and members of his church but noted that the testimonials whilst positive did not contain a statement to the effect that the referees understood the nature and extent of the allegations admitted by the Registrant.

76. The Committee also noted that the Registrant had undertaken some courses in respect of his offending through the probation service. Although the evidence of these courses was not provided the Committee, the Committee accepted the Registrant's oral evidence that through probation he was required to analyse his offending. However, the Committee determined that the Registrant provided no evidence of remediation relevant to the particulars of allegations.

77. The Committee considers that the Registrant has shown some insight, he has admitted to the allegations and apologised on multiple occasions. The Committee considered however that the Registrant's insight remains developing on the basis that;

    a. He has provided a reflection as to the potential harm that his actions could have caused, but has not fully explored what if any steps he has put in place to ensure the pattern of dishonest behaviour would not occur

    b. He has reflected in his oral evidence on the potential harm to the profession, but has not demonstrated or evidenced remediation of the significant attitudinal concerns which are present

    c. He has apologised but has not reflected fully on how his behaviour impacts the profession, particularly in respect of dishonesty towards the regulator

78. The Panel considered that the Registrant had not provided evidence of insight as to the risk of repetition in future and noted that this should be distinguished from whether a registrant has shown remorse for his past conduct. The Panel was not aware

of any practical safeguards put in place by the Registrant to ensure his pattern of dishonest behaviour would not be repeated.

79. On this basis the Committee considered that there remains a risk of repetition of the Registrant's conduct and therefore considered the Registrant's fitness to practice is currently impaired on public protection grounds.

80. Applying the tests set out in paragraph 2.15 of the Council's Outcomes Guidance, the Committee has concluded that the Registrant's conduct is not easily remediable; it has not been addressed, and it cannot be said that it is highly unlikely to be repeated.

81. The Committee next turned to consider its findings in light of Rule 5(2) of the Rules.

82. The Committee considered its findings that the Registrant behaviour represented a pattern of serious dishonesty. The Committee is of the view that Rule 5(2)(a) is engaged, in that there is a potential risk to the public on the basis of the Registrant's pattern of dishonesty and lack of candour with his own regulator.

83. In relation to Rule 5(2) (b), the Committee is satisfied that the Registrant's criminal convictions for possession of criminal property and his dishonesty in not declaring that he was being investigated had the potential to diminish public trust in the profession and to call into question the reliability and moral standing expected of pharmacy professionals, thereby bringing the entire profession of pharmacy into disrepute.

84. Furthermore, in relation to Rule 5(2) (c), the Committee is of the view that the Registrant's conduct breached fundamental principles of the profession of pharmacy relating to honesty, integrity and professionalism, as entrenched in Standard 6.

85. Finally turning to Rule 5(2)(d), the Committee is satisfied that the Registrant's conviction for a dishonesty offence and his dishonest declarations to the GPhC, show that his integrity can no longer be relied upon.

86. The Committee then considered the public interest, and bore in mind the case of CHRE v NMC and Grant [EWHC] 927 (Admin), in which Mrs Justice Cox stated that a panel must consider whether "the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances" of a case.

87. The Committee was of the view that a registrant who has been convicted of possession of criminal property and has dishonestly withheld information from his regulator plainly undermines public confidence in the profession and in the regulator. A fair-minded and informed member of the public, aware of the facts, would be shocked and troubled if they were to learn that no finding of impairment had been made.

88. The Committee was satisfied that this case given its facts, is one in which there is a need to make a finding of current impairment in order to declare and uphold proper standards of behaviour and maintain public confidence in the profession.

89. For all the reasons set out above, the Committee finds the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired on public protection grounds in that there is a risk of repetition, and in the wider public interest, that is, in order 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.

THE OUTCOME STAGE

90. Having found current impairment, the Committee went on to consider the matter of outcome, formerly referred to as sanction. The Committee's powers are set out in Article 54(2) of the Order. The Committee should consider the available outcomes in ascending order from least restrictive, take no action, to most restrictive, removal from the Register, in order to identify the appropriate and proportionate outcome that meets the circumstances of the case.

91. The purpose of the outcome is not to be punitive, though an outcome may in fact have a punitive effect. The purpose of the 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.

Submissions on Outcome

92. Ms Poku-Catani, on behalf of the Council, submitted written representations in respect of sanction as follows;

"It is the Council's position that removal from the Register will reflect the seriousness of the conduct in this matter.

In terms of the nature and extent of the Registrant's conduct in this case, the following aggravating features are noted:

a. *The Registrant's actions were repeated over 3 years and was not impulsive or isolated.*
b. *At the time of the misconduct, the Registrant continued to work for 3 years, and in evidence, admitted that he failed to consider published guidance that would have informed him that he had to disclose his arrest, police investigation and convictions within 7 days.*
c. *The Registrant's admissions to the allegations have been in a piecemeal manner, culminating in full admissions on the first day of the hearing.*
d. *The misconduct would have persisted if the Registrant had not been arrested. In his own words he was excited to make plans with the money despite his suspicion about the origin of the funds.*

The risk of repetition of misconduct, were he to return to work in pharmacy practice remains high in the light of the above circumstances.

Sanction options

The Council submits that a warning would not be suitable to mark the seriousness and conduct of the Registrant.

The Council would further submit that no conditions of practice are suitable in this case and would not reflect the nature and gravity of the misconduct.

A period of suspension would not sufficiently address the concerns raised in this case. The guidance in more than one paragraph, clearly invite a committee to consider a sanction at the upper end of the scale in the circumstances of this case when a practitioner has failed to self-report serious misconduct over such a significant period of time.

At the time of drafting this statement, the Council respectfully invites the Committee to consider removal from the Register.

Sanction bid

It is submitted that removal is proportionate. The case of Khan v. General Medical Council [2015] EWHC 301 (Admin) noted that "The decisions from this court have demonstrated that a very strict line has been taken in relation to findings of dishonesty. This court and its predecessor, the Priv Council, has repeatedly recognised that for all professional men and women, a finding of dishonesty lies at the top end of the spectrum of gravity of misconduct".

Further, in cases of proven dishonesty, the balance may fall on the side of maintaining public confidence in the profession by a severe sanction against the Registrant concerned. See Nicholas-Pillai v. General Medical Council [2009] EWHC 1048 (Admin) per Mitting J at [27) where he stated: "sanction will often and perfectly properly be the sanction of erasure, even in the case of a one-off instance of dishonesty."

In this case, the Registrant has pleaded guilty to and been convicted of the offence of possessing criminal property in circumstances where he suspected that the money did not come from legitimate means. Whilst the Registrant's dishonesty did not occur in the context of his pharmacy practice, pharmacy professionals are expected to uphold pharmacy standards whether within or outside the pharmacy environment. The matter is further aggravated by the Registrant's failure to report the incident to the council at the appropriate time."

93. Ms Poku-Catani expanded on the written submissions in her oral submissions. A summary of her submission is as follows;

i) Ms Poku-Catani noted that the Registrant was in significant debt at the time of the offences and when sentenced. She submitted the fact that the Registrant (REDACTED) heightens the risk of repetition in this case;

ii) Ms Poku-Catani referred the Committee to paragraph 5.21 of the Good decision making: Fitness to practise Hearings and Outcomes guidance' and noted the Standards that the Committee had found breached in this case. She noted that these were important standards, and noted that Pharmacists are held to a high standard due to the role they hold. She noted that due to the Registrant's debt problem he had allowed himself to breach the standards and had "let himself down";

iii) Ms Poku-Catani noted the Registrant's persistent failure to inform the regulator of the investigation, his arrest and conviction. Ms Poku-Catani noted that in line with paragraph 5.7 the Committee should give appropriate weight to the public interest and the maintenance of public confidence in the profession. She referenced the case of Boulton v. Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512, CA noting a finding of dishonesty against a professional person lies at the top end of the spectrum of gravity of misconduct.

iv) Ms Poku-Catani noted the Registrant in evidence gave quite a detailed account about his interaction with the police, she noted that even if it was disputed that he gave his PIN to the police early on in the investigation, he admitted he

lied to the police which would have delayed the investigation. Ms Poku-Catani noted he sought to protect his friend and lied to the police that the matters related to his cousin.

v) Ms Poku-Catani submitted the Registrant's actions represent a significant attitudinal concern and there is no evidence of that concern being remediated. Ms Poku-Catani noted the Committee considerations about the limited evidence on what steps are in place to ensure that this pattern of dishonesty, as evidenced, had been addressed.

vi) Ms Poku-Catani submitted the Registrant's actions were underpinned by his significant debt in the background. She submitted that both colleagues and members of the public would be shocked to learn of such conduct, namely lying to the police, not pleading guilty until close to the trial date and making multiple false declarations to the regulator.

vii) Ms Poku-Catani submitted that when the probation service assessed the Registrant as a low risk of offending they would not have known about the false declarations made to the regulator, she therefore submitted the assessment had limited weight.

viii) Ms Poku-Catani referred the Committee to its determination on insight and remediation at paragraph 77 of the determination and noted paragraph 5.35 of the guidance. She referred the Committee to the sections of the guidance in respect of Dishonesty and the duty of candour.

ix) Ms Poku-Catani noted the aggravating features of the case as set out within her written submissions. She submitted that the misconduct would have persisted if the Registrant had not been arrested and in his own words he was excited when the money was deposited in his account, even though he was suspicious about the origin of that money. She noted that the Registrant was really focused on resolving that debt problem rather than his reputation as a as a pharmacist.

x) Ms Poku-Catani referred to the case law set out in her written submissions and submitted that the appropriate outcome in this serious dishonesty case was one of removal.

94. Ms Poku-Catani was asked questions by the Committee in respect of what evidence there was to demonstrate the misconduct would have continued if the Registrant was not arrested. Ms Poku-Catani noted the Registrant making plans in relation to the money that had arrived in his account and then lying to the police in order to deflect attention from matters. She submitted that the Registrant intended to use the money that had arrived in his account until the police started the investigation.

95. Ms Poku-Catani was asked whether she had evidence that the Registrant (REDACTED). She noted the sentencing remarks in relation to his conviction and submitted that the Registrant owed large sums of money and the case was put on that basis.

96. The Registrant addressed the committee in submissions prior to doing so he provided the following evidence, which the Council agreed could be submitted to the panel;

i) Evidence from the probation service;
ii) WhatsApp messages confirming clinical practice which was praised by a colleague;
iii) Messages from Step Change a debt charity (REDACTED).

97. The Registrant addressed the panel at length in oral submissions and answered questions from the Council. A summary of these submissions is as follows;

i) The Registrant acknowledged the seriousness of the findings against him and expressed deep shame and remorse for the criminal conviction, lying to the police and failing to disclose the police investigation to the GPhC during his registration renewals in 2021, 2022 and 2023.
ii) The Registrant stated he accepted responsibility for his actions and recognised that his dishonesty fell below the standards expected of a pharmacist and undermined public confidence in the profession. He explained that, following his conviction, he had engaged with probation supervision from November 2023. He referred to correspondence from his probation officer, dated 28 June 2024. This correspondence confirmed that he had engaged with and complied

with the order, accepted assistance and had been assessed as presenting a low risk.

iii) The Registrant acknowledged that this assessment related to criminal reoffending rather than professional fitness to practise. He also explained that he had taken steps to address his financial difficulties (REDACTED).

iv) The Registrant accepted that (REDACTED) but he considered it a positive step towards addressing the financial pressures which had contributed to his previous poor decisions making.

v) The Registrant described his involvement in a church discipleship and the ongoing support he was receiving from a church mentor, which he stated provided opportunities for reflection, accountability and personal development.

vi) The Registrant asked the Committee to consider his registration declaration in June 2024, when he disclosed his criminal conviction despite knowing that doing so could have serious consequences for his career. He accepted that this disclosure did not undo his previous dishonesty but stated the Committee should considered it evidence of a change in his decision-making.

vii) The Registrant referred to allegations for which the Council has offered no evidence and noted his disclosure of his conviction and stated this highlighted a change in conduct also.

viii) The Registrant stated in relation to patient safety, that honesty and integrity are essential aspects of professional practice. He sought to distinguish the concerns about his probity from his clinical competence and referred to positive feedback from colleagues contained with a WhatsApp Message concerning a patient who had praised his clinical judgement after he identified possible polymyalgia rheumatica, which was subsequently confirmed following medical investigations.

ix) The Registrant accepted that his professional remediation had not been sufficient. He stated that he would be willing to commit to undertaking certified courses addressing honesty, integrity, probity, professional accountability, regulatory disclosure, ethical decision-making, financial integrity, reflective practice and professionalism.

x) The Registrant asked the Committee to consider his evidence of remorse, rehabilitation and his commitment to further remediation and to impose a further period of suspension rather than remove him from the register.

xi) The Registrant described significant personal challenges experienced following his interim suspension in July 2026 (REDACTED).

xii) The Registrant stated that these circumstances were not offered as an excuse for his actions but are presented as relevant context.

xiii) The Registrant acknowledged the shortcomings in documenting specific remediation in respect of dishonesty towards the regulator and accept that further structured professional development was required by him.

xiv) The Registrant asked the Committee to consider his acceptance of responsibility, engagement with probation, independent evidence of that engagement, efforts to address financial difficulties, subsequent disclosures, personal accountability, positive professional evidence and commitment to further remediation.

98. The Registrant was asked to clarify matters in respect of the documentation he submitted and his submissions. He was asked what he had been doing in the period of suspension. He noted he had undertaken dispensing work and had been doing more within his local community and with the church. This work included youth work in his local area. He stated he had been developing himself in artificial intelligence and coding.

99. He was asked why he had not started or completed the remediation courses he had identified in his submissions sooner. He stated he had been speaking to his uncle in the US and had sent him the decision of the Committee in respect of impairment from the previous day, and that his uncle had helped him identify the courses.

100. The Registrant was asked questions by the Council about his debt (REDACTED).

The Committee's Decision on Outcome

101. The Committee fully considered and took into account the detailed submissions of Ms Poku-Catani and the Registrant. It had regard to the relevant case law including the cases cited. It also took into account the Council's 'Good decision making: Fitness to practise Hearings and Outcomes guidance' (March 2024) ('Good decision making guidance'), which sets out that when deciding on outcome, key factors to consider include the public interest and an assessment of mitigating and aggravating factors. The Committee should give appropriate weight to protecting the public, maintaining public confidence in the profession, and maintaining proper standards of behaviour.

102. The Committee identified the following aggravating factors:

- The Registrant's dishonesty was not a one-off, but rather it represented a pattern which included lying to the police, receiving criminal conviction for a dishonesty offence and a repeated failing over a 3-year period to disclose matters to his regulator. The Committee noted this was not impulsive or isolated behaviour.
- The Registrant's criminal conviction involved a UK government backed loan provided for pandemic relief and resulted in a small business suffering significant hardship;
- The Registrant acted for the purpose of financial gain;
- The Registrant initially contested the criminal allegation, pleaded not guilty when charged at the Magistrates' Court, maintained this at the Plea and Trial Preparation hearing at the Crown Court and only changed his plea to guilty one day before trial;
- The Registrant admitted that he failed to consider published guidance that would have informed him that he had to disclose the police investigation and convictions within 7 days;

- The Registrant has provided limited evidence of remediation in respect of training and reflections to address the dishonesty towards his own regulator.

103. The Committee identified the following mitigating factors:

- No previous regulatory findings against the Registrant;
- Evidence and testimonials as to the Registrant positive achievements and his ability as a clinician;
- Full and frank admissions in the proceedings.

104. The Committee had regard to the principles of proportionality and weighed the interests of the public against those of the Registrant.

105. In light of the above, the Committee turned to consider the outcomes available to it in ascending order of severity.

106. Take no Action: The Committee first considered whether it would be appropriate to take no action, however it was of the view that this outcome would not be sufficient to reflect the seriousness of the proven facts. Whilst the Committee fully accepted that the Registrant has made admissions and demonstrated developing insight and remorse, the Committee had concluded that in the absence of remediation, there currently remains a risk of repetition. Taking no action would not protect the public from that risk. Moreover, it would not protect the wider public interest by sending out a message to the profession and the public about the seriousness of the Registrant's conviction for possession of criminal property and for his dishonesty towards the Regulator.

107. Warning: The Committee next considered whether issuing a warning would be appropriate, but it decided that, for the same reasons as above, a warning would not sufficiently protect the public nor be sufficient to mark the wider public interest.

108. Conditions of Practice. The Committee next considered whether to impose conditions of practice. The Council's 'Good decision making guidance' states that conditions may be appropriate where there is evidence of poor performance or of significant shortcomings in a registrant's practice. The Committee concluded that conditions would not be appropriate or relevant in this case since the Particulars of Allegation involve serious criminal conduct and dishonesty towards the regulator, which is unrelated to the Registrant's standard of clinical practice.

109. In any case, the Committee considered that an order for conditions would not be sufficient to mark the seriousness of the matter so as to maintain public confidence in the profession and the Regulator.

110. Suspension Order. The Committee next considered whether suspension would be a proportionate outcome. The Council's Good Decision-making: Hearings and Outcomes Guidance (2024) indicates that suspension may be appropriate where:

"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. [It may also be appropriate] [w]hen it is necessary to highlight to the profession and to 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 sanction."

111. The Committee was satisfied that the public would be protected from the risk that the Registrant might repeat his misconduct during any period of suspension from the register.

112. As for whether suspension would appropriately satisfy the public interest, the Committee had regard to relevant paragraphs of the 'Good decision making guidance' set out below, which are applicable when a committee makes a finding of dishonesty:

" 6.9 The GPhC believes that dishonesty damages public confidence, and undermines the integrity of pharmacy professionals. However, cases involving dishonesty can be complicated – committees should carefully consider the context and circumstances in which the dishonesty took place. Therefore, although serious, there is not a presumption of removal in all cases involving dishonesty. Some acts of dishonesty are so serious that the committee should consider removal as the only proportionate and appropriate outcome. This includes cases that involve intentionally defrauding the NHS or an employer, falsifying patient records, or dishonesty in clinical drug trials.

6.10 When deciding on the appropriate outcome in a case involving dishonesty, the committee should balance all the relevant issues, including any aggravating and mitigating factors. It is important to understand the context in which the dishonest act took place and make a decision considering the key factors. The committee should then put proper emphasis on the effect a finding of dishonesty has on public confidence in the profession".

113. The Committee considered the seriousness of the Registrant's criminal conviction and his repeated dishonesty towards the regulator. It took into account the 'Good decision making guidance' which makes clear that dishonesty does not lead to a presumption of removal from the register. The dishonesty must be considered in all of its context.

114. The Registrant submitted that he was an excellent practitioner and he had changed significantly since the criminal offending. He submitted he was willing in the future to engage with relevant training courses and CPD to demonstrate remediation, and identified a number of relevant courses designed to address honesty and integrity within the pharmacy profession.

115. The Committee noted however that it does not have the power to impose a suspension with a condition to attend relevant training courses. Further, the Committee had concerns that a significant amount of time has passed since the Registrant disclosed matters to the GPhC and he could and should have engaged with such course prior to this hearing. The Committee considered also there it could not be

confident that the Registrant would attend such courses in the future based upon the fact that he has not engaged with such remediation to date.

116. Taking all of this into account, the Committee was not persuaded by the Registrant's submissions that he would engage in relevant remediation. The Committee considered, given the significance of the allegations and his disclosures made in 2024, it was notable that no material steps had been taken to remediate his dishonesty towards the regulator to date. The Committee also determined that these submissions did not diminish the seriousness of the Registrant's conviction and his prolonged dishonesty toward his regulator.

117. The Committee took into account and carefully weighed up the testimonials as to the Registrant's character and standard of clinical practice. The Committed noted its previous decision that it was not clear whether those providing testimonials on behalf of the Registrant had full knowledge of the extent of the allegations. The Committee therefore determined the testimonials could be given limited weight.

118. The Committee must determine, taking all of the relevant factors into account, whether a suspension, even for a considerable period with a review, would adequately mark the gravity of the Registrant's convictions for a dishonesty offence and his prolonged dishonesty toward his regulator.

119. In paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 of the Council's 'Good decision making guidance', in reaching a decision on what outcome to impose, the Committee should give appropriate weight to the wider public interest. The Committee is entitled to give greater weight to the public interest, than to the consequences for the professional. Even if an outcome will have a punitive effect, it may still be appropriate.

120. After careful consideration, the Committee concluded that even if the public were protected from the risk of harm during a period of suspension, this outcome would

not be sufficient to satisfy the wider public interest in maintaining public confidence in the profession and upholding professional standards.

121. In coming to this conclusion, the Committee was of the view that the Registrant's conduct is at the serious end of the spectrum of dishonesty and observed that what the Registrant did represented a serious pattern of dishonesty spanning several years. The Registrant has demonstrated only developing insight into the concerns and has not provided any meaningful remediation in respect of his repeated false declarations to the GPhC. The Committee considered the 'Good decision making guidance' which requires it to assess the conduct and considered whether the conduct is so serious that the Committee should consider removal as the only proportionate and appropriate outcome.

122. Taking all of the above into account, the Committee was of the view that suspension would not be sufficient to send a message to patients and to the public, nor to the profession, reflecting how seriously the regulator views the dishonestly reflected in the Registrant's criminal conviction and the repeated dishonesty towards his own regulator.

123. Removal. Having concluded that a period of suspension would not be sufficient to satisfy the public interest, the Committee considered whether removal is in fact more appropriate. The Committee took into account that removal is reserved for the most serious conduct. The 'Good decision making guidance' states that:

"Removing a professional's registration is reserved for the most serious conduct… The committee should consider this outcome when the professional's behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with being a registered professional".

124. The Committee has taken into account all of the evidence before it and has carefully considered whether removal is appropriate. It has borne in mind the Registrant's right

to continue to practise in his profession and also the public's right to have competent practitioners they can consult.

125. However, the Committee has come to the view that the Registrant's conviction and his repeated dishonesty towards the regulator is fundamentally incompatible with being a registered professional and therefore removal of his name from the register is the only appropriate and proportionate outcome in this case so as to send out a clear message, both to practitioners and to the public, of the gravity of the findings in this case.

126. The Committee therefore resolved to give a direction that the Registrant's entry in the Register be removed.

Interim Order

127. The Committee considered that, pursuant to Article 56(10) of the Pharmacy Order 2010, as it has been determined that the Registrant's fitness to practise is impaired, that the interim order which was in place is revoked.

Decision on Interim Measures

128. On behalf of the Council, Ms Poku-Catani made an application for an interim measure of suspension to be imposed on the Registrant's registration, to take effect from today's date, pursuant to Article 60 of the Pharmacy Order 2010, pending the coming into force of the Committee's substantive order.

129. The Registrant made no representations in respect of the interim measures application.

130. In considering Ms Poku-Catani's application, the Committee took account of the fact that its decision to remove the Registrant from the Council register will not take effect

until 28 days after the Registrant is formally notified of the outcome, or until any appeal is concluded.

131. The Committee considered that an interim measure was necessary given:

a. It has found that there remains a risk that the Registrant might repeat his conduct, as set out in the determination.
b. The Registrant's criminal conviction and misconduct would have had an impact on public confidence in the Pharmacy profession.

132. The Committee was satisfied that it was necessary for an interim measure to be put in place to safeguard the public interest during the appeal period.

133. The Committee is satisfied that it is therefore appropriate for an interim measure to be in place prior to the taking effect of the substantive order.

134. 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.

135. This concludes the determination.

ORDER: The Committee directs the Registrar to remove the name of Mr Eghosa Odeh (Registration number 2084351) from the Register.