

PUBLIC RECORD**Dates:** 05/01/2026 - 06/01/2026

Doctor: Dr Alaaeldin KAMEL

GMC reference number: 7486732

Primary medical qualification: MB BCh 2006 Suez Canal University

Type of case

New - Misconduct

XXX

Summary of outcome

Adjourned to a new tribunal.

Tribunal:

Legally Qualified Chair	Mr Duncan Ritchie
Lay Tribunal Member:	Ms Samantha Jones
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Wang Lam
Tribunal Clerk:	Mr Michael Murphy

Attendance and Representation:

Doctor:	Present, not represented
GMC Representative:	Ms Elizabeth Dudley-Jones, Counsel

Attendance of Press / Public

In accordance with Rule 41 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 the hearing was held partly in public and partly in private.

Overarching Objective

Throughout the decision making process the tribunal has borne in mind the statutory overarching objective as set out in s1 Medical Act 1983 (the 1983 Act) to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public, to promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession, and to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of that profession.

ANNEX A – 05/01/2026

Application for proceedings to be heard in private session.

1. Parts of this hearing were heard in private in accordance with Rule 41 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 (the Rules). This determination will be handed down in private due to the confidential nature of matters under consideration.
2. On behalf of the GMC, Ms Dudley-Jones made an application for the entirety of these proceedings to be heard in private session.

Submissions

3. Ms Dudley-Jones submitted that, as XXX, all of the proceedings should be heard in private session.

The Tribunal's decision

4. In its deliberations, the Tribunal had regard to Rule 41(2) which states:

'41 (2) The Committee or FTP Panel may determine that the public shall be excluded from the proceedings or any part of the proceedings, where they consider that the particular circumstances of the case outweigh the public interest in holding the hearing in public.'

XXX

5. XXX
6. The Tribunal considered whether the hearing could be heard in public, with the hearing moving into private session only during the evidence and submissions XXX.
7. The Tribunal bore in mind the public interest of proceedings being heard in public, where possible, but considered Dr Kamel's interests to outweigh the public interest in this case

and took the view that in fairness to Dr Kamel, all of these proceedings should be heard in private session.

8. As such, the Tribunal granted the GMC's application to hear the entirety of the proceedings in private session.

ANNEX B – 06/01/2026

Determination on service and proceeding in the doctor's absence

9. At the outset of this hearing, the Tribunal announced that the entirety of the hearing should be heard in private in accordance with Rule 41 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 (the Rules) XXX.
10. Dr Kamel is neither present nor represented at these proceedings. The Tribunal has considered whether notice of this hearing has been properly served upon Dr Kamel in accordance with Rules 15 and 40 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004 (as amended)(the Rules) and Schedule 4, Paragraph 8 of the Medical Act 1983 (as amended). In so doing, the Tribunal has taken into account all the information placed before it, together with the submissions on behalf of the GMC.
11. The Tribunal has been provided with a service bundle, containing a copy of the Notice of Allegation, which was emailed to Dr Kamel on 27 November 2025. Dr Kamel confirmed receipt of this on 27 November 2025. The service bundle also contained a copy of the Notice of Hearing, which was emailed to Dr Kamel on 27 November 2025. Dr Kamel also confirmed receipt of this on 27 November 2025. Having considered all the information, the Tribunal is satisfied that notice of this hearing had been properly served upon Dr Kamel.
12. The Tribunal went on to consider whether to proceed with the case in Dr Kamel's absence in accordance with Rule 31 of the Rules. In its deliberations, the Tribunal had regard to the principles in *General Medical Council v Adeogba*; *General Medical Council v Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162 and the criminal cases *R v Hayward, Jones & Purvis* [2001] QB 862 and *R v Jones (Anthony)* [2003] 1 AC 1 HL. The Tribunal had regard to all the circumstances including the following:

- The nature and circumstances of the doctor’s behaviour in absenting himself, in particular, whether the behaviour was voluntary and therefore he had waived the right to be present;
 - Whether an adjournment would resolve the matter;
 - The likely length of any such adjournment;
 - Whether the doctor, although absent, wished to be represented or whether he had waived his right to be represented;
 - Whether the doctor’s representatives were able to receive instructions from him and the extent to which they could present a defence;
 - The extent of any disadvantage to the doctor in not being able to present his account of events;
 - The public interest that a hearing should take place within a reasonable time.
 - The effect of any delay on the memories of witnesses.
13. The Tribunal bore in mind that its discretion to proceed in Dr Kamel’s absence must be exercised with caution and with regard to the overall fairness of the proceedings. The Tribunal has balanced the interests of the practitioner, including fairness to him, against the public interest, including the need to protect patients.
14. XXX
15. The Tribunal also bore in mind that there are differences between the criminal jurisdiction and regulatory proceedings before the MPTS and that the analogy between the position of an absent criminal defendant and an absent registrant is imperfect – as explained by Sir Brian Leveson in *Adeogba & Visvadis*. The Tribunal adopted the approach recommended at paragraph 23 of the same judgement, namely that:
- ‘[the] discretion whether or not to proceed must be exercised having regard to all the circumstances of which the panel is aware, with fairness to the registrant being a prime consideration, but fairness to the GMC and the interests of the public being taken into account. The criteria for criminal cases must be considered in the context of the different circumstances and different responsibilities of both the GMC and the registrant.’*
16. The Tribunal considered the reasons for Dr Kamel’s non-attendance at the hearing. The Tribunal has been provided with emails from Dr Kamel. In an email, dated 30 October 2025, Dr Kamel stated XXX.

17. The Tribunal considered the above statements from Dr Kamel alongside his earlier statements about his intentions to engage with the regulatory process. The Tribunal noted that during a pre-hearing conference with the Case Manager on 12 May 2025 Dr Kamel said that he intended to attend the hearing and that he would be providing a witness statement and other evidence. On 14 October 2025 Dr Kamel told the Case Manager that he would attend this hearing and that he would rely upon his witness statement and other evidence. The Tribunal noted that Dr Kamel's apparent change in position XXX. The Tribunal also noted that in his email of 17 November 2025 Dr Kamel referred to: "XXX."
18. XXX
19. XXX
20. XXX
21. The Tribunal noted that, XXX Accordingly, the Tribunal were not able to conclude that Dr Kamel was deliberately and voluntarily absent from the hearing. XXX.
22. The Tribunal noted that Dr Kamel has not applied for an adjournment in this case XXX. It also noted the public interest of this case being heard in a timely manner. XXX.
23. In considering whether this was an exceptional case to justify proceeding in Dr Kamel's absence, the Tribunal considered the factors identified in *R v Hayward* and noted, among others, the following factors:
- Dr Kamel is aware of the hearing and that it can proceed in his absence.
 - Dr Kamel has been provided with a link to the MPTS guidance which includes guidance on how to apply for a postponement of the proceedings. At a pre-hearing meeting Dr Kamel was told to raise any issues with the hearing date as soon as possible and has not sought any postponement of the hearing. XXX.
 - XXX
 - In light of the matters set out above, Dr Kamel is not voluntarily absent from the hearing and could not be said to have waived his right to attend the hearing in light of the evidence set out above. XXX.

- Dishonesty is a central issue in these proceedings and the Tribunal considered that Dr Kamel would be at significant disadvantage if he were not able to present any evidence on his behalf to explain his actions and state of knowledge or belief at the time of his actions.
- XXX
- The evidence in this case is almost exclusively in documentary form, XXX. Accordingly, the Tribunal is not concerned that a delay in the proceedings will have an adverse effect on the recollections of witnesses.
- Not proceeding in Dr Kamel's absence will inevitably result in further delay and cost, which is not in the public interest.
- XXX
- The allegations against Dr Kamel are serious and, if found proved and a finding of impairment made, the sanction is likely to be significant.

24. Balancing these factors, the Tribunal considered that it could not find that this was an exceptional case which would justify proceeding in Dr Kamel's absence. The Tribunal has therefore determined that it is in the public interest and Dr Kamel's own interests not to proceed with the case in his absence.

25. The Tribunal considered that if Dr Kamel was unable to attend, or did not want to attend, any future Tribunal hearing, that Tribunal may be assisted by being provided with the following:

- XXX;
- Evidence that Dr Kamel has had the guidance on postponements specifically drawn to his attention;
- Information from Dr Kamel as to whether he would prefer the hearing to proceed in his absence.

26. Case adjourned.