

PUBLIC RECORD

Date: 29 November 2024

Medical Practitioner's name: Dr Praveen ALLA
GMC reference number: 6075593
Primary medical qualification: MB ChB 2003 University of Sheffield

Type of case	Outcome on impairment
Conviction	Impaired
XXX	XXX

Summary of outcome

Suspension for 9 months

Tribunal/Legally Qualified Chair:

Legally Qualified Chair:	Mrs Claire Lindley
--------------------------	--------------------

Review on the Papers

This case was reviewed on the papers, with the agreement of both parties, by a Legally Qualified Chair.

Overarching Objective

Throughout the decision making process the chair 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.

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers**

1. I have noted the background to Dr Alla's case, which was first considered by a medical practitioners' tribunal on 31 October - 4 November 2022. While Dr Alla was working as a GP in November 2018, he was confronted by colleagues at the practice regarding some of his prescriptions, as they were concerned that he was misdirecting prescriptions XXX. He was subsequently convicted of fraud by abuse of position and sentenced on 8 December 2020 to a suspended term of imprisonment for 12 months, with a direction to undertake rehabilitation activities. XXX

2. Dr Alla admitted each paragraph of the Allegation, which originally included an allegation of misconduct because of his dishonest actions in the surgery, including when confronted by his colleagues. The Tribunal found Dr Alla's fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of the conviction XXX, accepting that the dishonest actions that resulted in the misconduct were XXX. It decided that, notwithstanding the fact that Dr Alla had demonstrated insight, and had expressed genuine remorse, he had been convicted of a serious criminal offence and was still at that time serving his suspended sentence. XXX. It concluded therefore that all three limbs of the overarching objective were engaged, which are to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public, promote and maintain public confidence in the medical profession, and promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of that profession. On 4 November 2022, therefore, the Tribunal considered sanction and determined to suspend Dr Alla's registration for a period of three months.

3. In order to provide assistance for subsequent reviews, the Tribunal recommended that Dr Alla provide:

- Confirmation that Dr Alla has completed his suspended sentence
- XXX
- XXX
- Evidence of continuing engagement with those authorities which may help him return to practice

4. There have since been further reviews of Dr Alla's case. The first was a review by a medical practitioners' tribunal that sat on 27 February, 7 March and 3 April 2023. That tribunal noted that the suspended sentence had expired and there had been no further offending. It heard oral evidence from Dr Alla XXX. It therefore considered that he remained impaired by XXX his conviction XXX. The Tribunal then went on to consider sanction and

Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers

decided that all three limbs of the overarching objective were still engaged. It imposed a further four month suspension on Dr Alla's registration.

5. Again, in order to provide assistance for subsequent reviews, the Tribunal recommended that Dr Alla provide:

- XXX
- A further reflective statement from Dr Alla
- XXX
- Evidence that Dr Alla has kept his medical skills and knowledge up to date
- Any other evidence Dr Alla wishes to put before the reviewing tribunal

6. A review on the papers then took place on 29 August 2023. Agreed submissions had been made by the GMC and those representing Dr Alla that his registration should be subject to a further suspension period of six months. The Legally Qualified Chair (LQC) noted that Dr Alla was presently XXX unable to engage with the GMC XXX. The LQC determined that Dr Alla's fitness to practise remained impaired and decided that the proposed period of suspension of six months was appropriate to protect the public and the public interest.

7. A further review on the papers took place on 12 March 2024. Again, agreed submissions had been made by the GMC and those representing Dr Alla. This time, they submitted that Dr Alla's registration be subject to a further suspension period of nine months. XXX. He had XXX, and therefore no progress had been made. A further period of suspension was proposed by the GMC, to allow Dr Alla more time to XXX, and fully address the concerns of the previous Tribunal. Due to the fact that there had been no material change since the last review, the LQC decided that Dr Alla's a finding of impairment remained necessary to protect the public, maintain trust in doctors, and declare/uphold professional standards. When considering sanction, the LQC decided that a further period of suspension was necessary and that the period of nine months would allow Dr Alla to XXX and demonstrate further insight, remediation, and take other steps to minimise any risk of repetition.

8. Dr Alla and the GMC have now agreed that this further review should again be considered on the papers in accordance with Rule 21B of the GMC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004. They have provided agreed terms of an order which I could make at this review.

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers**

9. I have considered all of the evidence presented to me, and the agreed submissions made on behalf of Dr Alla and by the GMC. Dr Alla's representative and the GMC submit that Dr Alla's registration should be subject to a further period of suspension of nine months.

10. I have taken into account all the previous Determinations in Dr Alla's case. I have considered the new material that has been submitted since the last review on 12 March 2024.

11. On 19 April 2024, an Assistant Registrar directed XXX and a review. They recommended that:

'The reviewing tribunal will need to see objective evidence so they can assess Dr Praveen Alla's insight and remediation. This can include evidence that Dr Praveen Alla has kept their skills up to date, and that their return to unrestricted practice won't put patient safety at risk.'

12. XXX. In a further email dated 18 September 2024, Dr Alla's representative made a proposal to *'...extend the suspension by agreement, as we did before, until such time as Dr Alla is realistically in a position to engage.'*

13. XXX. There has been no new evidence to demonstrate what, if any, progress Dr Alla has made to XXX and gain further insight into his actions and XXX, in order to minimise any risk of repetition. The previous oral Tribunals had noted that Dr Alla's risk of repetition is closely related to XXX. XXX, there is not enough evidence to satisfy the Assistant Registrar's recommendations made on 19 April 2024. Dr Alla's finding of impairment therefore remains necessary to protect the public, maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold professional standards.

14. In reaching my decision on sanction, I have taken account of the Sanctions Guidance. I have borne in mind that the purpose of the sanction is not to be punitive, but to protect patients and the wider public interest, although it may have a punitive effect.

15. I have applied the principle of proportionality, weighing Dr Alla's own interests with the public interest. The public interest includes amongst other things, the protection of patients, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

**Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal
Review on Papers**

16. I am satisfied that a further period of suspension is proportionate and would be sufficient to protect the public and the public interest. I have therefore determined that Dr Alla's registration be suspended for a period of nine months from the date from which the present suspension would otherwise expire. This will allow Dr Alla time to XXX and fully address the concerns of the previous tribunals.

17. In reaching this decision, I have noted all the previous decisions made in relation to Dr Alla's case. There have been a number of periods of suspension. I note that the conviction was for a dishonesty related criminal offence, and XXX. I note the previous Tribunal decision that Dr Alla's behaviour falls short of being fundamentally incompatible with continued registration. Having considered the other possible sanctions in this case, (starting with the least restrictive first), I am of the view that any sanction less than one of suspension would not be sufficient to satisfy each limb of the overarching objective.

18. The effect of this direction is that, unless Dr Alla exercises his right of appeal, the period of suspension will take effect 28 days from when written notice of this determination has been served upon him. The current order of suspension will remain in place until the appeal period has ended, or in the event that he does appeal, that appeal is decided. A note explaining Dr Alla's right of appeal will be provided to him.

19. Notification of this decision will be served on Dr Alla in accordance with the Medical Act 1983, as amended.