

PUBLIC RECORD**Dates:** 10/07/2026**Doctor:** Dr Sunita KHAMBRA**GMC reference number:** 6119124**Primary medical qualification:** MB BS 1988 University of Delhi**Type of case**Review - Non-compliance with a performance
assessment**Outcome on non-compliance**

Non-compliance found

Summary of outcomeSuspension for 12 months
Review hearing directed**Tribunal:**

Legally Qualified Chair	Mr Sean Ell
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Marianne Kennedy
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Neil Smart
Tribunal Clerk:	Mrs Olivia Gamble

Attendance and Representation:

Doctor:	Not present, not represented
GMC Representative:	Ms Anam Khan, Counsel

Attendance of press / public

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

Protecting the Public

Throughout the decision making process the tribunal has borne in mind the statutory duty as set out in s1(1) of the Medical Act 1983 (the 1983 Act) to protect the public. The tribunal has considered the relevance and impact on each of the three distinct parts of public protection 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.

Determination on consideration of Non-compliance - 10/07/2026

The Outcome of Applications Made at the Outset of Proceedings

1. The Tribunal determined that the service of the notice of this hearing has been effective in accordance with Rule 20 of the Rules. The Tribunal determined to proceed with the hearing in Dr Khambra's absence in accordance with Rule 31 of the Rules. The Tribunal's full decision on this matter is included at Annex A.
2. This is the first review of Dr Khambra's case following a Medical Practitioners Tribunal (MPT) Non-compliance hearing which occurred in June 2025 ('the 2025 Tribunal').

Background

3. Dr Khambra qualified at the University of Delhi in 1988. She first registered with the GMC in 2005, working in Birmingham between 2005 and 2007. Dr Khambra practised in India between 2007 and 2024. In April 2024, Dr Khambra commenced a role as a Consultant Anaesthetist at The Northern Care Alliance ('the Trust'). Dr Khambra resigned from this role in August 2024.
4. On 14 January 2025, the Trust submitted an online referral form from NCA to the GMC. This referral detailed that, while employed by the Trust, Dr Khambra had failed to demonstrate the competencies required for independent consultant practice in anaesthesia and had required ongoing supervised practice. It stated that 33 specific concerns had been raised by a range of colleagues, which Dr Khambra had denied, before resigning from her role to seek employment elsewhere. The referral was raised after the Trust was contacted for an

employment reference, and concerns were raised that Dr Khambra had not been transparent about the issues she had whilst working at the Trust.

5. On 30 January 2025, the GMC sent a letter to Dr Khambra via email, to inform her that an Assistant Registrar had issued a direction for her to undergo a Performance Assessment ('PA') and that failure to comply with the direction might result in her case being referred to a Medical Practitioners Tribunal (MPT) to consider her non-compliance. Dr Khambra responded to the GMC email on the same day, disagreeing with the concerns raised by the Trust, and stating that she intended to relinquish her GMC licence to practise.

6. On 7 February 2025, Dr Khambra telephoned the GMC and stated that she did not agree to the PA and that she intended to leave the UK. An email was sent to her the same day, asking her to confirm in writing that she did not wish to undertake the PA. No response was received. Further emails were sent to her on 12 and 18 February and 5 March 2025, but no reply was received.

7. On 31 March 2025, Dr Khambra was notified of the decision to refer her case to an MPT non-compliance hearing.

The 2025 Tribunal

8. A hearing convened in June 2025 ('the 2025 Tribunal') to consider Dr Khambra's case. The 2025 Tribunal had regard to evidence before it and found that Dr Khambra had not engaged with the GMC's correspondence regarding arranging a Performance Assessment or provided evidence to explain why she could not undergo one, despite being sent correspondence on numerous occasions to her registered postal address and email address provided to the GMC.

9. The 2025 Tribunal considered that Dr Khambra had failed to provide any valid justification for her ongoing refusal to undergo the GMC directed PA. It acknowledged Dr Khambra's stated belief that she was being unfairly targeted. However, the 2025 Tribunal determined that she provided no supporting evidence to substantiate this claim or to excuse her non-compliance.

10. In those circumstances, the 2025 Tribunal determined that non-compliance had been found.

11. The 2025 Tribunal considered Dr Khambra's non-compliance with the direction to undertake a PA, and the wide-ranging concerns regarding her clinical practice. It bore in mind that suspension would have a deterrent effect and could be used to signal to the doctor, the medical profession, and the public what standards and behaviour are expected from a registered doctor. The 2025 Tribunal further noted that an order of suspension would also send a message about the importance the role the GMC and MPTS play in ensuring that a doctor's practice meets the expected standards and behaviour and that the public is adequately protected where fitness to practise concerns have been raised, and that a failure to engage with these organisations is a serious matter. It considered that the circumstances of this case warranted such a message to be sent. Therefore, the 2025 Tribunal suspended Dr Khambra's registration for a period of 12 months. The 2025 Tribunal considered that Dr Khambra required this period in order to gain insight into her non-compliance and to undertake a PA.

12. The 2025 Tribunal determined to direct a review of Dr Khambra's case. It suggested that Dr Khambra's case could be assisted by providing the following at a review hearing:

- Evidence that Dr Khambra has engaged with the GMC
- Evidence that Dr Khambra has undertaken a Performance Assessment
- Any further information Dr Khambra considers will assist the Tribunal.

Today's Hearing

Documentary Evidence

13. The Tribunal received documentary evidence which included but was not limited to:

- MPTS Determinations from the non-compliance hearing – June 2025;
- Online referral – dated 14 January 2025;
- Invitation to undergo a PA – dated 30 January 2025;
- Various correspondence between Dr Khambra and the GMC;

GMC submissions

14. On behalf of the GMC, Ms Khan, Counsel for the GMC submitted that there is continued non-compliance by Dr Khambra and that there is no good reason for this failure.

15. Ms Khan submitted that there has been no change in situation since the last hearing. Dr Khambra has still not undergone a PA, which was directed in January 2025 and she has provided no reason as to why. Ms Khan reminded the Tribunal that Dr Khambra has been reminded numerous times about the requirement upon her to undergo a PA, but has continued to fail to do so.

16. Ms Khan referred the Tribunal to the Non-compliance Guidance for Medical Practitioner Tribunals ('the Guidance'), in particular paragraph C53. She submitted that it was difficult to see how there can be any other finding by this Tribunal other than a finding that Dr Khambra has continued to fail to comply with the direction to undergo a PA.

17. Ms Khan further submitted that there is a risk to public protection in this case if the Tribunal did not find non-compliance given the concerns raised about Dr Khambra and she invited the Tribunal to determine that Khambra has continued to fail to comply with the direction to undergo a PA.

The Tribunals' Approach

18. Whilst the Tribunal bore in mind the submissions made, the decision regarding non-compliance is one for the Tribunal to reach, exercising its own judgement.

19. At this stage of the hearing the Tribunal asked itself the following question, as per paragraph C53 of the Guidance as follows:

'C53 The tribunal will need to consider, and make a finding, as to whether the doctor has:

a continued to fail to comply with the direction or request to provide information that led to the non-compliance order being made, and

b failed to comply with any requirement imposed on them as a noncompliance condition at the previous hearing.'

The Tribunal's Decision

20. The Tribunal reminded itself that the onus is on Dr Khambra to demonstrate compliance at a review hearing. It noted that there is no evidence before it that the position

regarding compliance has changed since Dr Khambra's previous hearing in 2025. It also noted that the GMC had made efforts to contact Dr Khambra to ensure her compliance with the directions made to undergo a PA but had not been successful. To date Dr Khambra has not undergone a PA, nor given any indication that she is willing to do so.

21. The Tribunal considered that Dr Khambra was aware of the ongoing proceedings and background to her case, but that she has chosen not to engage with these regulatory proceedings nor the directions from the GMC to undergo a PA.

22. The Tribunal considered that the GMC's directions that Dr Khambra should undergo a PA remained reasonable as found by the previous Tribunal. The Tribunal found that Dr Khambra has still not provided a good reason for her to have failed to comply with those directions. There was no evidence to demonstrate that Dr Khambra was likely to comply with the direction in a reasonable timeframe and she has failed to comply with a PA since the direction was first made in January 2025.

23. The Tribunal noted that Dr Khambra had indicated an intention to voluntarily erase herself from the medical register in February 2025. However, the doctor had failed to respond to further contact from the GMC about undertaking the required PA or making an application for voluntary erasure. The potential of Dr Khambra seeking voluntary erasure was not expressly referred to by the previous Tribunal. It is not something that Dr Khambra has subsequently raised, but in any event, it would not of itself be a good reason for her not to undertake a PA.

24. The Tribunal considered that if it were not to make a finding in this case, public protection would be at risk due to the concerns in relation to Dr Khambra's practice.

25. Therefore, in all the circumstances, the Tribunal is satisfied that Dr Khambra has continued to fail to comply with the GMC's directions that she undergoes a PA.

Determination on Sanction - 10/07/2026

26. Having determined that there is continuing non-compliance by reason of Dr Khambra's failure to comply with the GMC's request that she undertake a Performance Assessment in accordance with Schedule 2 of the Rules, the Tribunal has considered what direction, if any, to make.

The Evidence

27. The Tribunal has taken into account evidence received during the earlier stages of the hearing.

GMC Submissions

28. On behalf of the GMC Ms Khan invited the Tribunal to further suspend Dr Khambra.

29. Ms Khan submitted that Dr Khambra has now had over a year to comply with the direction to undergo a PA and has continued to fail to do so. Ms Khan further submitted that there is no new information before this Tribunal in relation to this case.

30. Ms Khan drew the Tribunal's attention to the relevant guidance and submitted that continued suspension is necessary in this case. She stated that variation of the order would not be appropriate given the circumstances and concluded by inviting the Tribunal to further suspend Dr Khambra.

The Tribunal's Approach

31. The Tribunal was mindful that the main reason for making any direction is to protect the public and that any direction is not made to punish or discipline doctors, even though it may have a punitive effect. In reaching its decision, the Tribunal has taken the "*Guidance on Non-compliance hearings*" into account and borne in mind the overarching objective of protecting the public, which includes:

- a) protecting, promoting, and maintaining the health, safety and well-being of the public;
- b) promoting and maintaining public confidence in the medical profession;
- c) promoting and maintaining proper professional standards and conduct for members of that profession.

32. Throughout its deliberations and in conducting its risk assessment, the Tribunal applied the principle of proportionality, balancing Dr Khambra's interests with the public interest.

The Tribunal's Decision

33. The Tribunal bore in mind its finding of continued non-compliance, along with the evidence already adduced and the further submissions of Ms Khan.

No Action

34. The Tribunal first considered whether to conclude Dr Khambra's case and take no further action.

35. Given the concerns identified in relation Dr Khambra's continued failure to comply with the GMC's direction to undergo a PA, the Tribunal was satisfied that it would be inappropriate and insufficient to take no action in this case taking into account the overarching objective.

Conditions

36. The Tribunal next considered whether it would be appropriate to impose conditions on Dr Khambra's registration. It has borne in mind that any conditions must be appropriate, proportionate, workable and measurable.

37. The Tribunal considered Dr Khambra's continued lack of engagement with the GMC since 2025, and its finding that she has continued to fail to comply with the direction for a PA and the risk that poses to the public. In the circumstances, the Tribunal concluded that there were no conditions it could impose which would be workable or measurable, particularly in the absence of information regarding Dr Khambra's performance. The Tribunal was not satisfied that she would comply with conditions in any event. It therefore determined that conditions were not appropriate in these circumstances.

Suspension

38. Having determined that the imposition of conditions would not be appropriate, the Tribunal next considered whether to extend the current order of suspension on Dr Khambra's registration as per Ms Khan's submission.

39. The Tribunal reminded itself of Dr Khambra's continued failure to engage with the requirement to undergo a PA. It concluded that there was no new information before it which might have a bearing on its decision as to the appropriate non-compliance order to

impose. Similarly, there was no indication that Dr Khambra was likely to engage or undergo a PA in the near future.

40. In reaching its decision, the Tribunal took into account the relevant paragraphs of the Guidance, in particular paragraphs C23 and C24, which state:

‘C23 When considering whether a period of suspension is a proportionate response to a doctor’s non-compliance, the Tribunal may want to take into account the previous opportunities the doctor has had to comply and the level of the doctor’s engagement with the fitness to practise process’

‘C24 Suspension is likely to be appropriate where a doctor has explicitly refused to comply with a direction or request to provide information or has failed to respond to a direction or request to provide information, and there is no mitigating information to suggest that conditions are likely to be sufficient.’

41. The Tribunal found that it had no evidence before it to indicate that Dr Khambra would engage with the direction for a PA in a reasonable timeframe. It found that no good reason for Dr Khambra’s non-compliance had been advanced, and it considered that she had been given adequate time to engage with her professional regulator and many opportunities to comply with the directions of the GMC and MPTS.

42. The Tribunal concluded that, given Dr Khambra’s non-compliance, the only appropriate and proportionate direction to be made in this case was one of a further period of suspension. The Tribunal determined that only a period of suspension would uphold its overarching objective to protect the public, maintain confidence in the profession and promote and maintain proper professional standards.

43. A suspension was considered appropriate because Dr Khambra had explicitly refused to comply with requests to provide necessary information. The Tribunal considered that there are wide-ranging and serious concerns in relation to Dr Khambra’s practice and that without a PA, public protection would be at risk.

44. The Tribunal considered the length of time it would potentially take for Dr Khambra to engage with the GMC’s investigation, undergo a PA as directed, and demonstrate compliance. It took into account that the previous 12-month suspension had not resulted in a PA being completed, and therefore imposing a period less than that would not be

appropriate. A further period of 12 months would allow Dr Khambra the opportunity to do what she is required to, namely, to comply with the directed PA.

45. Having had regard to all the circumstances of this case, the Tribunal determined that it was necessary and proportionate to suspend Dr Khambra's registration for a further period of 12 months.

Review

46. The Tribunal noted that if Dr Khambra continues to fail to comply with the direction it is possible that she could be suspended indefinitely at the next review hearing.

47. A review hearing will convene shortly before the end of the period of suspension, when a reviewing Tribunal will consider whether any further action should be taken in respect of Dr Khambra's registration. The onus is on Dr Khambra to demonstrate compliance and if, at any time within the 12-month period of suspension, Dr Khambra undertakes the PA, it is open to her to make a request to the GMC for them to consider arranging an early review of the non-compliance order.

48. The effect of this direction is that, unless Dr Khambra exercises her right of appeal, this decision will take effect 28 days from when written notice of this determination is deemed to have been served upon her. If Dr Khambra decides to appeal against this decision, the suspension currently imposed on her registration will remain in force until the appeal is determined.

49. That concludes this hearing.

ANNEX A – 10/07/2026

Service and Proceeding in Absence

1. Dr Khambra is neither present nor legally represented at this hearing.

Service

2. At the outset of these proceedings, on behalf of the General Medical Council ('GMC'), Ms Anam Khan, Counsel, made submissions in relation to service. The Tribunal was also provided with a copy of a GMC Service bundle which contained the following:

- Screenshot of Dr Khambra's registered address and email address;
- WDF confirming Dr Khambra's contact details;
- Letter from the GMC to Dr Khambra, sent via special delivery regarding non-compliance – dated 29 May 2026;
- Email from the GMC to Dr Khambra regarding non-compliance – dated 29 May 2026 and delivery receipt of that email also dated 29 May 2026;
- Proof of delivery letter sent from the GMC to Dr Khambra via special delivery – dated 4 June 2026;
- Returned undelivered mail to Dr Khambra from the GMC regarding non-compliance – dated 4 June 2026, marked as a 'refused delivery';
- Letter to Dr Khambra regarding notice of hearing sent by the MPTS by special delivery – dated 4 June 2026;
- Email to Dr Khambra from the MPTS regarding notice of hearing – dated 4 June 2026;
- Letter to Dr Khambra from the MPTS regarding notice of hearing sent by first class post – dated 4 June 2026;
- Proof of delivery of notice of hearing letter – dated 9 June 2026;
- First class letter returned undelivered – dated 18 June 2026, marked as 'addressee gone away';
- Special delivery letter returned undelivered from the MPTS to Dr Khambra regarding notice of hearing – dated 12 June 2026, marked as 'addressee gone away'.

3. Ms Khan referred to the relevant documentation and submitted that service of the notice had been effected.

4. Having considered all the documentation contained within the service bundle as set out above, the Tribunal determined that notice of this hearing had been served on Dr Khambra, in accordance with Rule 20 of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise Rules) 2004 as amended ('the Rules'), and paragraph 8 of Schedule 4 to the Medical Act 1983, as amended.

Proceeding in Absence

5. The Tribunal went on to consider whether to proceed in Dr Khambra's absence in accordance with paragraph 31 of the Rules. It was noted that the decision was a matter for its discretion.

6. Ms Khan submitted that all reasonable efforts have been made to serve the doctor in this case. Ms Khan said that Dr Khambra has been served both by email and post, however, the doctor appears to be refusing to accept service. Ms Khan submitted that it is a feature of this case that Dr Khambra has disengaged with this process. She has not attended previous hearings, does not respond to emails and seems to refuse to accept post in relation to this matter. Ms Khan stated that neither the GMC nor the MPTS could do any more to serve notice on this doctor. In light of these Ms Khan submitted that it is reasonable to proceed.

Tribunal Decision

7. In deciding whether to proceed with this hearing in Dr Khambra's absence, the Tribunal carefully considered all the information before it.

8. The Legally Qualified Chair ('LQC') referred the Tribunal to the cases of *R v Jones* and *General Medical Council v Adeogba* which set out the various considerations to take into account when deciding whether to proceed in absence.

9. The Tribunal noted that the discretion to proceed in the absence of a doctor should be exercised with the utmost care and caution, balancing the interests of the doctor with the wider public interest.

10. In the circumstances, the Tribunal determined that all reasonable efforts had been made to ensure that Dr Khambra was aware of today's hearing. It considered it to be clear that she had voluntarily absented herself from the regulatory proceedings. The Tribunal noted that no request for an adjournment has been submitted by Dr Khambra to enable her

Record of Determinations
Medical Practitioners Tribunal

to attend on a later date. The Tribunal was satisfied, from the information before it, that an adjournment would not result in Dr Khambra's participation at a hearing in the future, given her refusal to participate in the regulatory process so far.

11. The Tribunal has balanced the public interest against Dr Khambra's interests and concluded that the wider public interest in the case proceeding expeditiously outweighed Dr Khambra's own interests in adjourning, particularly when no useful purpose would be served by adjourning to a later date.

12. In all the circumstances, the Tribunal therefore determined that it was appropriate to proceed with the hearing in Dr Khambra's absence in accordance with Rule 31 of the Rules.