

PUBLIC RECORD**Date:** 06/07/2026

Doctor: Dr Tapan PATEL

GMC reference number: 4368285

Primary medical qualification: MB BS 1996 University of London

Type of case	Outcome on facts	Outcome on impairment
New - Misconduct	Facts relevant to impairment not found proved	Consideration of impairment not reached

Summary of outcome

Case concluded

Tribunal:

Legally Qualified Chair	Mrs Clair McCarthy
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr John Alcolado
Registrant Tribunal Member:	Dr Kamran Shahid

Tribunal Clerk:	Mrs Jennifer Ireland
-----------------	----------------------

Attendance and Representation:

Doctor:	Present, represented
Doctor's Representative:	Mr Anthony Haycroft , Counsel, instructed by Carbon Law Partners
GMC Representative:	Ms Fiona McNeil, 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 Facts - 06/07/2026

Background

1. Dr Patel qualified MB BS in 1996 from the University of London.
2. The allegation that has led to Dr Patel's hearing relates to his conduct. It is alleged by the General Medical Council (GMC) that, between 24 November 2023 and 15 January 2024, Dr Patel '*liked*' various posts on 'X' formerly known as Twitter (referred to hereafter as 'X'). It is alleged that these actions were seriously offensive, objectively Islamophobic and/or motivated (in whole or in part) by racial hostility.
3. The initial concerns were raised with the GMC on 24 January 2024 by a Dr A, acting as a member of the public. Dr A's referral contained two videos purporting to show posts and likes on a social media account which indicated apparent endorsement of anti-Muslim sentiment. The allegation was that Dr Patel had liked the posts. Dr A declined to make a statement to explain the means by which she acquired the material.

The allegation and the doctor's response

4. The allegation made against Dr Patel is as follows:

That being registered under the Medical Act 1983 (as amended):

1. Between 24 November 2023 and 15 January 2024, on one or more occasion, you '*liked*' one or more of the posts as set out in Schedule 1. **To be determined.**
2. Your actions as referred to in paragraph 1 above were:

- a. seriously offensive; **To be determined.**
- b. objectively Islamophobic; **To be determined.**
- c. motivated (in whole or in part) by racial hostility; **To be determined.**

And that by reason of the matters set out above your fitness to practise is impaired because of your misconduct. **To be determined.**

The facts to be determined

5. Dr Patel made no admissions before this Tribunal. In light of Dr Patel's response to the allegation made of him, the Tribunal is required to determine the allegation in full.

The Evidence

6. The Tribunal was provided with a copy of a determination made by a Tribunal at a preliminary hearing, which concluded on 29 May 2026 (The Preliminary Tribunal). In that decision, all the evidence relied upon by the GMC was determined to be inadmissible. That decision is binding on this Tribunal. The GMC did not adduce any further evidence before this Tribunal.

Comments on behalf of Dr Patel

7. Mr Haycroft, on behalf of Dr Patel, stated that Dr Patel was '*horrified*' by the allegation and reminded the Tribunal that the preliminary hearing had determined that it would not be fair to admit the GMC evidence. He stated that Dr Patel had fully and proactively engaged with the Tribunal over the last two years, including obtaining, at his own cost, two expert IT reports challenging the GMC evidence. He stated that Dr Patel had intended, at this Tribunal, to adduce positive evidence from both, clinical staff including Muslim colleagues, and from family members.

The Tribunal's approach

8. In reaching its decision on the facts, the Tribunal will apply the civil standard of proof. This means that the Tribunal must decide whether, on the balance of probabilities, the GMC is able to prove it is more likely than not that the matters occurred as alleged. The burden of proof rests with the GMC and it is for the GMC to prove the case that it is presenting against Dr Patel. There is no burden on Dr Patel to prove or disprove anything. The Tribunal is bound by the decision of the preliminary hearing.

9. The Tribunal will approach fact finding by firstly identifying agreed facts and evidence. To reach a decision on the disputed facts, the Tribunal will assess the evidence in the round. It will consider what conclusions and inferences can be drawn from the documentary evidence. The Tribunal will then consider the available oral evidence and subject that evidence to critical scrutiny against the agreed facts and documentary evidence to consider a witness' reliability and credibility. The Tribunal should not decide reliability and credibility based on the demeanour of a witness alone.

The Tribunal's analysis of the evidence and findings

10. The Tribunal noted that the video evidence which was the subject of the application under Rule 34 to the preliminary hearing was the sole evidence the GMC relied on in proving the allegation against Dr Patel. The Preliminary Tribunal's decision, handed down on 29 May 2026, which is binding on this Tribunal, determined that it was not satisfied on the balance probabilities that it was fair to admit the evidence being relied on by the GMC. Accordingly, the Tribunal granted Dr Patel's application for all of the GMC's evidence to be ruled inadmissible, pursuant to Rule 34(1) of the Rules.

11. Following the determination of the Preliminary Tribunal, this Tribunal determined that there was no admissible evidence before it. This lack of evidence meant that the Tribunal had no evidence to assess in determining the allegation against Dr Patel; that between 24 November 2023 and 15 January 2024, on one or more occasion, Dr Patel '*liked*' one or more of the posts as set out in Schedule 1 of the allegation.

12. The Tribunal found that the GMC had not discharged its burden of proof and therefore did not find any of the paragraphs of the allegation proved.

The Tribunal's overall determination on the facts

13. The Tribunal has determined the facts as follows:

That being registered under the Medical Act 1983 (as amended):

1. Between 24 November 2023 and 15 January 2024, on one or more occasion, you '*liked*' one or more of the posts as set out in Schedule 1. **Not proved.**
2. Your actions as referred to in paragraph 1 above were:
 - a. seriously offensive; **Not proved.**

- b. objectively Islamophobic; **Not proved.**
- c. motivated (in whole or in part) by racial hostility; **Not proved.**

And that by reason of the matters set out above your fitness to practise is impaired because of your misconduct. **Impairment not considered.**