

香港醫務委員會
The Medical Council of Hong Kong

DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY
MEDICAL REGISTRATION ORDINANCE, CAP. 161

1st Defendant: Dr BRAMLEY Lauren Mary (Reg. No.: M12950)
2nd Defendant: Dr KULENKAMPPF Charlene Julia (Reg. No.: M16940)
3rd Defendant: Dr LEUNG Chor Hung Steven (梁楚洪醫生) (Reg. No.: M01729)
4th Defendant: Dr MUI Winnie (梅麥惠華醫生) (Reg. No.: M11973)

Date of hearing: 3 March 2023 (Friday)

Present at the hearing

Council Members/Assessors: Prof. LAU Wan-yee, Joseph, SBS
(Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel)
Prof. KONG Pik-shan, Alice
Dr HSU Yung-chak
Ms LIU Lai-yun, Amanda
Ms LAU Sze-wan, Serena, JP

Legal Adviser: Mr Edward SHUM

All the Defendants except the 1st Defendant are present. The 2nd Defendant attends the inquiry via remote video link.

Defence Counsel representing the 1st Defendant: Mr Anthony ISMAIL as instructed by
Messrs. Mayer Brown

Defence Counsel representing the 2nd and 3rd Defendants: Mr Ashok SAKHRANI as
instructed by Messrs. Kennedys

Defence Counsel representing the 4th Defendant: Ms Ann LUI as instructed
by Messrs. Kennedys

Senior Government Counsel (Ag.) representing the Secretary: Mr Edward CHIK

1. The amended charges against the 1st Defendant, Dr BRAMLEY Lauren Mary, are:

“That in or about August 2017, she, being a registered medical practitioner,

(i) instigated, sanctioned, acquiesced in, or failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the advertisement(s) in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners, in which there was promotion of her, her services and/or her skills as follows:

(a) the impermissible promotional statements that “[she] takes a holistic approach to health, combining medicine, cutting-edge preventative testing, lifestyle and nutrition to ensure her clients live longer, healthier and better lives. [She] successfully combines western medicine with eastern understandings of nutrition, body balance and the power of natural healing for an all-encompassing approach to well-being”, which were misleading, exaggerating and/or claiming superiority over others;

(b) the statements of “[being] uniquely sensitive to the cultural and social differences of her clients, their health and suitable treatments”, which were claiming superiority over others;

(c) statements about platelet-rich plasma (“PRP”) in the web pages known as “O shot” and/or “Priapus Shot”. There was a YouTube video at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDnMzviDw_I published by “Dr Lauren Bramley & Partners” concerning platelet-rich plasma (PRP) facial therapy, which were tending to be misleading and exaggerating and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients;

(d) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “anti-ageing medicine”, “medical aesthetics” and/or “regenerative medicine” which were misleading, exaggerating to the public, and/or claiming superiority over others;

(e) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “General and Family Practice”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council

for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Family Medicine”; and

- (ii) *she engaged in impermissible practice promotion through the publication of Facebook posts at <https://www.facebook.com/DrLBandP>.*

In relation to the facts alleged, either singularly or cumulatively, she has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”

2. The amended charges against the 2nd Defendant, Dr KULENKAMPPF Charlene Julia, are:

“That in or about August 2017, she, being a registered medical practitioner, failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the following in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners, with which she had financial or professional relationship with, in which there was promotion of her, her services and/or her skills as follows:

- (a) *the statements concerning her training in platelet-rich plasma (“PRP”) with one “American Cosmetic Cellular Medicine” and her qualification with one “American Academy of Aesthetics” which were not quotable qualifications;*
- (b) *the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “anti-ageing medicine”, “genomics”, and/or “regenerative medicine” which were misleading;*
- (c) *the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “Children’s Health”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Paediatrics, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Paediatrics”; and/or*
- (d) *the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “General and Family Practice”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a*

specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Family Medicine”.

In relation to the facts alleged, either singularly or cumulatively, she has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”

3. The amended charges against the 3rd Defendant, Dr LEUNG Chor Hung Steven, are:

“That in or about August 2017, he, being a registered medical practitioner,

(i) failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the following in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners, with which he had financial or professional relationship with, in which there was promotion of him, his services and/or his skills as follows:

(a) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “anti-ageing medicine”, “medical aesthetics” and/or “regenerative medicine”, which were misleading;

(b) the use of the title of “Anti-Ageing Physician”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that he was a specialist in anti-ageing medicine;

(c) the statements concerning his experience in aesthetic medical injections, which canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients;

(d) the statements of hormonal treatment, which were claiming superiority over others;

(e) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “General and Family Practice”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that he was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact his name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Family Medicine”; and/or

(ii) he quoted the qualification of “specialty Fellowship in Neurosurgery

from the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons in New Zealand”, which was not permitted for use by the Medical Council.

In relation to the facts alleged, either singularly or cumulatively, he has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”

4. The amended charges against the 4th Defendant, Dr MUI Winnie, are:

“That in or about August 2017, she, being a registered medical practitioner, failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the advertisement(s) in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners, with which she had financial or professional relationship with, in which there was promotion of her, her services and/or her skills as follows:

- (a) the statements concerning her purported “focus on the health and wellness of people of all ages” and “through her warm and caring approach, Dr. Winnie Mui also strongly advocates disease screening and prevention”, which were sensational or unduly persuasive;*
- (b) the statements concerning her experience in aesthetic medical injections, which promoted medical or health related products and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients;*
- (c) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “anti-ageing medicine”, “medical aesthetics” and/or “regenerative medicine”, which were misleading;*
- (d) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “children’s health”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Paediatrics, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Paediatrics”;*
- (e) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “gynaecology”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Obstetrics & Gynaecology, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Obstetrics & Gynaecology”;*

- (f) *the use of the title of “Family Physician”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Family Medicine”;*
- (g) *the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “General and Family Practice”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Family Medicine”; and/or*
- (h) *the YouTube Video “You Tube: Dr. Bramley explains the benefits of PRP”, which promoted platelet-rich plasma and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients.*

In relation to the facts alleged, either singularly or cumulatively, she has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”

Facts of the case

5. The name of the 1st Defendant has been included in the General Register from 4 January 2001 to the present. Her name has never been included in the Specialist Register.
6. The name of the 2nd Defendant has been included in the General Register from 2 January 2013 to the present. Her name has never been included in the Specialist Register.
7. The name of the 3rd Defendant has been included in the General Register from 6 July 1971 to the present. His name has never been included in the Specialist Register.
8. The name of the 4th Defendant has been included in the General Register from 13 July 1998 to the present. Her name has never been included in the Specialist Register.

9. Briefly stated, the Medical Council (the “Council”) received an email from one [REDACTED] on 30 August 2017 complaining the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Defendants (“the Four Defendants”) of practice promotion and inappropriate quoting of their qualifications and experience in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners (“the Website”) and other social media.
10. Attached to the complaint email were extracts from the Website, webpages known as “O Shot” and “Priapas Shot”; and screen shots from YouTube Video at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDnMzviDw_I. By another email dated 29 April 2020, the complainant further provided the Secretary with extracts of Facebook posts at <https://www.facebook.com/DrLBandP>. Together they now form the basis of the respective amended disciplinary charges against the Four Defendants. Copies of the same were placed by the Legal Officer before us for our consideration today.

Burden and Standard of Proof

11. We bear in mind that the burden of proof is always on the Legal Officer and the Defendants do not have to prove their innocence. We also bear in mind that the standard of proof for disciplinary proceedings is the preponderance of probability. However, the more serious the act or omission alleged, the more inherently improbable must it be regarded. Therefore, the more inherently improbable it is regarded, the more compelling the evidence is required to prove it on the balance of probabilities.
12. There is no doubt that the allegations against each of the Defendants here are serious ones. Indeed, it is always a serious matter to accuse a registered medical practitioner of misconduct in a professional respect. Therefore, we need to look at all the evidence and to consider and determine the respective amended disciplinary charges against each of the Four Defendants separately and carefully.

Findings of the Inquiry Panel

13. It is clearly stated in the Code of Professional Conduct (2016 edition) (the “Code”) that:

“5.1.3 ... Practice promotion of doctors’ medical services as if the provision of medical care were no more than a commercial activity is

likely both to undermine public trust in the medical profession and, over time, to diminish the standard of medical care.

...

5.2.1 A doctor providing information to the public or his patients must comply with the principles set out below.

5.2.1.1 Any information provided by a doctor to the public or his patients must be:

(a) accurate;

(b) factual;

(c) objectively verifiable;

(d) presented in a balanced manner (when referring to the efficacy of particular treatment, both the advantages and disadvantages should be set out).

5.2.1.2 Such information must not:-

...

(b) be comparative with or claim superiority over other doctors;

...

(d) aim to solicit or canvass for patients;

(e) be used for commercial promotion of medical and health related products and services...;

(f) be sensational or unduly persuasive...;

(h) generate unrealistic expectations...

5.2.2. Practice promotion

5.2.2.1 Practice promotion means publicity for promoting the professional services of a doctor, his practice or his group... Practice promotion in this context will be interpreted by the Council in its broadest sense, and includes any means by which a doctor or his practice is publicized, in Hong Kong or elsewhere, by himself or anybody acting on his behalf or with his forbearance (including the failure to take adequate steps to prevent such publicity in circumstances which would call for caution), which objectively speaking constitutes promotion of his

professional services, irrespective of whether he actually benefits from such publicity.

...

6.1 *It is appropriate for a doctor to take part in bona fide health education activities, such as lectures and publications. However, he must not exploit such activities for promotion of his practice or to canvass for patients. Any information provided should be objectively verifiable and presented in a balanced manner, without exaggeration of the positive aspects or omission of the significant negative aspect.*

6.2 *A doctor should take reasonable steps to ensure that the published or broadcasted materials, either by their contents or the manner they are referred to, do not give the impression that the audience is encouraged to seek consultation or treatment from him or organizations with which he is associated. He should also take reasonable steps to ensure that the materials are not used directly or indirectly for the commercial promotion of any medical and health related products or services.*

6.3 *... Doctors must not give the impression that they, or the institutions with which they are associated, have unique or special skills or solutions to health problems...*

14. A doctor has a personal responsibility to ensure that the service information about him or her in the practice website of a medical practice group to which he or she belongs is in compliance with the Code. In this connection, section 7.1 of the Code specifically provides that “[o]nly doctors on the Specialist Register are recognized as specialists, and can use the title of “specialist in a specialty”.

15. Whilst doctors may be categorized as specialist practitioners on the practice website of a medical practice group but their names must actually be registered under the relevant specialties in the Specialist Register or they will be in breach of section 7.2 of the Code which expressly prohibits the use of “any misleading description or title implying specialization in a particular area (irrespective of whether it is a recognized specialty)”.

16. And a doctor is not allowed to publish in his or her practice website or the website of his or her medical practice group qualifications which are not quotable qualifications approved by the Council.
17. With these basic principles in mind, we shall look at the evidence adduced by the Secretary against each of the Four Defendants in the present case.

1st Defendant (Dr BRAMLEY Lauren Mary)

18. Through her solicitors, the 1st Defendant admitted the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charges against her.
19. It remains for us to consider and determine on the evidence whether the 1st Defendant has by her conduct in the present case been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.
20. Publication of the impermissible promotional statements, particulars of which are set out in the amended disciplinary charges (i)(a) and (b), which were misleading, exaggerating and/or claiming superiority over others, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 1st Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 1st Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charges (i)(a) and (b) against her.
21. Publication via a hyperlink from the Website of statements about platelet-rich plasma (“PRP”) in the web pages known as “O shot” and/or “Priapus Shot”, which were tending to be misleading and exaggerating; and of the said YouTube Video about PRP facial therapy, which were tending to be misleading and exaggerating and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients, was again in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 1st Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 1st Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(c) against her.
22. By claiming special[i]ties in “anti-ageing medicine”, “medical aesthetics”, and/or “regenerative medicine”, which were misleading, exaggerating to the

public, and/or claiming superiority over others, the 1st Defendant was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code and has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 1st Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(d) against her.

23. By claiming specialty in “General and Family Practice”, when in fact she has not been approved by the Council to have her name included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Family Medicine”, the 1st Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 1st Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(e) against her.
24. It is also evident to us from reading the subject posts in the Facebook at <https://www.facebook.com/DrLBandP> that readers were offered discount for various treatments. By engaging in such impermissible practice promotion, the 1st Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 1st Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (ii) against her.

2nd Defendant (Dr KULENKAMPPF Charlene Julia)

25. Through her solicitors, the 2nd Defendant admitted the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charges against her.
26. It remains for us to consider and determine on the evidence whether the 2nd Defendant has by her conduct in the present case been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.
27. Publication in the Website of the statements concerning her training in *platelet-rich plasma (“PRP”)* with one “*American Cosmetic Cellular Medicine*” and her qualification with one “*American Academy of Aesthetics*”, which were not quotable qualifications, was in our view a form of impermissible practice promotion. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the said publication, the 2nd Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 2nd Defendant guilty of

professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (a) against her.

28. The claim of “*Special[ities]*” in “*anti-ageing medicine*”, “*genomics*”, and/or “*regenerative medicine*”, which were misleading, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent its publication in the Website, the 2nd Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 2nd Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (b) against her.
29. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication in the Website of the claims of specialities in “*Children’s Health*” and “*General and Family Practice*”, which were misleading and not acceptable to the Council and when in fact she has not been approved by the Council to have her name included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of either “*Paediatrics*” or “*Family Medicine*”, the 2nd Defendant was in breach of sections 5.2.1.2 and 7.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 2nd Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 2nd Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charges (c) and (d) against her.

3rd Defendant (Dr LEUNG Chor Hung Steven (梁楚洪醫生))

30. Through his solicitors, the 3rd Defendant admitted the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charges against him.
31. It remains for us to consider and determine on the evidence whether the 3rd Defendant has by his conduct in the present case been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.
32. The claim in the Website of “*Special[ities]*” in “*anti-ageing medicine*”, “*medical aesthetics*”, and/or “*regenerative medicine*”, which were misleading, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 3rd Defendant has in our view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 3rd Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(a) against him.

33. Use of the title of “*Anti-Ageing Physician*” in the Website, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that he was a specialist in anti-ageing medicine, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 3rd Defendant has in our view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 3rd Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(b) against him.
34. Publication of the statements concerning his experience in aesthetic medical injections in the Website, which canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients; and in hormonal treatment, which claimed superiority over others, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 3rd Defendant has in our view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 3rd Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charges (i)(c) and (d) against him.
35. And the claim in the Website of ““*Special[ist]ties*” in “*General and Family Practice*”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that he was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact his name was not included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of “Family Medicine”, the 3rd Defendant was in breach of sections 5.2.1.2 and 7.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 3rd Defendant has in our view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 3rd Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(e) against him.
36. And by quoting the qualification of “*Specialty Fellowship in Neurosurgery from the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons in New Zealand*” in the Website, which was not permitted for use by the Medical Council, the 3rd Defendant has again in our view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we also find the 3rd Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (ii).

4th Defendant (Dr MUI Winnie (梅麥惠華醫生))

37. Through her solicitors, the 4th Defendant admitted the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charges against her.
38. It remains for us to consider and determine on the evidence whether the 4th Defendant has by his conduct in the present case been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.
39. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the offending statements to which the amended disciplinary charge (i)(a) relates, which were sensational or unduly persuasive, the 4th Defendant was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 4th Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 4th Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (a) against her.
40. Publication of statements concerning her experience in “aesthetic medical injections”, which promoted medical or health related products and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients was in breach of sections 5.2.1.2 and 6.1 of the Code. Therefore, the 4th Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 4th Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (b) against her.
41. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the claim of “*Special[ities] in “anti-ageing medicine”*”, which was misleading, exaggerating to the public, and/or claiming superiority over others, the 4th Defendant was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 4th Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 4th Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (c) against her.
42. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the various claims of specialties, particulars of which are set out in the amended disciplinary charges (d), (e) and (g), the 4th Defendant was in breach of sections 5.2.1.1 and/or 7.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 4th Defendant has in

our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 4th Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charges (d), (e) and (g) against her.

43. Use of the title of “*Family Physician*” in the Website, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, was in breach of section 5.2.1.1 of the Code. Therefore, the 4th Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, we find the 4th Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (f) against her.

44. And in failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the YouTube Video entitled “*Dr. Bramley explains the benefits of PRP*”, which promoted PRP and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients, the 4th Defendant was in breach of sections 5.2.1.2 and 6.2 of the Code. Therefore, the 4th Defendant has in our view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the 4th Defendant guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (h) against her.

Sentencing

45. In line with our published policy, we shall give each of the Four Defendants credit in sentencing for their frank admission and not contesting the issue of professional misconduct.

46. We bear in mind that the primary purpose of a disciplinary order is not to punish the Four Defendants but to protect the public from persons who are unfit to practise medicine and to maintain public confidence in the medical profession by upholding its high standards and good reputation.

47. In June 2006, the Council issued a clear warning that all future cases of unauthorized practice promotion would be dealt with by removal from the General Register for a short period with suspension of operation of the removal order, and in serious cases the removal order would take immediate effect. The same warning was repeated in subsequent disciplinary decisions of the Council.

1st Defendant (Dr BRAMLEY Lauren Mary)

48. The 1st Defendant has a clear disciplinary record.
49. It was upon the instigation of the 1st Defendant that the said offending materials were published in the Website and the YouTube. Worse still, the 1st Defendant was charged with and convicted of engaging in impermissible practice promotion through Facebook posts, which offered discount for various treatments.
50. We are told in mitigation that the 1st Defendant has turned off the Facebook page of the Practice. However, despite repeated requests made to Google, she was unable to remove the YouTube Video. This reinforces our view the need to be vigilant in ensuring that no impermissible contents in breach of the Code would be published in social media.
51. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the proven case against the 1st Defendant and her plea of mitigation, we shall make a global order in respect of the amended disciplinary charges (i)(a) to (e) and (ii) that the name of the 1st Defendant be removed from the General Register for a period of 3 months. We further order that the removal order be suspended for a period of 24 months.

2nd Defendant (Dr KULENKAMPPF Charlene Julia)

52. The 2nd Defendant has a clear disciplinary record.
53. We appreciate that the gravamen of the 2nd Defendant lies in her failure to take adequate steps to prevent the offending publications.
54. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the proven case against the 2nd Defendant and her plea of mitigation, we shall make a global order in respect of the amended disciplinary charges (a) to (d) that the name of the 2nd Defendant be removed from the General Register for a period of 1 month. We further order that the removal order be suspended for a period of 6 months.

3rd Defendant (Dr LEUNG Chor Hung Steven (梁楚洪醫生))

55. The 3rd Defendant has a clear disciplinary record.
56. We are told in mitigation that the 3rd Defendant qualified as a Board Certified Physician with the American Board of Anti-Ageing and Regenerative Medicine and holds the Neurosurgery Fellowship of Royal Australasian College of Surgeons.
57. We wish to point out that whilst academic biography of a doctor may be published in medical literature or the like, it does not necessarily follow that the same information can be provided to the public without modification through the practice website of a doctor or the website of his medical practice group.
58. But then again, we appreciate that the gravamen of the 3rd Defendant lies in his failure to take adequate steps to prevent the offending publications.
59. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the proven case against the 3rd Defendant and his plea of mitigation, we shall make a global order in respect of the amended disciplinary charges (i)(a) to (e) and (ii) that the name of the 3rd Defendant be removed from the General Register for a period of 1 month. We further order that the removal order be suspended for a period of 6 months.

4th Defendant (Dr MUI Winnie (梅麥惠華醫生))

60. The 4th Defendant has a clear disciplinary record.
61. We are particularly concerned about the 4th Defendant's participation in the video about the benefits of PRP, which was eventually uploaded to the YouTube.
62. Through her Counsel, the 4th Defendant told us in mitigation that she was given to understand the video about PRP was intended for internal use by the Practice for showing to its existing patients.
63. Be that as it may, it was the 4th Defendant's personal responsibility to ensure that the video about PRP would not be misused for promoting PRP and/or

canvassing for the purpose of obtaining patients. This is particularly true when the video about PRP was not presented in a balanced manner when referring to its efficacy by setting out both the advantages and disadvantages.

64. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the proven case against the 4th Defendant and her plea of mitigation, we shall make a global order in respect of the amended disciplinary charges (a) to (h) that the name of the 4th Defendant be removed from the General Register for a period of 2 months. We further order that the removal order be suspended for a period of 12 months.

Prof. LAU Wan-ye, Joseph, SBS
Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel
The Medical Council of Hong Kong