

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

---

**DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY**  
**MEDICAL REGISTRATION ORDINANCE, CAP. 161**

Defendant: Dr HUI Kim Ming Christopher (許建名醫生) (Reg. No.: M12921)

Date of hearing: 14 April 2026 (Tuesday)

Present at the hearing

Council Members/Assessors: Prof. FOK Tai-fai, SBS, JP  
(Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel)  
Dr WONG Chun-kwan, Bonnie  
Dr TAM Sau-man, Barbara  
Ms LAU Queenie Fiona SC  
Mr HO Chun-kit

Legal Adviser: Mr Edward SHUM

Defence Solicitor representing the Defendant: Ms CHUNG Hui-ye of  
Messrs. Howse Williams

Legal Officer representing the Secretary: Miss Linda CHAN,  
Government Counsel

**The Charge**

1. The amended charge against the Defendant, Dr HUI Kim-ming Christopher, is:

*“That, in or around November 2022 and October 2023, he, being a registered medical practitioner, falsely declared on (i) the “Declaration of medical-in-charge or medical practitioner” dated 1 November 2022 attached to the application for re-registration of clinic and (ii) the “Declaration of medical-in-charge or medical practitioner” dated 26 October 2023 attached to the application for change of registration particulars of clinic submitted to the Department of Health that he had not been subject to disciplinary action by Medical Council of Hong Kong.*

*In relation to the facts alleged, he has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”*

**Facts of the Case**

2. The name of the Defendant has been included in the General Register from

- 2 January 2001 to the present. His name has been included in the Specialist Register under the Specialty of Respiratory Medicine since 7 April 2021.
3. The Defendant admits the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charge against him.
  4. Briefly stated, by a Memo dated 1 December 2023, the Department of Health informed the Secretary of the Medical Council (the “Secretary”) that the Defendant was appointed by the licensee of the Kiangsu Chekiang and Shanghai Medical Centre (the “Clinic”) as the medical-in-charge of the Clinic. And it had come to the attention of the Department of Health that the Defendant falsely declared that he had not been subject to disciplinary action by the Council.
  5. Pursuant to section 5 of the Medical Clinics Ordinance (“MCO”), Cap. 343 of Laws of Hong Kong, application(s) for registration as a clinic should be made to the Registrar of Clinics (the “Registrar”) in such form as he may prescribe; and the Registrar may refuse to register the applicant if he is satisfied, amongst others, that the applicant or any person employed by him at the clinic is not a fit person, whether by reason of age or otherwise, to carry on or to be employed at a clinic.
  6. For the purposes of processing application(s) for registration or re-registration of a clinic and change of registration particulars of a clinic, the medical-in-charge or medical practitioner of a clinic was required to make a declaration that (a) he or she had / had not been convicted in Hong Kong or elsewhere of any offence punishable with imprisonment; and (b) he or she had / had not been subject to disciplinary action by the Medical Council of Hong Kong.

### **Burden and Standard of Proof**

7. We bear in mind that the burden of proof is always on the Secretary and the Defendant does not have to prove his innocence. We also bear in mind that the standard of proof in 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.
8. There is no doubt that the allegation against the Defendant here is a serious one. We need to look at all the evidence and to consider and determine the amended disciplinary charge against the Defendant carefully.

### **Findings of the Inquiry Panel**

9. The Defendant admits the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charge against him and indicates through his solicitor that he is not going to contest the issue of misconduct in a professional respect. It remains for us to consider and determine on the evidence whether the Defendant has by his conduct in this case fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong

Kong.

10. The whole point about requiring the medical-in-charge or medical practitioner of a clinic to declare, amongst others, whether he or she had / has not been subject to disciplinary action by the Medical Council of Hong Kong was to facilitate the Registrar in making an informed assessment under section 5 of MCO as to whether the declarant is a fit person to carry on or be employed in a clinic.
11. It is therefore essential in our view for the declarant to be full and frank when making his or her declaration. Indeed, the footnote to the proforma declaration specifically reminded the declarant to provide details of the conviction or disciplinary action in a separate sheet.
12. In making a false declaration on 1 November 2022 and again on 26 October 2023 that he had not been subject to disciplinary action by the Medical Council when in fact he had been found guilty of misconduct in a professional respect by an inquiry panel after due inquiry on 2 September 2022, the Defendant has by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong.
13. Accordingly, we find the Defendant guilty of misconduct in a professional respect as per the amended disciplinary charge.

### **Sentencing**

14. The Defendant has one disciplinary record relating to wrongful use of specialist title in around early 2021 in an article in the Headline Daily and on a website. After due inquiry, the Defendant was issued with a warning letter and the disciplinary order was subsequently published in the Gazette.
15. In line with our published policy, we shall give the Defendant credit in sentencing for his admission and not contesting the issue of misconduct in a professional respect.
16. We bear in mind that the primary purpose of a disciplinary order is not to punish the Defendant 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.
17. Untruthful information was repeatedly provided to the Department of Health in two declarations. The Medical Council has always considered candour to be an important attribute of every medical practitioner. But then again, we accept that the Defendant lacked diligence when making the declarations. Indeed, the false declaration in November 2022 was brought to the notice of the Secretary by the Defendant through his solicitors. This reinforces our view that he did not deliberately mislead the Registrar.
18. We are however particularly concerned about the Defendant's explanation in his apology letter that "[i]t was not clear to [him] at the time that a warning letter

*was required to be declared to the DOH under the MCO.*” This illustrates to us that the Defendant did not appreciate the solemnity of disciplinary proceedings under the MRO.

19. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of this case and what we have heard and read in mitigation, we order that the name of the Defendant be removed from the General Register for a period of 1 month. We further order that our removal order be suspended for a period of 3 months.

**Remark**

20. The name of the Defendant is included in the Specialist Register under the Specialty of Respiratory Medicine and we shall leave it to the Education and Accreditation Committee to consider whether anything needs to be done in respect of his specialist registration.

Prof. FOK Tai-fai, SBS, JP  
Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel  
The Medical Council of Hong Kong