

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

DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY
MEDICAL REGISTRATION ORDINANCE, CAP. 161

Defendant: Dr WONG Man Ho (王文灝醫生) (Reg. No.: M17338)

Date of hearing: 31 July 2026 (Friday)

Present at the hearing

Council Members/Assessors: Dr CHOI Kin, Gabriel
(Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel)
Prof. CHAN Ka-leung, Francis, SBS, JP
Dr LAU Tin-kay, Peter
Ms FUNG Dun-mi, Amy, MH, JP
Mr CHONG Sing-kee, Keith

Legal Adviser: Mr Edward SHUM

Defence Solicitor representing the Defendant: Ms Jaime LAM of
Messrs. Johnson Stokes & Master

Legal Officer representing the Secretary: Miss Esther CHAN,
Senior Government Counsel

The Charge

1. The disciplinary charge against the Defendant, Dr WONG Man Ho, is:

“That he, being a registered medical practitioner, was convicted at the West Kowloon Magistrates’ Courts on 15 December 2023 of the offence of Fraud, which is an offence punishable with imprisonment, contrary to section 16A of the Theft Ordinance, Cap. 210, Laws of Hong Kong.”

Facts of the case

2. The name of the Defendant has been included in the General Register from 1 July 2014 to the present. His name has never been included in the Specialist Register.
3. On 15 December 2023, the Defendant was convicted on his own plea at the West Kowloon Magistrates' Courts of the offence of fraud, which was and still is an offence punishable with imprisonment, contrary to section 16A of the Theft Ordinance, Cap. 210, Laws of Hong Kong. The Defendant was sentenced to Community Service Order for 160 hours.
4. According to the Amended Summary of Facts upon which the Defendant was convicted, the Defendant was all material times a Resident Doctor of Yan Chai Hospital ("YCH") and was posted to the Department of Medicine. His normal working hours were from 0900 hours to 1700 hours on weekdays and 0900 hours to 1300 hours on Saturdays. He was also required to perform on-call duty on rotation.
5. As an incentive for medical staff to provide extra sessions of medical services outside their normal call of duties, the Hospital Authority ("HA") had implemented a Special Honorarium Scheme ("SHS") since 2007. Medical staff of HA could seek approval from their supervisors by submitting application forms to participate in SHS and remuneration would be calculated on an hourly basis.
6. On 19 June 2015, 1 April 2016, 29 April 2016 and 26 March 2019, the Defendant signed on and submitted four application forms to obtain approval from his supervisors for performing SHS duties. In all the four applications, the Defendant declared that the extra sessions of medical services should be *"in addition to [his] normal call of duties and will not affect performance of [his] normal duties in HA."*
7. After performing SHS duties, the Defendant was required to sign on the attendance record and to specify the date, time and duration of SHS duties performed.
8. It was later found out that between 21 January 2017 and 28 November 2019, there were 64 occasions that the Defendant's normal call of duties at YCH overlapped with

his reported SHS duties at the Accident & Emergency Department (“AED”) of Tuen Mun Hospital (“TMH”). The overlapping durations amounted to 168 hours and resulting in extra remuneration of \$110,824 being paid to the Defendant under SHS.

9. On 31 May 2022, the Defendant was arrested by the ICAC. Under caution, the Defendant admitted that he had signed and submitted to HA attendance records for SHS containing false information; and he also admitted that he had either left YCH earlier than his normal working hours without approval from his supervisors or he arrived at TMH later than he claimed in the attendance records.

Findings of the Inquiry Panel

10. There is no dispute that the offence of fraud was and still is punishable with imprisonment. Accordingly, our disciplinary powers against the Defendant pursuant to section 21(1)(a) of the Medical Registration Ordinance (“MRO”), Cap. 161, Laws of Hong Kong are engaged.

11. Section 21(3) of the MRO expressly provides that:-

“Nothing in this section shall be deemed to require an inquiry panel to inquire into the question whether the registered medical practitioner was properly convicted but the panel may consider any record of the case in which such conviction was recorded and any other evidence which may be available and is relevant as showing the nature and gravity of the offence.”

12. We are entitled to take the said conviction as conclusively proven against the Defendant. We therefore find the Defendant guilty of the disciplinary charge.

Sentencing

13. The Defendant has a clear disciplinary record.
14. In line with our published policy, we shall give him credit for his admission and cooperation in these disciplinary proceedings. However, given that there is hardly any room for dispute in a disciplinary case involving criminal conviction, the credit to be given to the Defendant must necessarily be of a lesser extent than in other disciplinary cases.
15. We bear in mind that the primary purpose of a disciplinary order is not to punish the Defendant for the criminal offence for a second time, 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.
16. It is essential in our view to maintain amongst members of the public a well-founded confidence that all registered medical practitioners whom they consult will be persons of unquestionable integrity, probity and trustworthiness. This is also the reason why the Council has taken a particularly serious view in respect of convictions for offences involving dishonesty.
17. We are told in mitigation that the Defendant has satisfactorily completed 160 hours of community services.
18. In the present case, the Defendant received extra remuneration of \$110,824. Although the Defendant had already repaid the whole amount to HA, we are particularly concerned that the Defendant signed on and submitted to HA fraudulent attendance records on 64 occasions over a period of nearly 3 years.
19. But then again, we appreciate that the Defendant made full admission at the first opportunity when he was interrogated by the ICAC. This illustrates in our view that the Defendant is genuinely remorseful. We are particularly impressed by his apology letter which shows his insight into his wrongdoing.

20. We noted from reading the letters written by his former colleagues at TMH that the Defendant was all along a responsible and conscientious doctor, who took the extra mile of relieving their heavy workload and thereby shortening patients' waiting time at the AED. Letters written by consultant geriatricians at YCH and HA's Staff Development Review of the Defendant done shortly after his arrest by the ICAC in May 2022 also testified that his overall performance frequently exceeded the requirements for the job.
21. 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 3 months. We further order that the operation of the removal order be suspended for a period of 12 months.

Dr CHOI Kin, Gabriel
Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel
The Medical Council of Hong Kong