

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

DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY
MEDICAL REGISTRATION ORDINANCE, CAP. 161

Defendant: Dr LAU Chi Kin (婁子堅醫生) (Reg. No.: M16847)

Date of hearing: 1 September 2025 (Monday)

Present at the hearing

Council Members/Assessors: Dr CHOI Kin, Gabriel
(Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel)
Prof. LIANG Hin-suen, Raymond, SBS, JP
Dr MAK Siu-ming
Mr LAM Chi-yau
Mr YUEN Hon-lam, Joseph

Legal Adviser: Mr Stanley NG

Defence Solicitor representing the Defendant: Mr Woody CHANG of Messrs. Woody Chang Law Office

Legal Officer representing the Secretary: Mr Louis POON, Government Counsel

The Charge

1. The charge against the Defendant, Dr LAU Chi Kin, is:

“That he, being a registered medical practitioner, was convicted at Eastern Magistrates’ Courts on 15 June 2022 of four counts of the offence of publishing an obscene article, which is an offence punishable with imprisonment, contrary to section 21(1)(a) of the Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance, Chapter 390, Laws of Hong Kong.”

Facts of the case

2. The name of the Defendant has been included in the General Register from 1 July 2012 to the present. His name has been included in the Specialist Register under the Specialty of Orthopaedics & Traumatology since 2 October 2019.
3. The Defendant and a female X, a nurse (“Madam X”), became acquainted during work and developed into a romantic relationship in June 2016. They broke up in September 2016. Madam X started a new romantic relationship with a male Y (“Mr Y”) and both of them got married.
4. On 14 May 2020, Mr Y’s friend added Mr Y into a telegram group named “HK 調教人妻之綜合 J 谷 ~香港人加油” (“Telegram Group 1”) upon seeing one wedding photo of himself and Madam X posted there. After being added to Telegram Group 1, Mr Y saw the wedding photo being posted by the Defendant on 14 May 2020 at 2356 hours.
5. At around 0107 hours on 16 May 2020, Mr Y found someone posting one photo of a naked Madam X, performing oral sex for a male at Telegram Group 1 with 15,986 members. Madam X recalled that the Defendant took the naked photo, when they were still lovers, without Madam X’s consent at a hotel in 2016.
6. At around 1836 hours on 17 May 2020, Mr Y found someone posting a photo of a naked Madam X, with her breasts exposed, in Telegram Group 1.
7. At around 1432 hours on 22 May 2020, Mr Y found one naked video (17 seconds) of Madam X exposing her breasts and pubic hair on another telegram group “大人の玩具” (“Telegram Group 2”) with 10,011 members. Madam X claimed that the video was taken by the Defendant when they were lovers in 2016. Mr Y then requested the administrator of Telegram to delete the video.
8. At around 1545 hours on 22 May 2020, Mr Y again saw the previously deleted video (17 seconds) of Madam X being posted in Telegram Group 2.
9. On 26 May 2020, the police arrested the Defendant. The Defendant was charged with four counts of the offence of publishing an obscene article, contrary to section 21(1)(a) of the Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance, Cap. 390, Laws of Hong Kong.

10. On 15 June 2022, the Defendant was convicted after trial at Eastern Magistrates' Courts in Case No. ESCC 2394/2020 of all four counts of the offence of publishing an obscene article. On 29 June 2022, for each count, the Defendant was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment, with 1 month in charges (2) to (4) to run consecutively to charge (1), making a total term of imprisonment to 12 months.
11. The Defendant appealed against his conviction and sentence. By judgment dated 18 April 2024, the Court of First Instance dismissed the Defendant's appeal against conviction and sentence. On 6 June 2025, the Appeal Committee of the Court of Final Appeal in FAMC 19/2024 ordered that the Defendant's leave to appeal be dismissed.

Findings of the Inquiry Panel

12. The offence of publishing an obscene article is an offence punishable with imprisonment under section 21(1)(a) of the Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance, Cap. 390, Laws of Hong Kong. Accordingly, our disciplinary powers under section 21(1)(a) of the Medical Registration Ordinance ("MRO") are engaged.
13. 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."
14. We are therefore entitled to take the said conviction as conclusively proven against the Defendant.
15. Accordingly, we find the Defendant guilty of the disciplinary offence as charged against him.

Sentencing

16. The Defendant has a clear disciplinary record.
17. In line with our published policy, we shall give credit to the Defendant for his frank admission and full cooperation throughout the 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 him must necessarily be of a lesser extent than in other cases.
18. We bear in mind that the 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.
19. We have considered the character reference letters as submitted and the Defendant's contributions to the community.
20. The offence of publishing an obscene article is very serious. What the Defendant did had tarnished the reputation of doctors in Hong Kong.
21. It is clearly stated in paragraph 27.2 of the Code of Professional Conduct (2016 edition) that a particularly serious view will likely be taken in respect of offences involving indecent behaviour.
22. We gratefully adopt what the learned Magistrate said in his reasons for sentence in Case No. ESCC 2394/2020, as follows:

"... what I found the defendant to have done were very serious crimes and so damaging to others', people's lives..."

... As I said, what the defendant did to PW1 and PW2, in particular, PW2, were horrible. I have no doubt that the incident changed their lives. Without going into detail of the fact of the case again, all I can say at this stage is that I cannot even begin to imagine what they both have gone through or are going through and probably will go through because of this case. The fear, distress, humiliation and shame that they both have to go through is simply unimaginable. Anyone with some common sense knows that anything put on the internet, it stays there forever. There is simply no way you can erase something from the internet.

There are at least two aggravating factors in this case:

(1) According to PW2, the intimate photos and videos were taken without her consent and, if she knew it, she would definitely not allow the defendant to do it, so what the defendant did was betrayal of trust of PW2, who trusted him because of their intimate relationship back then.

(2) With respect, what the defendant did was not momentary stupidity ... What the defendant did was premeditated and persistent. He first posted the wedding photo of PW1 and PW2 in the group and, when the video was taken down by the administrator, as requested by PW1, for the first time, he posted the same video again within several hours. The defendant knew very well what he was doing and they were not acts done impulsively.

While I accept that the photos and videos may not be the most obscene of its kind, however, to PW2, it is the most intimate, private images and video and what the defendant did seriously violated her privacy. Now she can never be sure whether these photos or videos are still out there in the internet, shared by strangers. The impact on not only PW2 but also PW1, as her husband, will be enduring and we can never be sure what the impact would be done to their relationship..."

23. The Defendant proposed to us to impose a 3-year supervision plan. We do not find the said proposal appropriate.
24. In his mitigation, we do not see the Defendant has shown any remorse. There is no apology whatsoever to Madam X and Mr Y.
25. It is essential in our view to maintain amongst members of the public a well-founded confidence that any medical doctor whom they consult will be a person of unquestionable integrity, probity and trustworthiness. Any person who lacks these essential attributes can hardly be a fit and proper person to practise medicine.
26. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the 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 9 months.

27. We have considered carefully whether the operation of the removal order should be suspended. We do not consider it appropriate to suspend the operation of the removal order for the reasons aforesaid.

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