

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

DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY
MEDICAL REGISTRATION ORDINANCE, CAP. 161

Defendant: Dr WU Sheung Yung Raymond (胡尚勇醫生) (Reg. No.: M15492)

Date of hearing: 23 January 2026 (Friday)

Present at the hearing

Council Members/Assessors: Prof. FOK Tai-fai, SBS, JP
(Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel)
Dr CHEUNG Chin-pang
Dr CHENG Chun-pong
Miss LAU Queenie Fiona, SC
Mr LI Chun-tak

Legal Adviser: Mr Stanley NG

Defence Solicitor representing the Defendant: Mr Bernard MURPHY of Messrs. Howse
Williams

Legal Officer representing the Secretary: Miss Christy TSO,
Government Counsel

The Charge

1. The charge against the Defendant, Dr WU Sheung Yung Raymond, is:

“The particulars of the complaint are that, he, being a registered medical practitioner, claimed superiority over other doctors, and claimed uniqueness without proper justifications in his LinkedIn profile, in that he claimed to have developed various unique injection techniques for different regions of the face and his unique injection skills led to his appointments to injectable brands, contrary to Section 5 “Professional

communication and information dissemination” of the Code of Professional Conduct.

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 2008 to the present. His name has never been included in the Specialist Register.
3. On 31 July 2023, the Medical Council received via email a complaint against the Defendant for impermissible practice promotion. A copy of the LinkedIn profile of the Defendant (“LinkedIn Profile”) was enclosed in the email.

Burden and Standard of Proof

4. 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 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 required to prove it on the balance of probabilities.
5. There is no doubt that the allegation against the Defendant here is a serious one. 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 disciplinary charge against him carefully.

Findings of the Inquiry Panel

6. The Defendant admits the factual particulars of the disciplinary charge against him but it remains for us to consider and determine on the evidence whether he has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.

7. It is stipulated in the Code of Professional Conduct (2022 edition) (“Code”) that:

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

...

5.2.1.2 Such information must not:-

...

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

(c) claim uniqueness without proper justifications for such claim...”

8. The LinkedIn Profile contains *inter alia* the following statements about the Defendant:

“... He has developed various unique injection techniques for different regions of the face. His unique injectable skills and the generosity of sharing them has led him to be appointed as an expert trainer and speaker by several injectable brands such as Teoxane, Galderma, Dysport and Medytox ...”

9. The Defendant claimed uniqueness in both his injection techniques and injectable skills in the LinkedIn Profile. However, no proper justification was set out to support such claims.

10. The Defendant also claimed in the LinkedIn Profile that his unique injectable skills had led him to several appointments by injectable brands. His claims of uniqueness and appointments by several injectable brands clearly implied that his injectable skills were superior to other doctors.

11. The Defendant had in our view fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, we find the Defendant guilty of misconduct in a professional respect as charged.

Sentencing

12. The Defendant has a clear disciplinary record.
13. We give credit to the Defendant for not contesting the charge at today's inquiry.
14. 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.
15. In June 2006, the Council advised that all future cases of practice promotion not allowed under the Code 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.
16. We have considered the Defendant's letter to the Council dated 20 January 2026 and the various character reference letters as submitted by him.
17. The Defendant has already removed all the offending statements from the LinkedIn Profile. The Defendant told us that he had since the incident reviewed the Code and he would take extra care in the future to ensure that his professional communications and dissemination of information comply with the Code. We are satisfied that the risk of re-offending is low.
18. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the disciplinary charge for which the Defendant is convicted and what we have heard and read in mitigation, we order that:-
 - (i) the Defendant's name be removed from the General Register for a period of 3 months; and
 - (ii) the operation of the removal order be suspended for a period of 9 months.

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