

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

---

DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY  
MEDICAL REGISTRATION ORDINANCE, CAP. 161

Defendant: Dr CHAN Ho Lam Eric (陳浩霖醫生) (Reg. No.: M18101)

Date of hearing: 22 October 2025 (Wednesday)

Present at the hearing

Council Members/Assessors: Prof. FOK Tai-fai, SBS, JP  
(Chairperson of the Inquiry Panel)  
Dr Pierre CHAN  
Dr HSU Yung-chak  
Ms LEE Yin-han, Yvonne  
Ms TONG Tin-fung

Legal Adviser: Mr Stanley NG

Government Counsel representing the Secretary: Miss Linda CHAN

The Defendant is present and he is not legally represented.

The Charges

1. The charges against the Defendant, Dr CHAN Ho Lam Eric, are:

*“The particulars of the information are that he, being a registered medical practitioner, was convicted at the Kowloon City Magistrates’ Courts on 25 October 2024 of:*

*(a) two counts of the offence of possession of a dangerous drug, which is an offence punishable with imprisonment, contrary to sections 8(1)(a) and (2) of the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance, Cap. 134, Laws of Hong Kong;*

- (b) *two counts of the offence of possession of apparatus fit and intended for the smoking or inhalation of dangerous drug, contrary to section 36 of the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance, Cap. 134, Laws of Hong Kong; and*
- (c) *the offence of possession of Part I Poison, contrary to sections 23, 33(1) and 34 of the Pharmacy and Poisons Ordinance, Cap. 138, Laws of Hong Kong.”*

#### **Facts of the case**

2. The name of the Defendant has been included in the General Register from 1 July 2016 to the present. His name has been included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of Obstetrics & Gynaecology since 19 May 2023.
3. At around 0105 hours on 26 March 2024, police conducted road block outside 8 Dundas Street, Yau Ma Tei and intercepted a taxi in which the Defendant and another male of surname LAU (“LAU”) were passengers. Upon search, LAU was found to be in possession of certain Part I poison (Exhibits 1-2). In a sling bag inside the Defendant’s rucksack, police found (i) a plastic bag containing 0.06g of a solid containing methamphetamine (Exhibit 3); (ii) a plastic bag containing 2.25g of a crystalline solid containing 2.24g of methamphetamine hydrochloride (a salt of methamphetamine) (Exhibit 4); and (iii) an “ICE” inhaling bottle and a glass tube (Exhibits 10-11). Both the Defendant and LAU were arrested.
4. Police then conducted search of a room at Harbour Grand Kowloon Hotel (“Hotel Room”), which was rented by the Defendant and occupied by both the Defendant and LAU. Police found in a safe therein the following items:
  - (i) a bag containing a plastic bag containing 9.9g of a crystalline solid containing 9.73g of methamphetamine hydrochloride (a salt of methamphetamine) (Exhibit 13);
  - (ii) a plastic bag containing 11.4g of a crystalline solid containing 11.3g of methamphetamine hydrochloride (a salt of methamphetamine) (Exhibit 14);

- (iii) a plastic bag containing 8 tablets containing a total of 1.35g of 3, 4 – methylenedioxymethamphetamine (being a compound structurally derived from N-alkyl- $\alpha$ -methylphenethylamine by substitution in the ring with an alkyl-enedioxy substituent) (“Ecstasy”) (Exhibit 15);
- (iv) four foilpacks containing a total of 16 tablets containing sildenafil, which is a Part I poison (Exhibit 16);
- (v) a paper bag containing three plastic bottles containing 155g of a liquid containing 153g of gamma-butyrolactone (“GBL”) (Exhibit 17); and
- (vi) an “ICE” inhaling bottle and three glass tubes (Exhibits 18-19).

5. During cautioned interviews, the Defendant admitted that:
  - (a) Exhibits 3-4 were for his own consumption;
  - (b) Exhibits 10-11 were used by him for inhaling drugs;
  - (c) Exhibit 16 was Viagra and for his own consumption;
  - (d) Exhibits 13-14 were for his own consumption; and
  - (e) Exhibits 18-19 seized from the Hotel Room were for inhaling “ICE”.
6. During cautioned video-recorded interviews, the Defendant, *inter alia*, stated that:
  - (a) he used Exhibits 10-11 to heat and inhale drugs found on him for stimulation;
  - (b) he had drug addiction for 3-4 years;
  - (c) he would use LAU’s dating app “Grindr” to purchase drugs from different drug dealers usually in the parks in person by cash;
  - (d) he last bought the drugs about two months ago;

- (e) he deleted the drug dealers' contact numbers or chat history;
- (f) the "ICE and "GBL were bought via "Grindr";
- (g) the Hotel Room was rented and used as his residence since September 2023;
- (h) there were five room cards kept by himself, his parents, LAU and one left in the Hotel Room;
- (i) the safe in the Hotel Room belonged to the hotel and was locked with a password which only he knew;
- (j) the drugs inside the safe were purchased through "Grindr" about two months ago at HK\$6,700; and
- (k) the drugs were purchased in cash and collected in park.

7. Government chemists confirmed that the drugs seized in the case as Dangerous Drugs and Part I poison.

8. Both the Defendant and LAU were charged. The Defendant was charged with the following five offences in Case No. KCCC 821/2024:

- (i) Possession of a dangerous drug, contrary to sections 8(1)(a) and (2) of the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance, Cap. 134 ("DDO") (Charge 2);
- (ii) Possession of apparatus fit and intended for the smoking or inhalation of dangerous drug, contrary to section 36 of DDO (Charge 3);
- (iii) Possession of a dangerous drug, contrary to sections 8(1)(a) and (2) of DDO (Charge 4);
- (iv) Possession of Part I Poison, contrary to sections 23, 33(1) and 34 of the Pharmacy and Poisons Ordinance, Cap. 138 (Charge 5); and
- (v) Possession of apparatus fit and intended for the smoking or inhalation of dangerous drug, contrary to section 36 of DDO (Charge 6).

9. On 25 October 2024, the Defendant was found guilty on his own plea of all five offences.
10. On 8 November 2024, the Defendant was sentenced to 2 months imprisonment for Charge 2, 2 months imprisonment for Charge 3, 10 months imprisonment for Charge 4, 1 month imprisonment for Charge 5, and 2 months imprisonment for Charge 6. Charges 2 to 3 to run concurrently. Charges 4 to 6 to run concurrently. 1 month of Charges 2 to 3 to run consecutively to the 10 months for Charges 4 to 6. There was a 1 month reduction for positive good character. The total terms of imprisonment was 10 months.
11. By letters of 28 October 2024 and 13 November 2024 from Messrs. Cheng & Co., Solicitors for the Defendant, the Defendant reported to the Medical Council his conviction and sentence.

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

12. There is no dispute that the aforesaid offences were and still are punishable with imprisonment. By virtue of section 21(1)(a) of the Medical Registration Ordinance, Cap. 161 (“MRO”), our disciplinary powers against the Defendant 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. Taking into consideration the Amended Brief Facts, Certificate of Trial and the Transcript in Case No. KCCC 821/2024, we are therefore entitled to treat the aforesaid convictions as conclusively proven against the Defendant.
15. Accordingly, we find the Defendant guilty of the disciplinary offences as charged.

## 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 these disciplinary proceedings. However, given that there is hardly any room for dispute in a disciplinary case involving criminal convictions, 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 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.
19. We have considered the Defendant's contribution to the community and the character reference letters as submitted. We take note of what the learned Magistrate said about the Defendant's positive good character.
20. The Defendant told us in mitigation that he no longer relies on dangerous drugs and the reason he committed the offences was because of stress at work.
21. It is stipulated in paragraph 27.2 of the Code of Professional Conduct (2022 Edition) that offences which may affect a doctor's fitness to practise (e.g. alcohol or drug related offences) will be of particular concern to the Council. We cannot accept that work stress was a valid reason for transgressing the law by purchasing and using dangerous drugs.
22. The offences committed by the Defendant in this case are of very serious nature. The quantity of dangerous drugs in question, particularly under Charge 4, was not of a small amount. According to the Amended Brief Facts in Case No. KCCC 821/2024, the Defendant told the police in cautioned video-recorded interviews that he had drug addiction for 3-4 years. The Defendant also said that he purchased dangerous drugs from different drug dealers. These are also factors we will take into account when assessing on the overall the Defendant's fitness to practice medicine.
23. 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. For the protection of the public, if the Defendant is allowed to practise medicine, we have to have assurance that he will not be under the influence of any dangerous drugs.

24. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the Defendant's case and what we have heard in mitigation, we make a global order in respect of charges (a), (b) and (c) that the name of the Defendant be removed from the General Register for a period of 6 months. We further order that the operation of the removal order shall be suspended for a period of 18 months on the following conditions, namely that:
  - (a) the Defendant shall at his own expense submit himself to be examined by a psychiatrist nominated by the Council thrice, at least every 6 months, during the suspension period;
  - (b) the examining psychiatrist shall be allowed full access to all treatment records kept on the Defendant, particularly on whether the Defendant has any dangerous drug addiction; and
  - (c) the examining psychiatrist shall report directly to the Chairman of the Council after the examining report is available and to report any irregularity or non-compliance directly to the Chairman of the Council.

### **Remark**

25. The name of the Defendant is included in the Specialist Register under the Specialty of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. It is for the Education and Accreditation Committee to consider whether any action should be taken in respect of his specialist registration.

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