

Hearing Information Sheet – Medical Practitioners Tribunal

On 15 November 2021 a Medical Practitioners Tribunal will consider the case of:

Medical Practitioner: Dr Adrian HARROP

GMC reference number: 7266505

Primary Medical Qualification: MB ChB 2012 University of Manchester

Area of incident: Online

The hearing will commence at 9.30 am at:

Medical Practitioners Tribunal Service (MPTS)

7th Floor, St James's Buildings, 79 Oxford Street, Manchester, M1 6FQ

The case has been listed for 15 days until 3 December 2021.

| | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Tribunal Members: | Mr Nicholas Flanagan | (Legally qualified) Chair |
| | Dr Vivek Sen | (Medical) |
| | Mr Gulzar Mufti | (Medical) |

Type of case: New case of impairment by reason of misconduct.

The allegation against the doctor, and the facts upon which it is based, is attached.

Consideration to be given to the exclusion of press and public

Please note that the tribunal may decide, under Rule 41(2) or (3) of the General Medical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2004, that the press and public be excluded from all or parts of the hearing.

Enquiries from members of the Public or Media:

If you require any further information please visit the MPTS website www.mpts-uk.org. All decisions are published online within 28 days of the conclusion of the hearing.

If you are a journalist and require up to date information regarding the allegation throughout the course of the hearing, please contact the MPTS press office at pressoffice@mpts-uk.org or on 0161 250 6868.

The attached information reflects the allegation as it stands at the point when this document was updated. The allegation may be amended as the hearing progresses and when the findings of fact are determined by the tribunal.

Dr Adrian Antony Harrop

GMC reference number: 7266505

That being registered under the Medical Act 1983 (as amended):

1. At all material times you were the user of a Twitter account in which you represented yourself as a doctor ('your Twitter account'), as set out in Schedule 1. **Admitted and found proved**
2. From 10 May 2018 – 23 November 2019 you inappropriately used your Twitter account to post tweets that were offensive and/or insulting and/ or inappropriate in nature, **item 10 of Schedule 2**
3. as set out in Schedule 2.

Admitted and found proved in respect of items 1- 9 of Schedule 2

Determined and found proved in respect of item 10 of Schedule 2

A

4. On 30 July 2018, you inappropriately used your Twitter account to post tweets to A in that you:
 - a. posted a tweet detailing A's full name; **Admitted and found proved**
 - b. posted the tweet at paragraph 3a with the intention of revealing A's identity, in the knowledge that A held an anonymous Twitter account; **Admitted and found proved**
 - c. continued to post tweets detailing A's full name after they had asked you to stop due to concerns for their safety; **Admitted and found proved**

- d. refused to delete your tweets detailing A's full name and job unless they deleted all their material from Twitter, including all their tweets and their profile. **Admitted and found proved**
- 5. Your actions at paragraph 3 above were:
 - a. motivated, in whole or in part, by your knowledge that A held different views to you on transgender issues; **Admitted and found proved**
 - b. intended to intimidate A. **Admitted and found proved**

B

- 6. On 29 January 2019, you inappropriately used your Twitter account to engage in a Twitter conversation with the user of the Twitter account detailed in Schedule 3 ('C'), where you referred to the:
 - a. place(s) where B works; **Admitted and found proved**
 - b. nature of the work B does; **Admitted and found proved**
 - c. fact and/ or perception amongst the Twitter community about the matter set out in Schedule 9; **Amended under Rule 17(6), Admitted and found proved**
 - d. area where B lives. **Admitted and found proved**
- 7. You posted the tweets referred to in paragraph 5 above in the knowledge of the:
 - a. place(s) where B works; **Admitted and found proved**
 - b. nature of the work B does; **Admitted and found proved**
 - c. area where B lives. **Admitted and found proved**
- 8. You posted some, or all, of the tweets, referred to in:
 - a. paragraph 5a above, with the whole or partial intention, of revealing to your followers the location of B's work; **Not proved**
 - b. paragraph 5b above, with the whole or partial intention, of revealing to your followers the nature of the work B does; **Not proved**
 - c. paragraph 5d above, with the whole or partial intention, of revealing to your followers the area where B lives. **Not proved**

9. Your actions at paragraphs 5 to 7 above were:
- a. motivated in whole or in part, by your knowledge that B held different views to you on transgender issues; **Admitted and found proved**
 - b. intended to intimidate B. **Not proved**
- D
10. On 9 August 2019, you used your Twitter account to inappropriately publish a tweet that inferred D was suffering symptoms of a medical condition, the details of which are set out in Schedule 4. **Admitted and found proved**
11. You published the tweet at paragraph 9 above in the knowledge that:
- a. D was not your patient; **Admitted and found proved**
 - b. you had not examined D in person; **Admitted and found proved**
 - c. you had not obtained a medical history regarding D; **Admitted and found proved**
 - d. you had never treated D in a clinical capacity; **Admitted and found proved**
 - e. the tweet was being posted in a public forum. **Admitted and found proved**
12. Your actions at paragraphs 9 and 10 above were motivated, in whole or in part, by your knowledge that D held different views to you on transgender issues. **Admitted and found proved**
13. On 29 September 2020, you used your Twitter account to publish a tweet about the conduct of D, the details of which are set out in Schedule 5, in which you inappropriately stated that 'It is time that this was brought to an end, by whatever means necessary.' **Admitted and found proved**
14. Your actions at paragraph 12 above were:
- a. motivated, in whole or in part, by your knowledge that D held different views to you on transgender issues; **Admitted and found proved**
 - b. intended to intimidate D. **Not proved**

E

15. During the period from 21 March 2019 – 30 ~~April 2019~~ June 2020, you inappropriately used Twitter in that: **Amended under Rule 17(6)**
- a. on 21 March 2019, you engaged in a conversation about E with C as set out at Paragraphs 3-5 of Schedule 6 that was inappropriate in that, you:
 - i. made reference to the fact and/or perception amongst the Twitter community of the matter set out in Schedule 9; **Amended under Rule 17(6), Admitted and found proved**
 - ii. knowingly made reference to visiting a Golf Club located in the same area where E lives; **Admitted and found proved**
 - b. on 25 March 2019, you retweeted a tweet, the details of which are set out in Paragraph 34 of Schedule 6; **Admitted and found proved**
 - c. on 1 April 2019, you posted a number of tweets discussing E's health, as set out in Schedule 7; **Admitted and found proved**
 - d. you posted the tweets referred to at paragraph 14c above, and as set out in Schedule 7, when you knew:
 - i. you were discussing E's health; **Admitted and found proved**
 - ii. E was not your patient; **Admitted and found proved**
 - iii. you had not seen E in person; **Admitted and found proved**
 - iv. you had never treated E in a clinical capacity; **Admitted and found proved**
 - v. the tweets were in a public forum; **Admitted and found proved**
 - ~~e. on or around 3 April 2019, you posted two tweets in which you referred to another person and/or Twitter user, the details of which are set out in Schedule 8, which was a reference to E; **Withdrawn under Rule 17(6)**~~
 - f. on 30 April 2019, you posted a tweet, as set out at Paragraph 22 of Schedule 6, when you:
 - i. sought to discourage other persons from contributing to E's crowdfund for her legal defence in respect of the injunction application made against her by C, by referring to the threat of third-party costs; **Not proved**

- ii. knew you were a witness in support of C's case in the injunction application; **Not proved**
 - iii. knew, or ought to have known, you were insufficiently qualified to advise others regarding costs orders in legal proceedings; **Not proved**
- g. you:
- i. posted ~~a significant number of~~ at least 38 tweets referring directly or indirectly to E, and/or her family ~~and/or her employer~~, as set out in Schedule 6; **Amended under Rule 17(6), Not proved**
 - ii. continued to post such tweets to E despite her requesting you to stop in a tweet dated 10 April 2019. **Not proved**

16. Your actions at paragraphs 14 above were:

- a. motivated, in whole or in part, by your knowledge that E held different views to you on transgender issues; **Admitted and found proved**
- b. intended to intimidate E. **Not proved**
- c. carried out as part of a campaign of cyber bullying against E. **Not proved**

And that by reason of the matters set out above your fitness to practise is impaired because of your misconduct. **To be determined**