

**STATUTORY COMMITTEE OF THE PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY OF
NORTHERN IRELAND**

In the matter of: Adam Micah Hanna (7132)

Location: The offices of the Pharmaceutical Society NI, 73 University Street, Belfast, BT7 1HL.

Date: 16 June 2026.

Committee: Mr Gary Potter KC (Chair), Mrs Allison Hume (Lay), Dr Briegeen Girvin (Registrant).

Persons Present and Capacity: Mr Adam Micah Hanna (Registrant), Mr Dennis Hamill - Barrister instructed by Ms Rachael McAdorey – Solicitor, Mr Jacob Patterson - Trainee Solicitor, (Registrant's Legal Representatives). Mr Jonpaul Shields - Barrister, instructed by the Society, Mr Ian Black (Case Presentation Lawyer), Ms Zulema Horner (Secretary) and Dr Jenny Millar (Secretary).

SERVICE

1. There were no issues about service.

PRELIMINARY LEGAL ARGUMENT

2. There was no preliminary legal argument.

BACKGROUND

3. The Committee reminded itself that this was a review hearing of the decision made at the principal hearing of 01 & 02 September 2025, which found the Registrant's fitness to practise to be currently impaired. In accordance with paragraph 7(2)(d) of Schedule 3 to the Pharmacy (Northern Ireland) Order 1976,

the Committee directed that the Registrant should be suspended from practice for a period of nine months.

4. The Committee reminded itself that on the 01 & 02 September 2025 the Registrant had faced the following allegations:

ALLEGATIONS

5. The particulars of the alleged misconduct from which it is alleged that impairment of fitness to practise arises are set out as follows, namely:

Misconduct:

- a. On various dates on and between 01 January 2024 and 15 March 2024, whilst employed as a pharmacist by McKenzie's Pharmacy, you unlawfully obtained for your own or another's use, prescription only medicine, without a valid prescription.
- b. On various dates on and between 01 January 2024 and 15 March 2024, whilst employed as a pharmacist by McKenzie's Pharmacy, having obtained for your own or another's use prescription only medicine, you made no record of any transaction undertaken.
- c. On various dates on and between 01 January 2024 and 15 March 2024, whilst employed as a pharmacist by McKenzie's Pharmacy, you abused your position as a pharmacist to unlawfully obtain medicinal products [REDACTED] [REDACTED] not available to the general public without a prescription.
- d. On one or more dates unknown between 01 January 2023 and 15 March 2024 you, a registered pharmacist, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- e. Between 01 January 2024 and 15 March 2024, you failed, either promptly or at all, to inform the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland of circumstances, known to you, that may have called into question your fitness to practise or had the potential to bring the profession into disrepute.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Convictions for Criminal Offences:

- g. On 08 October 2024, at the Magistrates' Court at Laganside, Belfast, you were convicted of the following offences:
- (i) On 14 March 2024, you unlawfully had in your possession, a controlled drug of Class C of Schedule 2 to the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, namely Pregabalin, in contravention of section 5(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, contrary to Section 5(2) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971;
 - (ii) On 14 March 2024, you unlawfully had in your possession, a controlled drug of Class C of Schedule 2 to the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, namely Diazepam, in contravention of section 5(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, contrary to Section 5(2) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971; and
 - (iii) Between 01 January 2024 and 15 March 2024, you stole medication of value belonging to Peter Rice, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969.

On 19 November 2024, you were sentenced and you received a Community Service Order with the Court ordering that you be required to perform unpaid work for 180 hours.

DECISION ON IMPAIRMENT

6. When dealing with this review, the committee had regard to the words of Blake J, who said in the case of *Abrahaem v GMC*:

“the review has to consider whether all the concerns raised in the original finding of impairment through misconduct have been sufficiently addressed to the Panel's satisfaction. In practical terms there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he or she has fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments.”

7. The Registrant has a persuasive burden at this hearing to demonstrate sufficient insight, and the achievement of sufficiently addressing past impairments. As Lord Wilson said in the case of *GPhC v Khan*:

“the focus of a review is upon the current fitness of the registrant to resume practice, judged in the light of what he has, or has not, achieved since the date of the suspension. The review committee will note the particular concerns articulated by the original committee and seek to discern what steps, if any, the registrant has taken to allay them during the period of his suspension. The original committee will have found that his fitness to practise was impaired. The review committee asks: does his fitness to practise remain impaired?”

8. As the Committee must consider current impairment, the Committee must look back to the original misconduct, look at what the Registrant has done since, consider evidence of insight and any remedial steps taken, and then consider whether, notwithstanding the misconduct, the Registrant's fitness to practise remains impaired. This was set out by Sales J in *Yeong v GMC*:

“It is a corollary of the test to be applied and of the principle that a FFTP is required to look forward rather than backward that a finding of misconduct in the past does not necessarily mean that there is impairment of fitness to practise - a point emphasised in *Cohen v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) at 63-64 (Silber J), and *Zygmunt*, at 31. In looking forward, the FFTP is required to take account of such matters as the insight of the practitioner into the source of his misconduct, any remedial steps which have been taken and the risk of recurrence of such misconduct. It is required to have

regard to evidence about these matters which has arisen since the alleged misconduct occurred: see Cohen, at 69 to 71, and Azzam v General Medical Council [2008] EWHC 2711 (Admin) at 44, 105 BMLR 142 (McCombe J).”

9. Referring back to the Committee’s decision on impairment at the principal hearing, the Committee summarised the nature of the Registrant’s behaviour giving rise to the allegations at paragraph 29. The Committee identified that the Registrant’s behaviour involved dishonesty, and that his dishonesty was linked to his position as a pharmacist. The Committee noted that the Registrant had been convicted of unlawful possession of Class C drugs, pregabalin, and diazepam.
10. At the principal hearing, the Committee considered the nature of the dishonesty and set out relevant factors at paragraph 53 of its decision.
11. In deciding that suspension was the most appropriate and proportionate sanction, at paragraph 57, the Committee noted that the Registrant had developed insight and had shown evidence of remedial steps. The Committee, however, did consider a suspension was required to highlight to the profession, and to the public, that the conduct of the Registrant was unacceptable and unbefitting of a member of the pharmacy profession.
12. At the Schedule of its decision, the Committee set out a number of recommendations that it expected the Registrant to abide by.
13. It was clear from the evidence put before this Committee undertaking a review that the Registrant had complied with the four recommended steps.
14. However, whilst the Committee now considered that the Registrant has shown demonstrable insight and has taken remedial steps insofar as he could in a case of dishonesty, the Committee considers that on public interest grounds, there should be a finding of current impairment.
15. The Committee also took into consideration that the Registrant through his counsel did not dispute that there should be a finding of impairment on public

interest grounds. This concession reinforced the Committee's view as to the level of insight that the Registrant now had into the seriousness of the allegations and the impact that they had on the profession and the public at large.

DECISION AS TO SANCTION

16. The Committee is grateful for the submissions on behalf of the Society, from Mr Shields and on behalf of the Registrant, from Mr Hamill.
17. The Committee has reviewed the Indicative Sanctions Guidance and reminded itself that its decision must be proportionate. The Committee acknowledges that the purpose of the sanction is not to be punitive, but to protect the public interest, and that the sanction it determines should impose no greater restriction on the Registrant than is absolutely necessary to achieve regulatory objectives.
18. The Committee is entitled to give greater weight to issues of public interest, and to the need to maintain public confidence in the profession, than to the consequences to the Registrant himself of the imposition of the appropriate Sanction.
19. The Committee has to take into consideration issues of protection of the public, maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the maintenance of proper standards of professional behaviour.
20. As is required, the Committee considered all the potential sanctions available to it, starting with the lowest potential sanction, to decide which was the most appropriate and proportionate sanction in the circumstances of this particular case.
21. The Committee considered both relevant mitigating and aggravating circumstances.
22. As to aggravating factors, at the principal hearing, the Committee took in to account:

- a. The Registrant's actions amounted to a pattern of behaviour over a period of time, having stolen medication on six to ten occasions over a period of approximately six weeks.
- b. His actions amounted to abuse of trust.
- c. His actions led to convictions for offences of dishonesty.

23. As to mitigating factors, at the principal hearing, the Committee took in to account:

- a. As we have said in our decision on impairment there is evidence of developing insight.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- c. The Registrant is a person of otherwise good character who gave truthful evidence to the Committee.
- d. He admitted his behaviour fairly quickly, cooperated with his former employer, the MRG, the Police, the Courts and the Society, by admitting the facts, admitting the criminal charges and the allegations.

At the review hearing the Committee received evidence that the Registrant had fully complied with the recommendations of the Committee set out in the Schedule to its principal decision. This was considered to be a relevant mitigating factor at this stage of the proceedings.

24. Addressing sanctions in ascending order, the Committee considered that taking no action, or giving a warning, will not be proportionate or in the public interest given the facts of this case.

25. At this review, the Committee received further written evidence from the Registrant, in particular, a detailed written reflective piece, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and testimonials from professional colleagues, who worked with him in his present employment, in special educational needs. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Based on the new evidence, the Committee considered that, the imposition of Conditions on his practice was the most appropriate sanction at this stage, and was one which was in the public interest, and would maintain confidence in the pharmacy profession, and maintain proper standards of behaviour. The Registrant has clearly made significant progress in terms of addressing concerns about insight and remediation since the principal hearing.

26. The Committee have decided to impose a Conditions order for a period of 18 months. The Conditions set out in the Schedule are workable, have a realistic chance of being met by the Registrant, and are capable of being verified by the Committee on completion of the period of Conditions. At the principal hearing, Conditions would not have been appropriate or proportionate for the reasons set out in our principal decision. However, since the imposition of the Suspension order, the Registrant has worked very hard to fully comply with the recommended steps that the Committee set out in the Schedule to its decision. This was a compelling point in the Registrant's favour at this review hearing in terms of assessing the most appropriate and proportionate sanction.
27. As to Suspension, the Committee does not consider that this would now be an appropriate or proportionate sanction, and was not necessary either in the public interest or to maintain public confidence in the profession. The Committee are reminded that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, and that the Committee must go no further than what is absolutely necessary to achieve its objectives of maintaining public confidence in the profession and maintaining proper standards of behaviour.
28. It follows from our decision as to sanction, that a sanction of removal would not be appropriate, nor proportionate, in the circumstances of this case.

COSTS

29. No costs application was made by the Society.

Gary Potter, KC

Chair of the Statutory Committee

18 June 2026

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. To notify the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland, before you take any position for which you must be registered, the details and hours you will work each week, and the contact details of your employer and or pharmacy owner.
2. To notify the following people in writing, in relation to any work (whether paid or unpaid) for which registration with the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland is required, of the restrictions imposed on your pharmacy practice:
 - a. All employers and contractors
 - b. Prospective employers or contractors
 - c. Agents acting on behalf of employers
 - d. Health and Social Care Trusts
 - e. Superintendent pharmacist
 - f. Responsible pharmacist
 - g. Line manager
 - h. Workplace supervisor.
3. To consent to the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland exchanging information with your employer, Health and Social Care Trusts or any other person or organisation for whom you provide services that require registration with the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland.
4. To inform the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland if you apply for work as a pharmacist/pharmacy technician outside of Northern Ireland.
5. To nominate a suitable pharmacist to act as your mentor. Such nomination shall be provided to the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland within four weeks from the date this order takes effect.
6. To maintain regular contact with your mentor within the period of these conditions.
7. To arrange for your mentor to write a report to the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland prior to the review hearing, to update on your progress and to confirm that meetings have taken place.

8. To consent to the mentor reporting any concerns/issues to the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland.
9. To identify the name and contact details of a Supervisor, who must be a pharmacist registered with the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland ("the Society"), 14 days prior to recommencing practice, with such person to be approved by the Society.
10. To place yourself and remain under the close supervision of this Supervisor at all times.
11. To arrange for your Supervisor to send a written report to the Society every 6 months after the recommencement of your practice, with a total of 3 written reports being provided within the 18-month period, with the third and final report from the Supervisor to be provided in advance of the review hearing.
12. Not to work as a Responsible Pharmacist, Superintendent Pharmacist or sole Practitioner during the period of these Conditions.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

16. To produce a further written reflective piece updating your reflections in advance of the review hearing.