

Report of the Professional Conduct Committee (“the PCC or the Committee”) to the Council of the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland in relation to a complaint made pursuant to Part 6 of the Pharmacy Act 2007 (“the Act”).

Registered Pharmacist: Ms Martina Geraghty MPSI

Dated: 12th November 2025

Introduction - Summary Details

Registered Pharmacist:	Ms Martina Geraghty MPSI
Pharmacist Registration Number:	5903
Complaint Reference:	625.2021
Date of Inquiry:	23 September 2025
Public/Private Hearing:	Public
Meeting Format:	PSI House, Fenian Street, Dublin 2
Members of Committee:	Mr Mark Kane - Chair Dr Conor McCrystal MPSI Ms Valerie Beatty
Legal Assessor:	Ms Lorna Lynch S.C
Appearances:	
For the Registrar:	Mr Eoghan O'Sullivan, B.L Ms Dena Keane, Fieldfisher LLP
For the Registrant:	Ms Maria Dillon, Horan & Company Solicitors
Registrant in attendance:	Yes
Witnesses:	Mr Shane McGlynn, Authorised Officer, PSI Mr. Keith O'Hourihane MPSI, expert witness on behalf of Registrar.
Other Attendees:	Mr Noel Stenson Mr James Geraghty
Stenography services	Deirdre O'Malley
In Attendance from the PSI:	Ciaran Lyng, Solicitor, PSI Clara O'Reilly, Regulatory Executive, PSI

1. Subject Matter of the Complaint and Proceedings

This matter concerns a complaint of the Registrar of the PSI dated 21 April 2021 in respect of Ms Martina Geraghty, MPSI (Registration number 5903). The complaint was referred by the Preliminary Proceedings Committee ('PCC') on 9 September 2021 to this Committee on the grounds, including, of professional misconduct and/or poor professional performance within the meaning of Section 35(1)(a) and 35(1)(b) of the Pharmacy Act 2007, respectively.

2. Preliminary application in private

[REDACTED]

3. Allegations

The allegations against the Registrant as set out in the Notice of Inquiry dated 14 April 2025 are:

That you, while you were a Registered Pharmacist at Ballaghaderreen Pharmacy Limited trading as Molloy's Lifestyle Pharmacy and Healthstore, New Street, Ballaghaderreen, County Roscommon (PSI registration no. 6590 and CRO no. 414896) (hereinafter referred to as the "**Pharmacy**"):

1. On or about 05 March 2020, caused and/or permitted the Pharmacy to be open to the public and/or operated in the absence of a Registered Pharmacist to supervise the sale and/or supply of medicinal products, contrary to the Pharmacy's Standard Operating Procedures; *and/or*
2. On or about 05 March 2020, caused and/or permitted the medicinal products referred to in **Appendix A** to be sold and/or supplied from the Pharmacy otherwise than under the personal supervision of a Registered Pharmacist; *and/or*

3. Such further or other allegations as may be identified to you in advance of the Inquiry.

AND FURTHER by reason of one or more of the allegations set out at 1 and/or 2 above, either individually and/or cumulatively and/or in combination, you are guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous and/or disgraceful in a professional respect; *and/or*
- ii. Is in breach of Principles 1 and/or 2 and/or 5 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2019.

AND FURTHER by reason of one or more of the allegations set out at 1 and/or 2 above, either individually and/or cumulatively and/or in combination, you are guilty of poor professional performance in that you failed to meet the standards of competence that may be reasonably expected of a Registered Pharmacist.

AND TAKE NOTICE that the nature of the evidence proposed to be considered at the Inquiry and the names of the witnesses whom it is the intention of the Registrar to request to be in attendance at the Inquiry for the purpose of giving evidence are to be found in the document which is attached to this Notice of Inquiry.

AND TAKE NOTICE that you, or any other person representing you, will be given an opportunity of being present at the Inquiry, of being heard and of calling evidence.

If you do not attend or are not represented, the Inquiry may proceed in your absence.

AND TAKE NOTICE that the Professional Conduct Committee shall have the power to award and authorise the recovery of costs.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE that, following the Inquiry and Report by the Professional Conduct Committee, pursuant to section 48 of the Act, the Council shall, if the Committee finds that the Complaint is substantiated, impose one or more of the following disciplinary sanctions on you:-

1. An admonishment or censure.
2. The attachment of conditions to your registration, which may include restrictions on practice.
3. The suspension of your registration for a specified period.
4. The cancellation of your registration.
5. A prohibition for a specified period on applying for restoration to the Register.

4. Evidence

Mr O’Sullivan BL opened the case and referred to Ms Geraghty’s registration as a pharmacist since 1996 and stated that she is also a director and shareholder of Ballaghaderreen Pharmacy trading as Molloy’s Lifestyle Pharmacy and Healthstore (“the Pharmacy”). Mr O’Sullivan confirmed that Ms Geraghty was not the supervising or superintendent pharmacist of the Pharmacy at the time of the relevant events. Mr O’Sullivan referred to a call to the PSI from a member of the public on 5 March 2020 reporting that the Pharmacy was open without a pharmacist being present. He outlined further contact by authorised officers of the PSI with the Pharmacy that day and requests to speak to the pharmacist on duty. Mr O’Sullivan referred to the subsequent attendance by PSI authorised officers at the Pharmacy on 9 March 2020 and provided an overview of the authorised officers report recording evidence by staff members, details of till reports and the prescription register. Mr O’Sullivan set out the medicinal products that were supplied on the relevant day and after Ms Geraghty had left the Pharmacy. Mr O’Sullivan referred to the steps taken by the Pharmacy after the events on 9 March 2020 including reviewing documents and the relevant SOPs and contacting patients. Mr O’Sullivan referred to the response submitted on behalf of Ms Geraghty setting out her qualifications and explanation for what happened on the day and certain admissions made by her regarding the relevant events. Her response also refers to a critical event analysis, a review of all SOPs and further training and implementation. Mr O’Sullivan opened the letter from Ms Dillon on behalf of Ms Geraghty agreeing documentation, witness statements and setting out admissions on behalf of Ms Geraghty.

Mr Shane McGlynn, authorised officer with the PSI gave oral evidence. He referred to the call to the PSI on 5 March 2020 about the Pharmacy being open without a pharmacist present and the PSI’s subsequent telephone contact with the Pharmacy and unsuccessful attempts to speak with the pharmacist on duty. Mr McGlynn referred to the unannounced attendance at the Pharmacy by authorised officers on 9 March 2020. He stated that the superintendent and supervising pharmacist were present and it was confirmed that the Pharmacy had been opened on 5 March 2020 without a pharmacist being present. He referred to the examination of the till record and the prescription register particularly concerning the sale and supply of medicinal products after Ms Geraghty had left the Pharmacy. Mr McGlynn discussed prescription only medicines and pharmacy only medicines, which are only available for supply from a pharmacy under the supervision of a pharmacist. Mr McGlynn gave evidence of the particular medicinal

products which were supplied on 5 March 2020 between 5pm and 6pm when no pharmacist was present in the Pharmacy and he referred to the product characteristics of some of the medicines involved.

Mr McGlynn referred to the SOPs in place in the Pharmacy to govern situations where a pharmacist is not present in a pharmacy and what should occur in those circumstances. He referred to correspondence issued by the PSI to Ms Collins, the superintendent pharmacist, and undertakings sought regarding the sale and supply of medicinal products together with details of measures taken since the relevant event. Mr McGlynn confirmed that the undertakings sought were provided and a critical event analysis report by Mr Noel Stenson was submitted on behalf of the Pharmacy. Mr McGlynn referred to his subsequent attendance at the Pharmacy on 7 April 2021 and stated that broadly speaking, everything was satisfactory. He referred to follow up on unrelated matters.

On cross examination, Ms Dillon referred Mr McGlynn to page 65 of the Core book which recorded 38 items supplied through the till report on 5 March 2020 and which were not medicinal products. Mr McGlynn agreed that all documentation requested by the PSI was supplied by the Pharmacy. Mr McGlynn agreed that it was not unusual for a pharmacy technician to prepare a prescription for collection the next day or that a prescription for a patient on phased medication would be collected the next day but he stated that this was required to be under the supervision of a registered pharmacist. Mr McGlynn agreed that there had been complete co-operation with the PSI from staff members of the Pharmacy.

Mr Keith O'Hourihane gave expert evidence on behalf of the Registrar. He referred to his qualifications and experience and the report he had prepared for the Inquiry. Mr O'Hourihane referred to allegation 1 and outlined his opinion as to professional misconduct. He referred to the requirement for a pharmacist being present on the premises both in respect of supplying medicine and providing health advice to customers. He stated that when emergencies occur, the Pharmacy should be closed to the public and efforts made to arrange for patients to be supplied elsewhere. Mr O'Hourihane stated that leaving a pharmacy open to the public with medication supplied to patients without the presence of a registered pharmacist is a serious matter. Mr O'Hourihane confirmed that the SOPs in place in the Pharmacy at the relevant time were standard SOPs. He outlined his opinion that allegation 1 amounted to conduct that was infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect because it was completely contrary to the basic standard expected of a registered pharmacist. He stated that it was an absolute given that

a pharmacist must be present in a pharmacy. Mr O’Hourihane outlined his opinion that the conduct was in breach of Principle 1, 2 and 5 of the Code of Conduct in place at the relevant time. He set out his opinion that allegation 1 amounted to poor professional performance and gave evidence as to what should have happened.

Mr O’Hourihane addressed allegation 2 and stated that his opinion was the failings at issue were similar and he gave his opinion that the allegation amounted to poor professional performance and that it amounted to professional misconduct as conduct that was infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect. When asked if his opinion about whether the conduct was in breach of Principle 1, 2 and 5 of the Code of Conduct was any different to his opinion in respect of allegation 1, Mr O’Hourihane replied “no”.

After the direct evidence and cross examination of the expert witness, Mr O’Sullivan referred to witness statements contained in the Core Book (Exhibit 1) and an additional witness statement which was admitted as Exhibit 2. That concluded the case on behalf of the Registrar.

Ms Dillon on behalf of Ms Geraghty referred to the Independent Event Analysis Report dated 25 January 2021 by Mr Noel Stenson. She referred to conclusions and summary and asked the Committee to have regard to the contents of the report. She referred to the conclusion that the Pharmacy team and the superintendent pharmacist had completed a comprehensive and robust review of patient safety issues that may have arisen from the lack of professional cover at the relevant time. She also referred to Mr Stenson’s conclusion that the Pharmacy team had an understanding of the failures in the SOP and introduced a new SOP and he highlighted the training offered.

5. Submissions on the question of an undertaking pursuant to Section 46

The Committee considered an application made by Ms Dillon on behalf of Ms Geraghty that the matter be dealt with by way of undertaking pursuant to section 46 of the Pharmacy Act 2007. Ms Dillon stated that offering an undertaking was prefaced on the basis that Ms Geraghty acknowledged and accepted that the Registrar was taking a very serious view of the conduct and that the conduct at issue is a serious matter. Ms Dillon outlined the terms of the undertaking that was being offered on behalf of Ms Geraghty as set out in correspondence in the Core Book at p489. Ms Dillon referred to the passage of time since the relevant events which she referred to as an isolated aberration. Ms Dillon submitted that an undertaking could meet the circumstances of the case.

Mr O’Sullivan stated that the Registrar was not supportive of the matter being dealt with by undertaking. He referred to the allegations as being extremely serious and that the legislature decided that it was necessary to place strict limitations on sale and supply of medicinal products. He stated that the reason for strict controls is self evident and many items for sale need to be strictly controlled in order to protect the public. Mr O’Sullivan referred to a pharmacist being placed in a vital role in that context and they are the gatekeeper between members of the public seeking medicine and it being provided to the public. He stated that a pharmacist must be available to assess a prescription, and other staff members are not qualified pharmacists. Mr O’Sullivan referred to the SOPs in place and the heavy onus on Ms Geraghty to close the Pharmacy and that is what should have occurred. He submitted that even if an emergency situation arose, the proper step was to close the Pharmacy and he noted that the applicable SOP was drafted by Ms Geraghty. Mr O’Sullivan concluded by stating that the seriousness would not be appropriately marked and it was not an appropriate message to the public or the profession if the matter was dealt with by way of undertaking.

Legal advice on undertaking

Ms Lynch advised the Committee that it could deal with the matter by way of an undertaking if they decided it was an appropriate way to proceed. Ms Lynch stated that Ms Dillon had indicated the terms of the proposed undertaking and the Registrar was not supportive of the application but it was a matter for the Committee to determine. Ms Lynch advised the Committee that it had to consider whether they have sufficient information to consider dealing with the matter by way of an undertaking. If so, the Committee had to determine whether an undertaking was appropriate in the circumstances and the Committee’s consideration should take account of a number of matters to include protection of the public and the circumstances of the case.

Committee decision on undertaking

The Committee decided that it had sufficient information and evidence to assess the appropriateness of an undertaking. The Committee noted the admissions and the comprehensive terms of the undertaking offered on behalf of the Registrant but in light of the seriousness of the conduct involved and the obligations on a pharmacist in such circumstances, the Committee decided that it was not an appropriate case to deal with by way of an undertaking.

6. Closing Submissions

The Registrar's submissions:

Mr O'Sullivan referred to the role of the Committee and the applicable burden and standard of proof. He referred to the conduct at issue as being very serious. He referred to the limitation on the supply of medications for good reason to protect the public from the risk of harm. He referred to the importance of the role of the pharmacist as being a professional person who is entrusted to act as the gatekeeper and the importance of the pharmacist bringing their independent professional judgment to bear in assessing whether it is appropriate to make a supply of medication or not. Mr O'Sullivan referred to the conscious and deliberate decision on the part of the only pharmacist on duty in the Pharmacy to absent herself from the Pharmacy. He stated that what was required was to ensure that there was no risk of harm to the public and that was to close the Pharmacy. He stated that Ms Geraghty's actions created a risk to the public and it put staff who remained on the premises and who were not pharmacists in an invidious situation.

Mr O'Sullivan referred to the SOPs that were in place in the time and indicated the Committee would have an opportunity to consider the SOPs in detail. He stated that there were two relevant SOPs in place at the time and the description of what was to occur was perfectly clear and it did not happen in this case.

Mr O'Sullivan stated that in relation to professional misconduct, there was an admission in relation to a breach of Principle 1 and Principle 5 of the Code. He stated there was a dispute in relation to a breach of Principle 2 and the Committee had heard Mr O'Hourihane's evidence. Mr O'Sullivan referred to the Code and stated that in his submission, the voluntary choosing to absent herself from the Pharmacy and not taking measures to ensure that no supplies were made in her absence, meant that Ms Geraghty had not acted in accordance with Principle 2.

Mr O'Sullivan stated that the second issue in dispute was concerning the allegations against Ms Geraghty in relation to the other limb of professional misconduct, which is infamous and/or disgraceful conduct in a professional respect. Mr O'Sullivan submitted that what is required in order to make a finding under the heading of infamous and/or disgraceful conduct is a serious departure from what you would expect of a pharmacist, such that it has the potential at the very least to bring the profession into disrepute. Mr O'Sullivan referred to the allegations of poor professional performance, which involved a serious want of competence. Mr O'Sullivan

referred to the deliberate and conscious conduct on the part of Ms Geraghty, which was fundamentally incompatible with an SOP that had been authored by her, and that he suggested to the Committee that she had acted in a way that called her competence into serious question.

Submissions on behalf of the Registrar in respect of Sanction:

Mr O'Sullivan referred to the Sanctions Guidance and the objective was first and foremost the protection of the public. He referred to the Committee being conscious of the need to send a message to Ms Geraghty and to the profession more broadly as to how conduct, such as that at issue, is viewed. He referred to the importance of promoting public confidence in the profession, including its regulation and the need to be no more severe than is necessary in order to meet the various appropriate objectives.

Mr O'Sullivan referred to the sanctions available and stated that the Registrar's view was that the conduct was at the upper end of professional misconduct given the dereliction of duty involved. He stated that were it not for the admissions, the insight, the passage of time and the relatively short period of time that the Pharmacy was open without Ms Geraghty present, the Registrar would be advocating for a suspension. He stated that when it comes to public protection going forward, he was submitting that the Committee should give very firm consideration to the attachment of conditions to Ms Geraghty's registration.

Closing submissions on behalf of the Registrant:

Ms Dillon reiterated and re-emphasised that this matter concerned an isolated incident and was one lapse, albeit a serious lapse, of professional judgment. She stated that there was no systematic or pattern of conduct that had been demonstrated which could cause the Committee to have concern about the current behaviour of Ms Geraghty or her behaviour since the incident. She stated that when the Authorised Officers arrived at the Pharmacy on 9 March 2020 that they were met with full cooperation and candour. Ms Dillon emphasised that the medications being considered by the Committee were pharmacy only and prescription only medications and that there were no controlled drugs dispensed on 5 March 2020.

In considering Principle 2 of the Code of Conduct, Ms Dillon submitted that consideration must be given to the context and the fact that 5 and a half years have passed and that Ms Geraghty had continued to provide community services in retail pharmacy. Ms Dillon referred to professional misconduct in the form of infamous and disgraceful behaviour and she noted that

while the particular incident on 5 March 2020 was a serious departure from professional practice, it did not form part of a pattern of conduct or systemic behaviour or demonstrate repeated behaviour. In addressing poor professional performance in the context of a serious want of competence, Ms Dillon stated that the Registrar had a suite of measures available if Ms Geraghty had a serious want in her competence during the last 5 and a half years, but there had been no steps to call into question her professional standing, registration or competence. Ms Dillon referred to the extent of the admissions that were made, including admissions in communication with the PPC and full cooperation since that date. Ms Dillon referred to the personal and professional toll on Ms Geraghty and noted that it had taken a very considerable period of time for the matters to come before the Committee.

Submissions on Sanction:

Ms Dillon stated the period of delay was a factor that should be taken into account in considering the appropriate sanction and whether a sanction was going to extend the length of the process. Ms Dillon referred to the Committee's consideration to sanctions starting at the lesser sanction before seeking to impose a punitive sanction against Ms Geraghty. Ms Dillon submitted that it was not necessary to make an example of Ms Geraghty and that this would not instil morale or promote confidence amongst the registered pharmacist profession.

7. Legal Assessor's Advice

Ms Lynch provided advice to the Committee as to what findings were open to it. She advised the Committee that the burden is on the Registrar to prove the matter as set out in the Notice of Inquiry, both as to fact and as to professional misconduct and poor professional performance to the criminal standard of proof. Ms Lynch advised the Committee that there were full admissions as to the facts underpinning the allegations and she advised the Committee that they were entitled to rely on those admissions which had been given in a voluntary manner and with the benefit of legal advice. Ms Lynch advised the Committee that in considering professional misconduct or poor professional performance, a threshold of seriousness must be met. Ms Lynch advised the Committee that they were limited to the allegations as set out in the Notice of Inquiry.

In terms of professional misconduct, Ms Lynch advised the Committee that there were admissions on the part of Ms Geraghty in terms of a breach of the Code under Principles 1 and 5 and the Committee was entitled to rely on those admissions. Ms Lynch advised the

Committee that it was a matter for them to decide whether a breach of the Code in relation to Principle 2 had been proven beyond a reasonable doubt having regard to the evidence. Ms Lynch noted that there were no admissions in relation to professional misconduct under the infamous and/or disgraceful limb, but that Mr O'Sullivan had submitted that a finding could be made in that regard. Ms Lynch advised the Committee that they were free to disagree with the opinion of the expert, but if they did so, they must provide reasons. Ms Lynch advised the Committee as to the definition of poor professional performance and that there were no admissions in this regard on behalf of the Registrant. She noted that again Mr O'Sullivan had submitted that it was open to the Committee to make findings in that regard.

On the question of sanction, Ms Lynch advised the Committee that they were in a position to make a recommendation as to sanction and that the final decision maker in terms of sanction is the Council. She advised the Committee to have regard to the submissions and the Sanction Guidance Document and the Committee must decide itself what is the appropriate recommendation. In addressing the relevant legal principles, Ms Lynch referred to the issue of public protection and the factors that must be borne in mind by the Committee. Ms Lynch advised the Committee that it was necessary to impose a proportionate sanction that went no further than necessary and to be as lenient as possible in the particular circumstances to the Registrant. She advised the Committee that the purpose of a sanction is not to punish a Registrant, but that there may be a punitive effect. Ms Lynch advised the Committee to have regard to the appropriate aggravating and mitigating circumstances. In approaching the question of sanction, Ms Lynch advised the Committee to start with the lowest possible sanction and to consider whether it was an appropriate and proportionate sanction in all the circumstances. She advised that it was only if the answer to that question is no, that the Committee should move on to consider the next most serious sanction.

8. Decision of the Committee

Allegation 1

Finding as to fact

The Committee found allegation 1 proven as to fact beyond a reasonable doubt. The Committee relied upon the admissions on behalf of the Registrant and had regard to the authorised officer's report and the oral evidence by the authorised officer.

Findings as to professional misconduct

The Committee found allegation 1 proven as to professional misconduct beyond a reasonable doubt in a manner that is a breach of principles 1, 2 and 5 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists. The Committee relied upon the admissions on behalf of the Registrant in respect of the breach of principles 1 and 5. The Committee relied upon the expert evidence and was satisfied that the allegation as proven engaged principle 2 of the Code and amounted to a failure to ensure public trust and confidence in the pharmacy profession.

The Committee found allegation 1 proven as to professional misconduct beyond a reasonable doubt in a manner that is disgraceful in a professional respect. The Committee relied upon the expert evidence by Mr O’Hourihane and was satisfied that the conduct was clearly contrary to what would be acceptable conduct on the part of a registered pharmacist.

Finding as to poor professional performance

The Committee found allegation 1 proven as to poor professional performance beyond a reasonable doubt. The Committee relied upon the expert evidence by Mr O’Hourihane and was satisfied that the action by Ms Geraghty did not meet the standards of competence that may be reasonably expected of a registered pharmacist.

Allegation 2

Finding as to fact

The Committee found allegation 2 proven as to fact beyond a reasonable doubt. The Committee relied upon the admissions on behalf of the Registrant, the authorised officer’s report and the oral evidence by the authorised officer.

Findings as to professional misconduct

The Committee found allegation 2 proven as to professional misconduct beyond a reasonable doubt in a manner that is a breach of principles 1, 2 and 5 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists. The Committee relied upon the admissions on behalf of the Registrant in respect of the breach of principles 1 and 5. The Committee relied upon the expert evidence and was satisfied that the allegation as proven engaged principle 2 of the Code and amounted to a failure to ensure public trust and confidence in the pharmacy profession.

The Committee found allegation 2 proven as to professional misconduct beyond a reasonable doubt in a manner that is disgraceful in a professional respect. The Committee relied upon the expert evidence by Mr O’Hourihane and was satisfied that the conduct was clearly contrary to what would be acceptable conduct on the part of a registered pharmacist.

Finding as to poor professional performance

The Committee found allegation 1 proven as to poor professional performance beyond a reasonable doubt. The Committee relied upon the expert evidence by Mr O’Hourihane and was satisfied that the action by Ms Geraghty did not meet the standards of competence that may be reasonably expected of a registered pharmacist.

9. Committee Recommendations on Sanction

The Committee considered the findings against the Registrant and the seriousness of the findings. The Committee was of the view that there were a number of aggravating factors present in the case. The Committee noted the Registrant's position within the Pharmacy, which was that of a pharmacy owner, although she was not at the relevant time either a superintendent or supervising pharmacist. The Committee was of the view that the nature of the conduct was connected to the fundamental obligations of a pharmacist.

The Committee carefully considered the mitigating factors, including the extent and timing of the admissions made by the Registrant and the insight shown by her. The Committee had regard to the fact that the Registrant enjoyed an unblemished career prior to the matters giving rise to the Inquiry and had continued to practice for a period of in excess of five years since that date without coming to the attention of the Regulator. The Committee noted that the conduct at issue was not part of a pattern of conduct and constituted a single isolated incident. The Committee noted the Registrant's reference to personal circumstances to explain her absence, but the Committee was of the view that this was not a significant mitigating factor. While the Committee noted that there was no harm caused to any patient or customer of the Pharmacy, the Committee was still of the view that the conduct at issue was extremely serious. The Committee had regard to the significant passage of time since the events at issue and the matter proceeding to a full Inquiry.

In considering the question of sanction, the Committee was of the view that the sanction of admonishment would not adequately reflect the seriousness of the findings, the factual circumstances and the importance of protecting the public. The Committee was of the view that the sanction of censure was appropriate but the Committee went on to consider whether the sanction of censure alone was sufficient to protect the public.

The Committee carefully considered the question of conditional registration. The Committee considered the Registrar's submissions that there should be conditions attached to Ms Geraghty's registration and the reference to a clinical audit at six monthly intervals with a report prepared by an expert suitable to the PSI being provided.

The Committee was of the view that a number of factors mitigated against the imposition of conditional registration in the circumstances. In particular, the Committee noted the passage of time since the incident giving rise to the allegations and the fact that the Registrant has continued to practise in community pharmacy for a period in excess of five years since the events without complaint. Overall the Committee was satisfied that the Registrant is a safe and competent pharmacist. The Committee could not identify conditions that could usefully or properly be said to be required to protect the public.

The Committee decided to recommend to Council that the sanction of censure be imposed on the Registrant.

SIGNED:



Mark Kane, Chairperson

DATE:

12th November 2025