

IN THE MATTER OF THE PHARMACY ACT 2007, AS AMENDED

AND

IN THE MATTER OF AN INQUIRY PURSUANT TO PART 6

IN RESPECT OF

Mr. John Corr MPSI

with Registration Number 5616

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Dated: 1st May 2025



Table of Contents

Introduction and Summary Details	3
Subject Matter of the Complaint and Proceedings	6
Preamble to Inquiry	6
Allegations	6
Applications	10
Evidence & Submissions	11
Legal Assessor's Advice	11
Standard and Burden of Proof	12
Decision of the Committee	13
Recommendation as to Sanction	66

Introduction and Summary Details

Introduction:

This is the Report of the Professional Conduct Committee (the “Committee”) to the Council of the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland (the “PSI”) following an Inquiry held pursuant to Part 6 of the Pharmacy Act 2007, as amended (the “Act”).

Registered pharmacist:	Mr. John Corr MPSI
Pharmacist Registration Number:	5616
Complaint Reference(s):	597.2021
Date of Application:	24 th March 2025 & 1 st April 2025
Public/Private Hearing:	Public
Meeting Format:	24 th March 2025: PSI House, Fenian Street, D2 1 st April 2025: MS Teams Video Conferencing
Members of Committee:	Mr. Mark Kane, Chair, non-pharmacist Dr. Sabine Eggers, MPSI Ms. Valerie Beatty, non-pharmacist
Legal Assessor:	Mr. Nicholas Butler SC

Appearances:

For the Registrar: Mr. Hugh McDowell, BL

Instructed by Ms. Dena Keane, Fieldfisher LLP

For the Registrant: None in attendance

Registrant in attendance: No

Solicitor on Record for the Registrant: Susan Martin of Martin Solicitors

Other Attendees: Ms. Deirdre O'Malley of D. O'Malley Stenography

In Attendance from the PSI: Mr. Ciaran Lyng, Solicitor, PSI

Ms. Clara O Reilly, Regulatory Executive, PSI

Witnesses Heard:

- [REDACTED] Registrant and Customer Relations Manager of the PSI.
- [REDACTED] former Head of Pharmacy Function in the Primary Care Reimbursement Service section of the HSE.
- [REDACTED] former employee of Corr's Pharmacy Group and former Supervising Pharmacist in the Mell Pharmacy.
- [REDACTED] Authorised Officer of the PSI.

Primary Documentation and Material Considered:

- PSI Professional Conduct Committee Procedures.
- Core Book.
- Affidavit of Ms Keane (Service Sworn) dated 20th March 2025 with Exhibits.
- Email of Ms Keane timed 20th March 2025 @ 18:34 with attachments.
- Final Amended Notice of Inquiry RE Mr John Corr MPSI.
- Transcript – Day 1.
- PSI Sanctions Guidance.
- Transcript – Day 2.

Subject Matter of the Complaint and Proceedings

Preamble to Inquiry

The Complaint was made and submitted by the Registrar of the PSI (the "Complainant") on 11th January 2021 in respect of John Corr, MPSI registered No. 5616, and was referred to the Preliminary Proceedings Committee of the PSI ('PPC').

The PPC on the 27th May 2021, having considered all information furnished to it in relation to the complaint of the Complainant, pursuant to Part 6 of the Act, did advise the Council of the PSI that there was sufficient cause to warrant further action being taken against Mr. Corr on the ground of professional misconduct within the meaning of Section 35(1)(a) of the Act.

The complaint was referred to this Committee on the grounds of professional misconduct as set out in Section 35(1)(a) of the Pharmacy Act 2007.

Allegations

The allegations against Mr. Corr are set out in the Notice of Intention to Hold an Inquiry dated 8th November 2024, and the relevant part is recited as:

That you, whilst you were a Registered Pharmacist and/or Supervising Pharmacist at Life Pharmacy Mell, Upper Mell, Drogheda, Co. Louth ("**Mell Pharmacy**"):

1. On one or more dates between 07 July 2016 and 28 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Mell Pharmacy dispensing system false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in **Appendix A**, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; *and/or*

2. On one or more dates between 14 July 2016 and 20 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, on the dates specified in Column D of Appendix F, one or more of the items which appear at rows 1-21 of Column B of Appendix F (the "**Column B Items**"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F in circumstances where:
 - a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; *and/or*
 - b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; *and/or*
 - c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed; *and/or*
 - d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; *and/or*
3. On or about 30 March 2016, altered and/or caused to be altered in handwriting the date of the prescriptions which appear at rows 1-2 of Column A of **Appendix G** in circumstances where:
 - a. One or more of these items were recorded as dispensed but were not in fact supplied to patient [REDACTED] *and/or*
 - b. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed; *and/or*

AND FURTHER, that you, whilst you were a Registered Pharmacist:

4. In or around 15 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Corr's Life Pharmacy Blackbull, Dublin Road, Drogheda, Co. Louth ("**Blackbull Pharmacy**") dispensing system, false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in **Appendix B**, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; *and/or*
5. In or around 15 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, one or more of the items which appear at rows 22-26 of Column B of Appendix F (the "**Column B Items**"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F at Blackbull Pharmacy, in circumstances where:
 - a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; *and/or*
 - b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients

- referred to in Column A of Appendix F; *and/or*
- c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; *and/or*
 - d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; *and/or*
6. On one or more dates between 16 July 2016 and 30 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Corr's Pharmacy Limited, Unit 6 Clonshaugh S.C., Coolock, Dublin 17 ("**Clonshaugh Pharmacy**") dispensing system false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in **Appendix C**, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; *and/or*
7. On one or more dates between 09 July 2016 and 27 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, one or more of the items which appear at rows 33-43 of Column B of Appendix F (the "**Column B Items**"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F at Clonshaugh Pharmacy, in circumstances where.
- a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; *and/or*
 - b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; *and/or*
 - c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; *and/or*
 - d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; *and/or*
8. On or about 25 May 2016, altered and/or caused to be altered in handwriting the date of the prescriptions which appear at rows 5-6 of Column A of **Appendix G** at Clonshaugh Pharmacy, in circumstances where:
- a. One or more of these items were recorded as dispensed but were not in fact supplied to patient [REDACTED] *and/or*
 - b. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; *and/or*
9. In or around 19 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Corr's Pharmacy Limited, 82 Main Street, Clogherhead, Co. Louth ("**Clogherhead Pharmacy**") dispensing system false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in **Appendix D**, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact

later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; *and/or*

10. In or around 19 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, one or more of the items which appear at rows 27-30 of Column B of Appendix F (the "**Column B Items**"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F at Clogherhead Pharmacy, in circumstances where.
 - a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; *and/or*
 - b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; *and/or*
 - c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; *and/or*
 - d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; *and/or*
11. In or around 25 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Corr's Pharmacy Limited, Elmfield Rise, Clarehall, Dublin ("**Clarehall Pharmacy**") dispensing system false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in **Appendix E**, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; *and/or*
12. On or about 28 April 2016, altered and/or caused to be altered in handwriting the date of the prescriptions which appear at rows 3-4 of Column A of **Appendix G** at Clarehall Pharmacy, in circumstances where:
 - a. One or more of these items were recorded as dispensed but were not in fact supplied to patient [REDACTED] *and/or*
 - b. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; *and/or*
13. In or around 25 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, one or more of the items which appear at rows 31-32 of Column B of Appendix F (the "**Column B Items**"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F at Clarehall Pharmacy, in circumstances where.

- a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; *and/or*
- b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; *and/or*
- c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; *and/or*
- d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; *and/or*

AND FURTHER by reason of one or more of the allegations and/or sub-allegations as set out at 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 and/or 4 and/or 5 and/or 6 and/or 7 and/or 8 and/or 9 and/or 10 and/or 11 and/or 12 and/or 13 above, taken 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 or disgraceful in a professional respect; *and/or*
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; *and/or*
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Please have regard to Exhibit 1: Core Book for sight of the Appendices to Notice of Intention to Hold an Inquiry dated 8th November 2024.

Applications

At the commencement of each day of the inquiry, the Committee enquired into the non-attendance of Mr. Corr and/or his Representative. The Registrar's Representative made submissions as to the notice given to Mr. Corr's Representative and that they had been informed that Mr. Corr and/or his Representative would not be engaging with the Inquiry. The Committee took legal advice from Mr. Butler. The Committee considered that Mr. Corr and his Representative were on notice of the Inquiry and the Inquiry should proceed.

At the commencement of the inquiry, on Day 1, the Registrar's Representative made a number of minor amendments to the Notice of Intention to Hold an Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 and its Appendices.

After the conclusion of Day 1 the Registrar made an application for Day 2 to be by way of remote hearing. The Registrant's Representative was given an opportunity to engage on that application, no engagement was forthcoming. The Committee took legal advice from Mr. Butler. The Committee considered the application and legal advice and decided to accede to the application.

Evidence & Submissions

The parties put into evidence the documentation and material listed. The detail of which parts of that evidence were brought to the Committee's attention is contained in the Inquiry's two days of transcripts.

The Registrar called the witnesses listed who gave sworn evidence. The detail of the evidence heard is contained in the Inquiry's two days of transcripts.

Mr. Corr did not call evidence or make a final or closing submission in respect of his position. The submissions and points put forward by Mr. Corr are contained throughout the Inquiry's Core Book and the Committee were conscious to have regard to same in so far as they might be beneficial to Mr. Corr.

Legal Assessor's Advice

Mr. Butler advised the Committee on the approach to determining findings in a disciplinary matter. He explained that the Registrar bears the burden of proving each allegation and sub-allegation beyond reasonable doubt. This standard does not require absolute certainty but does require that no reasonable doubt remains. If there is any reasonable doubt regarding a factual matter, the benefit must be given to the pharmacist concerned. For each sub-allegation, the Committee must first decide whether the alleged facts are proven to this standard. If they are, the next step is to consider whether those proven facts amount to professional misconduct. If the facts are not proven, there is no need to proceed further on that allegation. Sub-allegations may be conjunctive or disjunctive (i.e., connected by "and/or"), and findings on the main allegation can be made based on one or more sub-allegations. The Committee may group sub-

allegations when expressing its findings without repeating detailed analysis for each one individually.

Professional misconduct is defined by statute and includes conduct that is infamous or disgraceful in a professional context, or conduct involving moral turpitude, fraud, or dishonesty that impacts the practice of pharmacy. It can also include breaches of Principles 1, 3, 4, or 6 of the Code of Conduct. These statutory terms are to be interpreted according to their ordinary, natural meanings, and concepts such as dishonesty are considered widely understood. While it is usual for an expert pharmacist to provide opinion on whether conduct breaches the Code, the Committee is not precluded from making findings on this basis in the absence of such evidence. However, if the Code adds nothing substantial to the assessment of misconduct, and particularly where the Committee feels less confident in interpreting it without expert guidance, it may decline to make findings under that limb.

Mr. Butler further advised that if adverse findings are made, the Committee must then consider an appropriate sanction. However, recommendations on sanctions should only follow after findings of fact and misconduct have been made. Both parties should be given the opportunity to address the Committee on this matter unless there is a clear agreement to proceed otherwise. Finally, any findings reached by the Committee must be supported by adequate reasons, stated with enough clarity and detail to enable the Mr. Corr to understand the basis for the decision and to take legal advice, including on whether proper legal principles were applied. If any additional advice is provided in private, it must be disclosed to both parties before final decisions are made.

The Registrar's Representative agreed with all the advices.

Standard and Burden of Proof

The Committee applied the criminal standard in respect of all its findings. The Committee considered the Registrar bore the burden of proving all matters beyond a reasonable doubt.

Decision of the Committee

The Committee having considered all the evidence and oral submissions and advice put to it publicly delivered its findings and holdings orally at the end of Day One:

“CHAIRPERSON: So, the Committee, having considered the submissions and evidence heard, have decided that allegations 1 through to 13, inclusive, are proven beyond a reasonable doubt as to fact.

The Committee, having considered each of the findings of fact, taken individually and in combination, amount to professional misconduct in that Mr. Corr acted in a manner that, having regard to (i) and (ii), is infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect, and involved moral turpitude, fraud, dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of his profession as a pharmacist.

In terms of the allegations of breach of the Principles 3, 4 and 6 of the Code for Pharmacists 2009, the Committee does not make any findings.

The reasons for all the findings will be communicated to the parties as soon as possible, and the parties will be invited to make submissions on the Committee's recommendation as to sanction to the Council.”

The Committee, on 27th March 2025, delivered a written recording of the findings and reasons. The objective of the findings and reasons being provided in this format, ahead of the Statutory Report of the Committee, was to aid the parties in making submissions to the Committee on their sanctions recommendation to be made to the Council after the sanctions hearing to be held at 10am on 1st April 2025. The operative part of that written recording is recited here:*

* **Note in ease of the Reader:** The Committee considered each allegation separately, *one by one*, in respect of finding fact and then whether the allegation proven amounted to Professional Misconduct under the alleged Limbs, and as this was the process followed, the Report follows that format, but the reader might note that there is very significant overlap in the reasons as between allegations.

Allegation 1

That you, whilst you were a Registered Pharmacist and/or Supervising Pharmacist at Life Pharmacy Mell, Upper Mell, Drogheda, Co. Louth ("Mell Pharmacy"):

1. On one or more dates between 07 July 2016 and 28 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Mell Pharmacy dispensing system false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in Appendix A, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating

the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee

considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 2

2. On one or more dates between 14 July 2016 and 20 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, on the dates specified in Column D of Appendix F, one or more of the items which appear at rows 1-21 of Column B of Appendix F (the "Column B Items"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F in circumstances where;

- a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; and/or
- b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; and/or
- c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed; and/or
- d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the

meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 3

3. On or about 30 March 2016, altered and/or caused to be altered in handwriting the date of the prescriptions which appear at rows 1-2 of Column A of Appendix G in circumstances where:

a. One or more of these items were recorded as dispensed but were not in fact supplied to patient [REDACTED]; and/or

b. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or

ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or

iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee

considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 4

AND FURTHER, that you, whilst you were a Registered Pharmacist:

4. In or around 15 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Corr's Life Pharmacy Blackbull, Dublin Road, Drogheda, Co. Louth ("Blackbull Pharmacy") dispensing system, false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in Appendix B, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee

considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 5

5. In or around 15 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, one or more of the items which appear at rows 22-26 of Column B of Appendix F (the "Column B Items"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F at Blackbull Pharmacy, in circumstances where.

- a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; and/or
- b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; and/or
- c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; and/or
- d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the

meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 6

6. On one or more dates between 16 July 2016 and 30 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Corr's Pharmacy Limited, Unit 6 Clonshaugh S.C., Coolock, Dublin 17 ("Clonshaugh Pharmacy") dispensing system false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in Appendix C, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating

the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee

considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 7

7. On one or more dates between 09 July 2016 and 27 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, one or more of the items which appear at rows 33-43 of Column B of Appendix F (the "Column B Items"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F at Clonshaugh Pharmacy, in circumstances where.

- a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; and/or
- b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; and/or
- c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; and/or
- d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the

meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 8

8. On or about 25 May 2016, altered and/or caused to be altered in handwriting the date of the prescriptions which appear at rows 5-6 of Column A of Appendix G at Clonshaugh Pharmacy, in circumstances where:

- a. One or more of these items were recorded as dispensed but were not in fact supplied to patient [REDACTED] and/or
- b. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee

considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 9

9. In or around 19 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Corr's Pharmacy Limited, 82 Main Street, Clogherhead, Co. Louth ("Clogherhead Pharmacy") dispensing system false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in Appendix D, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the

Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and

disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 10

10. In or around 19 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, one or more of the items which appear at rows 27-30 of Column B of Appendix F (the "Column B Items"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F at Clogherhead Pharmacy, in circumstances where.

- a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; and/or
- b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; and/or
- c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; and/or
- d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the

meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 11

11. In or around 25 July 2016, knowingly generated and/or created on the Corr's Pharmacy Limited, Elmfield Rise, Clarehall, Dublin ("Clarehall Pharmacy") dispensing system false records in respect of one or more of the supplies as specified in Appendix E, which false records you intended to later rely on, and/or did in fact later rely on, to claim payment(s) from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the

Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee

considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 12

12. On or about 28 April 2016, altered and/or caused to be altered in handwriting the date of the prescriptions which appear at rows 3-4 of Column A of Appendix G at Clarehall Pharmacy, in circumstances where:

- a. One or more of these items were recorded as dispensed but were not in fact supplied to patient [REDACTED]; and/or
- b. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee

considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegation 13

13. In or around 25 July 2016, added and/or caused to be added and/or permitted to be added in handwriting, one or more of the items which appear at rows 31-32 of Column B of Appendix F (the "Column B Items"), to prescriptions which appear in Column A of Appendix F at Clarehall Pharmacy, in circumstances where.

- a. One or more of the Column B Items were not prescribed and/or authorised to be prescribed by the prescriber; and/or
- b. One or more of the Column B Items were not in fact supplied to the Patients referred to in Column A of Appendix F; and/or
- c. Payment from the HSE Primary Care Reimbursement Scheme for one or more of the Column B Items was claimed and received; and/or
- d. One or more of the Column B Items were recorded in the patient medication record for the applicable patient as having been dispensed; and/or

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Allegation Proven as to Fact: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the allegation was proven as to Fact as:

Mr. Corr's Solicitor's Letter dated 24th February 2021 in reply to the Registrar's Complaint expressed Mr. Corr's full and unqualified admission of wrongdoing in respect of the Registrar's Complaint, and although the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had not been seen on that date, the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 had been seen by Mr. Corr's side and the allegations in the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 are on all fours with the Registrar's Complaint and the Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021 and so this is taken by the Committee as an admission that speaks to the proving of the allegation.

The Authorised Officer's Report dated 8th January 2021, and his Oral Evidence was very professional and persuasive in proving the allegation as it traces the evidence substantiating the allegation through the relevant period and pharmacy. The Committee noted that the Appendix to the allegation to the Notice of Inquiry dated 8th November 2024 had been created on foot of the Authorised Officer's accurate examination of the pharmacy records and same clearly demonstrated the fraud that Mr. Corr had perpetrated.

The Internal Audit and Oral Evidence of [REDACTED] is accepted as professionally carried out and was persuasive in proving the allegation, including as she demonstrated a good moral compass in carrying out the audit.

The Settlement Agreement dated 13 March 2019 was persuasive in proving the allegation as a recording of the wrongdoing done at the Corr's Pharmacy Group and same agreement being signed by Mr. Corr on behalf of the pharmacy companies.

The Oral Evidence of the HSE's [REDACTED] was persuasive in proving the allegation in that it provided a convincing account of an investigation that occurred in an unbiased and open minded way, having a strong and methodical foundation whereby a planned and comprehensive investigation was conducted and findings and analysis were triple checked, same investigation uncovering wrongdoing at the Corr's Pharmacy Group.

The admission to the criminal charges before the Court, as seen in the Court Order dated 23rd July 2021 on foot of the Indictment Bill No. 204/21, was persuasive of the wrongdoing set out in the allegation, as although the allegation does not exactly map the criminal charges there is sufficient similarity to place some weight on Mr. Corr's admissions in that criminal context.

The Duty Registers for the relevant dates confirm that Mr. Corr had access and was the responsible pharmacist on the dates set out in the allegation.

The Committee having heard all the evidence and submissions was left with no reasonable doubt that the facts of the allegation are proven to the criminal standard. Mr. Corr was the pharmacist and there is no other explanation as to how the allegation would have happened without Mr. Corr's intentional conduct bringing about the facts of the allegation.

Allegation Proven as to amounting to Professional Misconduct: Yes

Reasons:

The Committee was satisfied to the criminal standard that the factual allegation proven was a very serious failure in expected conduct of a Pharmacist and in particular was infamous and disgraceful in a professional respect and involved moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty of a nature or degree which bore on the carrying on of the profession of Mr. Corr as pharmacist as:

I & II – The proven conduct in the allegation is a very serious breach in that it was deliberately done and was carried out through Mr. Corr's use of his highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist, all in circumstances where Mr. Corr's activities were diametrically opposed to the proper use of that highly privileged position and expertise as a pharmacist as it was done to defraud a fund of money used to support a vulnerable cohort of persons needing pharmaceuticals and equally was an infamous fraud on the tax payer. The Committee viewed Mr. Corr's conduct as being the opposite of leading by example and it being a disgraceful breach of trust carried out in a professional respect. The Committee considered that the core of the professional misconduct was Mr. Corr told lies to obtain money in circumstances where he had to engage in a lot of planning, thought and effort to further this elaborate and illegal scheme to obtain money, all in circumstances where there was no possible legitimate reason for why the wrongdoing happened. The Committee considered the proven allegation was serious professional misconduct as it was so obviously infamous, disgraceful, involving moral turpitude, fraud and dishonesty that one does not need to be a pharmacist or hear expert evidence to have a sense of shock and abhorrence at Mr. Corr's conduct as a Pharmacist.

III - As to the alleged breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists 2009 the Committee was of the view that interpretation and guidance as to the

meaning of the Principles and Instances thereunder would be necessary to make a finding in this case, such guidance could have been provided by an expert witness, no expert evidence was tendered. The Committee was of the view that although the Principles were somewhat clear the instances brought to the Committee's attention under each of the Principles are not as clear and so the Committee applying the Criminal Standard was not confident to make a finding of misconduct on ground of breach of the Code. In deciding this matter the Committee considered that the alleged breach of Code not being found does not in any way diminish the very serious finding of professional misconduct under the first two limbs of the professional misconduct allegation.

Allegations in Combination amounting to Professional Misconduct

Guilty of professional misconduct in that you acted in a manner that:

- i. Is infamous or disgraceful in a professional respect; and/or
- ii. Involves moral turpitude, fraud or dishonesty of a nature or degree which bears on the carrying on of the profession of a pharmacist; and/or
- iii. Is a breach of Principles 3 and/or 4 and/or 6 of the Code of Conduct for Pharmacists, 2009.

Although the Committee was very satisfied that each of the 13 Allegations amounted to Professional Misconduct in their own right, it is noted and decided that in addition to those findings the allegations taken in any combination also amount to Professional Misconduct for the same Reasons set out for each of the allegations, i.e. Limbs I & II are proven, and Limb III is not proven.

Recommendation as to Sanction

Following the delivery of its reasoned findings on the allegations, the Committee sat to consider its sanction recommendation, having invited both parties to appear and make a submission.

Mr Corr did not respond or participate and was not represented. This was consistent with earlier correspondence on his behalf in which he indicated that he accepted the complaints against him and that findings against him would result in the removal of his name from the Register.

The Registrar's Representative made submissions as contained in the transcript.

Having heard the submissions the Committee took legal advice in public, summary of which is:

Mr. Butler advised the Committee on the legal framework and principles relevant to recommending a sanction to the Council following their findings against Mr. Corr. He confirmed that the Registrar's Representative correctly outlined the applicable legal standards and emphasised the importance of considering the Registrar's sanction recommendation, i.e. cancellation of registration, be imposed. While this recommendation is not binding, it should be given careful attention given the Registrar's insight into the seriousness of the wrongdoing. The full range of sanctions provided under the Act is available to the Committee, including admonishment or censure, the imposition of conditions, suspension for a defined period, and cancellation of registration. Cancellation may also include a recommendation that any application for restoration to the Register be restricted for a specified period.

Mr. Butler reminded the Committee of the key principles from legal precedent, particularly *Murphy v The Medical Council* and *Hermann v The Medical Council*, which guide sanction decisions. A sanction should reflect the seriousness of the conduct to the individual practitioner and act as a deterrent both to them and to the wider profession. Public protection is the paramount consideration, not only from the specific misconduct but also to uphold public confidence in the profession and its regulatory mechanisms. A proportionate approach must be

taken: lesser misconduct warrants a lesser sanction, and more serious wrongdoing a greater one, balancing the interests of the practitioner with those of the public.

Regarding the optional restriction on applications for restoration following cancellation, Mr. Butler noted that the legislation offers no specific criteria for determining its length. However, the same core principles: deterrence, public protection, and proportionality should guide that decision. It is within the Committee's discretion to recommend such a restriction and determine its duration, but it is not obligatory. On the matter of aggravating and mitigating factors, the Registrar's Representative has drawn attention to Mr. Corr's limited participation in the process. Mr. Butler suggested that while this could be seen as aggravating, it is more cautious and fair to treat it as a limited mitigating factor, though in practical terms the distinction may not affect the outcome significantly.

Finally, Mr. Butler reiterated the requirement for the Committee to provide adequate reasons for its recommendation. These reasons must be clear enough to demonstrate that the correct legal approach was followed, allowing the affected party to understand the basis for the decision and, if necessary, to challenge it.

The Registrar's Representative agreed with all the advice.

The Committee having considered all the evidence and oral submissions and advice put to it recommends the following Sanction to Council:

- That Mr. Corr's registration as a Pharmacist be Cancelled with a five-year Prohibition on any application for restoration to the Register of Pharmacists.

Reasons:

The Committee had regard to the helpful and instructive PSI Sanctions Guidance in approaching sanctioning, same Guidance indicates that when the proven Professional Misconduct is of such a very serious nature a very serious sanction is appropriate.

The Committee had regard to Section 48 of the Act and the Council's role therein.

The Committee noted that Mr. Corr's Solicitor had written to the PSI and indicated knowledge that the matter raised against Mr. Corr would lead to his removal from the Register of Pharmacists.

The Committee had regard to the submissions of the Registrar's Representative which proposed cancellation of Mr. Corr's registration as a Pharmacist and a prohibition on any application for the restoration of his name to the Register for a specified period. The registrar did not propose a specific period in this context.

The Committee considered that there were mitigating factors that were to be recognised, including that there was a degree of insight from Mr. Corr as he did accept the allegations in a general sense and express remorse early in the PSI process. The Committee further considered the fact that the HSE had been made whole for the loss perpetrated was a mitigating factor, as was the assumed early acceptance of the Cancellation sanction through his Solicitor's Letter. In addition, there appears to be no previous complaints against Mr. Corr. It is further noted that this is not a case where patient harm was identified.

The Committee considered that there were aggravating factors that were to be recognised, including that Mr. Corr did not engage in the Inquiry and this undermined the mitigation found, as an oral admission at the Inquiry or even simple engagement would have been to Mr. Corr's credit. There was no rationale for the Professional Misconduct and the Committee in recommending sanction is left with the impression that greed alone drove Mr. Corr's systemic

and methodical conduct. Mr. Corr's conduct was an exercise in his taking advantage of his position of trust, as a registered Pharmacist, to the detriment of the public health service in Ireland. Mr. Corr's senior positions, control and roles in the pharmacies was such that the Professional Misconduct is particularly egregious. Mr. Corr's conduct has professional dishonesty, fraud and misrepresentation at its heart and that very negatively undermines trust in the profession.

The Committee considered that the criminal convictions of Mr. Corr arising from the same facts as were alleged in the complaint to the PSI. It did not consider these convictions to be significant one way or the other in determining the appropriate sanction.

The Committee was left with no misapprehension that the Professional Misconduct was at the upper most end of seriousness and so there was a need for the sanction to unequivocally:

- promote and maintain public confidence in the pharmacy profession and the delivery of pharmacy services and its regulation,
- promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the profession and those who operate pharmacies.

As to the specific Section 48 sanctions open to Council the Committee considered:

Admonishment would be wholly inadequate and unduly lenient and would be such that Professional Misconduct of the nature proven in this case obtaining Admonishment would serve to undermine the regulatory process. Furthermore an Admonishment would not be capable of preventing a recurrence of the Professional Misconduct proven in this case.

Censure, although stronger than Admonishment, would be wholly inadequate and unduly lenient and would be such that Professional Misconduct of the nature proven in this case obtaining a Censure would serve to undermine the regulatory process. Furthermore a Censure

would not be capable of preventing a recurrence of the Professional Misconduct proven in this case.

Attachment of Conditions to Mr. Corr's Registration was not considered to be appropriate given Mr. Corr's non-engagement with the Inquiry and as it would not readily meet the seriousness of the proven Professional Misconduct, and there is a question as to the appropriateness of conditions where the Professional Misconduct found involves very serious dishonesty and moral turpitude.

Suspension of Mr. Corr's Registration was not considered to be appropriate given Mr. Corr's non-engagement with the Inquiry and as it would not readily meet the seriousness of the proven Professional Misconduct, including due to very serious dishonesty and moral turpitude, as after that suspension is served Mr. Corr would be at large again as a registered Pharmacist.

Cancellation of Mr. Corr's Registration was considered to be the only appropriate way to send a signal to Mr. Corr, pharmacists, pharmacy owners, and those who rely on these critical health services and the wider public that the proven Professional Misconduct in this case is entirely incompatible with the practice of pharmacy and registration as a pharmacist.

A Prohibition of Mr. Corr's Restoration to the Register for a Specified Period was considered and it was considered that this is an appropriate case to apply such a sanction alongside Cancellation and for the same reasons. In addition, there is little evidence of Mr. Corr having taken learnings or having gained any real or convincing insight from the proven misconduct such that there is a risk of reoffending. Therefore, a period of 5 years is recommended in order to allow Mr. Corr structured time to reflect on his conduct so that, if he wishes to apply for restoration in the future, he will have had an opportunity to demonstrate that he is a trustworthy person, fit to be registered again as a pharmacist. In recommending this minimum prohibition period from applying for restoration, the Committee expresses no view as to when, if at all, it might actually be appropriate to restore Mr Corr's name to the Register.

This concludes the Section 47 Report of the Committee to Council.

SIGNED:



Mark Kane, Acting Chairperson

DATED:

1st May 2025