

BEFORE THE PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE OF THE  
ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS

RCVS

v

KAI MURRAY RVN (Respondent)

---

DECISION ON SANCTION

---

1. Ms Curtis informed the Committee that the Respondent first registered with the RCVS in June 2023, and that there had been no other regulatory findings against him.
2. Dr Jadoo made oral submissions on the issue of sanction, referring to the Respondent's witness statement and the testimonials and character references submitted on his behalf. Dr Jadoo made submissions regarding the efforts the Respondent had made to rehabilitate himself with the help of his community network and church support, as well as his efforts to succeed in his career as a veterinary nurse. Dr Jadoo emphasised to the Committee the remorse of the Respondent, his wish to apologise to the Committee, and that the Respondent left the issue of sanction to the Committee's judgment.
3. The Committee took into account the Sanctions Guidance 2020, and accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor, who referred to the general principles governing the imposition of sanctions.
4. The Committee had in mind that the decision whether to impose a sanction is for its own independent judgment. The primary purpose of the available sanctions is not to punish but: (i) to protect the welfare of animals, and the public (ii) to maintain public confidence in the profession and (iii) to

declare and uphold proper standards of conduct. The Committee was aware that any sanction imposed must be proportionate to the nature and extent of the conduct and to the maintenance of appropriate standards expected of members of the veterinary nursing profession, and must weigh the seriousness of the professional misconduct and the need to protect animals, the public and the public interest with and against the interests of the Respondent. No greater sanction should be imposed than is absolutely necessary. Accordingly the Committee considered the available sanctions in reverse order of seriousness.

5. The Committee took into account the following aggravating factors:

- i. risk of injury to a human;
- ii. recklessness.

6. The Committee took into account the following mitigating factors:

- i. no actual harm or risk of harm to any animal;
- ii. no concerns raised about the Respondent's competence or quality of his practice;
- iii. youth at the time of the incident (22 years of age);
- iv. significant lapse of time since the incident;
- v. absence of premeditation;
- vi. plea of guilty;
- vii. [REDACTED]
- viii. co-operation with the regulatory process;
- ix. disclosure of the conviction to the RCVS;
- x. subsequent efforts to avoid repetition of the offending behaviour;
- xi. subsequent efforts to remediate the past offending;
- xii. demonstration of insight into the offence;
- xiii. personal character references/ testimonials.

7. The Respondent's witness statement set out his views on his offending behaviour, including remorse for the physical injuries which were caused as a result of the incident (although he did not inflict them), as well as setting out the steps he had taken to turn his "life around", and follow his career. The Respondent set out the support he has from his parents, and described the voluntary work he does at a resettlement

service for people who are released from prison, and the talks he gives about turning one's life around to inspire others. The help the Respondent gives to others is indicative of an insight into why his behaviour was wrong. The Respondent apologised many times through Dr Jaddoo in the hearing, not only for his behaviour, but also for the need for a Committee to convene to consider his case at a hearing. What was clear to the Committee from the witness statement was the Respondent's acknowledgement of his past failings, but also his desire to "continue to reflect and learn lessons from poor decisions". The Committee considered that all the aforementioned matters demonstrated, deep and meaningful reflection, and a significant level of insight and remedial steps taken.

8. The Committee considered the testimonials and character references. There are a number from his employer, Local Vets, at which he started employment in February 2022, and where he has continued to work to date. The commencement was some two months after the sentencing hearing, and demonstrated, in the Committee's view, a strong determination by the Respondent to progress and leave his past behind him. The references from his employer attest to his integrity, "exemplary" work, his "caring and compassionate" approach to patients and clients, and confirm that he made them aware of his conviction during the interview process. The Committee also read a testimonial from a Mental Health Chaplain and Bishop who supported the Respondent while he was in custody on remand, and has continued to do so since. The Committee took into account the significant efforts which the Respondent has made, not only to obtain employment but also to qualify as a veterinary nurse, following challenging personal circumstances occasioned by his remand in custody and the criminal process. He also sought help from the prison chaplain while on remand, which again shows a genuine and timely wish to address his offending and make progress. The Committee considered that these were all indicators of steps taken to address the concerns arising out of the incident in question, and a determination to work hard at his chosen career at which he was, according to his employer, excelling.
9. In light of the ongoing support he has received, including the community support through his church, as well as the considerable insight shown, the steps taken to address the concerns arising out of the conviction, and the determination to progress which has been demonstrated, the Committee considered that the risk of repetition of the offending behaviour was minimal.

10. The Committee first considered whether to take no further action. It took into account the Sanctions Guidance which states that in certain cases, the Committee may consider that a finding that a conviction renders a practitioner unfit to practise, is sufficient to protect animals and the wider public interest, without a reprimand or warning as to future conduct and the Committee may decide to close the case with no further action.
11. This was not a case involving any risk to animals. The risk of repetition of the offence is minimal. The Committee therefore considered the demands of the public interest, namely the need to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process. The Committee considered that in light of the significant insight and remediation shown, and the minimal risk of repeating the behaviour which led to the conviction, the Committee was not satisfied that the public interest required a sanction to protect it. The Committee decided that the demands of the public interest were adequately marked and served by the finding already made that the conviction rendered the Respondent unfit to practise.
12. As a result, the Committee decided that it would be appropriate and proportionate to impose no further action in this case.
13. The Committee did go on to consider a reprimand or warning as to future conduct, but did not consider this was appropriate or proportionate. Such a sanction would, in the Committee's judgment, be superfluous, and punitive in nature, particularly because of the current significant levels of insight into what the Respondent had done wrong nearly three years ago, when he was 22 years old, and prior to his entry onto the RCVS register.
14. The Committee therefore decided to close this case with no further action.

**Disciplinary Committee**  
**5 April 2024**