



RCVS

Inspiring confidence
in veterinary care

Decision of the Charter Case Committee

in respect of

Mr Oliver Morrison, MRCVS

The Charter Case Committee met remotely on 1 May 2026 to consider the following allegation against the Registrant:

That, being registered in the Register of Veterinary Surgeons held by the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons ("the College"), you:

1. On or around 24 March 2024, made entries in clinical records for cattle belonging to [REDACTED], to the effect that you had certified export health declarations for three cattle, to include confirmation that the cattle were clear of Tuberculosis (TB), and that you had seen test sheets from a recent TB test in order to confirm this, when you had not seen any such test sheets at the time of certifying the export and/or at the time of writing the clinical records;

2. On or around 24 March 2024, signed a declaration on an export certificate for cattle, and in doing so you:

(i) referred to your position as an Official Veterinarian, when the export certificate was not of the kind which was approved by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra);

(ii) used your Official Veterinarian stamp, when the export certificate was not of the kind which was approved by Defra;

3. Your conduct in 1 above was:

(a) dishonest; and/or

(b) misleading;

4. Your conduct in 1 and/or 2 above risked undermining:

(a) procedures and/or regulations and/or rules designed to protect and promote animal welfare and/or public health; and/or

(b) procedures and/or /regulations and/or /rules designed to assist in the promotion of international trade and relations;

AND it is alleged that, in relation to the matters set out above, whether individually or in any combination, you are guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.

Background:

1. The Registrant is a registered veterinary surgeon.
2. In 2024, Dr Sophie Aylett MRCVS raised concerns with the Animal and Plant Health Agency (“APHA”) and, subsequently, the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (“the College”) about Mr Oliver Morrison MRCVS. The concerns related to an export certificate The Registrant had signed, in March 2024, for cattle exported to the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The Registrant had signed the certificate to enable the export to go ahead, and he had stamped it using an APHA Official Veterinarian stamp.
3. APHA is an executive agency sponsored by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (“Defra”), the Welsh Government and the Scottish Government. APHA is responsible for monitoring and regulating animal welfare and human health through animal disease control. Official Veterinarians (“OVs”) are veterinary surgeons in private veterinary practice who also perform work on behalf of the UK government. They are granted authorisation by the APHA to work as OVs. They are required to undertake revalidation at various intervals. The Registrant is an OV.
4. One of APHA’s responsibilities is to keep a number of template “Export Health Certificates” (“EHC”)s for livestock or animal products being exported abroad, together with guidance to OVs on that type of export. OVs who are asked by exporters to certify livestock or animal products for export are able to obtain the relevant template EHC from the APHA (if such an EHC exists) and complete it in line with the APHA’s guidance. APHA does not, however, hold template EHCs for all countries, nor for all animals/products. In particular, there is no APHA EHC in existence for cattle exports to the UAE.
5. At the material time, in March 2024, Dr Aylett owned and ran Meadows Farm Vets Ltd, Worcestershire (“Meadows Farm”), along with [REDACTED], the Practice Manager. They employed a team of farm vets and APHA-approved OVs to undertake farm export work. The Registrant worked at MacArthur, Barstow & Gibbs, a mixed veterinary practice in the same area as Meadows Farm. Mr Morrison had previously worked for the Ayletts at Meadows Farm.

6. On Friday 22 March 2024, [REDACTED], a farmer and client of both Meadows Farm and MacArthur, Barstow & Gibbs, approached Meadows Farm with regard to the certification of cattle for export. He sent Meadows Farm photographs of an Import Permit and an Export Declaration form, the latter on the letterhead of a livestock auctioneer, [REDACTED]. The Import Permit was for the importation of numerous cattle, including 30 Piedmontese, into the UAE.
7. During the evening of Friday 22 March 2024, Dr Aylett spoke to the [REDACTED] auctioneer, [REDACTED]. Dr Aylett told [REDACTED] that she was concerned with the Export Declaration form (as sent to Meadows Farm by [REDACTED]) in that it did not include sufficient information. [REDACTED] told Dr Aylett that there were a number of other cattle being exported to the UAE along with [REDACTED], and that everyone else was happy with the Export Declaration form. Dr Aylett told him that there was no active APHA EHC for the export of cattle to the UAE. [REDACTED] said that he had spoken to APHA about this and said that they were sorting it out. Dr Aylett declined to complete the Export Declaration form. Her understanding was that because APHA did not provide an approved EHC for the UAE, no exports could be made to that country.
8. On Saturday 23 March 2024, the Registrant called Meadows Farm and spoke to [REDACTED]. The Registrant asked permission (on the basis that [REDACTED] was primarily a Meadows farm client) to undertake work for [REDACTED] by certifying the export. [REDACTED] told him that would be "OK," but said that their view was that the export was unauthorised and that Meadows Farm had declined to complete it.
9. The Registrant signed the Export Declaration form for [REDACTED] dated Sunday 24 March 2024 and stamped it with the Registrant's OV stamp. The form listed three Piedmontese cattle.
10. As stated, Dr Aylett's understanding was that if there was no APHA EHC in place for a particular export, then the export could not take place. She was concerned that the Export Declaration form she had been asked to sign for [REDACTED] was not an EHC issued by the APHA. It required an OV's signature and OV stamp: the declaration began with the words "*As official veterinarian of the following herd...*" and the words "*OFFICIAL STAMP*" were under the signature clause at the bottom of the form. Dr Aylett understood that an OV stamp (issued by the APHA) must only be used on APHA issued documents, and this was not an APHA document. She raised concerns about the certificate with the APHA.
11. The APHA investigated Dr Aylett's concerns. They concluded that the Registrant should be advised that he should not use his OV stamp on documents which were not approved by Defra/APHA. In April 2024, APHA wrote to the Registrant to this effect.

12. APHA did not consider any other matters raised by Dr Aylett about the export certificate to be of particular concern. Dr Aylett raised concerns with the RCVS by way of a referral dated 12 October 2024.
13. During the course of the RCVS' investigation, a witness statement was taken from Dr Anne Tordoff MRCVS, Veterinary Advisor for Border Controls in the Centre for International Trade team at APHA. Dr Tordoff confirmed that a veterinary surgeon should not sign a non-APHA EHC in their capacity as an OV and should not use their OV stamp. She described this, however, as a fairly common error made by OVs and explained that APHA have to give advice to OVs about it regularly.
14. Dr Tordoff also commented that the absence of an approved APHA EHC for a particular country does not mean that a private export could not be made and certified by a veterinary surgeon. The APHA had not raised concerns about the Registrant having signed a private EHC.
15. In addition, Dr Tordoff noted that one of Dr Aylett's concerns was that the Registrant had certified to the effect that the cattle were free of disease, including Tuberculosis (TB), when the last TB tests for these cattle had been carried out by an Approved Tuberculin Tester (ATT) (██████) and not by a veterinary surgeon. Dr Aylett's understanding was that, whilst lay ATTs may test cattle for TB, if the results are to be relied on for the purposes of export, a veterinary surgeon must have obtained those results. However, Dr Tordoff explains that if the documents being certified specify that the animals must be tested for TB, then the testing does need to be done by an OV. The declaration on the form signed by the Registrant, however, stated that the herd must be "*officially Tuberculosis free.*" Dr Tordoff explains that this may refer to a standard routine test to confirm the official TB freedom of the herd, and this may properly be done by an ATT: she noted that APHA accepts the results of TB tests undertaken by ATTs for the purpose of confirming official TB freedom of herds. Dr Tordoff explained that it was clear from the wording on the export certificate for ██████ cattle that only routine testing to confirm freedom was required, and this was what the Registrant had done.
16. Dr Tordoff concluded: "*I was surprised that the RCVS pursued the concerns raised by Dr Aylett, as for the APHA the issues are quite run of the mill. The mistakes made... are mistakes made frequently by OVs and, although this is frustrating and should not happen, they are considered to be relatively minor mistakes. This issue was dealt with as it would have been for any other vet who had done the same thing. They are routine mistakes and having given advice, for us that is the end of the matter. If we found out the same mistakes had been made again, we would take it more seriously....*"
17. On 25 November 2024, the College wrote to the Registrant raising a formal allegation and asked for further comments regarding the matter.

18. On 25 November 2024, the Registrant replied to the College and provided what the Registrant considered to be relevant background information, including the following: *"From 2015 to 2018 I worked for Meadows Farm Vets Ltd [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I left Meadows Farm Vets in 2018 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I subsequently joined another local practice, MacArthur, Barstow and Gibbs (MBG) and have since become a director."*
19. On 29 January 2025, the Registrant provided the College with a copy of his indemnity cover and an attachment containing their Continuing Professional Development.
20. Further concerns were raised, in relation to entries made by the Registrant, within the clinical records for [REDACTED] cattle in relation to the export to the UAE.
21. At the time of the export, [REDACTED] cattle had been last tested for TB on 20 and 23 February 2024 by [REDACTED] an ATT. The cattle were found to be clear. [REDACTED] had used a hand-held electronic machine for the tests, with a direct link to APHA's secure on-line system. The results were recorded and transmitted to APHA without any paperwork. [REDACTED] verbally told [REDACTED] that the results were clear, but no details of the results were given to him. The details were only accessible on-line by members of Meadows Farm staff. [REDACTED] did not have access to the secure system himself in order to obtain the results. At the time of the export on 24 March 2024, there was no paperwork available to the Registrant confirming the TB test results.
22. The Registrant included in his clinical records, for [REDACTED] exported cattle, a reference to the export being completed on 24 March 2024. The clinical notes are dated 25 March 2024 at 12:27 and state as follows: *"client of meadows farm vets, exporting 3 cattle to dubai, MFV don't want to get involved so farmer asked myself. spoke to [REDACTED] from MFV to confirm they are happy for me to do it. certify export health declaration for 3 piemontese cattle going to dubai, tag number uk302859201892, uk320455301336, uk302859402132. basic form to confirm clear of TB (test sheets from recent test seen to confirm), brucellosis, ebl, bse, treated with an external parasiticide, born after ban of feeding meat and bonemeal to livestock, and examined and clear of sign of infectious disease. all 3 cattle healthy, no signs of above diseases, treated each animal with 100mg deltamethrin at time of examination (used farmers product) signed and stamped paperwork, cattle being loaded to go at 2pm today"*

23. It is noted that it was not possible for the Registrant to have seen the “*test sheets from recent test seen to confirm*” – i.e. the results of a recent TB test at the date he signed the certificate, 24 March 2024, as they were not available to him, and he had not asked Meadows Farm for copies. The entry in the Registrant's clinical records, to the extent that it indicated that he had seen test results at the time he signed the certificate, was therefore false.
24. The College asked the Registrant for further comments on the complete allegations raised against him. In a written response dated 19 November 2025, the Registrant stated: “*My clinical records were untrue and I knew this at the time of writing them. I accept my conduct in this respect was both misleading and dishonest. This was a serious lapse of judgement on my behalf and one I deeply regret.... I deeply regret that I have acted dishonestly when making my clinical records on 25th March 2024. This was a very serious lapse of judgment and one I have never made before or since. I had taken the farmer's word that he had the necessary documentation to verify the TB test undertaken 30 days earlier and that he would provide this to me (which he later did). Nevertheless, I made an entry in the clinical records which I knew to be untrue, and therefore dishonest. This was totally unacceptable and inexcusable. I recognise it breached the core principles of veterinary practice and would undermine public confidence in our profession. I have reflected on this and will never again put my professional reputation, or my membership of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons at risk again. I can give a complete assurance that there is absolutely no risk of repetition.*”
25. At a meeting on 3 December 2025, the Stage 2 Preliminary Investigation Committee (S2PIC) considered all the evidence before it and concluded that there was a realistic prospect of the concerns being proved, and of them amounting to serious professional misconduct. It proposed referring the matter to the Charter Case Committee.
26. On 11 December 2025, the Registrant confirmed their agreement to referring the matter to the Charter Case Committee.
27. Dr Aylett has stated (undated) that in her view, a disciplinary hearing would be a suitable response to the wider public interest, specifically other exporting veterinary surgeons who may find themselves in a similar situation and that the Registrant should be ‘*struck off*’.

Decision:

28. The Charter Case Committee (the Committee) has been provided with a bundle of 215 pages which included witness statements from Dr Aylett, [REDACTED], Dr Tordoff and written representation from the Registrant (dated 25 November 2024, 29 January 2025 and 19 November 2025) which included his admissions to the alleged misconduct. On this basis of all this information, the Committee was satisfied that there was a realistic prospect of finding the allegations proved.
29. In line with the Charter Case Protocol, the Charter Case Committee may:
- Issue a warning to a veterinary surgeon or Registered Veterinary Nurse, to be published on the RCVS website for a period of time specified by the Committee, or
 - Issue a confidential warning to a veterinary surgeon or Registered Veterinary Nurse, or
 - Refer cases back to the Preliminary Investigation Committee.
30. The Committee considered whether it would be appropriate to conclude this matter by issuing the Registrant with a warning, either public or confidential, without the need for a referral to the Disciplinary Committee for a hearing.
31. It bore in mind that the overarching remit of the RCVS was to protect animal welfare and to act in the public interest, which included protecting the public, maintaining proper standards within the professions and maintaining public confidence in the profession. The Committee considered whether a warning would meet these criteria.
32. In reaching its decision the Committee had regard to the RCVS Charter Case Committee Protocol and considered all relevant factors, including the following:
- the seriousness of any allegations;
 - admissions that have been made;
 - the level of insight demonstrated;
 - the complainant's view;
 - any relevant mitigation;
 - the previous history of the veterinary surgeon;

- whether there is any risk to animal welfare or the wider public interest in dealing with the matter in the way proposed
- the risk of repetition and steps take to address the concerns raised;
- the time that had elapse since the alleged allegation.

33. The Committee then went on to consider each of these factors in turn.

'the seriousness of any allegations'

34. The Committee considered the nature of the allegations. It concluded that allegation 1 is a serious allegation because it involves dishonesty. The Committee took into account that creating false clinical records can have an adverse impact upon animal welfare and that there is a need to maintain proper standards within the professions and maintain public confidence. The Committee considered allegation 2 to be less serious taking into account the comments made Dr Tordoff that such mistakes are *'quite run of the mill...mistakes made frequently by Ovs...relatively minor mistakes.'*

'admissions that have been made'

35. The Committee took into account that the Registrant has admitted all matters. The Committee was reassured that the Registrant has accepted full responsibility, does not seek to minimise his actions and has expressed regret and remorse.

'the level of insight demonstrated'

36. As stated, the Registrant has provided three written reflections dated 25 November 2024, 29 January 2025 and 19 November 2025 which demonstrated appropriate insight.

37. Within the Registrant's letter dated 25 November 2024 and in relation to using his OV stamp, the Registrant states: *"I now accept this was incorrect and that the OV stamp should only be used on DEFRA issued certificates, not on certificates issued in a private capacity.... I have since revalidated my Ungulate Export qualification with Improve International and have therefore refreshed my knowledge of exports and the importance of the RCVS code of professional conduct relating to certification. I will certainly not get involved in such 'unofficial' exports again."*

38. Within the Registrant's letter dated 29 January 2025, the Registrant states: *"I recognise that my clinical record keeping in this case has fallen below the standards expected by the RCVS and the Code of Professional Conduct and I apologise for this. Having reflected carefully on my professional obligations I am confident I have learned from this experience and it will not happen again."*
39. As quoted above, the Registrant also recognises within his written reflections dated 19 November 2025 that misleading clinical records amounts to dishonesty which it *'totally unacceptable and inexcusable'* and which breached the core principles of veterinary practice and undermines public confidence in the profession. The Committee was further reassured that the Registrant recognises the seriousness of his actions and its impact upon the wider public interest.
40. In addition, the Committee considered the Registrant to have demonstrated remediation because the Registrant has:
- revalidated his APHA qualification and refreshed his knowledge of exports;
 - reminded himself of the importance of the RCVS Code of Professional Conduct relating to certification;
 - reflected upon the principles of the four 'C's of Certification: Caution, Clarity, Certainty and Challenge.
41. Taking account the Registrant's three written reflections which demonstrated his remorse, an acceptance of full responsibility, his reassuring reflections, the efforts he has made to remediate his practice and his acknowledgment of the impact upon the wider public interest - the Committee concluded that the Registrant has demonstrated insight.

'the complainant's view'

42. In relation to the complainant's view, it is noted that Dr Aylett considered this matter should be referred to the Disciplinary Committee and that the Registrant should be struck off. The Committee considered that the view of the complainant is one of the factors to be taken into account and is not necessarily determinative.

'any relevant mitigation'

43. In relation to relevant mitigation, the Committee noted that the Registrant states as follows within their written reflections: *"On Sunday 24th March I visited the farm to inspect the animals prior to signing the paperwork. I found them to be healthy, fit to travel and free from evidence of infectious or contagious disease. I was aware that the UK is officially free of Brucellosis and Enzootic Bovine Leukosis. [REDACTED] provided a written declaration that they had had a clear TB test 4 week previously and that they were clear of Bovine Tuberculosis, he has subsequently provided me copies of the TB test certificates."* Whilst the Registrant has admitted to not having sight of the TB test certificate, the Committee considered it to be a mitigating factor that the Registrant had seen, on 24 March 2024, a relevant 'written declaration' from [REDACTED].

'the previous history of the veterinary surgeon'

44. In relation to the previous history of the Registrant, the panel accepted that this was a single incident before the RCVS in an otherwise unblemished career.

'Whether there is any risk to animal welfare or the wider public interest in dealing with the matter in the way proposed'

45. In relation to any risk to animal welfare or the wider public interest in dealing with the matter by way of a warning, the panel is of the view that the risk of repetition is low (see below) and therefore there is a low risk to animal welfare. In respect of the wider public interest, the Committee noted that it can issue a public warning for a maximum of six months which can uphold the wider public interest issues.

'the risk of repetition and steps take to address the concerns raised'

46. The Committee concluded that the risk of repetition is low because the Committee is satisfied the Registrant has demonstrated insight, remediation and that this was an isolated incident with the RCVS.

'the time that had elapse since the alleged allegation'

47. The Committee notes a period of 2 years has elapsed since this incident. The Committee considered this to be a significant period of time with no evidence of any other concerns emerging since.

48. Whilst the Committee considered dishonesty to be a serious matter (allegation 1), it balanced this against the following factors:

- the Registrant accepts full responsibility and does not seek to minimise his errors;
- the Registrant has shown insight into his behaviour. This insight includes the impact of their actions upon the reputation of the veterinary profession;
- there is evidence of relevant remediation;
- there is mitigation;
- the Registrant has given repeated reassurances that this behaviour will not be repeated;
- this is an isolated incident before the RCVS that arose in a single day, namely 24 March 2024;
- the likelihood of repetition is assessed as low;
- a period of two years has elapsed since with no evidence of any further concerns

49. As a result, the Committee was satisfied that it was reasonable, proportionate and in the public interest to conclude this matter by issuing the Registrant with a warning as to their future conduct, as set out below.

50. The warning will remain on the Registrant's record for the maximum period of 6 months from the date of issue. The Committee considered that this was proportionate bearing in mind the admitted dishonesty (allegation 1).

51. The Committee then considered whether the warning should be confidential or public. Taking into account that the allegation involves dishonesty, and the wider public issues that this engages, the Committee considered it appropriate for the warning to be public so as to send a clear message to the professions.

Warning: The Committee therefore requested the Registrar to conclude this case by issuing the Registrant, Mr Oliver Morrison BVM&S MRCVS with a Warning as to their conduct in respect of the matters set out in the allegation and to note that this Warning will be taken into account by any future Committee which has to consider imposing a sanction. The Warning will remain on their record for a period of 6 months from the date of issue.

1 May 2026