INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE - CASE TO ANSWER – FLOWCHART (DRAFT 3.5.13)

Viewed uncritically, could the complainant's evidence disclose:
1. unprofessional conduct;
2. professional incompetence;
3. a criminal conviction relevant to fitness to practise;
4. serious impairment to practice due to a physical or mental condition?

No → Dismiss

Yes ↓

Is the complainant's evidence materially flawed (insufficient, contradictory, implausible, etc)?

Yes → Dismiss

No ↓

In the light of the osteopath's information and observations, does the evidence still disclose:
1. unprofessional conduct;
2. professional incompetence;
3. a criminal conviction relevant to fitness to practise;
4. serious impairment to practice due to a physical or mental condition?

No → Dismiss

Yes ↓

Is there a real prospect of the alleged facts being proved before the PCC/HC?

No → Dismiss

Yes ↓

Is there a real prospect that those alleged facts, if established, would amount to the relevant allegation?

No → Dismiss

Yes ↓

Is there any substantial reason why the case should <u>not</u> proceed further?

Yes ↓

Does the reason override the public interest in the complaint being publicly ventilated before the PCC?

Yes → Dismiss

No

No ↓

There is a case for the osteopath to answer. → **Refer to PCC**