

GENERAL OSTEOPATHIC COUNCIL

DECISION OF THE PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE

In the case of:

JOAO CORREIA

Registration Number: 11061

7 July 2026

The Panel:

Sue Ware (Chair)

Manjit Darby (Lay Member)

Tamsyn Webb (Osteopath Member)

Tim Grey (Legal Assessor)

This case has been considered by the Professional Conduct Committee without a hearing, under the procedure set out in Rule 8 of the General Osteopathic Council (Professional Conduct Committee) (Procedure) Rules 2000.

ALLEGATION:

The allegation is that Joao Correia (the Registrant) has been guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, contrary to section 20(1)(a) of the Osteopaths Act 1993, in that:

1. From 1 December 2024 to 17 December 2024 inclusive of both dates ('the Relevant period'), the Registrant:
 - a) Was registered and/or practised as an osteopath; and
 - b) failed to obtain and maintain insurance cover required by Rule 3 of the General Osteopathic Council (Indemnity Arrangements) Rules Order 2015 ("the Order");
2. During the Relevant Period, the Registrant:
 - a) knew that in holding himself out to the public as a registered osteopath, he was required to hold professional indemnity insurance; and/or
 - b) treated patients despite not having appropriate professional indemnity insurance, thereby acting to the potential detriment of such patients and placing them at risk;

3. The Registrant's conduct as set out at paragraph 1(b) and/or paragraph 2(b):
- a) was misleading; and/or
 - b) Demonstrated a lack of integrity.

DECISION:

The Registrant has admitted both the allegation and the facts in support of the allegation. Accordingly, the allegation is found proved. The Registrant accepts that he is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct which has a material relevance to his fitness to practise osteopathy.

SANCTION:

Having regard to the Professional Conduct Committee's published Hearings and Sanctions Guidance; the Registrant's admissions set out in the Rule 8 Statement signed by him on 7 April 2026, his witness statement and exhibits, the Committee is satisfied that a sanction of admonishment is appropriate in this case.

The Committee's reasons for imposing an admonishment are as follows. The Registrant has admitted the allegation and has shown insight. He has reflected on the complaint and expressed regret for his failings. There is no allegation before the Committee that the registrant deliberately or knowingly failed to have appropriate professional indemnity insurance ("PII"). The Registrant rectified his position as soon as he became aware of his failure. There is no evidence before the Committee that he poses any risk to patients or the public.

The Registrant was first registered on 2 November 2023. The Registrant self-referred on 18 December 2024, admitting failing to have PII cover in place for a period of time. His cover had expired on 30 November 2024 and he was therefore not insured from 1 December 2024 until 17 December 2024, when his new policy commenced. The period represented his first full year in practice and coincided with the Registrant going overseas [REDACTED]. The Registrant accepted it was his responsibility to ensure he had appropriate PII cover and that he had failed to do so. He has now set up robust systems to prevent recurrence of the issue.

Accordingly the Committee was satisfied that the case was appropriate for disposal under the Rule 8 procedure and ordered that the registrant be admonished.

Section 22(13) of the Osteopaths Act 1993 requires this Committee to publish a report that sets out the names of those osteopaths who have had allegations found against them. The Registrant's name will be included in this report together with details of the allegations we have found proved and the sanction that that we have applied today.