

**UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA**

**A LEGAL STUDY ON INQUIRY  
PROCEDURE UNDER THE  
REGISTRATION OF PHARMACISTS  
ACT 1951 AND ITS REGULATIONS**

**NURUL AFIFAH BINTI OSMAN**

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
**Master of Enforcement Law**

**Faculty of Law**

**January 2018**

## **AUTHOR'S DECLARATION**

I declare that the work in this dissertation was carried out in accordance with the regulations of Universiti Teknologi MARA. It is original and is the results of my own work, unless otherwise indicated or acknowledged as referenced work. This thesis has not been submitted to any other academic institution or non-academic institution for any degree or qualification.

I, hereby, acknowledge that I have been supplied with the Academic Rules and Regulations for Post Graduate, Universiti Teknologi MARA, regulating the conduct of my study and research.

Name of Student : Nurul Afifah binti Osman

Student I.D. No. : 2016802886

Programme : Master of Enforcement Law – LW 707

Faculty : Law

Thesis : A Legal Study On Inquiry Procedure Under The  
Registration Of Pharmacists Act 1951 And Its  
Regulations

Signature of Student : .....

Date : January 2018

## **ABSTRACT**

In Malaysia, pharmacist's misconduct cases are handled by Pharmacy Board Malaysia using existing inquiry process provides under the Registration of Pharmacists Act 1951 and its regulations. However, the implementation of the procedure has a limitation in certain aspects. Therefore, this research is to examine and compare the current laws on inquiry procedure for pharmacists between Malaysia and United Kingdom so as to highlight the inadequacies of the law in Malaysia. Subsequently, it is to recommend the methods in order to improve the current procedure. This research adopted qualitative research methodology where the information gathered from journals, reports, articles, books and a semi-structured interview. From this research, it was discovered that provisions in the Registration of Pharmacists Act 1951 are inadequate to assist the Pharmacy Board Malaysia in implementing the inquiry procedure for pharmacists. The obvious lacking is the absence of the definition of 'infamous and disgraceful conduct'. Besides that, there are differences between Malaysia and United Kingdom in term of appointment of Board's Members and no provision on notification to the complainant and interim order as compared with Pharmacy Order in the United Kingdom. Thus there is a need to improve on the administrative and legislative with regard to implementation of inquiry procedure in Malaysia.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>AUTHOR'S DECLARATION</b> .....   | <b>i</b>    |
| <b>ABSTRACT</b> .....   | <b>ii</b>   |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....  | <b>iii</b>  |
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....  | <b>iv</b>   |
| <b>LIST OF STATUTES</b> .....   | <b>vii</b>  |
| <b>LIST OF CASES</b> .....  | <b>viii</b> |
| <b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....   | <b>ix</b>   |
| <b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....  | <b>x</b>    |
| <b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....  | <b>xi</b>   |
| <br>  |             |
| <b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b> .....  | <b>1</b>    |
| 1.1 Research Background .....   | 1           |
| 1.2 Literature Review.....  | 4           |
| 1.3 Problem Statement .....   | 7           |
| 1.4 Research Questions.....   | 8           |
| 1.5 Research Objectives.....  | 9           |
| 1.6 Research Methodology .....  | 9           |
| 1.7 Significant Contribution Of The Research .....                                  | 10          |
| 1.8 Scope And Limitation Of Research .....  | 11          |
| <br>  |             |
| <b>CHAPTER TWO: LAW RELATING TO PHARMACIST IN MALAYSIA AND UNITED KINGDOM</b> ..... | <b>12</b>   |
| 2.0 Introduction.....   | 12          |
| 2.1 Definition of Pharmacist .....  | 12          |
| 2.2 Law Related To Pharmacist In Malaysia .....                                     | 14          |
| 2.2.1 Registration of Pharmacists Act 1951 (Act 371) & Regulations .....            | 15          |
| 2.2.2 COC for Pharmacists and Bodies Corporates 2009 .....                          | 19          |
| 2.3 Law Related To Pharmacist In the United Kingdom (UK) .....                      | 21          |

|       |   |    |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.3.1 | Pharmacy Order 2010 .....                 | 22 |
| 2.3.2 | General Pharmaceutical Council .....      | 23 |
| 2.3.3 | Standards for pharmacy professionals..... | 25 |
| 2.4   | Conclusion .....                          | 26 |

### **CHAPTER THREE: THE IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPARISON OF INQUIRY PROCEDURE BETWEEN MALAYSIA AND UNITED KINGDOM... 27**

|         |   |    |
|---------|---|----|
| 3.0     | Introduction.....   | 27 |
| 3.1     | Other pharmacy agencies involved in the enforcement of inquiry procedure .....                            | 27 |
| 3.2     | Implementation of Inquiry Procedure in Malaysia .....   | 28 |
| 3.2.1   | Complaint against a registered pharmacist and a body corporate.....                                       | 28 |
| 3.2.2   | Committee of Inquiry (COI).....   | 28 |
| 3.2.3   | Investigation by the COI .....  | 28 |
| 3.2.4   | Inquiry by the Board.....   | 29 |
| 3.2.5   | Appointment and payment of legal adviser.....   | 29 |
| 3.2.6   | Punishment .....  | 29 |
| 3.2.7   | Appeal .....  | 30 |
| 3.3     | Implementation of Inquiry Procedure in the United Kingdom.....  | 31 |
| 3.3.1   | Investigation of Information .....  | 31 |
| 3.3.1.1 | <i>Stage one: when concern received</i> .....   | 34 |
| 3.3.1.2 | <i>Stage two - initial inquiries and investigation</i> .....  | 35 |
| 3.3.1.3 | <i>Stage three - investigating committee</i> .....  | 35 |
| 3.3.1.4 | <i>Stage four - fitness to practice committee (FtPC)</i> .....  | 36 |
| 3.3.1.5 | <i>Appeal committee</i> .....   | 39 |
| 3.3.2   | Example of cases .....  | 39 |
| 3.3.2.1 | <i>R v Statutory Committee of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain ex parte Sokoh [1986]</i> ..... | 39 |
| 3.3.2.2 | <i>Numan v General Pharmaceutical Council, High Court of Justice, CO/923/2016</i> .....                   | 40 |
| 3.3.2.3 | <i>Burrows v General Pharmaceutical Council, QBD Administrative Court, 2016</i> .....                     | 41 |
| 3.4     | Comparative analysis .....  | 42 |