

MEDICAL REGISTRATION ORDINANCE (Chapter 161)

ORDER MADE BY THE INQUIRY PANEL
OF THE MEDICAL COUNCIL OF HONG KONG

DR BRAMLEY LAUREN MARY (REGISTRATION NO.: M12950)
DR KULENKAMPFF CHARLENE JULIA (REGISTRATION NO.: M16940)
DR LEUNG CHOR HUNG STEVEN (REGISTRATION NO.: M01729)
DR MUI WINNIE (REGISTRATION NO.: M11973)

It is hereby notified that after due inquiry held on 3 March 2023 in accordance with section 21 of the Medical Registration Ordinance, Chapter 161 of the Laws of Hong Kong, the Inquiry Panel of the Medical Council of Hong Kong found Dr BRAMLEY Lauren Mary (Registration No.: M12950), Dr KULENKAMPFF Charlene Julia (Registration No.: M16940), Dr LEUNG Chor Hung Steven (Registration No.: M01729) and Dr MUI Winnie (Registration No.: M11973) guilty of the following amended disciplinary charges:—

Dr BRAMLEY Lauren Mary (Registration No.: M12950)

“That in or about August 2017, she, being a registered medical practitioner,

- (i) instigated, sanctioned, acquiesced in, or failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the advertisement(s) in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners, in which there was promotion of her, her services and/or her skills as follows:—*
 - (a) the impermissible promotional statements that “[she] takes a holistic approach to health, combining medicine, cutting-edge preventative testing, lifestyle and nutrition to ensure her clients live longer, healthier and better lives. [She] successfully combines western medicine with eastern understandings of nutrition, body balance and the power of natural healing for an all-encompassing approach to well-being”, which were misleading, exaggerating and/or claiming superiority over others;*
 - (b) the statements of “[being] uniquely sensitive to the cultural and social differences of her clients, their health and suitable treatments”, which were claiming superiority over others;*
 - (c) statements about platelet-rich plasma (“PRP”) in the web pages known as “O shot” and/or “Priapus Shot”. There was a YouTube video at (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDnMzviDw_I) published by “Dr Lauren Bramley & Partners” concerning platelet-rich plasma (PRP) facial therapy, which were tending to be misleading and exaggerating and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients;*
 - (d) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “anti-ageing medicine”, “medical aesthetics” and/or “regenerative medicine” which were misleading, exaggerating to the public, and/or claiming superiority over others;*
 - (e) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “General and Family Practice”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Family Medicine”; and*
- (ii) she engaged in impermissible practice promotion through the publication of Facebook posts at (<https://www.facebook.com/DrLBandP>).*

In relation to the facts alleged, either singularly or cumulatively, she has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”

Dr KULENKAMPFF Charlene Julia (Registration No.: M16940)

“That in or about August 2017, she, being a registered medical practitioner, failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the following in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners, with which she had financial or professional relationship with, in which there was promotion of her, her services and/or her skills as follows:—

- (a) the statements concerning her training in platelet-rich plasma (“PRP”) with one “American Cosmetic Cellular Medicine” and her qualification with one “American Academy of Aesthetics” which were not quotable qualifications;*

- (b) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “anti-ageing medicine”, “genomics”, and/or “regenerative medicine” which were misleading;
- (c) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “Children’s Health”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Paediatrics, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Paediatrics”; and/or
- (d) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “General and Family Practice”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Family Medicine”.

In relation to the facts alleged, either singularly or cumulatively, she has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”

Dr LEUNG Chor Hung Steven (Registration No.: M01729)

“That in or about August 2017, he, being a registered medical practitioner,

- (i) failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the following in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners, with which he had financial or professional relationship with, in which there was promotion of him, his services and/or his skills as follows:—
 - (a) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “anti-ageing medicine”, “medical aesthetics” and/or “regenerative medicine”, which were misleading;
 - (b) the use of the title of “Anti-Ageing Physician”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that he was a specialist in anti-ageing medicine;
 - (c) the statements concerning his experience in aesthetic medical injections, which canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients;
 - (d) the statements of hormonal treatment, which were claiming superiority over others;
 - (e) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “General and Family Practice”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that he was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact his name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Family Medicine”; and/or
- (ii) he quoted the qualification of “specialty Fellowship in Neurosurgery from the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons in New Zealand”, which was not permitted for use by the Medical Council.

In relation to the facts alleged, either singularly or cumulatively, he has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”

Dr MUI Winnie (Registration No.: M11973)

“That in or about August 2017, she, being a registered medical practitioner, failed to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the advertisement(s) in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners, with which she had financial or professional relationship with, in which there was promotion of her, her services and/or her skills as follows:—

- (a) the statements concerning her purported “focus on the health and wellness of people of all ages” and “through her warm and caring approach, Dr. Winnie Mui also strongly advocates disease screening and prevention”, which were sensational or unduly persuasive;
- (b) the statements concerning her experience in aesthetic medical injections, which promoted medical or health related products and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients;
- (c) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “anti-ageing medicine”, “medical aesthetics” and/or “regenerative medicine”, which were misleading;
- (d) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “children’s health”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Paediatrics, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Paediatrics”;
- (e) the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “gynaecology”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Obstetrics & Gynaecology, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Obstetrics & Gynaecology”;

- (f) *the use of the title of “Family Physician”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Family Medicine”;*
- (g) *the claim of “Special[i]ties” in “General and Family Practice”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact her name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Family Medicine”;* and/or
- (h) *the YouTube Video “You Tube: Dr. Bramley explains the benefits of PRP”, which promoted platelet-rich plasma and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients.*

In relation to the facts alleged, either singularly or cumulatively, she has been guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.”

2. The names of Dr BRAMLEY, Dr KULENKAMPPF, Dr LEUNG and Dr MUI have been included in the General Register from 4 January 2001, from 2 January 2013, from 6 July 1971 and from 13 July 1998 to the present respectively. Their names have never been included in the Specialist Register.

3. Briefly stated, the Medical Council (the “Council”) received an email from one Amy Wu on 30 August 2017 complaining Dr BRAMLEY, Dr KULENKAMPPF, Dr LEUNG and Dr MUI (“the Four Defendants”) of practice promotion and inappropriate quoting of their qualifications and experience in the website of Dr. Lauren Bramley & Partners (“the Website”) and other social media.

4. Attached to the complaint email were extracts from the Website, webpages known as “O Shot” and “Priapas Shot”; and screen shots from YouTube Video at (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDnMzvIDw_I). By another email dated 29 April 2020, the complainant further provided the Secretary with extracts of Facebook posts at (<https://www.facebook.com/DrLBandP>). Together they formed the basis of the respective amended disciplinary charges against the Four Defendants.

5. It was clearly stated in the Code of Professional Conduct (2016 edition) (the “Code”) that:—

“5.1.3 ... Practice promotion of doctors’ medical services as if the provision of medical care were no more than a commercial activity is likely both to undermine public trust in the medical profession and, over time, to diminish the standard of medical care.

...

5.2.1 *A doctor providing information to the public or his patients must comply with the principles set out below.*

5.2.1.1 *Any information provided by a doctor to the public or his patients must be:—*

- (a) *accurate;*
- (b) *factual;*
- (c) *objectively verifiable;*
- (d) *presented in a balanced manner (when referring to the efficacy of particular treatment, both the advantages and disadvantages should be set out).*

5.2.1.2 *Such information must not:—*

...

(b) *be comparative with or claim superiority over other doctors;*

...

- (d) *aim to solicit or canvass for patients;*
- (e) *be used for commercial promotion of medical and health related products and services...;*
- (f) *be sensational or unduly persuasive...;*
- (h) *generate unrealistic expectations...*

5.2.2. *Practice promotion*

5.2.2.1 *Practice promotion means publicity for promoting the professional services of a doctor, his practice or his group... Practice promotion in this context will be*

interpreted by the Council in its broadest sense, and includes any means by which a doctor or his practice is publicized, in Hong Kong or elsewhere, by himself or anybody acting on his behalf or with his forbearance (including the failure to take adequate steps to prevent such publicity in circumstances which would call for caution), which objectively speaking constitutes promotion of his professional services, irrespective of whether he actually benefits from such publicity.

...

- 6.1 *It is appropriate for a doctor to take part in bona fide health education activities, such as lectures and publications. However, he must not exploit such activities for promotion of his practice or to canvass for patients. Any information provided should be objectively verifiable and presented in a balanced manner, without exaggeration of the positive aspects or omission of the significant negative aspect.*
 - 6.2 *A doctor should take reasonable steps to ensure that the published or broadcasted materials, either by their contents or the manner they are referred to, do not give the impression that the audience is encouraged to seek consultation or treatment from him or organizations with which he is associated. He should also take reasonable steps to ensure that the materials are not used directly or indirectly for the commercial promotion of any medical and health related products or services.*
 - 6.3 *... Doctors must not give the impression that they, or the institutions with which they are associated, have unique or special skills or solutions to health problems.."*
6. A doctor has a personal responsibility to ensure that the service information about him or her in the practice website of a medical practice group to which he or she belongs is in compliance with the Code. In this connection, section 7.1 of the Code specifically provides that "[o]nly doctors on the Specialist Register are recognized as specialists, and can use the title of "specialist in a specialty".
7. Whilst doctors may be categorized as specialist practitioners on the practice website of a medical practice group but their names must actually be registered under the relevant specialties in the Specialist Register or they will be in breach of section 7.2 of the Code which expressly prohibits the use of "any misleading description or title implying specialization in a particular area (irrespective of whether it is a recognized specialty)".
8. And a doctor is not allowed to publish in his or her practice website or the website of his or her medical practice group qualifications which are not quotable qualifications approved by the Council.
9. With these basic principles in mind, the Inquiry Panel would look at the evidence adduced by the Secretary against each of the Four Defendants in the present case.
- Dr BRAMLEY Lauren Mary (Registration No.: M12950)
10. Dr BRAMLEY admitted the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charges against her.
11. Publication of the impermissible promotional statements, particulars of which were set out in the amended disciplinary charges (i)(a) and (b), which were misleading, exaggerating and/or claiming superiority over others, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, Dr BRAMLEY had in the Inquiry Panel's view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr BRAMLEY guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charges (i)(a) and (b) against her.
12. Publication via a hyperlink from the Website of statements about platelet-rich plasma ("PRP") in the web pages known as "O shot" and/or "Priapus Shot", which were tending to be misleading and exaggerating; and of the said YouTube Video about PRP facial therapy, which were tending to be misleading and exaggerating and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients, was again in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. Therefore, Dr BRAMLEY had in the Inquiry Panel's view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr BRAMLEY guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(c) against her.
13. By claiming special[i]ties in "anti-ageing medicine", "medical aesthetics", and/or "regenerative medicine", which were misleading, exaggerating to the public, and/or claiming superiority over others, Dr BRAMLEY was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry

Panel's view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr BRAMLEY guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(d) against her.

14. By claiming specialty in "General and Family Practice", when in fact she has not been approved by the Council to have her name included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of "Family Medicine", Dr BRAMLEY had in the Inquiry Panel's view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr BRAMLEY guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(e) against her.

15. It was also evident to the Inquiry Panel from reading the subject posts in the Facebook at (<https://www.facebook.com/DrLBandP>) that readers were offered discount for various treatments. By engaging in such impermissible practice promotion, Dr BRAMLEY had in the Inquiry Panel's view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr BRAMLEY guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (ii) against her.

16. Dr BRAMLEY had a clear disciplinary record.

17. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the proven case against Dr BRAMLEY and her plea of mitigation, the Inquiry Panel made a global order in respect of the amended disciplinary charges (i)(a) to (e) and (ii) that Dr BRAMLEY's name be removed from the General Register for a period of 3 months. The Inquiry Panel further ordered that the removal order be suspended for a period of 24 months

Dr KULENKAMPPF Charlene Julia (Registration No.: M16940)

18. Dr KULENKAMPPF admitted the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charges against her.

19. Publication in the Website of the statements concerning her training in *platelet-rich plasma* ("PRP") with one "*American Cosmetic Cellular Medicine*" and her qualification with one "*American Academy of Aesthetics*", which were not quotable qualifications, was in the Inquiry Panel's view a form of impermissible practice promotion. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the said publication, Dr KULENKAMPPF had in the Inquiry Panel's view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr KULENKAMPPF guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (a) against her.

20. The claim of "*Special[ities]*" in "*anti-ageing medicine*", "*genomics*", and/or "*regenerative medicine*", which were misleading, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent its publication in the Website, Dr KULENKAMPPF had in the Inquiry Panel's view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr KULENKAMPPF guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (b) against her.

21. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication in the Website of the claims of specialties in "*Children's Health*" and "*General and Family Practice*", which were misleading and not acceptable to the Council and when in fact she had not been approved by the Council to have her name included in the Specialist Register under the specialty of either "Paediatrics" or "Family Medicine", Dr KULENKAMPPF was in breach of sections 5.2.1.2 and 7.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel's view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr KULENKAMPPF guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charges (c) and (d) against her.

22. Dr KULENKAMPPF had a clear disciplinary record.

23. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the proven case against Dr KULENKAMPPF and her plea of mitigation, the Inquiry Panel made a global order in respect of the amended disciplinary charges (a) to (d) that Dr KULENKAMPPF's name be removed from the General Register for a period of 1 month. The Inquiry Panel further ordered that the removal order be suspended for a period of 6 months.

Dr LEUNG Chor Hung Steven (Registration No.: M01729)

24. Dr LEUNG admitted the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charges against him.

25. The claim in the Website of “*Special[ist]ties*” in “*anti-ageing medicine*”, “*medical aesthetics*”, and/or “*regenerative medicine*”, which were misleading, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr LEUNG guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(a) against him.

26. Use of the title of “*Anti-Ageing Physician*” in the Website, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that he was a specialist in anti-ageing medicine, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr LEUNG guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(b) against him.

27. Publication of the statements concerning his experience in aesthetic medical injections in the Website, which canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients; and in hormonal treatment, which claimed superiority over others, was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr LEUNG guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charges (i)(c) and (d) against him.

28. And the claim in the Website of ““*Special[ist]ties*” in “*General and Family Practice*”, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that he was a specialist in Family Medicine, when in fact his name was not included in the Specialist Register under the speciality of “Family Medicine”, Dr LEUNG was in breach of sections 5.2.1.2 and 7.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr LEUNG guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (i)(e) against him.

29. And by quoting the qualification of “*Specialty Fellowship in Neurosurgery from the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons in New Zealand*” in the Website, which was not permitted for use by the Medical Council, Dr LEUNG had again in the Inquiry Panel’s view by his conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel also found Dr LEUNG guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (ii).

30. Dr LEUNG had a clear disciplinary record.

31. The Inquiry Panel was told in mitigation that Dr LEUNG qualified as a Board Certified Physician with the American Board of Anti-Ageing and Regenerative Medicine and held the Neurosurgery Fellowship of Royal Australasian College of Surgeons.

32. The Inquiry Panel wished to point out that whilst academic biography of a doctor might be published in medical literature or the like, it did not necessarily follow that the same information could be provided to the public without modification through the practice website of a doctor or the website of his medical practice group.

33. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the proven case against Dr LEUNG and his plea of mitigation, the Inquiry Panel made a global order in respect of the amended disciplinary charges (i)(a) to (e) and (ii) that Dr LEUNG’s name be removed from the General Register for a period of 1 month. The Inquiry Panel further ordered that the removal order be suspended for a period of 6 months.

Dr MUI Winnie (Registration No.: M11973)

34. Dr MUI admitted the factual particulars of the amended disciplinary charges against her.

35. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the offending statements to which the amended disciplinary charge (i)(a) relates, which were sensational or unduly persuasive, Dr MUI was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr MUI guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (a) against her.

36. Publication of statements concerning her experience in “aesthetic medical injections”, which promoted medical or health related products and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients was in breach of sections 5.2.1.2 and 6.1 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners.

Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr MUI guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (b) against her.

37. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the claim of “*Special[ities] in anti-ageing medicine*”, which was misleading, exaggerating to the public, and/or claiming superiority over others, Dr MUI was in breach of section 5.2.1.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr MUI guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (c) against her.

38. In failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the various claims of specialties, particulars of which are set out in the amended disciplinary charges (d), (e) and (g), Dr MUI was in breach of sections 5.2.1.1 and/or 7.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr MUI guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charges (d), (e) and (g) against her.

39. Use of the title of “*Family Physician*” in the Website, which was not acceptable to the Medical Council for use and was misleading to the public that she was a specialist in Family Medicine, was in breach of section 5.2.1.1 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel found Dr MUI guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (f) against her.

40. And in failing to take adequate steps to prevent the publication of the YouTube Video entitled “*Dr. Bramley explains the benefits of PRP*”, which promoted PRP and/or canvassed for the purpose of obtaining patients, Dr MUI was in breach of sections 5.2.1.2 and 6.2 of the Code and had in the Inquiry Panel’s view by her conduct fallen below the standards expected of registered medical practitioners in Hong Kong. Accordingly, the Inquiry Panel’s found Dr MUI guilty of professional misconduct as per the amended disciplinary charge (h) against her.

41. Dr MUI had a clear disciplinary record.

42. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the proven case against Dr MUI and her plea of mitigation, the Inquiry Panel made a global order in respect of the amended disciplinary charges (a) to (h) that Dr MUI’s name be removed from the General Register for a period of 2 months. The Inquiry Panel further ordered that the removal order be suspended for a period of 12 months.

43. The orders are published in the *Gazette* in accordance with section 21(5) of the Medical Registration Ordinance. The full decision of the Inquiry Panel of the Medical Council is published in the official website of the Medical Council of Hong Kong (<http://www.mchk.org.hk>).

LAU Wan-ye, Joseph Chairman, *The Medical Council of Hong Kong*