

BY EMAIL
Dr Arun Chopra
Interim Chief Executive
Care Quality Commission

12 February 2026

Dear Dr Chopra,

**RE: CQC'S RESPONSE TO SERIOUS OFFENDING BY PAUL LIPSCOMBE AND NHS
MANAGERIAL FITNESS**

I write to raise some matters with respect to the very serious matter of Paul Lipscombe, an Associate Director at University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust (UHCW).

He was sentenced to over 28 years imprisonment on 11 November 2025 for serious sex offences against girls aged 12 to 15, and for making and distributing indecent images of children. This was an exceptional sentence, and in part represents an extended sentence under section 280 of the Sentencing Act 2020, relating to rape of a child under 13, such was the gravity of the offences. The sentencing judge concluded that Lipscombe was "very highly dangerous":

"The dangerousness of you, it shouts out from the evidence in this case, it then becomes utterly compounded by the contents of the pre-sentence report, and I have a firm view that you are very highly dangerous"

The transcript of sentencing proceedings from the Court evidences the gravity of Lipscombe's offences. A copy is attached to inform CQC's response to my enquiry.

NOTIFICATIONS TO THE CQC

UHCW was informed by the police of his initial arrest on 23 April 2024. This was for suspected kidnapping of a missing fifteen year old girl. The trust informed me via FOI disclosure that it did not formally notify the CQC of this. Moreover, UHCW informed me in a subsequent FOI disclosure that it consulted the local CQC relationship manager and together they decided that the arrest of a senior manager was not a reportable incident:

"On 23rd April 2024, the Trust was informed that PL had been arrested for a serious criminal charge involving one person. The Trust made an initial assessment that the CQC would not need to be informed. A verbal conversation with the CQC relationship manager confirmed that the incident did not trigger Regulation 18."

The trust nevertheless informed NHS England of the incident in June 2024:

"The Trust also informed NHSE of this matter on 5th June 2024."

UHCW informed me that it only formally notified the CQC about Lipscombe's case in August 2025, after it had been informed on the 6 August 2025 that he had pleaded guilty to further offences:

"On 6th August 2025, the Trust was informed that PL's court case was due to commence in late August 2025 and that PL had pleaded guilty to further criminal charges. The CQC were formally notified on 6 August 2025."

For accuracy, I should note that the police have indicated that Lipscombe in fact pleaded guilty to the offences in February 2025.

I was surprised and concerned to learn that the trust did not consider the arrest of the senior manager of a regulated provider on a "serious criminal charge" (its words) to be reportable, and that the local CQC relationship manager reportedly agreed with this.

I was also concerned to see that the trust and the CQC relationship manager only appeared to consider Regulation 18, staffing, when there were other CQC Regulations that might have been considered. Such as on governance, Safeguarding and Fit and Proper Persons.

As far as I can see, there was no CQC inspection in response to the CQC relationship manager being informed in April 2024 of Lipscombe's arrest.

The police have indicated that after the missing fifteen year old girl was found with Lipscombe, and taken to a place of safety, she accused him of rape.

Did UHCW and the CQC relationship know this, and did they decide that the arrest was not a reportable incident despite this?

I would be grateful if CQC could advise if UHCW's account of events is correct, and what was known to CQC about Lipscombe's arrest and allegations against him at the point that it was decided that his arrest was not reportable.

Most of all, I would be grateful for clarification from CQC about whether or not there may be a repetition of the events. Should a similar circumstance arise, would CQC still take the position that the arrest of a senior manager of regulated provider on a serious criminal charge is not a reportable incident?

CQC's REVIEW OF UHCW LEADERSHIP AUGUST 2025

Within nine days of being formally notified on 6 August 2025 of Lipscombe's crimes and his guilty plea, the CQC undertook a Well Led inspection.

This concluded that the trust had complied with the administrative requirements of Regulation 5 Fit and Proper Persons, and it concluded overall that the trust merited a rating of "Good" on the Well Led domain.

“The trust followed the NHS England guidance for ensuring those persons who met the criteria in Regulation 5 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014 were fit and proper to carry out their roles.”

“We reviewed a number of trust files for executive and non-executive directors and found the sample of documents to be in good order. This included evidence such as references, qualifications, self-declarations, disqualification and insolvency registers, and criminal record checks. Any executives that were members of other bodies through their trust role, such as sitting on the local Integrated Care Board were confirmed as fit and proper by the trust Chair. The trust executive with oversight for legal requirements maintained a spreadsheet with all the required information for this Regulation which was complete and up to date. Declarations of interest were made by executives and recorded at each trust board meeting and papers made public”

However, I found no reference by CQC to the fact that there had been major criminality by a senior manager, even alleged, or to the trust’s internal response to such a major event.

The reality is that the trust did not appear to conduct any meaningful review of its governance in relation to the Lipscombe case, or if it did, it has not acknowledged this to me.

The trust claimed publicly that it had conducted “an internal review”.

However, via FOI, the trust indicated to me that this review consisted only of supplying information to the police as follows:

“In liaison with the police, the Trust reviewed whether there was any evidence that PL had used any Trust devices to make contact with children and whether there was any inappropriate material on any of his Trust devices. The Trust also reviewed whether there was any evidence that PL had made any inappropriate access to patient information as part of his non patient contact role.”

The Trust disclosed that the senior trust managers in charge of this exercise were as follows:

“The review was undertaken by the Director of Performance & Informatics, Director of ICT & Digital and Director of Workforce reporting to the Chief People Officer on behalf of the Trust Board”

So as far as I can see, UHCW did not meaningfully and fully review its governance in the light of Lipscombe’s arrest for a serious criminal charge, of suspected kidnapping of a minor. There appears to have been no full review of Safeguarding, no wider checking of processes for ensuring managerial fitness and no attempt to review the impact on Lipscombe’s colleagues or to formally garner their feedback or assess any need for support.

Did CQC review at all the trust's response and governance specifically in relation to Lipscombe's offending and its implications? If not, why not? If CQC did examine UHCW's specific response to the Lipscombe case, why was this not acknowledged by the report of the Well Led inspection as a matter of public accountability?

I should point out that in the past, when I asked CQC about the case of a CQC inspector who was jailed for eighteen years for sex offences and perverting the course of justice ([Carl Beech](#), the notorious individual behind malicious, false claims of a VIP sex abuse ring), [CQC informed me via FOIA that it reviewed all relevant records:](#)

"...we have reviewed all records to identify any risks from the inspections and CQC activities that he was involved in and we have no information of concern about his conduct on any inspection. All of the providers have been notified of his involvement in the inspection of their services."

Can CQC say the same of UHCW in respect to Lipscombe, whose offences were more violent and intrusive than Beech's?

Lipscombe's case was widely reported and his senior position in the NHS was squarely featured in headlines. Some of the reports featured images of Lipscombe in his NHS role.

BBC 11 November 2025 ["NHS manager who groomed young girls on Snapchat jailed for 28 years for rape and abuse"](#)

Daily Telegraph 10 November 2025 ["Married NHS boss raped girl, 12, in campaign of sexual abuse"](#)

ITV 11 November 2025 ["NHS executive at Coventry hospitals trust facing jail after pleading guilty to child sex offences"](#)

Sky News 11 November 2025 ["NHS manager jailed after raping a girl he groomed on Snapchat"](#)

Daily Mail 11 November 2025 ["NHS executive who raped or abused girls he groomed on Snapchat is jailed for over 28 years"](#)

Daily Mirror 11 November 2025 ["Vile NHS boss who raped child, 12, and sexually abused five more jailed for 28 years"](#)

It is clear that Lipscombe's case raised public interest issues of confidence in the NHS.

I hope the CQC will provide some reassurance that there will be governance to support public confidence.

Many thanks,

Dr Minh Alexander

Cc Dr Toli Onon CQC Chief Inspector of Hospitals
Prof Sir Mike Richards CQC Chair