

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

DR AMIR KASHIV

-and-

ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND ISSUES

1. Dr Amir Kashiv is a registered Veterinary Surgeon.
2. On 21 August 2025 Dr Kashiv was removed from the register of veterinary surgeons following a Disciplinary Committee (“Committee”) hearing that had begun on 18 August 2025.
3. The particulars of allegation against Dr Kashiv were framed as follows:

That, being registered in the Register of Veterinary Surgeons, you:

1. On 2 January 2024, at Stevenage Magistrates’ Court, you were convicted, following a guilty plea, of the offence of carrying out a prohibited procedure on a protected animal, namely that on 17 December 2022 at Broxbourne in the county of Hertfordshire carried out on a protected animal, namely a Labrador dog called Bella, a procedure which was prohibited by section 5(3) of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, namely de-chipping her;

and in relation to the above, you were sentenced to a community order of an unpaid work requirement of 50 hours within 12 months, and ordered to pay a surcharge to fund victim services of £114 and costs of £85;

AND THAT it is alleged that the conviction above renders you unfit to practise as a veterinary surgeon;

2. On 17 July 2024, at Stevenage Magistrates’ Court, you were made subject to a Criminal Behaviour Order made for five years from 17 July 2024, with the following requirements:

i. Ensure all dogs owned by you have a working and up to date microchip, and you must provide full details of this dog (microchip number, date of ownership, breed, age of dog, colouring and markings, name, previous ownership) to the Local Authority dog warden service provider;

ii. Inform the Local Authority dog warden service provider if at any time any dog leaves your care or ownership for any reason, including the date of change and fate of the dog;

iii. Use your best endeavours to ensure your property/land and its boundary (and in particular any fencing) is maintained to prevent any dog you own from escaping/straying off of the land;

iv. Allow inspection of your property every three months by a constable or officer of the local authority for the purpose of ensuring compliance of this order;

v. To fix any issues raised by those inspecting your property under the terms of this order and to record it with a nominated individual acting as a witness;

and with the following prohibition: accept permanent or temporary care or ownership of any additional dog(s) for rehabilitation, veterinarian procedures or rehoming beyond those you already have;

3. In relation to the offence at 1 above, your conduct was dishonest, in that you removed the microchip in order to conceal Bella's identity;

4. In relation to the offence at 1 above, you failed to keep any adequate clinical records in relation to Bella, and your conduct was thereby:

(i) misleading: and/or

(ii) dishonest.

AND that in relation to the matters set out at 2 and/or 3 and/or 4 above, whether individually or in any combination, you are guilty of disgraceful conduct in a professional respect.

4. All the particulars of allegation were either admitted or found proved. The Committee determined that Dr Kashiv's conviction rendered him unfit to practise

(particular 1) and that his conduct in particulars 2, 3 and 4 amounted to disgraceful conduct in a professional respect. It further determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction was removal from the register.

5. This is an appeal against sanction only. Dr Kashiv advances two overarching and linked points:
 1. Principal submission: the sanction imposed by the Committee was disproportionate
 2. Linked but secondary submission: the Committee's determination was flawed in many key respects and was not founded on sound and lawful reasoning
6. As to point 1, above, Dr Kashiv contends that the sanction imposed could and should have been a lesser one, namely a Suspension from the Register, which the Committee might have imposed had it wished for a period of up to two years.
7. As to point 2, above, Dr Kashiv advances that the Committee's decision was flawed in the following respects:
 1. The Committee gave insufficient regard to Dr Kashiv's long and distinguished career history and his numerous, excellent character references.
 2. The Committee erred in finding the dishonesty found in this case to be at the upper end of dishonesty matters, when they had earlier conceded that Dr Kashiv had done what he had done because of a genuinely held belief that what he was doing was in the best interests of the animal in question, whom he believed to be being abused.
 3. The Committee inappropriately speculated in their determination that Dr Kashiv had "de-chipped" other dogs (i.e. "done it before") from a passage that should have been redacted from the bundle, was in any event unclear, and did not relate to matters charged.
 4. The Committee erred in equating Dr Kashiv's conduct to part of a conspiracy to steal. There was no evidence of this and it was not the College's case against him.

5. The Committee gave no consideration to the well-recognised public interest in keeping good vets on the Register where possible given the national shortage.
8. The College contend that : (a) the sanction was not excessive or disproportionate; (b) the Committee's reasoning was not flawed in any of the ways described in point 2 above; and (c) in any event, even if the Committee's reasoning was flawed in one or more of the ways described in point 2, those flaws were not material to the correctness of the sanction.
9. In response to point 2 above, the College submits, among other things, that:
 1. The Committee had proper regard to Dr Kashiv's career history and positive references. Dr Kashiv was not a person of good character. He had been the subject of previous disciplinary and criminal findings (as summarised in the attached chronology).
 2. The Committee's analysis of the seriousness of Dr Kashiv's conduct is unimpeachable. It properly considered motive alongside other factors that made the dishonest conduct more serious, including findings that Dr Kashiv's actions were unethical and illegal and that he sought to cover up his dishonesty.
 3. The College disputes that the passage about de-chipping other dogs to which Dr Kashiv refers in his grounds (which formed part of the record of Dr Kashiv's police interview) "should have been" redacted from the bundle. The bundle was agreed by Dr Kashiv's representatives; they did not ask for this particular passage to be redacted. The Committee were entitled to have regard to the record of the police interview as part of its overall assessment of insight and risk of repetition.
 4. The Committee did not use the term "conspiracy to steal". The sanction was based on findings made at the fact-finding stage. Dr Kashiv's state of knowledge (that the dog was stolen) and purpose (to conceal the dog's identity) were integral to the Committee's findings on dishonesty and were properly taken into account at the sanction stage.
 5. The Committee found Dr Kashiv was not a "good" vet. Evidence that he was clinically competent could not justify a lesser sanction than removal from

the register where his conduct was fundamentally incompatible with continued registration.

10. The agreed issues, in summary, are as follows:

1. Was the sanction disproportionate?
2. Was the Committee's reasoning flawed in all or any of the ways described in point 2 above?
3. If so, were those flaws material to the correctness of the overall sanction?

PETER MANT KC
TOM ORPIN-MASSEY

5th August 2026

IN THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL
ON APPEAL FROM THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE
OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS
BETWEEN:-

DR AMIR KASHIV

Appellant

and

ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS

Respondent

TAB 2

PRECIS

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

DR AMIR KASHIV

-and-

ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS

PRECIS

1. This is an appeal against sanction only.
2. On 21 August 2025, following a substantive hearing before the RCVS Disciplinary Committee, the Committee directed that Dr Kashiv's name be removed from the Register.
3. For the reasons set out in Dr Kashiv's grounds of appeal, he contends that a lesser sanction, namely Suspension, was the more appropriate outcome, and he further contends that some of the findings made by the Committee were flawed.
4. The College oppose this appeal and say that removal from the register was a sanction well open to the Committee, and that the Committee's reasoning was sound.

IN THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL
ON APPEAL FROM THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE
OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS
BETWEEN:-

DR AMIR KASHIV

Appellant

and

ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS

Respondent

TAB 3
CHRONOLOGY

Kashiv v RCVS: Chronology – Annex to Statement of Facts and Issues

Date	Event
Various dates in 2014 and 2015	There were a number of episodes of Dr Kashiv's dogs escaping from his land, and issues with dogs barking and howling. He was served with warnings and Community Protection Notices as a result.
April 2016	Dr Kashiv was convicted of three offences of breaching the Community Protection Notices. The breaches related to allowing dogs to roam freely on the public highway. He was also convicted of one offence of breach of an Abatement Notice, relating to a failure to take action to resolve noise arising from barking and howling of dogs at his home address. He was sentenced to fines and was made subject to a Criminal Behaviour Order ("CBO") for two years.
November 2016	Dr Kashiv was convicted of breaching that CBO, by allowing a dog to escape from his premises and stray onto a public road. He was fined for that breach.
December 2016	Dr Kashiv appeared before the College's Disciplinary Committee on charge relating to his treatment of a dog "Tanzy", failure to discuss matters with the owner and poor record keeping. He was found guilty of disgraceful conduct. The sanction decision was postponed for two years upon Dr Kashiv giving undertakings as to this conduct.
July 2017	Dr Kashiv appeared before the College's Disciplinary Committee in relation to the two convictions in 2016. On 20 July 2017, the Disciplinary Committee concluded that the convictions did not render Dr Kashiv unfit to practise veterinary surgery, although the matter was "borderline" and capable of bringing the profession into disrepute.
November 2018	Dr Kashiv was again convicted for a breach of the CBO. This matter was not referred to the Disciplinary Committee.
December 2018	Disciplinary Committee imposes reprimand for the disgraceful conduct in relation to the dog "Tanzy" (for which sanction was postponed in December 2016).
Various dates in 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023	A number of dogs belonging to Dr Kashiv were found wandering without supervision in the vicinity of his home address or further afield. On some occasions, neighbours made complaints to the authorities. On two occasions, the dogs were found roaming freely and were taken to rescue centres. Huntingdon District Council investigated the reports and issued notices and penalties on Dr Kashiv in relation to keeping his dogs from straying.
7 December 2022	Dog "Bella" is taken from her owner
17 December 2022	Dr Kashiv de-chips dog "Bella" after persons unknown brought Bella to him.
Date unknown in-between	Bella reunited with her owner

Kashiv v RCVS: Chronology – Annex to Statement of Facts and Issues

Date	Event
28 January 2023	Bella was taken to West Mount Vets in Halifax, the veterinary practice which had cared for her throughout her life. Dr AP, a veterinary surgeon at that practice, examined Bella and found a shaved section on her neck. Dr AP re-shaved the area and found a small surgical scar consistent with the removal of a microchip.
28 February 2023	Dr Kashiv was arrested for performing the surgery. On the same day, he was interviewed by police officers with a legal representative present. He admitted the offence.
2 January 2024	Dr Kashiv pleads guilty to and is convicted of carrying out a prohibited procedure on a protected animal, namely that on 17 December 2022 at Broxbourne in the county of Hertfordshire carried out on a protected animal, namely a Labrador dog called Bella, a procedure which was prohibited by section 5(3) of the Animal Welfare Act 2006, namely de-chipping her. He was sentenced to a community order of an unpaid work requirement of 50 hours within 12 months, and ordered to pay a surcharge to fund victim services of £114 and costs of £85.
17 July 2024	Dr Kashiv was made subject to a Criminal Behaviour Order made for five years from 17 July 2024, with the following requirements: i. Ensure all dogs owned by you have a working and up to date microchip, and you must provide full details of this dog (microchip number, date of ownership, breed, age of dog, colouring and markings, name, previous ownership) to the Local Authority dog warden service provider; ii. Inform the Local Authority dog warden service provider if at any time any dog leaves your care or ownership for any reason, including the date of change and fate of the dog; iii. Use your best endeavours to ensure your property/land and its boundary (and in particular any fencing) is maintained to prevent any dog you own from escaping/straying off of the land; iv. Allow inspection of your property every three months by a constable or officer of the local authority for the purpose of ensuring compliance of this order; v. To fix any issues raised by those inspecting your property under the terms of this order and to record it with a nominated individual acting as a witness and with the following prohibition: accept permanent or temporary care or ownership of any additional dog(s) for rehabilitation, veterinarian procedures or rehoming beyond those you already have

Kashiv v RCVS: Chronology – Annex to Statement of Facts and Issues

Date	Event
6 March 2025	A Case Management Conference was held before the Chair of the RCVS Disciplinary Committee
27 March 2025	Dr Kashiv listed for substantive hearing before the RCVS Disciplinary Committee. Case adjourned as RCVS sought and were granted permissions to amend the charges to allege dishonesty
18-21 August 2025	Dr Kashiv substantive hearing before the RCVS Disciplinary Committee. The outcome was removal from the register
September 2025	Dr Kashiv appeals to the Privy Council