

RADIOGRAPHERS BOARD
放 射 技 師 管 理 委 員 會

DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY
ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS ORDINANCE, CAP. 359

Date of Inquiry : 1 June 2026 (Mon)

Respondent : Mr LEUNG Tak-wong, Registered Part I Radiographer
(Diagnostic) (Registration No.: RD101937)

Charges against the respondent

The charges as extracted from the Notice of Inquiry sent to the Respondent on 28 October 2025 are as follows:-

“That you, being a radiographer registered in Part I of the register (Category: Diagnostic), were convicted at the District Court on 1 December 2022 of the offence of Riot, which is an offence punishable with imprisonment, contrary to section 19(1) and (2) of the Public Order Ordinance, Cap. 245, Laws of Hong Kong, and were sentenced to imprisonment for 30 months.”

Decision of the Radiographers Board

The respondent is a radiographer registered in Part I of the register (Category: Diagnostic). In the present inquiry, he is represented by legal representative, whereas the Secretary is represented by Legal Officer. Both parties did not call witnesses. Legal Officer relied on the bundle of documents to support her case against the respondent.

According to Legal Officer’s case, on 29 September 2019, the respondent, together with other persons, took part in a riot at the area of Queensway, Admiralty; and was convicted at the District Court on 1 December 2022 of the offence of riot and sentenced to imprisonment for 30 months.

According to the Reasons for Sentence provided by Legal Officer, the circumstances

relevant to the respondent's offence were as follows: -

“ ...

7. 案發於 2019 年 9 月的最後一個星期天，有大批人士參與了一個名為「全球反極權大巡遊」的活動，以銅鑼灣崇光百貨公司對開的軒尼詩道路段為起點，直到金鐘夏慤道政府總部。警方並無就該次活動發出「不反對通知書」。

8. 與當時發生的大部分社會事件一樣，當遊行接近終結時，示威者拒絕與執法人員合作，由起初的口頭爭議迅速演變為暴力衝突。主要的暴力場面發生在金鐘道太古廣場附近及夏慤道政府總部外面。

...

23. 是次涉及的暴動為時多於兩小時，參加人士亦近千；示威者在不同的地點設立路障、防線與警方對峙。更以打開的雨傘、交通圓筒、木牌為阻擋、打著旗幟向警方投擲汽油彈及硬物、在連接[太古廣場]及金鐘廊的行人天橋橋底縱火，與警方拉鋸前推進、把港島的心臟地帶變成戰場。本案沒有人傷亡，原因是警方沒有用盡手上的武器。各被告雖然可能在不同的地方、不同的時段加入，但從其衣著及裝備可以看出，這不是即興所為。他們的加入亦直接助長了參與暴動者的殺傷力和氣勢，更延長行動。所以，各人之罪責亦大致相等。

24. 示威者的行為不但師出無名，更是自私自大，挾其自以為高尚的理念，犧牲了其他的人的財產及自由和安全，更為社會帶來普遍的恐懼和不安。是次暴動為社會帶來最大的損失主要不在於公帑，亦不止於私有財產被毀；而是整個社會的和諧、互信及香港的國際形象受到的破壞。公眾措施可以很快修復，塗污的牆亦不難擦洗乾淨，但香港人之間的互信、社會的和諧卻不可能在短時間內回復。...

...

第一被告梁德煌

28. 本案之第一被告梁德煌在犯案之時只有 22 歲，在判刑之日已 25 歲。他在警方掃蕩之時在金鐘道被捕，曾一度用身體撞向警方，以企圖脫離控制。他全身黑衣，戴有過濾式口罩、手套，袋中更有另一個口罩。他在承認案情及認罪之下被裁定罪名成立。

...”

In the present inquiry, the respondent admitted that he was convicted of the offence as alleged.

According to section 22(1)(a) of the Allied Health Professions Ordinance, Cap. 359, if the Board is satisfied that a registered person has been convicted in Hong Kong of an offence punishable with imprisonment, the Board may make a disciplinary order against the person.

Upon considering the documents adduced by both parties and upon hearing the submissions by them, the Board is satisfied that the respondent has been convicted at the District Court on 1 December 2022 of the offence of riot, which is an offence punishable with imprisonment. The Board therefore determines that the allegation in the Notice of Inquiry has been proved to its satisfaction.

Sentence

The Board understands its responsibility to ensure that the professional conduct of all registered persons meets adequate standard in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. At the same time, the Board believes that society needs to provide opportunities for young offenders to rehabilitate, allowing them to utilize their knowledge and skills and contribute to the society.

The respondent has a clear disciplinary record, and there is no evidence that he has any other criminal record. At the time of the offence, he was 22 years old. There is no evidence that he played a leading role, nor was there any evidence showing he had damaged any property. He did not carry any offensive weapon or unlawful equipment on him.

According to the Reasons for Sentence provided by Legal Officer, the judge had this to say in considering the appropriate sentence: -

“...

29. [The respondent]本在一間醫院裡面當放射[技]師，於[2022]年12月1日已經辭職。被告的父母、兄長皆對其美言有加，其上司稱讚他工作熱誠，對病人關心，更有責任心，在疫情期間亦主動協助。

30. 本席在量刑之時特別考慮到他在求情信中提及自己的心路歷程，本席認為他所說的話可以套用在很多在當時受到別人影響、自己思想不成熟、沒有能力分析客觀事實而妄作非為的人身上，所以本席特別在此引用：

「一直以來，我都希望自己的行動能為自己、其他人、社會帶來良好影響。2019 年是非常轉折的一年，具爭議的決策出台，反政府聲音出現，社會運動開始，我受到社會氣氛和許多輿論影響，9 月 29 日，我抱著滿腔熱誠，上街參與了遊行，只望為自己的訴求、自己的理想發聲。無奈，非我本意地，遊行最後演化成大型衝突，有人受傷，自己亦被捕。在等待審訊的時間裡，我反思了很多，究竟自己做的事是否正確。從結論說起，我當日無疑是做了錯事，理想很豐滿，現實很骨感。理想是我嚮往一個更好的社會，現實是有人因我受到傷害，社會卻沒有變得更好，這是令我感到後悔的事。至少，追尋理想絕不應從犯法途徑，需要其他的正確方式。在此，我想向所有受到影響、受傷害的人道歉，我願意認罪，承擔做錯事的後果。」

31. 第一被告[i.e. the respondent]的求情信中所表達的心路歷程，正好反映了整個社會事件的悲劇；一些容易受到別人影響的人在未有想清楚自己行動對別人的影響，亦沒有想清楚自己行動的後果之下對別人所作出的傷害，以為違法可以達義，更以「守法是過時的想法」支持自己的行為。

32. 當然，提出此等歪理的人最應受罰，但被告本身已是一個成年人，他應該有基本的能力作出分析及決定，亦得考慮到家人及社會的福祉。違法祇是在走投無路之下的反應，可能在其他極之壓抑、極之暴政的社會中一個沒有選擇之下的表現；但香港尚未到這個地步；香港本身有現行的改進機制。當然，香港會受到獨特的歷史處境影響，在改變之時可能會有些制肘，但所有國家、所有人類的社會在蛻變時都有一定的限制，不可能一揮而就。

33. 第一被告讀書成績優異，熱心工作，亦關心家人。父親亦是因為疫情而失去工作，被告不提早認罪，是因為希望使用時間多與家人共聚。第一被告雖然沒有作出顯見的暴力行為，但亦得為其對暴力團體支持的行為而負責。於考慮總體程況之後本席亦接納第一被告是一個有正面品格的人；所以決定以 45 個月監禁為量刑基數，因為其認罪而下調至 30 個月，立時執行。

...”

The respondent submitted two mitigation letters from his former and present employers respectively. Both provided positive remarks regarding his background,

character, personality and work performance.

After taking into account all the relevant circumstances of this case and the respondent's mitigation submissions, the Board accepts that the respondent has deeply reflected on his misconduct and shown genuine remorse. However, the Board takes the view that the offence of the respondent was a serious one. The Board decides to order the name of the respondent to be removed from the register for one month and such order shall be published in the Government Gazette.

(Dr Danny CHO Hing-yan)
Chairman, Radiographers Board
1 June 2026