

**Professional Conduct Committee  
Review Hearing****9 May 2025****Name:** NOTTA, Gurpreet Singh**Registration number:** 150378**Case number:** CAS-187684-M9V5X5

---

**General Dental Council:** Instructed by Carla Marie Clough, IHLPS**Registrant:** Not present  
Unrepresented

---

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired by reason of misconduct**Outcome:** Suspended indefinitely

---

**Committee members:** Jane Everitt (Chair, lay member)  
Avril Fraser (Dental Care Professional member)  
Samaneh Nezamivand-Chegini (Dentist member)**Legal adviser:** Richard Ferry-Swainson**Committee Secretary:** Sara Page

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee pursuant to section 27C of the '*Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)*' ('the Act'). Members of the Committee, as well as the Legal Adviser and the Committee Secretary, are participating via Microsoft Teams in line with the General Dental Council's (GDC) current practice of holding hearings remotely.
2. Neither party was present at today's hearing, following a request for the review of the substantive order to be conducted on the papers. The hearing was conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams in line with current General Dental Council (GDC) practice.
3. In the absence of both parties, the Committee first considered the issues of service and whether to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Notta and any representatives for either party. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on these matters.

#### **Decision on service of Notice of Hearing**

4. The Committee was informed at the start of this hearing that Mr Notta was neither present nor represented at today's hearing.
5. In his absence, the Committee first considered whether the Notice of Hearing ('the Notice') had been served on Mr Notta in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the '*General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006*' ('the Rules').
6. The Committee had regard to the indexed hearing bundle of 214 pages, which contained a copy of the Notice, dated 8 April 2025. The Notice was sent to Mr Notta's registered address by Special Delivery and First Class post on 8 April 2025, in accordance with Section 50A of the '*Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)*' ('the Act') and via email on the same date.
7. The Committee was satisfied that the Notice contained proper and correct information relating to today's hearing. This included the time, date and that it is being conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams, as well as notification of the GDC's intention to conduct the review on the papers and in the absence of the parties.
8. Whilst it is not a requirement of the Rules, the Committee had sight of an extract from the Royal Mail 'Track and Trace' service which showed the item was delivered to Mr Notta's registered address on 9 April 2025. It was signed for against the printed name of 'NOTTA'.
9. In light of the information available, the Committee was satisfied that Mr Notta has been served with proper notification of this hearing, with at least 28 days' notice, in accordance with the Rules.

#### **Decision on whether to proceed in the absence of Mr Notta and on the papers**

10. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Notta and any representative for either party. The Committee was mindful that the discretion to proceed in the absence of Mr Notta must be exercised with the utmost care and caution. The Legal Adviser reminded the Committee of the requirement to be fair to both parties, as well as considering the public interest in the expeditious review of this case.
11. The Committee noted that there has not been any engagement by Mr Notta in relation to today's review hearing and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure his attendance on some future occasion.
12. The Committee bore in mind that today's hearing has been arranged as there is a statutory requirement for the substantive order imposed on Mr Notta's registration to be reviewed before it expires on 5 June

2025. It noted that no application for an adjournment had been made by Mr Notta and there was no information before the Committee that adjourning would secure his attendance at a later date as a result of his lack of engagement with these proceedings. Further, the Committee noted that Mr Notta has not engaged with these regulatory proceedings since November 2022. On the basis of the information before it, the Committee concluded that Mr Notta had voluntarily absented himself from today's hearing.

13. In all these circumstances, the Committee determined that it was fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing on the papers and in the absence of the parties.

## **Background**

14. This hearing was convened to review the current suspension order, which is due to expire on 5 June 2025.
15. This is the fourth review of a substantive order initially imposed as a suspension by the Professional Conduct Committee ('the PCC') in November 2021.
16. Mr Notta has been registered as a Dentist with the GDC since 18 June 2008. Mr Notta's case was first considered by a PCC at a hearing which took place in March 2021 and in November 2021. A summary of the findings made by that initial PCC is as follows:
  - *The initial PCC found that there were multiple failings in your clinical practice. These failings were repeated on several patients and occurred over several years. In particular, the initial PCC found in relation to three patients, that you had failed to tell them that their permanent dentures were the same, lesser quality as temporary dentures, and that this failing was misleading and dishonest. The initial PCC also found that you had failed to quality grade radiographs in respect of two patients.*
  - *The initial PCC found multiple failings in your record keeping, including failing to record discussions with patients about treatment options and the risks and benefits of treatment.*
  - *The initial PCC found that in February 2018, you knowingly utilised a chairside assistant whose scope of practice did not permit him to undertake the role.*
  - *The initial PCC found that you practised without adequate indemnity insurance on two occasions, in December 2016 and February 2017, when treating UK patients in India for dental implants.*
  - *The initial PCC found that you had permitted or caused to be published an advertisement for dental implant treatment in the Solihull Observer on or around 19 May 2016 stating, "success rates > 99%", which was misleading and dishonest.*
17. The initial PCC imposed a suspension order for a period of six months. This order was reviewed on three further occasions, as follows:
  - 6 June 2023 (Suspension revoked, conditions of practice imposed for 12 months);
  - 3 May 2023 (Conditions revoked, suspension imposed for 12 months); and
  - 24 April 2024 (Suspension order extended for 12 months).
18. At the most recent review, the PCC found Mr Notta's fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of misconduct. The PCC's findings on impairment can be summarised as follows:

*'There is no evidence before this Committee that Mr Notta has addressed his past misconduct and provided any evidence of remediation. It also took account of the fact that Mr Notta is unrepresented and accepted that this process may be challenging for him. However, the Committee was of the view that it is incumbent on Mr Notta, as a GDC registrant, to engage with his regulator and provide evidence of remediation. The Committee considered that Mr Notta has not demonstrated sufficient insight into his misconduct.'*

*'Given its concerns regarding Mr Notta's lack of insight and incomplete remediation the Committee determined that a finding of current impairment is required to protect patients. The Committee was of the view that a finding of current impairment was also in the public interest in order to maintain public confidence and uphold the standards of the profession. It was also of the view that a fully informed member of the public aware of the initial findings made would be concerned if a finding of current impairment was not made.'*

19. The PCC directed that Mr Notta's registration be subject to a further period of suspension, extended for 12 months with a review, stating:

*'In all the circumstances, the Committee has determined to extend the current suspension order on Mr Notta's registration for a period of 12 months with a review. In deciding on the period, the Committee took into account the serious nature of all the facts found proved in this case. It was satisfied that this further period of suspension is required in this case. The Committee considered that a period of 12 months will afford him time to focus on any remediation and engagement with the GDC.'*

## **Submissions**

20. In its written submissions, the GDC confirmed that it has not received any information suggesting Mr Notta is now engaging with the fitness to practise process and the recommendations of the PCC since the last review hearing.
21. The GDC stated that the Council's Case Review team sent an email to Mr Notta on 30 October 2024, and 5 February 2025, reminding him of the upcoming review hearing. It is noted that both emails generated delivery failure notifications. The GDC confirmed that it has not received any download receipt or email response to the Notice of Hearing which was sent by post and email on 8 April 2025.
22. The GDC submitted that Mr Notta's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of his misconduct as, in the absence of any evidence of remediation or insight into the misconduct, there remains a high risk of repetition and therefore a risk of harm to patients. As such, an informed member of the public would be surprised if the suspension order were not continued in light of the concerns that remain.
23. The GDC further submitted that to revoke the current suspension order would not adequately protect the public or maintain the public's confidence in the dental profession. The GDC submitted that an order of conditions remains wholly inappropriate in this matter as Mr Notta appears to have disengaged with the proceedings and it would not be appropriate to impose an order of conditions where he has shown no insight or remediation into his clinical failings. Further, there is no evidence to suggest that Mr Notta would seek to comply with any conditions or engage with the GDC. As such, the GDC submitted that an order of conditions would not be workable and would not serve to protect the public or act in the public interest.
24. Given that Mr Notta has been continuously suspended for two years and has not engaged at all since the last review hearing, the GDC submitted that, in the circumstances of this case, it would be appropriate and proportionate to indefinitely suspend Mr Notta from the Register.

25. In the absence of any engagement from Mr Notta, he has not provided any written submissions for consideration by the Committee for the purposes of today's review.

### **Decision and reasons on impairment**

26. The Committee considered whether Mr Notta's fitness to practise remains impaired. In reaching its decision on the issue of impairment, the Committee exercised its own independent judgement. It bore in mind that its duty is to consider the public interest, which includes the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
27. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
28. The Committee had regard to the bundle provided today which included the determination from the initial PCC hearing, as well as those from the subsequent review hearings. In addition, the Committee was provided with 'Delivery failure notifications' for emails sent to Mr Notta's registered email address dated 30 October 2024 and 5 February 2025 relating to the upcoming review. Mr Notta has not provided any additional documentary evidence for consideration by the Committee.
29. In deciding whether Mr Notta's fitness to practise remains impaired, the Committee considered whether there has been any material change since the previous PCC review to satisfy the Committee that Mr Notta has addressed the outstanding issues in this case. The Committee bore in mind that there were two elements to the misconduct found by the initial PCC, namely an attitudinal element (relating to dishonesty to patients, use of an unqualified chairside assistant, and lack of adequate indemnity insurance) and a number of wide-ranging clinical concerns.
30. The Committee agreed with the previous PCC that the probity and attitudinal aspects of Mr Notta's misconduct had been remedied. In its consideration of the clinical concerns, the Committee noted that such issues are remediable and considered whether there was sufficient evidence to demonstrate any development since the previous review in April 2024.
31. The Committee noted that the emails sent to Mr Notta's registered email address in October 2024 and February 2025 have both generated a 'Delivery notification failure' and that Mr Notta has not directly engaged with the GDC since 31 October 2022. The Committee noted an email sent to the GDC on Mr Notta's behalf in February 2023, citing that Mr Notta had left the dental profession and was pursuing other career options. Therefore, the Committee was satisfied that Mr Notta has not practised as a dentist since at least February 2023 and that without having kept his skills and knowledge up to date, there is a risk of harm to the public. Further, notwithstanding the finding at the initial hearing that he was on the path towards full remediation of the clinical failings, there still remains no evidence that Mr Notta has embedded any learning regarding his clinical failings into his practice.
32. The Committee acknowledged that at the first review hearing it was recognised that Mr Notta had shown some insight and taken remedial action and as a consequence it was considered appropriate to replace the suspension order with a conditions of practice order. This was to allow Mr Notta the opportunity to return to practice and thereby demonstrate that he was able to embed into his clinical practice the changes he said he had made. However, it appears he did not follow that course and instead indicated, in October 2022, that he was no longer practising dentistry and was pursuing different career options. This means there continues to be no evidence to show that he has embedded the necessary changes in his clinical practice and thereby demonstrate that he is able to practise safely and effectively as a Dentist. Consequently, there continues to be a risk that he will repeat his previous clinical failings and thereby put the public at risk of harm. Furthermore, since he has not been practising as a Dentist since at least November 2021 there is a risk he has become de-skilled, there being scant evidence that he has maintained his knowledge and skills since the first review of the substantive order in June 2022.

33. In addition, the Committee determined that public confidence in the profession, and the GDC as its regulator, would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in a case where a registrant represented a continuing risk to patients and who had failed to engage with their regulator for over two and a half years.
34. As a result of all the above, the Committee concluded that Mr Notta's fitness to practise remains impaired on the grounds of both public protection and in the wider public interest.

### **Decision and reasons on sanction**

35. The Committee had regard to the '*Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance*' (Revised May 2019). The Committee considered what, if any, sanction to impose in this case. The Committee was aware of the range of sanctions available to it and that it must consider the sanctions in order from the least serious.
36. The Committee was aware that it should have regard to the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest against your own interests. The public interest includes the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding standards of conduct and performance within the profession.
37. In light of its ongoing concerns, the Committee concluded that it would be inappropriate to terminate the current suspension order. To do so would not adequately protect the public as an ongoing risk of harm has been identified. The Committee also concluded that it would not be in the public interest to allow him to return to unrestricted practice in light of the ongoing concerns raised.
38. Having considered the information before it that Mr Notta is no longer pursuing a career in dentistry and that he has failed to engage with these proceedings for some two and a half years, the Committee determined that conditional registration would be neither appropriate or proportionate, particularly in light of the ongoing wide-ranging clinical concerns. The Committee has no evidence before it that Mr Notta would be willing or able to engage with conditions imposed upon his practice rendering them unworkable in this case.
39. Having regard to all the circumstances, the Committee determined that the continued suspension of Mr Notta's registration remains necessary to protect the public and maintain public confidence in the dental profession. The Committee carefully considered whether to direct a further period of suspension with a review, or whether to give a direction for indefinite suspension.
40. The Committee had regard to the totality of these proceedings, and Mr Notta's continued lack of engagement and lack of demonstrable remediation and determined that a reviewing PCC would be in no different a position to the Committee today. Having carefully considered this matter, the Committee determined that a direction for indefinite suspension is the only proportionate and appropriate outcome today.
41. The effect of an indefinite suspension is that Mr Notta's registration would be suspended indefinitely but that he would have the right to request for his suspension to be reviewed after two years from the date the order is imposed. In this regard, the Committee concluded that indefinite suspension would not only be a proportionate use of the GDC's resources but, more importantly, would allow Mr Notta to apply for a review hearing if and when he chose to return to dentistry.
42. Accordingly, the Committee directed that Mr Notta's registration be indefinitely suspended.
43. This will be confirmed to Mr Notta in writing in accordance with the Act.

44. That concludes this determination.