

GENERAL DENTAL COUNCIL

AND

ZANGANEH, Boran

[Registration number: 71214]

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

SUBSTANTIVE HEARING

Notice that an inquiry will be conducted by a Practice Committee of the General Dental Council, to be held commencing at 10:00am on Monday 20 April 2026.

**The General Dental Council
37 Wimpole Street
London
W1G 8DQ**

The heads of charge contained within this sheet are current at the date of publication. They are subject to amendments at any time before or during the hearing. For the final charge, findings of fact and determination against the registrant, please visit the Recent Decisions page at <https://www.dentalhearings.org/hearings-and-decisions/decisions> after this hearing has finished.

Committee members

Carson Black	Dentist	Chair
Hannah Couch	DCP	
Amit Jinabhai	Lay	

Legal Adviser:

Jane Kilgannon	Legal Adviser
----------------	---------------

CHARGE

ZANGANEH, Boran, a dentist, Tandläkare Umeå University 1987 is summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 20 April 2026 for an inquiry into the following charge:

The Charge

The hearing will be held to consider the following charge against you:

‘That being registered as a dentist, Boran Zanganeh’s (71214) fitness to practice is impaired by reason of misconduct. In that:

Patient 1

1. You failed to provide an adequate standard of care to Patient 1 from 17 June 2022 and 14 February 2023 including by;
 - a. incorrectly diagnosing, including
 - i.* caries on LL5;
 - ii.* need for extraction of LL5.
 - b. extracting the LL5 rather than the LL6;
 - c. providing treatment that was not clinically indicated at LL5;
 - d. providing a poor standard of treatment, including, failing to carry out extraction at LL6;
 - e. not discussing the risks and benefits of the proposed course of treatment.
2. You failed to obtain informed consent for the treatment provided to Patient 1 on 13 October 2022 in respect of the extraction of LL5.
3. You stated in your response about Patient 1’s treatment, including that;
 - a. “the LL5 appeared carious”;
 - b. “there was a request from the patient to remove the LL5 instead”;

- c. "we did try to contact the practice";
- d. "there appears to have been a breakdown in communication and I understood that during a phone conversation with the orthodontic practice that the extraction of LL5 had been approved".

Patient 4

- 4. You failed to provide an adequate standard of care to Patient 4 from 01 September 2022 to 12 September 2022 including by;
 - a. not carrying out sufficient diagnostic assessments, in particular tenderness to percussion and palpation and/or sensitivity testing and/or radiographic examination;
 - b. not carrying out sufficient treatment planning as your planning was based on an incorrect diagnosis of traumatic occlusion and you advised crown removal rather than occlusal adjustment;
 - c. not adequately communicating the treatment plan to Patient 4;
 - d. providing a poor standard of treatment, including:
 - i. at LL6 you did not treat a fracture or investigate reported swelling;
 - ii. you unnecessarily removed the crown at LL6;
 - iii. you recemented the crown at LL6.
 - e. providing treatment that was not clinically indicated in that you removed the crown and then recemented the crown at LL6;
 - f. advising Patient 4 that Crown Treatment was not available on the NHS.
- 5. You failed to obtain informed consent for the treatment provided to Patient 4 from 01 September 2022 to 12 September 2022.

Patient 10

6. You failed to provide an adequate standard of care to Patient 10 on 28 November 2022 including by;
 - a. not treating/not adequately treating Patient 10, including
 - i. not treating caries diagnosed at LL7;
 - ii. not diagnosing the issues with UL8, which were that it was over-erupted and sharp and was causing trauma;
 - iii. prescribing antibiotics when this was not clinically necessary.
7. Your actions in respect of allegations 3a-d, 4f, above were;
 - a. misleading as the comments made at 3a-d and 4f were not accurate;
 - b. dishonest as the comments made at 3a-d and 4f were not true;
 - c. lacking integrity as the comments made at 3a-d and 4f were not accurate and/or true.
8. Your actions in respect of allegation 4f were;
 - a. financially motivated as you would gain a higher fee from the work being done privately than you would if the work was done on the NHS.
9. You have failed to uphold your duty of candour as you did not tell Patient 1 that the extraction of LL5 was not clinically necessary and/or was done in error.