

PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

17 April 2026

Name: ALLEN, Alesia Ann
Registration number: 120529
Case number: CAS-207851-L8N8V4

General Dental Council: Miss Peta-Louise Bagott, counsel
Instructed by Carly Smith, IHLPS

Registrant: Not Present
Not represented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct

Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)

Committee members: Marnie Hayward (Dental Care Professional) (Chair)
Gezala Umar (Dentist)
Rachel Onikosi (Lay)

Legal adviser: Judith Walker

Committee Secretary: Sarah Crewe

Purpose of hearing

1. The purpose of this hearing is to carry out a statutory review of an order suspending Mrs Allen's registration. The hearing is being held in accordance with section 36Q of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').

Service of Notice of Hearing

2. The Committee was informed at the start of this hearing that Mrs Allen was not in attendance nor was she represented. In her absence, the Committee first considered whether the notice of this hearing had been served on Mrs Allen in accordance with rules 28 and 65 of *the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006 (the Rules)*.
3. The Committee received a copy of the Notification of Resumed Hearing which was dated as sent to Mrs Allen's registered address via Special Delivery on 19 March 2026. The notice was also sent via first class post and secure email.
4. In all the circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that the notice had been served in compliance with the rules.

Proceeding in the absence of Mrs Allen:

5. The Committee then considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed in the absence of Mrs Allen. The Committee heard the submissions made by Miss Bagott on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee bore in mind that it must exercise the utmost care and caution when considering whether to exercise its discretion to proceed in Mrs Allen's absence. It has also borne in mind the overall fairness of the proceedings to both parties, as well as the public interest in the timely review of this case.
6. Miss Bagott outlined the background to this case, including the lack of engagement from Mrs Allen, despite attempts made by the GDC to correspond with her. She informed the Committee that there has been no engagement from Mrs Allen since October 2023.
7. Miss Bagott submitted that, having regard to the information before the Committee, it would be appropriate to proceed in the absence of Mrs Allen. She submitted that Mrs Allen has voluntarily absented herself. Further, that the Committee should take into consideration the previous lack of engagement in this case.
8. The Committee weighed Mrs Allen's interests against the need to protect the public and uphold the public interest. Mrs Allen has not made any request for an adjournment and the Committee considered that it was essential to review the existing order before it lapsed to ensure that the public would not be put at risk. The current suspension order is due to expire on 13 May 2026.
9. The Committee was satisfied that the public interest in this respect outweighed Mrs Allen's interests and determined to proceed in her absence.

Factual background

10. In April 2025 the PCC considered allegations relating to Mrs Allen's conviction. The matters before the Initial PCC came to light following a self-referral by Mrs Allen to the GDC on 18 April 2023, in which she notified the Council that she had been found guilty in a court of law of "*Criminal damage*" and "*Public order*".
11. In response to a request for further information regarding her self-referral, Mrs Allen provided the GDC with a number of documents, including a 'Notice of Criminal Charge' dated 3 January 2023, and a letter from her solicitor dated 19 April 2023. The letter had been sent to her regarding the outcome of her trial at Chelmsford Magistrates Court on 17 April 2023.
12. It was at the trial on 17 April 2023 that Mrs Allen, having denied the offence, was found guilty and convicted of Criminal Damage. Mrs Allen had previously pleaded guilty to Racially Aggravated intentional Harassment, Alarm and Distress and had been convicted of that offence at Chelmsford Magistrates Court on 9 February 2023. She was sentenced for that offence, and for the offence of Criminal Damage, following the conclusion of the trial on 17 April 2023.
13. It was also found proved that Mrs Allen failed to immediately inform the GDC first of her being charged with the offences in January 2023 and then subsequently of her conviction on 9 February 2023 for the racially aggravated offence.
14. The April 2025 PCC did not find that Mrs Allen's failure to notify the GDC amounted to misconduct. It did find that Mrs Allen's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of her conviction. It imposed a 12 month suspension with a review.
15. Mrs Allen was not in attendance at that hearing.

Current review hearing

16. This Committee has comprehensively reviewed the suspension order. In so doing, it has had regard to the GDC's bundle of documents as well as the submissions from Miss Bagott. Mrs Allen has not engaged with the GDC since before the initial hearing in 2025 and has not provided any information for this Committee to consider as part of the review.

Submissions

17. Miss Bagott outlined the background of this case and summarised the previous decisions made at the initial PCC hearing. She submitted that Mrs Allen has remained non engaging and has therefore not provided any evidence of remediation or insight. Miss Bagott referred the Committee to the attempts made by the GDC to contact Mrs Allen regarding the matters that the previous Committee had outlined and the recommended steps that Mrs Allen could take to demonstrate insight and remediation to this reviewing Committee. No response was forthcoming.
18. The GDC's position is that Mrs Allen's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her conviction, and that a further period of suspended registration for 12 months would be the appropriate and proportionate sanction.

19. Miss Bagott submitted that the lack of engagement from Mrs Allen demonstrates a lack of insight and there is no information of any attempts to remediate her misconduct. Therefore, Miss Bagott submitted that there remains a risk to the public.
20. Miss Bagott submitted that the public's confidence would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the circumstances of this case. She submitted that Mrs Allen's fitness to practise remains impaired on public interest grounds.
21. In looking at the possible sanctions available to this Committee Miss Bagott outlined the position of the GDC and summarised why it is said that nothing short of a further period of suspension would be appropriate in this case. Mrs Allen has not engaged with these proceedings, starting from the initial hearing in 2025 and there is nothing before the Committee to suggest that she would be compliant with any conditions, were the Committee to revoke the suspension and impose a conditions of practice order.
22. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Current Impairment

23. The Committee was mindful that there is a persuasive burden on the registrant to demonstrate that their fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The Committee considered that there has been no material change of circumstances since the last hearing in April 2025. Mrs Allen has not engaged with these proceedings and has produced no evidence of any insight into or remediation, and no evidence of any remorse or apology. Despite recommendations made by the initial Committee for Mrs Allen to be able to demonstrate that she is no longer impaired, she has chosen not to engage. Therefore, the Committee concluded that Mrs Allen continues to pose a risk to the public.
24. The Committee had no evidence before it to be able to assess Mrs Allen's level of insight.
25. As a result of the above, the Committee concluded that Mrs Allen fitness to practise remains currently impaired on public protection grounds.
26. The Committee also considers that a further finding of impairment is required to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour, and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process. The conviction was for serious matters that bring the profession into disrepute.

Sanction

27. The Committee then 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.
28. The Committee was aware that it should have regard to the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest against Mrs Allen's 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.
29. The Committee noted its powers outlined in the Act. The Committee had the power to extend the current order for a maximum period of 12 months. Alternatively, it could revoke the suspension order or allow it to lapse upon expiry, or it could replace the order with a

conditions of practice order for up to 3 years. Indefinite suspension is not currently an available option for this Committee.

30. The Committee first considered whether it would be appropriate to allow the current order to lapse at its expiry or to revoke it with immediate effect. The Committee considered that given all of the information before it, it would not be appropriate to revoke current order or to allow it to lapse, as this would not protect the public nor would it be in the public interest.
31. The Committee then considered whether a conditions of practice order would be an appropriate order in this case. Given Mrs Allen's lack of engagement, the lack of any current evidence of steps taken to address the misconduct and the lack of any demonstration of insight by Mrs Allen, the Committee considered that this would not be an appropriate order. The Committee considered that workable and appropriate conditions would not be possible to formulate in the circumstances, given there is no indication that she would comply. Further as the matters in this case relate to attitude and behaviour rather than clinical failings the Committee was not satisfied that any conditions could be formulated to address the issues.
32. The Committee considered that to extend the period of suspension was the appropriate and proportionate response in this case. The Committee considered that in the intervening months since the suspension order was imposed Mrs Allen has not demonstrated that she is willing to undertake the necessary steps to address the misconduct or to meaningfully engage with her professional regulator. The Committee concluded that in the absence of any evidence of willingness on his part to address the misconduct and engage with the GDC, she poses a real risk to the public.
33. The Committee therefore determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case is that at the expiry of the current order Mrs Allen's registration will be made subject to a further period of 12 months suspension. The Committee concluded that this would protect the public and uphold the public interest.
34. The Committee adopted the initial PCC's recommendations that it considered might be helpful for the next reviewing Committee to receive the following from Mrs Allen:
 - A written reflective piece demonstrating remorse and insight into her behaviour that resulted in her convictions, addressing the impact on the victim, the bystanders and the impact on the dental profession.
 - Evidence of specific steps taken to address her racially aggravated conduct and the management of anger.
 - Evidence of learning undertaken in relation to Principle 9 of the GDC Standards ("Make sure your personal behaviour maintains patients' confidence in you and the dental profession").
 - Testimonials or character references.
35. The Committee was also aware that the next reviewing Committee would have the option of indefinite suspension available to them. The Committee considered that the next reviewing Committee may find it beneficial in order to assess her level of insight and remediation that Mrs Allen engages positively with the GDC and this Committee would encourage her to attend the next review hearing.
36. The Committee was aware that the effect of this order is that Mrs Allen will be prevented from working as a registered dental professional in the UK. This could result in financial hardship, though the Committee received no direct information about that matter. However, in applying

the principle of proportionality, the Committee determined that Mrs Allen's interests in this regard are significantly outweighed by the need for public protection and protection of the wider public interest.

37. The Committee therefore directs that Mrs Allen's registration be suspended for a further 12 months. Section 36W(3) of the Act comes into operation to cover any period between the expiry of the current suspension and the date when the direction ordered by this Committee comes into force.

That concludes this determination.