Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing

23 September 2026

Name:	ROSE, Lana Margaret
Registration number:	281696
Case number:	CAS-202414-X2X3X6

General Dental Council:	Instructed by Ela Rexhaj, IHLPS
Registrant:	Not present (Hearing held on the papers) Unrepresented

---

Fitness to practise:	Impaired by reason of misconduct
Outcome:	Suspension extended (with a review)
Duration:	12 months

Committee members:	Gregory Heath	(Chair, dentist member)
	Clare Mcilwaine	(Dental Care Professional member)
	Konrad Chrzanowski	(Lay member)
Legal adviser:	Mike Bell	
Committee Secretary:	Sara Page	

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee pursuant to section 36Q 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.

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 Miss Rose and any representatives for either party.

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

4. The Committee was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Rose was neither present nor represented at today's hearing.

5. In her absence, the Committee first considered whether the Notice of Hearing ('the Notice') had been served on Miss Rose in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the *'General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006'* ('the Rules'). In coming to its decision, the Committee considered the written submissions of the GDC and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

6. The Committee had regard to the indexed hearing bundle of 30 pages, which contained a copy of the Notice, dated 24 August 2026. The Notice was sent to Miss Rose's registered address by Special Delivery and First Class post on 24 August 2026, in accordance with Section 50A of the Act and via email on the same date.

7. This included today's date and that it is being conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams, as well as notification of the GDC's intention to conduct today's 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 Miss Rose's registered address on 26 August 2026. It was signed for against the printed name of 'MORRICE'.

9. In light of the information available, the Committee was satisfied that Miss Rose has been served with proper notification of this hearing, with at least 28 days' notice, in accordance with the Rules.

Decision and reasons on whether to proceed in the absence of Miss Rose and on the papers

10. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Rose and any representative for either party. The Committee was mindful that the discretion to proceed in the absence of Miss Rose must be exercised with the utmost care and caution.

11. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who 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, referring to relevant case law to assist the Committee.

12. The Committee noted that there has not been any engagement by Miss Rose in relation to today's hearing and noted that there has been historic non-engagement by Miss Rose. As a consequence, there has been no application to adjourn or any reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion.

13. The Committee bore in mind that today's hearing has been arranged as there is a statutory requirement for the substantive suspension to be reviewed prior to its expiry. On the basis of the information before it, the Committee concluded that Miss Rose had voluntarily absented herself from today's hearing.

14. In all these circumstances, the Committee determined that it was fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Rose and any representatives for either party.

Background

15. This hearing was convened to review the current suspension order, which is due to expire on 23 October 2026. This is the second review of a substantive order initially imposed by the Professional Conduct Committee ('the PCC') on 23 September 2024.

16. The initial PCC found that Miss Rose had failed to cooperate with the GDC's investigation into her fitness to practice and had failed to maintain a correct and up to date registered address.

17. The suspension order was first reviewed on 11 September 2025. The reviewing PCC found Miss Rose's fitness to practise continued to be impaired by reason of her misconduct. The reviewing PCC stated:

> *'The Committee has determined that Miss Rose's fitness to practise remains impaired. The Committee has not been provided with any information to suggest that Miss Rose has taken any steps to develop insight into and remediation of her misconduct, or indeed that she intends to do so in the future. She has not enaged* [sic] *at the initial hearing nor for this review hearing. There appears to be a pattern of non-engagement by the Registrant. Miss Rose has not provided any evidence of insight or remorse. The Committee therefore considers, given a risk of repetition has been identified, that the public is still at real risk of harm, and that Miss Rose's fitness to practise remains impaired.*
>
> *The Committee also considers that a finding of current impairment is again needed to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession and declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. The Committee considers that a reasonable and informed observer would be concerned to note the findings of the Committee which considered this case in September 2024, and would consider that a finding of impaired fitness to practise is again required given the continued non-engagement in the past year and the lack of information from Miss Rose to suggest that she has reflected upon, has insight into, and has remedied, her misconduct.'*

18. The reviewing PCC directed that the suspension on Miss Rose's registration be extended for a further period of 12 months, stating:

> *'The Committee considered that revoking the suspension would not meet the ongoing public protection and public interest considerations and would have the effect of placing the public at unwarranted risk of harm and would undermine trust and confidence in the profession.*

The Committee next considered whether it could formulate conditions which would be workable and which would address the ongoing risks. The Committee concluded that it could not formulate any conditions which would be practicable or appropriate, particularly given Miss Rose's lack of substantive engagement with these proceedings. The Committee considers that the public, and the public interest, would be at considerable risk of harm were the suspension to be revoked and replaced by a period of conditional registration.

The Committee then went on to consider whether it would be appropriate to extend the current period of suspension. The Committee concluded that it would be appropriate and proportionate to extend the suspension for a period of 12 months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that extended period of suspension. It recognises the seriousness of the misconduct found in this case, and in the Committee's judgment a lesser period of time would not be sufficient for Miss Rose to commence and complete the process of remediation, should she be minded to do so.'

Submissions

19. In its written submissions, the GDC submitted that there is no evidence to show any material change in position since the last hearing before the PCC on 12 September 2025, as Miss Rose has continually failed to engage with the GDC and this process.

20. The GDC stated that the previous PCC provided recommendations to assist future reviewing PCC's, namely, that Miss Rose should engage in the process and provide a personal reflective piece on the importance of adhering to the standards of her regulatory body and the need to cooperate and engage with them at all times. Miss Rose has not engaged with the GDC to provide this evidence, therefore, there is no information to suggest that Miss Rose has remediated or developed insight into her actions.

21. The GDC submitted that to revoke the current suspension order would not adequately protect the public nor maintain the public's confidence in the dental profession. Further, the GDC respectfully submitted that conditions would not address the concerns, nor would they be workable given the continuous lack of engagement. There remains a risk of repetition given the pattern of non-engagement from Miss Rose.

22. With this in mind, the GDC submitted that Miss Rose's fitness to practise remains impaired and that the PCC should extend the suspension order for a further period of 12 months, with a review. This would allow further time for Miss Rose to engage with the GDC and to show appropriate and adequate insight into her behaviour and attitude.

23. Miss Rose has not provided any written submissions for consideration by the Committee for the purposes of today's review.

Decision and reasons on review

24. In coming to its decision, the Committee had regard to the GDC document, *'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (6 January 2026*)', ('the FtP Guidance') and heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee bore in mind that at this stage, the onus is on Miss Rose to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired and to consider whether she has acknowledged the deficiencies identified at the initial hearing and whether she has sufficiently addressed them.

25. The Committee considered whether Miss Rose's fitness to practise remains impaired and exercised its own independent judgement in coming to its decision. 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.

26. The Committee had regard to the bundle provided today which included the two previous determinations of the initial and reviewing PCCs and the reasons for having imposed and extended the suspension order. The Committee noted that Miss Rose has continued to not engage with these regulatory proceedings and her last communication with the GDC was 13 January 2023 and that there has been no evidence of remediation or insight on Miss Rose's behalf. In this regard, there is no information to confirm that there has been any material change since the extension of the suspension order on 11 September 2025.

27. As a result, the Committee determined that Miss Rose's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct.

28. In having determined that Miss Rose's fitness to practise remains impaired, the Committee considered the options available to it today, namely: to extend the period of suspension for a period of up to 12 months, starting from the date on which it would otherwise expire; or, to revoke the order of suspension and replace it with conditions of registration for up to three years. The Committee was mindful that the option to impose an order of indefinite suspension is not available to it as Miss Rose has yet to be continually suspended for a period of two years until 23 October 2026.

29. 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.

30. In its consideration of whether it would be appropriate to revoke the substantive suspension and replace it with conditional registration, the Committee took into account that Miss Rose is not currently practising as a dental nurse and is not engaging with the GDC. As a result, there was no way to determine whether she is willing to comply with conditional registration. Moreover, the Committee determined that it would not be able to formulate any conditions that would appropriately address the PCC's findings that she failed to cooperate with the GDC investigation and did not maintain her GDC contact details. In this regard, the Committee concluded that conditional registration would be neither appropriate nor proportionate in the circumstances of this case.

31. The Committee therefore determined that the current period of suspension should be extended by a further period of 12 months beginning with the date on which the present order would otherwise expire. It further determined that a review would be appropriate in the circumstances prior to the expiry of the extended order. It was satisfied that this would provide Miss Rose with an opportunity to re-engage with the GDC and provide information to demonstrate insight and remediative steps taken to address the findings of the PCC in September 2023.

32. At the review hearing, the Committee may revoke the order, it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order, including that of indefinite suspension.

33. This will be confirmed to Miss Rose in writing in accordance with the Act.

34. That concludes this hearing.