

PRIVATE HEARING
Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing

10 September 2026

Name: CHAHID, Hoda

Registration number: 308679

Case number: CAS-204362-J9M1V2

General Dental Council: Joe O'Leary, Counsel
Instructed by Amy Jones, IHLPS

Registrant: Not Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct and adverse physical or
mental health

Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)

Duration: 12 Months

Committee members: Kerry McKeivitt (Chair and Lay Member)
Robin Barber (Dentist Member)
Nosheen Kabal (DCP Member)

Legal adviser: Helen Gower

Committee Secretary: Kate Anderson

1. This is a resumed hearing of Ms Chahid's case before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) pursuant to section 27C of the *Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)* ('the Act').
2. Ms Chahid was neither present nor represented at the hearing. Mr Joe O'Leary, Counsel, appeared on behalf of the GDC.
3. The hearing was conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams.

Purpose of the hearing

4. The purpose of the hearing has been for the Committee to review a substantive suspension order currently in place on Ms Chahid's registration.

Service and proceeding

5. The Committee was informed at the start of this hearing that Ms Chahid was not in attendance nor was she represented. The Committee heard submissions from Mr O'Leary in relation to the matters of service and proceeding in the absence of Ms Chahid. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on these matters.

Decision on service

6. The Committee considered whether the Notice of the resumed Hearing (NOH) had been served on Ms Chahid in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006* ('the Rules'), and section 50A of the Act.
7. The Committee had before it a PCC Review hearing bundle which contained a copy of the Notice of Resumed Hearing, dated 5 August 2026 ('the notice'). The notice was sent to Ms Chahid's registered address by Special Delivery and First Class post.
8. The Committee took into account that there is no requirement within the Rules for the GDC to prove delivery of the notice, only that it was sent to her registered address.
9. The Committee further noted that on 5 August 2026, a copy of the notice was sent to Ms Chahid by way of an attachment within a secure email.
10. The Committee was satisfied that the notice sent to Ms Chahid complied with the 28-day notice period specified by the Rules. It was further satisfied that the notice contained all the required particulars, including the date and time of the resumed hearing, and that the hearing would take place remotely on Microsoft Teams. Ms Chahid was also advised that the Committee had the power to proceed with the hearing in her absence.
11. On the basis of all the information provided, the Committee was satisfied that notice of the hearing had been served on Ms Chahid in accordance with the Rules and the Act.

Decision on whether to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the registrant

12. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Chahid. It took account of the factors to be considered in reaching its decision, as set out in the case of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5*, and as affirmed

in subsequent regulatory cases, including the joined cases of *General Medical Council v Adeogba*, *General Medical Council v Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162, and *Davies v HCPC* [2016] EWHC 1593 (admin).

13. The Committee remained mindful that fairness to Ms Chahid was an important consideration, but it also took into account the need to be fair to the GDC. The Committee further considered the public interest in the expeditious review of the current order on Ms Chahid's registration.
14. The Committee had regard to the telephone file note of a conversation between Ms Chahid and Amy Jones of IHLPS on 9 September 2026, where Ms Chahid confirmed that she could not attend the hearing on its listed date and that she did not see the point in attending the hearing if it were postponed to a date that she could attend, as she does not have any more to say.
15. The Committee considered that adjourning the hearing would serve no meaningful purpose. Ms Chahid did not request an adjournment, and the Committee received no information to suggest that deferring today's hearing would secure Ms Chahid's attendance on a future date. It was satisfied that her absence is voluntary.
16. The Committee took into account that it had a statutory duty to review the substantive suspension order currently on Ms Chahid's registration, which is due to expire on 19 October 2026. The Committee considered that without good reason for an adjournment, today's hearing should go ahead as scheduled. In all the circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that it was fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing in Ms Chahid's absence.

Application and Decision for Private hearing under Rule 53 of the Rules

17. At the beginning of the hearing, Mr O'Leary made an application for the hearing to take place entirely in private pursuant to Rule 53(1) and (2) of the GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (the Rules). He submitted that some of matters at this hearing concerned Ms Chahid's health and that this is inextricably linked to the matters of the misconduct.
18. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules and the approach it should take to its decision.
19. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, having regard to the particular circumstances of Ms Chahid's case, the Committee determined that it was necessary that all of the hearing should be held in private to protect Ms Chahid's private and family life. The Committee was satisfied that this outweighed the public interest in open hearings. It therefore acceded to the application.

Initial hearing – 2-3 March and 5 March 2026

20. Ms Chahid's case was first considered by the PCC at a hearing held on 2-3 March and 5 March 2026. She was not present at that hearing nor was she legally represented. The initial PCC considered and found proved allegations relating to putting patient safety at risk [PRIVATE]. The Committee also found proved that Ms Chahid has an adverse mental and/or physical health condition [PRIVATE].
21. The PCC determined that the facts found proved against Ms Chahid amounted to misconduct, and that her fitness to practise was impaired by reason of this misconduct and her adverse health condition on both public protection and wider public interest grounds.

22. The initial PCC imposed a sanction of suspension on Ms Chahid's registration for a period of 6 months, with an immediate order. It also directed that a review of the order should be conducted shortly before the expiry of the 6 month period.

Today's review

23. This is the first review of the suspension first imposed on Ms Chahid's registration in March 2026.

Summary of submissions

24. Mr O'Leary referred the Committee to the background of the case, including the decision made by the initial PCC. He referred the Committee to its powers in reviewing the matters.
25. Mr O'Leary reminded the Committee that it was not bound by the previous Committee's decision. He submitted that the persuasive burden was on Ms Chahid to prove that she is no longer impaired. He submitted however that the GDC's position is that Ms Chahid remains impaired on both public interest and public protection grounds.
26. Mr O'Leary submitted that there had been very little material change in circumstances since the previous hearing in March 2026. He submitted that Ms Chahid was provided with suggestions by the initial PCC in March 2026 of what may assist a reviewing Committee including providing a written reflective piece on the matters, but that this has not been provided nor is there evidence that the other suggestions been actioned. Mr O'Leary submitted that Ms Chahid has not demonstrated insight into her misconduct and adverse health conditions on the dental profession and the safety of the public. Mr O'Leary also submitted that Ms Chahid has not provided any evidence of her management of her health condition. **[PRIVATE]** Mr O'Leary submitted that Ms Chahid had stated that she cooperated with the requirements placed upon her in 2023 for about a year, however he submitted that the initial PCC considered her case in 2026 which was a significant period of time since this initial cooperation. Mr O'Leary submitted that Ms Chahid has not addressed the findings to demonstrate that there is no risk of repetition, and therefore the risk of recurrence remains.
27. Mr O'Leary also submitted that a finding of impairment was necessary to uphold public confidence in the dental profession, as her misconduct and adverse health condition could affect the public perception. He submitted that a member of the public would expect that a dental profession would practise safely.
28. Mr O'Leary therefore submitted that Ms Chahid remains impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds.
29. Mr O'Leary submitted that the Committee are not able to impose an indefinite suspension at this stage as Ms Chahid has not been suspended for the minimum two year period, despite her request for this sanction in her email to the GDC dated 9 September 2026.
30. Mr O'Leary submitted that the current sanction of suspension should be extended, and that this remains the appropriate and proportionate sanction to address the findings. He submitted that conditions would be inappropriate as Ms Chahid has stated that her intention is not to return to the dental profession and she has shown an unwillingness to engage with the GDC, stating that engaging is onerous and requesting an indefinite suspension so that she need not engage further. Mr O'Leary submitted that the suspension should be for a period of 6 to 12 months, to allow time for Ms Chahid to address the recommendations made by the initial

PCC should she decide to return to practise. He also submitted that a suspension for 12 months may reduce the need for hearings, which Ms Chahid has requested.

Committee's decision

31. In comprehensively reviewing the order today, the Committee considered the submissions made by Mr O'Leary and all of the documentary evidence provided. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Decision on current impairment

32. The Committee considered whether Ms Chahid's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct and adverse physical or mental health. In doing so, it exercised its independent judgement. It had regard to the over-arching objective of the GDC, which is: the protection, promotion and maintenance of the health, safety and well-being of the public; the promotion and maintenance of public confidence in the dental profession; and the promotion and maintenance of proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession.
33. The Committee first considered whether Ms Chahid's fitness to practise remains impaired on the public protection ground. It noted that Ms Chahid has provided no further evidence of insight into her misconduct and adverse health condition that would support making a different finding to that of the initial PCC. The Committee noted that the previous PCC had provided suggestions for Ms Chahid to undertake that may assist a reviewing Committee including her attendance at the hearing, a reflective statement from her discussing her misconduct, [PRIVATE.] The Committee considered that there was no evidence of any of these suggestions being undertaken or completed by Ms Chahid. It therefore had no evidence before it that there is any change in the risk to public protection that would require a different finding.
34. The Committee determined that there was a risk of repetition of Ms Chahid's conduct given her lack of reflections, insight, and evidence of management of her adverse health condition and this put the public at risk. The Committee also noted that Ms Chahid appears to have disconnected from the GDC and its processes, and had requested an indefinite suspension, which it was unable to grant given that the minimum period of two years of suspension had not passed, because she did not wish to engage with the GDC any longer. It noted that she has not applied for voluntary removal to date, despite being sent the forms on four occasions. The Committee was satisfied that Ms Chahid remains impaired on the public protection ground.
35. The Committee also determined that a finding of impairment is required in the wider public interest. It considered that public trust and confidence in the dental profession would be undermined if such a finding were not made, given that there are ongoing concerns in this case due to the lack of evidence of Ms Chahid's insight and management of her health condition to date. The Committee considered that a finding of impairment would serve to promote proper professional standards and avoid the risk of the profession being brought into disrepute.
36. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Ms Chahid's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct and adverse health condition on both public protection and public interest grounds.

Decision on sanction

37. The Committee next considered what action to take in respect of Ms Chahid's registration. It had regard to section 27C(2) of the Act, which sets out the options available to it at this review. The Committee also took into account the GDC's *"Fitness to Practice: Guidance for the practice committees"* (January 2026). It noted that the purpose of any sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The Committee applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with Ms Chahid's own interests.
38. The Committee considered that a restriction on Ms Chahid's registration remains necessary, given the lack of evidence of remediation and insight into her misconduct and adverse health conditions [PRIVATE]. The Committee considered that the concerns of the initial PCC remain in place given this lack of evidence, despite Ms Chahid having received suggestions on what may assist a further reviewing Committee. The Committee also noted that Ms Chahid had repeatedly stated that she has no intention to return to practise.
39. The Committee decided that it would be inappropriate to revoke the current suspension order and impose a sanction of conditions of practice, as these would be unworkable and inappropriate given that Ms Chahid is currently not practising as a dental professional and disconnected from the GDC's processes. The Committee noted that Ms Chahid requested an indefinite suspension, however she has not been suspended for the minimum two year requirement and therefore it was not in its powers to impose this sanction. It also determined that to take no further action or to allow the order to lapse would pose a risk to the public and the wider public interest. The Committee was therefore satisfied that a sanction of suspension remained the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose on Ms Chahid.
40. The Committee determined that the suspension should be extended for a further 12-month period. The Committee's view was that a suspension order for 12 months was appropriate and proportionate given Ms Chahid's unwillingness to engage with the GDC's FtP process and her repeatedly having stated that she has no intention of returning to practise.
41. A resumed hearing will be held shortly before the end of the 12-month period in which the suspension order will be reviewed. Ms Chahid will be informed of the date and time of that resumed hearing.
42. The Committee suggested that a future Committee could be assisted by the same suggested actions as the initial PCC. These are Ms Chahid's attendance at the hearing, a reflective statement from her discussing her misconduct, [PRIVATE.]
43. Unless Ms Chahid exercises her right of appeal, the current suspension order on her registration will be extended by a period of 12 months, beginning with the date that it would otherwise expire.
44. Ms Chahid will have 28 days from the date that notice is deemed to have been served upon her to appeal this decision. In the event that she does exercise her right of appeal, the suspension order currently in place on her registration will remain in force until the resolution of the appeal.
45. That concludes this determination.