PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing

26 October 2026

Name:	INGRAM, Amy
Registration number:	312669
Case number:	CAS-213806-Z7M5D2

General Dental Council:	Mr Oliver Renton, counsel. Instructed by Clarice Tagoe-Reinhold, IHLPS
Registrant:	Not Present and Not Represented

Fitness to practise:	Impaired by reason of misconduct and conviction.
Outcome:	Fitness to Practise Impaired. Reprimand Issued

Committee members:	Fiona Abbott	(Lay member, Chair)
	Suki Sandhar	(Dentist member)
	Alexandra Ward	(Dental Care Professional member)
Legal adviser:	Jane Kilgannon	
Committee Secretary:	Sarah Crewe	

---

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) hearing in respect of a case brought against Miss Amy Ingram by the General Dental Council (GDC).

2. The hearing is being conducted remotely via TEAMs.

3. Miss Ingram was not present and not represented in her absence. The Case Presenter for the GDC was Mr Oliver Renton, Counsel.

The Charge

That being registered as a dental care professional, you, Amy Ingram:

1. *On 27/03/2024, you were convicted at Barnsley Magistrates Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 25/02/2024, contrary to section 5 (1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.*
2. *You failed to immediately inform the General Dental Council that on 25/02/2024 you were charged with Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.*

AND THAT, in consequence of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of conviction and misconduct.

Application to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Ingram

4. At the outset, Mr Renton made an application pursuant to Rule 54 of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006* ('the Rules'), to proceed with the hearing notwithstanding Miss Ingram's absence.

5. Mr Renton drew the Committee's attention to the relevant documents in respect of service. He submitted that there has been good service and this is further demonstrated by Miss Ingram's response. He also submitted that the Committee can rightly conclude from her communications with the GDC that she is aware of this hearing. In all the circumstances, Mr Renton invited the Committee to continue in Miss Ingram's absence.

6. The Committee took account of Mr Renton's submissions, and the supporting documentation provided. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to service and proceeding with a hearing in the absence of a registrant.

Decision on service

7. The Committee first considered whether notice of the hearing had been served on Miss Ingram in accordance with Rules 13 and 65. It had sight of the Notice of Hearing, which is dated 14 September 2026 ('the notice').

8. The notice was sent to Miss Ingram's registered address by Special Delivery and First-Class post on 14 September 2026. The Committee noted that the copy of the notice sent by Special Delivery

was delivered and signed for on 16 September 2026. However, it took into account that that there is no requirement within the Rules for the GDC to prove delivery of the notice, only that it was sent. The Committee was satisfied on the evidence provided that the GDC complied with the requirement to send notice.

9. The Committee further took into account that on 15 September 2026, a copy of the notice was sent to Miss Ingram by email, and that she responded by email to the GDC on 16 September 2026 to confirm she would not be attending this hearing as she did not have sufficient annual leave.

10. The Committee was satisfied that the notice sent to Miss Ingram complied with the 28-day notice period specified in the Rules. It was also satisfied that the notice contained all the required particulars, including the date and time of the hearing, confirmation that the hearing would be conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams, and that the Committee had the power to proceed in Miss Ingram's absence.

11. On the basis of all the information provided, the Committee was satisfied that Miss Ingram was duly notified of the hearing in accordance with the Rules.

Decision on whether to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Ingram

12. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Ingram. It approached this issue with the utmost care and caution. The Committee took account of the factors to be considered in reaching its decision.

13. The Committee bore in mind that fairness to Miss Ingram is an important consideration. It was also mindful of the need to be fair to the GDC, and of the public interest in the expeditious disposal of this case.

14. The Committee was satisfied that Miss Ingram is aware of this hearing. It noted that she has engaged with the GDC to some extent, however there was no response to the last email sent to her on 16 September 2026 outlining her options for the hearing as per her request as she would not be attending due to a lack of annual leave. Despite being made aware that she could submit written submissions for the Committee to consider there has been no further engagement from Miss Ingram.

15. In all the circumstances, it was the view of the Committee that adjourning the hearing would serve no meaningful purpose. Miss Ingram has not requested an adjournment, and there is no indication that deferring the hearing would secure her attendance on a future date. The Committee considered it clear that Miss Ingram has voluntarily absented herself.

16. The Committee considered fairness to the GDC, including the potential inconvenience that may cause to its witnesses by any delay. It also considered its duty to act expeditiously in the public interest. The Committee concluded that without good reason for deferring the matters, the hearing should proceed as scheduled. It determined that it was fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing in Miss Ingram's absence.

Case background

17. On 27 March 2024, Miss Ingram was convicted of driving a motor vehicle on a road after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in her breath, namely 69 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit. The offence occurred on 25 February 2024 at Barnsley, in the county of South Yorkshire. On 27 March 2024, Miss Ingram was sentenced to a fine of £120 and disqualified from driving for 17 months, with a reduction of 17 weeks upon satisfactory completion of an approved course.

18. On 26 April 2024, Miss Ingram sent an email to the GDC informing the Council that she had been convicted of drink-driving and had received a 12-month driving ban.

Evidence

19. The documentary evidence before the Committee included, but was not limited to, the following:
    - Statements from GDC witnesses and associated exhibits
    - Signed Court Extract.

The Committee's findings of fact

20. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It considered each head of charge separately, bearing in mind that the burden of proof rests with the GDC, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is, whether the alleged matters are proved on the balance of probabilities.

21. The Committee factual findings are as follows:

1.	On 27/03/2024, you were convicted at Barnsley Magistrates Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 25/02/2024, contrary to section 5 (1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988. **Found proved.** The Committee had regard to Rule 57(5) which states: *(5) Where a respondent has been convicted of a criminal offence—* *(a) a copy of the certificate of conviction, certified by a competent officer of a court in the United Kingdom (or, in Scotland, an extract conviction) shall be conclusive proof of the conviction; and* *(b) the findings of fact upon which the conviction is based shall be admissible as proof of those facts.* The Committee had sight of the signed Court Extract which showed that Miss Ingram was convicted and sentenced as above. This was signed by a member of the Court staff on 20 April 2026. Accordingly, this charge is found proved.
2.	*You failed to immediately inform the General Dental Council that on 25/02/2024 you were charged with Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic*

	Offenders Act 1988. **Found proved.** The Committee noted that the GDC guidance on reporting criminal proceedings states that you must inform the GDC upon being charged with a criminal offence. As a registered professional, Miss Ingram was under a duty to comply with that guidance. Furthermore, the relevant professional standards explicitly require a registrant to inform the GDC of any criminal proceedings. Specifically Standard 9.3: ***Standard 9.3*** *You must inform the GDC if you are subject to criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is made against you, anywhere in the world* *9.3.1 You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world.* Miss Ingram confirmed, in her correspondence with the GDC dated 29 April 2024, that she had already read the relevant guidance and knew that she had to report it, and was therefore aware of the duty imposed on her. Although she self-referred, she did not do so until 26 April 2024, despite having been charged on 25 February 2024 and convicted on 27 March 2024. Consequently, her self-referral was not made in a timely manner. Although there may be some ambiguity as to the meaning of "immediate", the Committee considered that a period of two months could not reasonably be regarded as immediate. The Committee therefore found the charge proved.

Decision and reasons on fitness to practise

22. Having announced its decision on the facts, the Committee next moved forward to consider the following matters: whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct; if so, whether Miss Ingram's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of that misconduct and/or her conviction; and, should impairment be found, what sanction, if any, to impose.

23. In accordance with Rule 20 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2006, the Committee heard submissions from Mr Renton on behalf of the GDC in relation to the matters of misconduct, impairment and sanction.

Submissions

24. Mr Renton addressed the Committee on misconduct, impairment and sanction, referring to the relevant professional standards and specific paragraphs of the applicable guidance.

25. Mr Renton submitted that Standards 1.3, 1.3.2, 9.1, 9.3, 9.3.1 and 9.4 had been breached and that the conduct was serious enough to amount to misconduct.

26. In relation to current impairment, Mr Renton submitted that there are no public protection issues in relation to the conviction, however the Committee should ask itself whether a reasonably informed member of the public would expect a finding of impairment in the public interest given the conviction and the misconduct. He referred to *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant* and the test concerning current impairment on the public confidence ground.

27. In relation to sanction, Mr Renton submitted that a reprimand was appropriate. Referring to the relevant sanctions guidance, he submitted that a reprimand was commensurate with the seriousness of the charges found proved and consistent with the factors identified in the guidance.

28. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Misconduct

29. The Committee, in reaching its decision, had regard to the public interest and accepted that there was no burden or standard of proof at this stage. The Committee exercised its own independent judgement in reaching its decision.

30. The Committee acknowledged that misconduct was defined in *Roylance (No. 2) v General Medical Council* [2000] AC 311 as "*a word of general effect, involving some act or omission, which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances with the standard of propriety often being found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a [registrant] in the particular circumstances*."

31. The Committee considered the following principles from the Standards had been breached:

Standard 9.1

You must ensure that your conduct, both at work and in your personal life, justifies patients' trust in you and the public's trust in the dental profession

Standard 9.3

You must inform the GDC if you are subject to criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is made against you, anywhere in the world

9.3.1 *You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world.*

32. The Committee took into account that a breach of the relevant Standards does not automatically result in a finding of misconduct. However, The Committee considered that failing to notify the GDC immediately of a criminal charge is serious. It undermines the GDC's ability to maintain the integrity of the register and to ensure that those who are registered meet the requirement to be of good character.

33. The Committee acknowledged that the delay in this case was two months and that Miss Ingram ultimately self-referred. However, it considered that these matters did not lessen the seriousness of her failure to comply with her duty as a registrant.

34. The Committee also considered that the delay prevented the GDC from undertaking the necessary considerations as to whether immediate action was required to protect the public.

35. The Committee concluded that Miss Ingram's failure to notify the GDC immediately of the criminal charge represented a sufficiently serious departure from the standards expected of a registrant to amount to misconduct.

Impairment

37. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that it must assess current impairment of fitness to practise. It is not sufficient to find that Miss Ingram's fitness to practise was impaired at the time of the events; rather, the Committee must determine whether her fitness to practise is impaired as of today.

38. In considering whether Miss Ingram's fitness to practise is currently impaired, the Committee took into account her self-referral, in which she acknowledged that what she had done was a

"silly mistake" and assured the GDC that she would never do it again. However, the Committee noted that Miss Ingram had not offered an actual apology, nor had she provided any further information to enable the Committee properly to assess her insight or remediation. The Committee also had no information confirming whether she had successfully completed the optional court-recommended course.

39. The Committee next considered whether a finding of impairment was necessary on the ground of public protection. The Committee considered that, whilst serious, the nature of the offence fell at the lower end of the spectrum. The Committee had no evidence before it to suggest that Miss Ingram had repeated the behaviour, and it regarded the conviction as an isolated incident. In those circumstances, the Committee considered it unlikely that she would repeat such conduct and concluded that a finding of current impairment was not required on public protection grounds for the conviction.

40. Although Miss Ingram ultimately self-referred after two months this does not lessen the seriousness of her failure to comply with her duty as a registrant. However, given the Committee considers that Miss Ingram is unlikely to repeat the behaviour that led to her conviction and she has acknowledged her duty to report to the GDC it concluded that the risk of repetition of the misconduct was low. Therefore, the Committee determined that there was no current impairment on public protection grounds for the misconduct.

41. In its consideration of the wider public interest, the Committee had regard to the test established in *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) (the "Grant test"). The Committee reminded itself that the overarching statutory regulatory objectives include protecting the public, maintaining public confidence in the dental professions, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

42. The Committee considered that Miss Ingram's actions, both in her conviction and subsequent misconduct, had in the past placed the public at risk, risked bringing the profession into disrepute, and breached a fundamental tenet of the profession by failing to comply with her professional duty to report the criminal charge to the GDC.

43. Applying the Grant test, the Committee was satisfied that an informed member of the public, aware of the regulatory objectives and all the circumstances of the case, would regard a finding of impairment as necessary to uphold proper professional standards and maintain confidence in the profession and the regulatory process.

44. The Committee therefore concluded that Miss Ingram's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her conviction and misconduct on the public interest ground.

Decision and reasons on sanction

43. In reaching its decision regarding sanction, the Committee carefully considered what action, if any, should be taken in relation to Miss Ingram's registration. It had regard to the GDC's Guidance for the Practice Committees (January 2026). The Committee reminded itself that any sanction imposed must be proportionate. The purpose of a sanction is not to punish, although it may have that effect.

44. The Committee identified the following mitigating factors:

- Miss Ingram's previous good character;
- The isolated nature of the incident;
- Some evidence of insight in her self-referral email.

45. No aggravating factors were identified.

46. The Committee considered each available sanction in ascending order of severity, applying the principle of proportionality throughout.
47. The Committee first considered whether to take no further action. It determined that taking no action would not be appropriate, as it would not mark the significance of the conviction or the Committee's findings on misconduct and current impairment. Furthermore, Miss Ingram did not engage with the hearing, and the Committee therefore had very limited information to consider on her behalf.
48. The Committee next considered whether to issue a reprimand. It concluded that a reprimand would be proportionate and sufficient to address the facts found proved and their level of seriousness, particularly given the isolated nature of the conviction. The Committee had regard to the fact that Miss Ingram’s sentence has been completed and that there has been no evidence of any repetition of the behaviour.
49. The Committee considered whether to impose conditions on Miss Ingram's registration, but concluded that conditions of practice would not be appropriate as there are no concerns that are required to be addressed through conditions and it would be disproportionate to the seriousness of the facts found.
50. The Committee determined that a reprimand is the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case. A reprimand marks the seriousness of the facts found proved and demonstrates to the public and the profession that the regulator takes this type of behaviour seriously.
51. The reprimand will be publicly recorded as the outcome of this case and will appear alongside Miss Ingram’s name on the GDC register for a period of 12 months.
52. The reprimand will form part of Miss Ingram’s fitness to practise history and may be disclosed to prospective employers or registration authorities in other jurisdictions.
53. Miss Ingram will receive written confirmation of this decision.
54. That concludes this case.