

PRIVATE HEARING

Health Committee Review Hearing

17 December 2025

Name: WILLIAMS, Charlotte

Registration number: 287262

Case number: CAS-203182-J5N0K9

General Dental Council: Instructed by Georgina Mayles, IHLPS

Registrant: Not Present and unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of adverse health, conviction and misconduct.

Outcome: Suspended indefinitely

Committee members: Helen Goulding (Chair, Lay Member)
Shabnum Ali (Dentist Member)
Kira Stearns (Dental Care Professional Member)

Legal adviser: Paul Kilcoyne

Committee Secretary: Jenny Hazell

At this hearing the Committee made a determination that includes some private information. That information has been omitted from this public version of the determination, and this public document has been marked to show where private material has been removed.

1. This was a resumed hearing pursuant to Section 36Q of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The purpose of this hearing was for this Health Committee (HC) to carry out a statutory review of the order of suspension on Ms Williams' registration. The hearing took place remotely on Microsoft Teams.

2. Neither party was present nor represented today following a request by the General Dental Council (GDC) that the hearing 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 Ms Williams and the GDC and on the basis of the papers. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on these matters.

Decision on Service of the Notice of Hearing

4. The Committee first considered whether notice of the hearing had been served on Ms Williams in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the GDC's Fitness to Practise Rules 2006 ('the Rules') and Section 50A of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The Committee received from the GDC an indexed hearing bundle, which contained a copy of the Notice of Hearing ('the notice'), dated 16 October 2025. The notice was sent by special delivery and first-class post to Ms Williams' registered address. The Committee was satisfied that the address shown on the Notice is the same address as that shown in the bundle as being Ms Williams' registered address. The Royal Mail receipt confirms that the notice was delivered and signed for on 17 October 2025, thereby complying with the 28-day notice period in Rule 28.

5. The Committee was satisfied that the notice sent to Ms Williams contained proper notification of today's hearing, including its time, date and that it will be conducted remotely, and the other prescribed information including notification that the Committee had the power to proceed with the hearing in Ms Williams' absence.

6. Additionally, the Committee notes that the GDC sent an email to Ms Williams on 16 October 2025, attaching a copy of the Notice.

7. On the basis of the information provided, the Committee was satisfied that the notice had been served on Ms Williams in accordance with the Rules and the Act.

Decision on Proceeding in the Registrant's Absence

8. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Williams and on the papers. The Committee approached the issue of proceeding in absence with the utmost care and caution. It bore in mind the need to be fair to both Ms Williams and the GDC, taking into account the public interest and Ms Williams' own interests in the expeditious review of the suspension order imposed.

9. The Committee was satisfied that all reasonable efforts had been taken to send the notification of hearing to Ms Williams in accordance with the Rules. It noted that the GDC made further efforts on 3 November 2025 to contact Ms Williams via email to confirm by 10 November 2025 whether she would undergo a health assessment and whether she would prefer the matter (ie the review hearing) to proceed with an oral hearing. No response was received from Ms Williams.

10. The Committee also noted a telephone attendance note dated 6 November 2025 which recorded that a member of GDC staff called Ms Williams on her registered mobile number but that the call rang out, with no answer.

11. The Committee has borne in mind that Ms Williams did not attend the substantive hearing in December 2023 and she has not engaged with these proceedings since then. The Committee has noted the HC's determination dated December 2023 which referred to an email from Ms Williams to the GDC dated 8 December 2023 where she had stated that she had "*explained on multiple times that I have not been practising. I do not intend to and do not wish to be on the register...*" No request has been made on her behalf for the hearing to be postponed or adjourned on the grounds that she is ill or for any other reason. The Committee concluded that Ms Williams had voluntarily absented herself and that to adjourn the hearing would not secure her attendance.

12. In those circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Williams and on the papers.

Private Hearing

13. The Committee noted the GDC's application, made in its written submissions, for today's hearing to be held in private in accordance with Rule 53. In the absence of either party, the Committee's review of the substantive order on Ms Williams' registration was conducted on the basis of the papers in the absence of any public observers. Nevertheless, in light of some of the information before it, which relates to Ms Williams' health, and following advice from the Legal Adviser, the Committee had regard to its power under Rule 53. It decided that it would produce a private and public version of its determination.

Background

14. On 13 December 2022, the HC found Ms Williams' fitness to practise as a dental nurse to be impaired by reason of her adverse health, her conviction and her misconduct. Ms Williams was neither present nor represented at that hearing.

15. In finding Ms Williams' fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of her adverse health, the HC stated:

[IN PRIVATE]

16. In finding Ms Williams' fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of misconduct, the HC had regard to her failure to co-operate with the GDC's investigation into her fitness to practise from April 2023 until at least July 2023. It stated:

"...In the absence of any evidence of remediation there remains a risk of repetition. There is a real risk to the public should Ms Williams be allowed to practise without restriction. Public confidence in the profession and this regulatory process also demands a finding of impairment given the seriousness of Ms Williams' failings. The public expects all dental professionals to act in a way both at work and in their private life which justifies the trust that patients place in them and the dental profession at large. She has acted in a way that has led to the GDC being unable to fully investigate the matter and in particular Ms Williams current state of health, which are clearly serious matters, and conduct that is inconsistent with the standards expected of those on the Register..."

17. In finding Ms Williams' fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of conviction, the HC stated: *"...The Committee considered that Ms Williams has not provided sufficient evidence of insight*

into her past wrong-doing and any remediation taken by her. Her conduct potentially put members of the public at risk.

18. [IN PRIVATE]

19. The HC directed that Ms Williams' registration be suspended for a period of twelve months with a review.

First review hearing – November 2024

20. The HC reviewed the suspension order on 29 November 2024. The matter was considered on the papers, in the absence of parties.

21. The HC noted that the GDC had emailed Ms Williams on previous occasions to invite her to undergo a health assessment, but no response was received. The HC noted that there was no evidence before it that Ms Williams had undertaken any remediation, shown any insight into the matters found proved or provided any information about her current state of health. The HC determined that Ms Williams remained impaired on the grounds of her adverse health, her conviction and her misconduct.

22. The HC also concluded that there remained a possible risk of repetition and a real risk of harm to the public and to wider public confidence in the profession in relation to Ms Williams' current health, her conviction and her misconduct.

23. The HC directed that Ms Williams' registration be suspended for a further period of 12 months with a review. It indicated that it would be helpful if Ms Williams attended the next hearing, and provided up to date information in relation to her health.

Today's review hearing

24. In its written submissions the GDC states that the GDC's Case Review Team (CRT) wrote to Ms Williams on 2 December 2025 to remind her of the HC's recommendations of November 2024. Further emails were sent to Ms Williams in September 2025, October 2025 and November 2025 in respect of a request to her to consent to a health assessment. On 6 November 2025 the GDC tried to call Ms Williams.

25. The GDC's position is that no correspondence has been received from Ms Williams and no material has been provided for this review.

26. The GDC refers to the Health Report dated 9 December 2025.

27. [IN PRIVATE].

28. The GDC submits that there has been no material change in circumstances since the last hearing. Ms Williams has not engaged with the GDC since the last review. In the absence of any evidence of remediation, insight or information about Ms Williams' current state of health, the public remains at risk if she were permitted to practise unrestricted.

29. Therefore, the GDC submitted that Ms Williams' fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of her health, conviction and misconduct. The GDC invited the Committee to direct that Ms Williams' registration be suspended indefinitely. It sets out that Ms Williams will have been suspended for two years on the date which the direction takes effect and advises that Ms Williams has been notified in the Notice that the Committee may give a direction that her registration be suspended indefinitely.

Committee's Decision on Impairment

30. It is the role of the Committee today to undertake a comprehensive review as per the request of the GDC. In doing so, the Committee has taken into account the information contained in the GDC's hearing bundle as well as the GDC's written submissions. No written submissions were received by or on behalf of Ms Williams. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee had regard to the Guidance for the Practice Committees including Indicative Sanctions Guidance, October 2016, revised December 2020, ("PCC Guidance").

Impaired by reason of health

31. [IN PRIVATE]

32. The Committee has concluded that Ms Williams' fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her adverse health.

Impaired by reason of conviction

33. The Committee went on to consider whether Ms Williams' fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her conviction.

34. The Committee considered that Ms Williams has not provided any evidence of insight into her past wrong-doing and any remediation taken by her. [IN PRIVATE]. Her conduct could potentially put members of the public at risk.

35. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Ms Williams' fitness to practise remains currently impaired by reason of her conviction.

Impaired by reason of misconduct

36. The Committee next considered whether Ms Williams' fitness to practise remains currently impaired by reason of her misconduct. It has borne in mind that Ms Williams initially engaged with the GDC but from April 2023 she failed to engage and respond to various requests by the GDC. The evidence points towards a consistent failure to co-operate with her regulatory body's investigation, albeit it notes that Ms Williams made it clear via email to the GDC in December 2023 that she no longer wished to be registered with the GDC.

37. The Committee has determined that Ms Williams' fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct. In the Committee's judgement there remains a real risk of harm to the public and to wider public confidence in the profession in relation to Ms Williams' misconduct. In the absence of any evidence of insight or remediation before this reviewing Committee, there remains a real risk of repetition. Public confidence in the profession and its regulation would also be undermined if no finding of impairment were to continue to be made on this ground.

38. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Ms Williams' fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct.

Committee's Decision on Sanction

39. The Committee next considered what sanction, if any, should be imposed on Ms Williams' registration. It bore in mind the need to protect patients and the public interest. The Committee has had regard to the principle of proportionality, weighing the interests of the public with Ms Williams' own interests.

40. The Committee was satisfied that taking no action and allowing the current suspension to expire would not protect the public. The Committee was also satisfied that imposing conditions would not be workable given Ms Williams' continuing non-engagement with these proceedings.

41. The Committee next considered whether to further extend the suspension order currently in place on Ms Williams' registration for a specified period. The Committee has borne in mind Ms Williams' failure to engage with the proceedings since prior to the initial HC hearing in December 2023. In these circumstances, the Committee considered that a further specified period of suspension would be of no benefit. There has been no material change in the circumstances of this case since the last review, and little or no progress since the suspension order was originally imposed in December 2023. For all these reasons, the Committee decided against the extension of the current order of suspension.

42. Accordingly, the Committee directs the indefinite suspension of Ms Williams' registration in accordance with section 36Q of the Act. In making this direction, the Committee was satisfied that the criteria for imposing an indefinite suspension have been met. It was the view of the Committee that the onus should now rest with Ms Williams to contact the GDC if she decides to re-engage with its fitness to practise process. The Committee noted that Ms Williams can request a review of the indefinite suspension order when at least two years have elapsed since the date on which the direction takes effect.

43. Unless Ms Williams exercises her right of appeal, her registration will be suspended indefinitely, 28 days from the date that notice of this direction is deemed to have been served upon her. 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.

44. That concludes this determination.